



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 18

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for lunch, so members would not have empty stomachs opposite, and could listen better or more easily. I was mentioning the fact that the Auditor General's Report, for the Year Ending March 31, 1970, showed that the Department of Debt Repayment, that is the Department of Government that pays interest on our debt and pays into sinking funds to meet the borrowing in the Year that ended March 31, 1970, was the fourth largest department. The largest spender was Education, next was Health, the third department, the Department of Welfare and the fourth was the department that pays interest charges and sinking fund payments. And that total in the Year Ending March 31, 1970 was \$39 million, to the nearest million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Estimates that were passed by this House for the Year that ended March 31, 1971, that is fifteen days ago, the Estimates that we passed last year, we discover that what should be the Department of Debt Repayment, that payments on interest and sinking funds last year brought that department up to number three. Last year in our estimates the gross expenditure of Current Account voted for Education \$82 million. I am giving it to the nearest million. We voted for the Department of Health \$63 million. This is on Current Account Gross. Low and behold, Debt Repayment, that is, payment of interest on our debt and payment to sinking funds, total \$50 million, approximately. And that came ahead of the Department of Welfare, the Department of Welfare or Social Services and Rehabilitation last year was \$45 million. So, as a result of the pass borrowing of the Government, the Government are now paying, in the year that just ended paid at least \$50 million to interest on the debt and sinking fund payments, to help meeting borrowings when they came due, \$50 million.

Other departments last year, Mr. Speaker, Welfare is \$45 million;

MR. CROSBIE: Interest on the Debt and Debt Repayments came ahead of Highways, both Current and Capital in Highways, which is \$49 million. It came ahead of Economic Development, it came ahead of Municipal Affairs and Housing, it came ahead of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, it came ahead of Legislative, Provincial Affairs, Finance, Fisheries, Supply and Services, Labrador Affairs, Community and Social Development, all those departments were picayune compared to the Department of Debt Repayment and sinking fund payment. The Government should probably start a department, Mr. Speaker, to be known as the "Department of Sinking Fund and Interest." It might be difficulty to find a minister to take over that job, because he would have a pretty sinking feeling, as he saw that department increasing in size each year. With the borrowing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, he is sinking, but he has not sunk. What was the placard we saw here two years ago, the fishermen from Placentia Bay were up picketing in front of Confederation Building and one of the placards where "Joey got her sunk." How true. "Joey's got her sunk." It is the sinking feeling one gets, when you consider the debt position of this Province. Mr. Speaker, \$50 million in the year that just ended. We know that in the year we are now in, we are fifteen days into the new Financial Year, we know that payments of interest this year will be up at least \$12 million to \$13 million, because of what the Government borrowed last year, \$12 million or \$13 million. So this year we can estimate that payments on interest and sinking funds are going to be \$65 million.

And as this record of reckless borrowing continues, Mr. Speaker, debt repayment is going to mount and mount and mount, until, within the next two or three or four years, at some point, it is going to be the biggest spending department. That is money, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be used by the Government on welfare payments, that cannot be used on grants to municipalities. It cannot be used for paying roads. It cannot

MR. CROSBIE: be used for paying salaries, because it has got to go to pay interest on our debt and sinking fund payment.

It is now the third largest department, and in addition to that, in addition to these sinking fund payments, we know, Mr. Speaker, that in the next two years, this year and next year, the Government have \$100 million in debt coming due, that has no sinking fund provided for it, that they have to borrow and repay in the next two years. That is certainly a frightening position. That is the position, Mr. Speaker, the state that the Government now have this Province in. The Province that is least able to afford this debt burden. As I said the other day, Personal Disposable Income in this Province, January 1st. 1970, was \$1400 per person, while in Nova Scotia it was \$2000 per person, while in Canada as a whole it was \$2400. So the people who are least able to bear this great debt burden, or least able to pay these high taxes, are the ones who are saddled with it here in Newfoundland.

And, as I pointed out the other day, Mr. Speaker, we are now in the position where the Newfoundland Government, it is costing the Newfoundland Government in excess of one and a-half percent more to borrow money than it does Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia has an issue of \$20 million. They pay seven point three percent interest, Newfoundland had a bond issue at about the same time, it pays eight and nine-tenths percent of the cost. And there have been borrowings by the Newfoundland Government in the past year where they paid over nine percent. Why is it that it costs us one and a-half percent more than Nova Scotia to borrow? The answer is that the investors consider this Province to be a far greater risk, because of the borrowing policy of the Government in the last five years. The Government that are borrowing at the rate of \$133 million a year, that are having deficits at the rate of \$100 million a year. That is the answer.

Steinburg Supermarket borrows at eight and a-half percent interest, almost half a percent interest less than the Newfoundland Government. That is where it is broadest. There is another point that needs to be made, Mr. Speaker, in this connection. And that is, the increasing cost

MR. CROSBIE: that we are being involved in with respect to guarantees of loans given by the Government. On page 39, of the Auditor General's Report for last year it lists payments that had to be made by the Government, because the people whose loans are guaranteed defaulted, and they amounted to \$1,270,000; Paragon Hotel Limited, Hotel Holdings, Limited, Skyways Motel Gander Limited, B.B. Spencer, Limited, the hotel in Windsor, Halfway House, Limited, the hotel in Carbonear, Hotel Buildings, Limited, that is the Crown Corporation that owns all the Holiday Inns, they defaulted \$1,061,000. The Government had to pay up.

And the Public Accounts for Newfoundland, for the year that just ended, page 5, again there is listed the payments under guarantees that had to be made by the Government. And that money now has to be voted in the estimates, Mr. Speaker. Now in the estimates each year, we are voting \$1.5 million, \$1.75 million that the Government have to pay out on these guarantees. The Public Accounts for 1969-70, page 63, it is shown here, paid out by the Government for that year, a year ago, \$1,728,000. had to be paid by the Government because they had guaranteed loans and the borrowers had defaulted. Brigus Knitting Mills \$151,000. Corner Brook Regional High School Board \$63,000. The Town of Clarenville \$83,000. B.B. Spencer, Limited \$54,000. Skyways Motel Gander, Limited \$13,000, Halfway House \$34,000. St. Anthony Athletic Club \$226,000. Bonavista Recreational Association \$310,000. Hotel Holdings \$38,000, Paragon Hotel \$9,000. Frontier Fishing \$21,000. Dawe's Nail and Hardware, Limited \$90,000. Hotel Buildings, Limited \$130,000. So ever increasing amounts, Mr. Speaker, have to be included under Consolidated -

MR. MURPHY: Assets and liabilities.

MR. CROSBIE: Not only in assets and liabilities, but under Consolidated Fund Services each year, the Government paying on guarantees have gone sour. And this year presumably will be no different.

MR. CROSBIE: Just look at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, Mr. Speaker, see what has happened with it. The increases in the prices of liquor and beer over the last five years. Increase after increase. Look at the mall-administration, the business of Atlantic Brewing \$407,000 owed by Atlantic Brewing to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Who took no action to collect it, because the hon. the Premier had given a letter to Atlantic Brewing assuring them that they did not have to pay any tax or commission, that they were legally obliged to pay. Now we are hoping to get it back from Bison Brewery in five or ten year bonds.

MR. EARLE: Without interest.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a question tabled about the Newfoundland Liquor Commission this year, I think, the licence fees for a brewer's agent, for taverns, for clubs and so on were doubled, or are very near doubled, to bring in more revenue. The Newfoundland Liquor Commission is paying in rentals \$377,000, for the year ending March 31, 1970. It is shown on page 321 of the Public Accounts.

It was disaussed in the House here last year, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous sums of money paid out by the Government on leases and by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission on leases, where the people of this Province are obliged to pay for little small liquor stores, 1600 square feet, in Grand Bank, Placentia, St. Lawrence, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission is paying rentals of \$12,000 a year, \$7.30 a square foot, \$12,000 a year, for twenty years, have entered into twenty year leases on those small buildings. So that the owner of the building, over the twenty year period, is going to get \$140,000 in rent for a building that costs perhaps \$35,000 or \$40,000. In other words, after the payment of five years rent is made or four years rent, \$12,000 a year, the owner has his money back and for the next sixteen years will collect \$12,000 a year from the people of Newfoundland. Two hundred and forty thousand dollars, over a twenty year period, for buildings that have 1660 square feet of space.

MR. CROSBIE: But, worse than that, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the people of Newfoundland do not know who those rents are being paid to. These three particular leases and another, and quite a few others, but these three particular leases, the lease is from the Royal Trust Company to the Government of Newfoundland and to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, and when the Government are asked a question, who owns those buildings? We all know the Royal Trust Company does not own them. We know they are not owned by the Royal Trust, they are acting as trustees for other individuals or companies. When the question was asked, who owns these buildings? Who is making this windfall? Who is making this terrific rental? Who is being paid this? When that question was asked the Government said it does not know, ask the Royal Trust Company. The Minister of Finance tabled an answer to a question of mine here today, about those leases. I have not had a chance to look at the leases, the Minister tabled the leases.

But, the part of the question that asked who is the owner of the buildings, the answer was; "ask the Royal Trust Company." Now why should a member of this House have to ask the Royal Trust Company who owns those leases? The Royal Trust Company is going to say that is a confidential matter between us and our client. That is not the point. They are not going to give that information. It is the Government that should know, and does know, and must know, who owns these buildings, because the real owner would have had negotiated with the Government about those leases, not the Royal Trust Company.

So, again, in this catalogue of mismanagement, and misadministration, Mr. Speaker, over the last five years, that is another item that has to be looked at. These tremendous rentals paid out, to whom we do not know, under twenty year leases - the leases are for twenty years. Instead of the Government or the Liquor Commission paying \$40,000 themselves, to put a building in St. Lawrence, to put one up in Placentia, or to put up one

MR. CROSBIE: in Grand Bank, instead of them doing that, \$120,000 for all three, instead of that, the Liquor Commission is paying out each year \$36,000 in rent and will pay over the twenty years \$720,000, for something that to put up all three costs \$120,000. How can that be right, Mr. Speaker, in a Province that has such limited resources, the limited financial ability that this Province does, where every cent and every dollar should count, if the Province is to expand and prosper as it should?

It is inexcusable. Giving those leases in the first place is inexcusable. But, then refusing to say who the actual owners of the leases are, who the actual owners of the buildings are, is even more inexcusable. Obviously, it is some friends of the Government, or some friends of someone in the Government, and the Government does not want the public to know who is making the bonanza.

MR MURPHY Look, I do not want to interrupt the Speaker.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I take my orders right from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, look at the Elizabethan Towers on Elizabeth Avenue, called Elizabeth Towers, Limited, but it should be called the "Elizabethan Towers," because seldom in the history of the Western World, since the Elizabethan age, has there been such oppulence in an apartment building to such little effect. We know that there are very swanky, lush penthouse apartments on the top floor, that only certain public servants can afford. We know that the public was told that they were going to cost \$2,500,000. We all remember "Terry, the Tiger Carter," in those days pointing out that it was going to cost double that, and being attacked and maligned by the Government for doing so.

Mr. Crosbie.

Remember, "Terry, the Tiger Carter" in those days pointing out that it was going to cost double that and being attacked in the line by the Government for doing so. Terrible Terry! Terrible Terry was terrifically right, when he said that. What is the actual cost, Mr Speaker? All we have to do is look at the public accounts for last year, under Elizabethan Towers. We will see whether "Terry the Tiger" was right. Elizabethan tigers -not Elizabethan tigers - Elizabethan Towers, page 200. On page 201, we see that the Elizabethan Towers has two bank loans of \$4 million, guaranteed by the Government, of Newfoundland and owes the St. John's Housing Corporation \$1,224,000. So that the investment in the Elizabethan Towers is \$5,224,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is there anyway to get the Opposition to pay a little attention, to show a little interest in this speech. Is there anyway to get them to wake up and pay some attention?

MR. CROSBIE: On this side of the House, we have heard of the "red rag" being waved in front of the bull. It is the first time we have seen the bull with the red rag on. On page 200...

MR. SMALLWOOD: I got them awake for awhile. They will be asleep again in five minutes from now. Drone on. Drone on.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier finds this boring.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. No! No! I am so excited by it.

MR. CROSBIE: Assets. Elizabethan Towers..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cannot wait for..

MR. CROSBIE: Furniture and equipment - building furniture and equipment, \$5,209,000. That is what it cost, not \$2.5 million, not even \$3.5 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not \$1.5 million, not \$500,000, not \$750,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly. I am glad to have this help

MR. SMALLWOOD: How exciting! How exciting!

MR. CROSBIE: \$5.25 million for this Elizabethan extravaganza on Elizabeth Avenue. In a Province which has such housing problems as this Province has, really, it is indefensible. It is indefensible! It was \$5 million guaranteed by the Province of Newfoundland..

MR. SMALLWOOD: The great democrat cannot stand it.

MR. CROSBIE: Part of our \$1 billion debt down on the Elizabeth Towers. It is only half full and now the Government are tearing out another floor and putting in commercial space so it can rent some more space to the Government itself. The deficit for one-half year, according to the public accounts (it is a wonder the Government allow these to be printed) the deficit for the first half year, Elizabeth Towers, Limited, for the six months ended December 31, 1969 lost for the period for six months, \$141,000. That was the first six months. The St. John's Housing Corporation has \$1.25 million tied up in it. that should be used to help develop subdivisions around St. John's; that should be used to help set a lower price for serviced land in St. John's. The St. John's Housing Corporation should not be gouging the public for all the market will bear. when it sells serviced land. It should be setting the price of land lower and keep the price of land low. Instead of that it has \$1.25 million tied up in Elizabethan extravaganza on Elizabeth Avenue. Is that the way to spend the public money, Mr. Speaker, when we have the housing conditions we have in St. John's, Corner Brook, Gander, Grand Falls, Grand Bank and elsewhere around the Province? That is \$5 million that should have been spent for subsidized rental housing, or \$5 million that should have been spent for shell housing and other endeavours to overcome our tremendous housing problems.

However, mentioning that just bores the Government. So, I will not pursue it at any great length. There are many other examples. We have

Mr. Crosbie

Prince Philip Place, where the Government are whacking out hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in rental. We have the Elizabethan Towers - the Elizabethan Towers by the way, in January, 1970 was still saying that it would not cost the public anything, that there was no deficit. Now we know what it has cost, and what the deficits are. Prince Philip Place, the Government are paying \$294,000 a year in rentals to Prince Philip Place, \$294,000 a year. Board of Liquor Control, \$32,000, a twenty year lease. Power Commission, \$140,000 and a five year lease. Workmen's Compensation Board, \$79,000, a twenty year lease, Board of Commission of Public Utilities, \$42,000, twenty years. The total, \$294,000 a year. That is going into Prince Philip Place. In addition to that those agencies have to spend their own money in interior partitions. They had to spend extra to get parking facilities. They had to spend extra in moving and the rest of it. What a sad situation.

Expo buildings: It can almost make me cry, you know, really. I think I do need a handkerchief. I got a handkerchief. I have a handkerchief. All right, the hon. the Premier is very kind. This really is sad, Mr. Speaker. Now where was I? Yes, we are off the Elizabethan. We are on Expo. One other point on buildings.

MR. HICKMAN: That is the Expo 1967.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. member opposite, perhaps, could enlighten us as to how many of the matters he refers to and which loosened the tears, were so evident, while he was a member of the Government?

MR. CROSBIE: Quite a few of them, Mr. Speaker. That is why I am no longer a member of the Government. Ah! Ah! Ah! Ah!

MR. HICKMAN: Touche'

MR. CROSBIE: That is the exact reason why I am no longer a member of the Government.

Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. Speaker, Expo buildings. They were going to cost this Province \$750,000. That is what we were assured by the Premier. These two summer-time shells of buildings from Montreal, the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav pavilions, \$750,000.

Then the House was told that the firm of Lundrigans were going to erect them and do all that and at the end of the whole business would present a bill. Last year \$100 was voted by the House for Expo buildings. The Opposition questioned it. The Opposition said that we will spend millions, if these are false estimates, if these are not true estimates. The Government said not a word of truth in it. We do not have to pay a cent on Expo buildings this year. That is what the Government said in this House last year. What do we find when the Lieutenant Governor's Warrants are tabled? Just about \$2 million spent on Expo buildings during those twelve months, not \$100 but \$2 million. What was spent by the Government before that? There was another \$2 million. So to date, Mr. Speaker, they have cost \$4 million. The hon. member for Burin, I believe said that so far, in Grand Bank, there is only a few pieces of steel on the site. They are going to end up costing..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Somewhere between eight and ten pieces.

MR. CROSBIE: Eight or ten pieces.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Eight or ten pieces of steel.

MR. CROSBIE: They are going to end up costing this Province, these magnificent Expo Buildings.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About \$500,000 each.

MR. CROSBIE: They are going to end up costing this Province about \$6 to \$7 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In other words about \$1 million a piece.

MR. CROSBIE: There are two buildings. And that would make them \$3.5 million each. They are being erected into three buildings.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. pieces at \$3.5 million, is how much?

MR. CROSBIE: There is no money spent down in Burin.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Less than \$500,000 per piece of steel. Seven feet long would they be?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman thought that there was no money spent on the buildings down in Burin, but according to the public accounts, for last year, under the Department of Public Works, we will see differently. The hon. member is going to get a surprise. (Where is that hidden. It is here somewhere, Economic Development, Bell Island Corporation. It is here somewhere. They are trying to hide Public Works on me. But I know it is here) .He will find that there were two hundred and some odd thousand dollars supposed to be spent at Grand Bank on those buildings last year. Public Works page 101. It was not last year, the year before last. Here it is here, page 102 of the public accounts for a year ago. It shows the following expenditure on Expo buildings: \$1,501,000 - \$1,501,000. Somewhere there is a breakdown showing what was spent in Burin. That is, if I can find it. Here it is here. Expo building, Grand Bank, \$260,000. The total to date \$344,000. So of that amount \$344,000 was for the Expo building in Grand Bank; \$393,000 for the Expo building in Gander; \$895,000 for the Expo building at Grand Falls and \$95,000 for Expo building works of art. There is a real work of art to get those Expo buildings. That was the breakdown to a year ago. Now the House has just been given a Lieutenant Governor's Warrant for another \$ 2million. So that it is \$3.5 million to date. How much is supposed to be spent at Grand Bank, I do not know. A year ago it was supposed to be that amount.

There are a whole lot of other things I could say, Mr. Speaker. But there are other members of the House who want to speak. I doubt that there will be anybody speak from the other side. I could outdo the Premier's record, but I feel it is too much for him to bear in one year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not stop. Do not stop. Do not give up. That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: If we had an election, he would have his record for long windedness destroyed in the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is if St. John's West re-elects the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Eight hours or ten hours, the Premier went one time, or was it twelve?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I went for five days.

MR. CROSBIE: Those were in the wonderful days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every word was precious and every word was commonsense.

MR. CROSBIE: Those were in the wonderful days, when the Premier thought he had the Province by the ears.

MR. NOLAN: Tell us why you were over here.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I never wrote a speech for the Premier.

You know, the Premier has never had anybody to write a speech for him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Because I do not need them.

MR. CROSBIE: It might be that in recent months, however. Perhaps this is an indication. The Cabinet Ministers are now writing speeches for the Premier. That is quite an admission. It was not done in my day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never need them.

MR. CROSBIE: It was not done in my day. They used to spring fully feathered from the hon. the Premier without anybody doing it for him, the day I was in the Cabinet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The difference between the hon. gentleman and me is that I did my practicing in the M.C.L. I. That is where I practiced.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier used to be the barrelman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Could we proceed with the order of business.

MR. CROSBIE: I am doing my best, Mr. Speaker, to proceed. We all appreciate the fact that the hon. the Premier was a barrelman at one day. Now he is the "Conversation with the Premier" man. The two programmes are exactly the same, both fictional. The great practice he had in the barrelman days telling stories is now being repeated on VOXM every morning. There is a story on this morning, every morning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Wit is utterly devastating.

MR. CROSBIE: I know the Premier loves..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Devastating wit.

MR. CROSBIE : These compliments are overcoming me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh!

MR. CROSBIE: But, Mr. Speaker, I could go on. I have a lot of material here on health. I have not touched on health. I have not touched on the \$100 million worth of hospitals that the Government has promised to build this year. I have not mentioned a word on it. They promised to build at Carbonear, in that area, after the plebiscite. The Minister of Health suffered from plebiscitis. The Premier said that they were going to have a plebiscite there in the Carbonear area. He now answers, no. There is the hospital at Carbonear, the hospital at Twillingate. There is a massive University hospital at Memorial. There is an extension of 284 beds on the West Coast Hospital. There is an extension to the Mental Hospital. There are medical school buildings over on the campus here, all totaling some \$60 million, \$80 million or \$100 million, which the Government are going to build this year, according to the great

MR. CROSBIE: The great disarmament conference. The disarmament conference was the conference held in January to disarm the people of Newfoundland. That is the one they had televised in the Arts and Culture Centre. Disarm the public so they would keep this Government in power. Pretending to the public that the Government has unlimited billions of dollars to spend in every nook and cranny of the island this year.

Well Mr. Speaker, while I know the hon. the Premier has not been paying much attention, or pretends he is not paying much attention, and while I know that the hon. the Premier is not going to pay any attention, the facts that have been presented so far in this debate to this House, show inalterably why, and how necessary it is to have a change of Government in this Province.

Health; I have not touched on health at all. I have not touched on Community and Social Development. There are dozens of subjects not touched on. They will be touched on by other speakers. The pity of it is Mr. Speaker, all right, the hon. the Premier wants some more. Will I continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Do not deprive us of all this wisdom.

MR. MURPHY: Carry on.

MR. CROSBIE: I will give some figures on these hospitals.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: There is St. Clare's Mercy Hospital now being.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us about the meeting at Spaniard's Bay.

MR. CROSBIE: Concluded, \$14 million. Regional hospital at Carbonear will cost at least \$5.5 million. The hospital at Twillingate \$3.5 million at least. The new university hospital if there is a 400 bed general hospital built for the medical school, in connection with the medical school, I will state now Mr. Speaker that that will cost at least twenty to twenty-four million dollars. If it is to be a university teaching hospital of 400 beds.

There is the extension to the Western Memorial Hospital at Corner Brook, that will cost in the nature of around \$8 million. The extension to the mental hospital here at St. John's will cost two to three million dollars. Twillingate, Carbonear, extensions and renovations to other hospitals. There are the medical school buildings themselves at memorial, apart from the

university hospital. That programme Mr. Speaker will total \$82 million in construction. The Government has not explained how it is going to finance that, how it is going to arrange that. It has promised that it is going to do it all. How is it going to finance it? Another \$100 million to be borrowed. How are they going to go about that?

The Government has not explained, Mr. Speaker, just to recapitulate before I sit down: The Government has not explained....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not sit down. Do not deprive us of all this wisdom.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum.

MR. CROSBIE: No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: You cannot say it is our fault, we are all here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: They are coming out of the cracks, from under the rocks. Do they get a sessional fee I wonder?

MR. CROSBIE: To recapitulate Mr. Speaker

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has lost his wisdom.

MR. CROSBIE: We have lots of speakers to speak on this side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we want the hon. gentleman's wisdom.

MR. CROSBIE: I will start again Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, start all over, from the beginning.

MR. CROSBIE: Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not, go ahead.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier has not learned a thing apparently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are anxious to hear it.

MR. CROSBIE: I will summarize.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, do not summarize, wait for a day or two.

MR. CROSBIE: Then I will not summarize.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not, just start from the beginning.

MR. CROSBIE: I will temporize.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could tell the hon. member another word, but I will not.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Premier has a great way with words, or used to have a great way with words. Now he has to listen occasionally, he does not like it.

He is on V.O.C.M. whining and wailing that the House is not doing its business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Crying.

MR. CROSBIE: Crying and bawling.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Roaring?

MR. MURPHY: This is really getting out of hand, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be given a chance to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A chance to speak? We are dying to hear him speak as all the other gentlemen were yesterday afternoon. Not one of them was in the House. Not one.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order Please! Would the hon. gentleman carry on?

MR. CROSBIE: If I can Mr. Speaker, we are used to this.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister of Pollution just piped up. Mr. Speaker, to summarize....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to him will you. What a gusher.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think he has petered out.

MR. CROSBIE: What a gusher.

MR. MURPHY: Barnum and Bailey would not put on such a show.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, if I summarize. The Resolution is one of non-confidence, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why it is being moved, and the reason why it should be accepted by the House is that it is one hundred percent accurate. In the last five years this Government did not adequately maintain, improve the public services of Newfoundland, it cut them back. It cut back the payment of social service allowances, welfare payments. It instituted a needs test for students attending Memorial University. It cut back on the grants to school boards, the operating grants to school boards. It cut back in several other directions which I have enumerated before in this speech. It has, despite claiming there has been tight money in effect the last five years, borrowed a record amount of in excess of \$660 million, at the rate of \$133 million a year.

It now has to pay in interest in sinking funds each year, an amount of \$50 million in the year just ended, and \$65 million coming up, so that item is now the third biggest spending department of the Government. 1250

It increased taxes in every direction in the last five years. The S.S.A. tax by two percent from five to seven. Gasoline tax by six cents a gallon. The personal corporation tax by five percent. The corporation tax was increased twice. They cut out the water and sewage subsidy instituted in '66. It has increased taxes and reduced services in the last five years. It has pretended that there was tight money in effect so it had to make these cut-backs at a time when it never borrowed so much. From 1949 to 1966, the Government borrowed \$333 million direct and indirect. From 1966 to today, the Government borrowed some \$660 million direct and indirect in those five years. The average for the seventeen years, from '49 to '66, \$20 million a year. The average from '66 to '71 \$133 million a year, in those five years, yet pretending all the while that there was tight money.

The Government is now in a position where it pays one and a half percent more in interest when it borrows than our neighbouring Province of Nova Scotia, and Nova Scotia has had the disaster of the heavy water plant that cost them \$120 million or \$130 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$109 million.

MR. CROSBIE: \$109 million the other day, but apparently, according to the papers it is up to \$120 million or \$130 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$109 million as of three days ago.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, \$109 million is bad enough. Despite that disaster, Nova Scotia is borrowing today at one and a half percent less interest than we are. Less cost. The Government has been so incautious in its financing that it has borrowed hundreds of millions of dollars, or a hundred million without making any arrangements for payment in the sinking fund, so that in the next two years \$100 million has to be repaid by the Government, so that it has to go out and borrow \$100 million just to repay it. The Government, just because this is election year, will borrow this year, my guess is, no matter what the budget shows, \$150 million to \$200 million to put on a good show in election year. In addition to the other forty it has to borrow to pay off.

The year after that it will have to borrow again just to keep standing still. \$100 million plus money to pay off the past borrowing. That is the 1251

position the Government has the Province in. From the record of the last five years, it can be seen, that if the Government stays in office this year, that next year, or at the least 1973, there will be a general tax increase and further decreases in services.

The Government will not answer, or has not answered yet, Mr. Speaker, two important points that I posed about the oil refinery at Come by Chance. Number (1), the \$5 million. They have not disputed the fact that the performance put on by the Premier and the Minister of Health last October, when they pretended that the \$5 million interim financing was paid back, was that exactly, a stage show, a pretense, that in fact, it never happened. The \$5 million is outstanding, Mr. Shaheen had the money, and we cannot even get an audited report on how he spent it.

The Government has not answered the point that I pointed out this morning, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Procon construction contract at Come by Chance, when I pointed out all the clauses that mean that the Government can be responsible for more money in connection with that project. \$118 million worth of machinery and goods to come from England out of the \$155 million, and the contract says that the Provincial Buildings, the Government of Newfoundland, is responsible if there is any customs duties or federal sales tax or any taxes in Canada at all. That could very well amount to \$10 million to \$20 million, only the Government can know. The Premier will not deny that this material and equipment may be subject to these customs duties and sales taxes. He cannot deny because it is in the contract, that if they are subject to those duties and taxes the people of Newfoundland have to pay them, not Shaheen, not Shaheen Natural Resources or Procon. Procon is getting \$155 million and that does not include any of those duties or taxes. He cannot deny that the Procon contract is not a turnkey contract. Clause after clause says that if there is any additional cost the money must be found by Provincial Buildings, that is the Newfoundland Government. If there is any overtime instituted down there we have to pay the extra cost. If there are any payments for patents or licenses we have to pay the extra cost. If there is any extra cost because of currency fluctuations we have to pay the extra cost, the people of Newfoundland. Instance after instance in that contract yet the Government has not explained

that to the people of Newfoundland.

The Government pretends that it is costing \$155 million, when even today we know that it is \$160 million, and when with customs duties and other increases and the rest of it, it may go to \$180 million or \$200 million quite possibly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier will not pipe up and say that there are no customs duties or sales taxes, we do not hear a word. We know that a year ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Pepin, announced that the Federal Government were concerned with countries that were exporting to Canada and financing the exports by giving cheap credit, low interest rates, the same situation we have at Come by Chance. In fact, it was while that issue was being debated the five and a half percent interest being given by England, the export credit guarantees of E.C.G.D., this is the finance English export, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the Federal Government was getting very, very concerned about this because, these were under-cutting Canadian manufacturers, and that an investigation was being made into that. What effect is that having on the refinery at Come by Chance? Not a word from the Premier on that. Not one sound, not a syllable, not a murmur on the customs duties or sales tax.

We know that there is a provision under the Customs and Tariff Laws that if machinery and equipment can be manufactured in Canada, and it is being imported, that the tariff board can increase the duty on it to protect the Canadian manufacturer. Does that apply to this Come by Chance machinery and equipment? Not a word on that. Not a word on the true situation with respect to the wharf which I neglected to add.

The wharf which is going to cost \$16 million to \$20 million. The Federal Government does not trust the Shaheen project to see that that is paid back. It is asking the Newfoundland Government, through its Crown Corporation, to guarantee repayment of it. We have never had an honest explanation of that from the Premier. There is another \$16 million to \$20 million. We can add that now to the \$160 million, so it is \$160 million plus the wharf which we are going to be obliged to see is repaid, plus the customs duties, the sales taxes and other

escape clauses in the agreement. We do not hear a word from the Government about that. The House of Assembly should not need to be opened to get that information, we should have had it last October when the documents were being signed. We did not have it then, we do not have it now.

The Premier says; "oh the business of the House is being obstructed," what tripe. We have been here now, this is our tenth day and we cannot get a word from the Government on what the true situation financial and economic of this Province is, or Come by Chance. We have a situation where the Javelin mill in Stephenville, we know not from the Government, not a word from the Government, we know from a financial prospectus filed down in New York that the price of that has gone up \$15.9 million since last year. So that our guarantee is now \$75 million instead of being \$58 million. Is there a word from the Government about that? Any explanation about that? No. Anybody who brings that up in the House, are they obstructing the business of the country? Or, is that the business of the country? Is it not the business of the country, guarantee that the Government gives and how it spends its money? That is the business of the country. But the Government is not giving an explanation about any of it. Trying to pretend that the Opposition are obstructing the business. That is our business, to try to find out some of these facts and information for the people of Newfoundland, instead of the fairy tales. to divert the people's minds from these issues, what happens? The Premier adjourns the House, if there were such pressing business to be done in this House, why was it adjourned from April 2nd. to April 13th. while the Premier and three or four Cabinet Ministers and the hon. member for Bonavista South, the only one that could really benefit from the trip went down to Louisiana to look at oil wells?

offshore oil wells. I can see sending Dean Bruneau down and some of these other experts who can appreciate what they are seeing and related to what it might be like off the coast of Newfoundland. But not the Premier and the rest traipsing off to Louisiana, to pretend that we are going to have an oil boom and gas boom here in Newfoundland this year and next, That is all that was for, to get the public's minds off the real problems here in Newfoundland. Some more pie in the sky, to wave in this election year. That was not the purpose of the trip, we all know that side trips were made Florida and everything else during that week. If the business of the House was so pressing the House could have stayed open. Why does the House have to shut every time the Premier wants to go somewhere? There are twenty-nine on the other side and ten on this side, we cannot overthrow the Government just because the Hon. the Premier goes off somewhere. Was he nobody over there he can leave in charge? To get on the radio and get on with tripe that the business of the House is being obstructed

The Government calls the business of the House and we are ready to deal with it. But we have a Government that will not answer the most serious questions that tries to pretend that it is all very boring and just tripe and there is nothing to answer. We would not need this debate if the Government would just give the House and the public the facts, but instead of that it tries to hide and obscure the facts, and that is why this part of this non-confidence motion states; "...deplores the failure of the Government during the same period to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning the economic and financial position of the Province, as well as failure to answer questions tabled here." The other night, Mr. Speaker, I reviewed the five Budget Speeches and five Speeches From the Throne that were given since 1966. Misstatement after misstatement in them. The 1967 Budget Speech, a turnkey contract has been given to Litton Industries to construct the pulp and paper mill

at Come by Chance, a deliberate misstatement of facts, was never done, no such contract or if there were what happened to it? It is not there now. The Budget Speech 1968 where the Government pretends that the Government takes \$90 million from the pockets of Newfoundlanders and gives them back \$104 million, and actually says that the Government of Newfoundland is costing the public of Newfoundland nothing. Imagine that for a piece of bluff; and the same budget speech going on and jacking up the taxes and putting up the SSA Tax and posing a means test on salaries and allowances at Memorial. This is just a couple of the more extreme examples. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this resolution of non-confidence is being moved and why I will support it and why I trust that members on both sides of the House will support it.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a period - when the Hon. the Premier is up in the gallery next year looking down we will not shout out "I spy strangers" if he happens to laugh or make an explanation, when he sees his successor sitting over there. The Hon. the Premier actually will be invited to sit in the Speaker's gallery, and if he makes the odd noise we will not say "I spy strangers," as he has said -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The gentleman is all heart. He loves me, the way he loves me it scares me to death.

MR. CROSBIE: I have the same deep abiding affection for the Hon. the Premier that he has for me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same love.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ever since he got trimmed in the Leadership Convention and he failed to become Premier, he loves me to death. Especially to death.

MR. CROSBIE: There is the same childish old stuff. The same childish old stuff. Leadership Convention.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Loves me to death. No, the hon. gentleman was not in that

Convention. He did not try to become Leader of the Liberals. Now he is voting Tory.

MR.CROSBIE: It was thought in those days Mr. Speaker, that it could be the same Liberal Party of Newfoundland but there is no chance of that now. The Premier is going to go down and take the Liberal Party with him, and to get a change of Government the Liberal Party has to be defeated to, that is the simple facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is being that, the five years I have mentioned the period of waste and extravagance. It has been a period of misguided industrial schemes. It has been a period of folly and incompetence -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Two Tories and five Liberals here - that is seven.

MR.CROSBIE: The trouble is that the enormity of this, Mr. Speaker, is yet to be realized.

MR.SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has the House in the hollow of his hand.

MR.CROSBIE: And the price of all this has yet to be paid.

MR.SMALLWOOD: We are here breathless with excitement listening -

MR.SPEAKER: Order -

MR.SMALLWOOD: The reason is they are gone out of the House, now he is going. Hard to take. Hard to take.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to speak uninterrupted and no one minds an interjection or something going back and forth but -

MR.SPEAKER: As the hon. gentleman said it is very difficult to hear. The Chair cannot enforce order in the House unless hon. members want order enforced. That is the first thing. Secondly, what happens is that an hon. member begins speaking in a light vein and get conversation back across the floor, the very people ask for order then are the people who break the rules of order and so on. Now it is impossible for the Chair to maintain order in this House unless the members want order maintained.

MR.CROSBIE: The only order I asked for, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not

mind an interjection across the floor but if somebody is just to out-shout you for two or three minutes, that is a different matter. Nobody minds a bit of heckling and banter but for all those reasons Mr. Speaker, despite the Premier's request, I will end up by saying that there is more than ample reason for this non-confidence motion, that the record of the last five years is a pitiful one and that we can only hope that the Government that has this record is going to be reversed this year, so that a Government, so someone can get into power who is going to seriously inform the people of Newfoundland what the position is and what can be done about it, and get this situation under control before it is too late.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please! The motion is that this House regrets the failure of the Government since 1966 to adequately maintain and improve the public service of the Province of Newfoundland despite severe increase in taxation in the Province of Newfoundland and despite the borrowings by the Government of monies and the guarantees of the borrowings of money by the Government of Newfoundland at a rate during the five financial years from April 1, 1966 three times in excess of borrowing of the Government for the seventeen years from April 1, 1949. and the failure of the Government during the same period to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning economic and financial position of the Province as well as the failure of the Government to answer fully and completely questions tabled in this House by members hereof touching upon the public affairs of the Province and therefore states that it has no confidence in the Government.

MR.MARSHALL: I rise in support of this non-confidence motion. It is very applicable to the present time. One of the reasons why this Government has been unable to maintain public services Mr. Speaker, is because of the lack of planning that we have heard so much about from time to time.

At the inception of this Government there was a Royal Commission Report made, that the Government has obviously ignored. It shows during its tenure to go from crisis to crisis, from the fishermen down in Placentia Bay, in that situation, to the present situation with respect to the teachers, the Government is unable to plan. It is unable to plan because it is spending so much beyond its means. This can be very easily seen Mr. Speaker, when one compares the estimated borrowings and the actual borrowings of this particular government. We all know that in 1966 what iniquitous legislation went through this House.

This was legislation empowering the Government, empowering the Cabinet to borrow money, to pledge the credit of the Province. This has been spoken about again and again. The powers originally were a little bit less and they became more and more expanded. We see the situation - I have a table here before me now - which, going south, the divergence between the estimated borrowing and the actual borrowings of this Government. It is a very interesting table because in 1965 - 66, this is before this particular legislation was used, Mr. Speaker, we had an estimate of borrowing of \$20 million and an actual borrowing of \$20 million, and so on, before that pretty well on line, so it should be at all times. There should not be a cent borrowed in this Province unless the Legislature passes on it. But Lo and Behold! let us take a look at the effect of the Act of the Amendment to the Revenue and Audit Act empowering the Government to borrow in its own secret Cabinet Chamber. In 1966-67, the estimated borrowings were \$28 million. But the actual borrowings were \$56 million; 1967-68, \$56 million was the estimated borrowings. The actual borrowings in secret Cabinet sessions were \$96 million, a difference of \$43 million of our money was borrowed in the Cabinet before the House knew about it, under the provisions of that Act. Not quite that bad in 1968-69; \$46 million estimated, \$67

million actual. Here we have a \$21 million borrowed in the secret Cabinet Chamber.

We come up to 1969-70, we see a difference of \$13 million, between the actual borrowings and the estimated borrowings, \$50 million were estimated to be necessary to be borrowed by the Crown in 1969-70 but actually \$63 million were borrowed, that is \$13 million. The good all and end all comes this year. In 1970-71, the estimated last year that this Province would have to borrow a sum of \$70 million and in actual fact, as far as we know at present, \$125 million has been borrowed and that is a whopping difference of \$45 million borrowed in the secret confines of the Cabinet. Now under the provisions of this Act it is all very well to say that the Cabinet must come and inform the Legislature of the borrowings, and they know about it. It is absolutely nothing that this Legislature can do about an act by the Government of this nature. It must honour the dead. It is delegated authority improperly. Probably not improperly, there were a different group of people in charge, but the situation I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been proven positive that the powers that were delegated by the Legislature to the Cabinet since 1966, have been abused and misused by the executive arm of this Government to the detriment of the people of this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the hon. gentleman tell me if he knows of any other one of the remaining nine Provinces of Canada? Is there another one besides Newfoundland that has the same authority? Is there another Province another Government?

MR. MARSHALL: If the Hon. the Premier will sit down I shall tell him, there are other Provinces. There are a few others -

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many? How many? How many?

MR. MARSHALL: But they have not abused the powers they have been given.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many? How many have the powers?

MR.MARSHALL: There are about five or six I -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Nine -

MR.MARSHALL: Oh no, about five or six I would say.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Nine. Nine. Nine. Nine other Provinces altogether.

MR.MARSHALL: I could not care less if there were twenty other Provinces, in every state but -

MR.SMALLWOOD: No, of course not, but it suits the hon. gentleman -

MR.MARSHALL: There is no state in the Western World that has abused its powers that have been delegated to it, like this Liberal Government has -

MR.SMALLWOOD: We are a Liberal Government -

MR.MARSHALL: None at all. Here we have here \$45 million in the secret confines of Cabinet borrowed that we have to pay back, As I say, it is a shocking abysmal abuse of the powers that has been delegated to it. We see the result if we look at the Supplementary Supply Bills that have come in, the mounting Supplementary Supply Bills that have come since 1966. There was \$53 million in 1966-67, \$54 million more supplementary supply sought. They had the money so they are going to spend it anyway, \$54 million spent as the result of borrowing, all of this excess money, in 1967-68. In 1968-69 we have \$23 million, 1969-70, \$21 million; and this year we have warrants, the information that we have, there has been spending on Lieutenant Governor's warrants last year of a whopping \$43 million, this is directly referable and relative to the power given to the Cabinet to borrow money. The Cabinet has unlimited, pretty well an unlimited supply of money in so far as its creditors will continue to lend money to the Cabinet, to the Government. That being so, they also spend and they are spending beyond their means. They are not able to balance the Budget. They have not been

able to balance the Budget. As a result of this they have not been able to provide any positive type of planning. As a result of this we have gone in the past five years, from crisis to crisis, over and over and over again -

MR. MARSHALL:

We are at the situation now where we pretty well have to stick our finger in the dyke because of the mounting debt that we have, over \$1. billion and it is all due, it is all due to the lack of proper management and you can put a lot of it at the foot by tracing the history of the borrowings of this Government. You can lay a lot of it at the foot of this legislation in 1966-1967 authorizing the Cabinet to borrow money, which has been abused. I say, Mr. Speaker, as no other Government in the Western society has ever abused the power entrusted to it.

So we talk about balancing the budget. It is absolutely necessary that we balance the budget. We are told this by the Liberal Government in one of its budget speeches and I want to quote from the one, I believe it was 1968-1969 on page 82 because it becomes very sad, it would be humorous, it would be very, very humorous if the situation had not become as grave as it is right now. I quote on page 82 of the Budget Speech by the Government of the Province, "A fast growing, fast expanding economy needs to have considerable amounts of fresh capital pouring into it at all times. That fresh capital must come almost entirely from outside the boundaries of our Province. It must come from investors, either directly or through our banks, bond houses or other financial institutions. These investors must feel that their money if invested in the Newfoundland economy will not only give a satisfactory return but is invested safely as well. There must be confidence in Newfoundland, in Newfoundland's economy and in Newfoundland's Government. This confidence could not last if Newfoundland's Government failed to maintain its finances in a condition of health and strength.

To say the very least, the Budget must be balanced. It is entirely possible even probable in such a fast growing Province that unexpected expenses arising in any year would tend to thrust the budget out of balance for that year. Catastrophe, storm damage, fishery failure can involve the Government in considerable exceptional expenditure and that is to be expected and when such events thrust the budget out of balance, in that year, a determined and successful effort must be made to balance the budget in the succeeding year or the two years succeeding and to collect sufficient

MR. MARSHALL:

additional revenue to take care of the deficit." Then briefly quoting on page 91, "We have decided"(this is the Government speaking)"two years ago that at all costs, at any cost we will balance the budget, we will keep Newfoundland's name good in the financial markets of the world. We will maintain Newfoundland's credit. We will prove to all concerned that Newfoundland has the courage and the skill to balance its budget." What a fraud, what a fraud that is when you judge it in relation to the present day performance and the performance since that time. Look at your supplementary supply. There was a valiant attempt made last year, look at the Lieutenant Governor's warrants, a valiant attempt made last year to balance the budget, \$43. millions of dollars by Lieutenant Governor's warrants. There you see the sincerity in the direction of this Government.

It is quite true that the foreign investors must have confidence in Newfoundland and in the economy of the Province and in the Government of the Province but I doubt very much whether they have too much confidence now in the Government of this Province and if this Government keeps on very much longer unfortunately they will not have any confidence in the economy of the Province and that will be a very, very serious situation and a sad, sad day for this Province. As a result of this, and I want to say again, emphasize again that the biggest problem that Newfoundland is facing now is a Cabinet that has taken the powers that have been delegated to it and has abused it and as a result of this there is an appearance, a false appearance that there was money galore, there was money for everything. We saw an example of this given at the Economic Development Conference and as a result of this particular attitude of the Government, what have we seen? We have seen a country that has lost faith in the Government of this Province and rightly so. We have seen unrest and acrimonious strikes such as this Province has never seen before. It is an abuse of the power of Government and it is diastereous.

Unless, Mr. Speaker, the legislatures of this Province, the general public of the Province, the news media and every section and segment of our society see the need to restore this assembly to its proper place in relation

MR. MARSHALL:

to the arrangement of the fiscal and social affairs of this Province diastereous results will pertain. We have seen, I say, the by-products of these particular acts by the Cabinet, we have seen the by-products of the loss of faith of the people of this Province in this Government and rightly so in the events which have transpired over the past five years. How can we have confidence, how can anyone have confidence in a Government or an entity which is abusing its powers?

Then we go on now, Mr. Speaker, the non-confidence motion touches upon answers to questions and I would certainly agree that questions have not been answered fully and completely. Not only completely, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid not completely correctly either and I want to quote and go into some detail with respect to question 195, appearing on the Order Paper of March 29th, last, as an example of the inability of the Government to completely and fully answer questions. That question asked by the hon. the member of Gander to the Premier asked, (1) "Who was the contractor to whom Hotel Buildings, Limited owed \$50,000. as shown in the Public Accounts the 31st of March 1969?" The answer given was Lundrigan's, Limited. The second question was, "What work or services were performed which created this indebtedness and at what date was it incurred?" The answer, transferred to title of land. (3) "Has this amount since been paid to the contractor involved?" The answer was yes. Then a supplementary question was asked about the area of the land involved and the distinct impression given at the time, by the hon. Premier, I asked a supplementary question was that, "Oh, this related to the land upon which Holiday Inns is built out on the road out there in St. John's."

Now this question, because this is very important, Mr. Speaker, and I want to go into it in some depth but this speaker was motivated by an observation of the Auditor General on March 31st, 1969 in the accounts of Hotel Buildings, Limited, on page 239. His note to the shareholder and he said in his report to the shareholders, "In connection with my examination of the accounts of the company, the company being Hotel Buildings, Limited, exclusive of those maintained by the operator, I report that: (1) the increase

MR. MARSHALL:

in the value of fixed assets, land, St. John's in the amount of \$50,000. and the balance will show that the fixed assets increased in 1968 from \$210,940. for land in St. John's to \$260,940 which is a difference of \$50,000. The increase in the value of the fixed assets of \$50,000., says the Auditor General, have not been supported by a valuation satisfactory to me. I am unable to express an opinion on this item pending a receipt of a recognized appraiser's report which I have requested the company to obtain."

Then again on March 31st, 1970, the Auditor General addressing himself to this particular observation, on page 251 of the Public Accounts, in the report to the shareholders of Hotel Buildings said, "In my report to the shareholders for the year ended 31 March 1969, reference was made to an increase in the value of fixed assets, land, at St. John's, in the amount of \$50,000., which was not supported by a valuation report satisfactory to me, and that I was unable to express an opinion on this item pending receipt of a recognized appraiser's report -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, I am not sure whether it is a good point of order but I apprehend that this House has adopted a motion to appoint a select committee to examine the report of the Auditor General, we have in fact adopted that motion. It is true that the select committee has not as yet been named by Your Honour but the House has ordered that a select committee be appointed to consider the report of the Auditor General. . . . In view of the fact that the House has taken that action and that the report is to be examined and reported upon by a select committee, which Your Honour will name, in view of that fact, is it in order now to be debating a report which the House has ordered a select committee to examine?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I am addressing myself to this non-confidence motion the last part of which condemns the failure of the Government to answer, fully and completely, questions tabled in this House by the members here touching upon the public affairs of the Province and therefore states it has no confidence in the Government. I am talking

MR. MARSHALL:

about that, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself to a question that was addressed to the hon. the Premier, question 195, and I would submit that I have the right to go into this question because I am not talking about anything relating to the Auditor General's committee or the committee on public accounts that is being set up but I am talking about a question that to my mind has not been answered properly and that the parts that have been answered properly require elucidation to the general public because it relates to a payment to Lundrigan's Limited of an amount far, far in excess of that which they should have attained.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in the Auditor General's report and the report is to be examined by a Select Committee.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will submit, Your Honour, that this is obvious nonsense. The report of the Auditor General on the public accounts for last year refer to just about every bit of money spent by the Government and everything the Government does. Now to suggest that members of the House cannot discuss any item that is in the Auditor General's report or any fact that is in the public accounts is just by stating it seems to be ridiculous. For example, the Auditor General reports that the debt of the Province, as of the end of March last year, is \$766. million, if the hon. Premier's point of order was correct the members of this House could not discuss the public debt of the Province in this House any further until the select committee brought in their report. Now that is obviously nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The appointment of this select committee has nothing, that we can discuss anything that is in the public accounts or the Auditor General's report whether or not a select committee is ever appointed or ever meets and to find otherwise would be to cut off all debate in this House on any public issues at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can see the point of order, it is a well-known and well accepted rule of Parliamentary procedure that a matter is debated only once in a session of the House and if the House is given an opportunity and is aware of the fact that it is going to have that opportunity to debate a certain matter then it is not allowed to debate it until that opportunity

MR. SMALLWOOD:

arises. Now in this case the House itself has ordered by a motion adopted yesterday that a select committee be appointed to examine the report of the Auditor General and to report back to the House here and to bring the Auditor General, no doubt, before the select committee and question him on his report. So the report of the Auditor General is to be examined by a select committee. Now that opportunity has not only been provided but it has been provided by the House, unanimously adopting a motion to that effect. So the House itself having decided that the report of the Auditor General will be examined by a select committee, I am submitting to Your Honour the possibility that it is out of order to debate a matter now which is to come before a select committee which will recommend to the House so that the House again will have the opportunity of debating the matter when the report of the select committee comes back.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on that point of order, I do not think it is the hon. member's intention to go through the public accounts. He is just using them for a reference to a matter

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not public accounts, it is a report.

MR. MURPHY: A red herring, an absolute red herring.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not public accounts . . .

MR. MURPHY: It is a reference to the Auditor General.

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER. Order Please.

MR. MURPHY: Just using it for reference to a matter. That is all we are getting, Sir, and I think the gentleman is perfectly in order to quote any factual figures in answer to a question - that was apparently not the proper answer that we received.

MR. SPEAKER: There has been a point of order raised.

MR. SPEAKER: I was having a little doubt about our continuing on this trend, when the point of Order was raised. Consequently, I have been going back and forth over the pages of Beauchesne here. But, I recognize the fact that the hon. member for St. John's East is talking to the Amendment which is now before the House and which deals with this particular subject.

I also recognize the fact that there is an element of anticipating a matter which is to become the House very shortly or I would presume very shortly, at least it is a matter that has been set down. Therefore, there are certain remarks that he has been making which are directly in anticipation and there will be provision made for this, and if we do it now there will be needless repetition.

But, it says; "references to debates to the current session is discouraged, even if the reference is not irrelevant to the issue that is before the House, as it tends to reopen matters already decided." And the next sentence, of course, is the key to the whole issue. "The same result is often obtained by indirect methods. Direct reference is permitted, however, when a member wishes to complain about something." This does not apply in this particular instance.

As I say, the matter the hon. member is raising is relevant to the matter that is before the House. But I think there is an element of anticipation and I think that he sees what I am driving at now and that he can do this without infringing either one of the rules.

Will the hon. member please continue.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I shall not refer to the Public Accounts, I will refer then to this question No. 195. The answer given was that this land on which Holiday Inns is constructed, out there on Portugal Cove Road, there was a sum of \$50,000 paid to Lundrigan's, Limited for an area of land involving Hotel Buildings, Limited. And in answer to a supplementary question (this does not affect the Auditor General's Report) but in answer to a supplementary question, Your Honour, the impression was given by the Premier to the effect that this \$50,000 - What area of land involved? It is all of the area. Well, it is not all of the area, Mr. Speaker, of land. On September 28th, 1966 Lundrigan's, Limited sold, (and anyone can see it in Volume 833, Folio 158 of the Registry of Deeds). On September 28, 1966, Lundrigan's, Limited sell to Hotel Buildings, Limited an area of land measuring 152.2 feet, on Portugal Cove Road. On the eastern side it measures 221.4 feet, on the back 128.6 feet and on the other side 83 feet and 76.2 feet. Now the area of land involved, Mr. Speaker, (and I want to be accurate about this, this is not in the Public Accounts either, this is from one of these computers) the area involved exactly is .5900407, if you want to be exact, of an acre. It involved 25,702.1763000 square feet. It is little over then half an acre. For some reason or other \$1.00 is expressed to be the consideration in the deed. We are told that \$50,000 was paid to Lundrigan's, Limited. This works out, if you want to do a mathematical calculation, Mr. Speaker, this works out to \$83,000 per acre. Lundrigan's, Limited were paid \$83,000 per acre. That is a pretty expensive piece of land.

The next question one asks oneself: How much did they pay for it? They must have had paid a healthy price in order for the Government to pay them \$83,000. Because the deed registered, Mr. Speaker, about two years before then, in January of 1964, there was a conveyance from Thomas Kenny, the Kenny family that have lived on Portugal Cove Road for years, of this exact, self-same piece of land, this .5900407 of an acre, for the wopping sum of \$15,000. Two years later, Hotel Buildings, Limited purchased it from Lundrigan's, Limited for the sum of \$50,000, a difference, Mr. Speaker, an inexplicable difference of \$35,000. Now that is not all: Obviously, Hotel Buildings, Limited, Holiday Inns is built on more than an acre a little bit over an half an acre of land. Hotel Buildings, Limited acquired from the City of St. John's this residual land, 7.7117 acres, if you want to be accurate about it, 7.7117 acres of land, with 300 feet frontage on the Portugal Cove Road, and this was purchased in September 1966. Remember the other purchase from Lundrigan's was made in September of 1966 as well. There the consideration was expressed to be \$1.00. But the balance sheet, if we look at the balance sheet, a balance sheet of Hotel Buildings, Limited, you will see that the sum of \$210,000 was paid for land. Presumably, allowing that all of this was paid to the City Council, this worked out to about \$27,000 or \$28,000 per acre, which was the valuation of land at that particular time in the area. We pay Lundrigan's, the Government is prepared to pay Lundrigan's over \$50,000 more for its land, proportionally, than it paid the City, and it paid the City the fair market value. Why did it pay Lundrigan's? Why did it pay Lundrigan's three times the fair market value? There has been some talk that there has been a valuation made, a valuation was asked by an official of this House. There has been some public reference

MR. MARSHALL: (we have not got Hansard yet) to the effect that an appraisal was made. When was the appraisal made? Note it was made after the fact, after an official of this House made the observation. But I would like to see that valuation. The valuation happens to be the opinion of a person doing the valuation itself. And I do not care what kind of dressing it got, how the turkey happens to be stuffed; what kind of title the person has; there is nobody that can put a valuation equivalent to \$ 83,000 that is paid to Lundrigan's, Limited, per acre for land in that area at that time. There are many questions that arise, when you talk about - and talking, Mr. Speaker, on this question on this failure to answer fully and completely the questions, is there any doubt about that? Why was the valuation given after, in many questions arising? Why was there \$1.00 in the dead? Two years later, after ferreting out questions and after an official of the House makes an observation, otherwise it would be lost, until the new Government came in and made its investigation. We would probably find a lot of other things then.

Why pay Lundrigan's at least 200 percent higher? Why was there an intimation given to this House, an impression given to this House that the area of land covered was much more than an half an acre? And how many other instances of waste, Mr. Speaker, of abysmal waste of Public Funds have we got in this Province? When a Government can afford to pay a company which everybody knows has been a favourite son of this Government for sometime. And \$83,000 -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that a crime?

MR. MARSHALL: It is a crime. It is a social crime to pay \$83,000 per acre to Lundrigan's, Limited, when children are going into portable classrooms in Newfoundland, when teachers' salaries are low, when you

MR. MARSHALL: have the service which you have in Labrador and all around the Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lawyers' fees are high.

MR. MARSHALL: Right, but they are earned honestly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next question we have, another question: We have from time to time being asking in this House a very important question affecting the public affairs of this Province. This is the amount of the subsidy; the actual cost of the power to the Newfoundland Power Commission. We must get the details of the ERCO subsidy, to find out what the situation really is. The Government have been refusing consistently to answer questions. Last year, Question No.232. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier in the dual role of Minister of Economic Devopment, what were the revenues, what were the reasons for underestimating the amount of power subvention to Electric Reduction Company, Limited, requiring an additional \$1,350,000 payment during 1969 - 1970. What period is covered by the total payment of \$3 million? Subsequently, Question 50, asked by the hon. the member for St John's West, that same year, a similar question, vital question: What quantity of electrical power was sold and delivered to the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Phosphorus Plant at Long Harbour, by the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, during the calendar year 1969, and what price per kilowatt hour was the said power sold and delivered? The answer given; that negotiations were presently going on and it was against public interest but it may be possible to answer it later.

Questions on the Order Paper right now, put there by myself:

Question No. ²¹¹210 and No.332, this year: and I would be delighted to receive the answers, as we must. We are now left to speculate. What does this speculation result in? We find most of our information,

1273

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, some of our information with respect to the financial condition of this Province through prospectus that have been filed by the Government and various Government agencies for the purpose of issuing getting loans, and issuing bond issues. And I have here in my hand a direct placement memorandum of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, also put out by that company, A.E. Ames and Company, on August 21, 1969. And in that particular memorandum we can see (page 8, I believe it is) we see that Electric Reduction Company has contracted to purchase a minimum -

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL): Order! Order, please! The attention of the Speaker has been drawn to the fact that there is no quorum. Would the clerk please count the House? Order, Please!

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL): I might say that it appears, when someone says, there is no quorum in the House; according to the authorities the Speaker is suppose to allow members who are standing in the Galleries time to resume their seats. Carry on please.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we see then on page 8 of this memorandum that the Electric Reduction Company of Canada contracted to pay to purchase a minimum monthly contract amount of 55,480,000 kilowatt hours of electricity. This works out to a yearly amount 665,760,000 kilowatt hours. We are given, that is the only information we have so far, we are given in the estimates of 1969-70, an estimate of the payment to ERCO by way of subsidy, that is, the difference between the actual cost

MR. MURPHY: To a point of order! It is very difficult to hear the speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL) Order, please.

MR. CROSBIE: There are other conversations going on, while other people are standing.

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in the estimates of 1969 or 1970, we see an amount of \$1,650,000 that is being provided for this subsidy to to pay the cost of the Newfoundland Power Commission, the amount that they

MR. MARSHALL: would be short by reason of selling power to the Electric Reduction Company of Canada, Limited at two and a-half mills a kilowatt hour.

Mr. Marshall.

This works out to \$1 million or expressed to be \$1,650,000. Subsequently, this Government, which has the power in its secret Cabinet meetings of borrowing money, extra money; did not pay too much attention to the estimates, got by Lieutenant Governor's Warrant, \$1,350,000, an additional \$1,350,000, which makes the total of \$3 million.

Now I want you to note first of all and draw the attention, Mr. Speaker, to the original estimate of \$1,650,000. This is the product of two and a half mils per kilowatt hour times the contractual amount actually contracted to be taken by ERCO according to this prospectus - two and a half mils times 665,760,000 kilowatt hours equals this amount of \$1,650,000. So, I think we can conclude from that - We do not have the information available to us. It is vital information to the public. We can conclude from that that originally the cost was estimated by Government to be two and a half mils per kilowatt hour. But the cost is actually in the vicinity of six mils or over six mils per kilowatt hour. It is nothing new, of course, for this Government to underestimate the liabilities which it is going to incur by reason of its actions.

Now if ERCO took the entire contract, Mr. Speaker, if you take - we do not know. We have to suppose. This is one of the problems we have here in Newfoundland, we have in this Government not answering questions. If we took, as given, the fact that Electric Reduction Company of Canada took its entire contractual amount of 665,760,000 kilowatt hours in that particular year and if we took the subsidy to be 3.5 mils per kilowatt hour, which is a difference between this amount I say of six mils and the two and half mil subsidy, you get \$2,330,000. So what about the balance of \$670,000. It must mean - it has to mean something. It has to mean that the power costs more or the accounting is bad or something. We are entitled to an explanation. It is very doubtful, in any event. It is very doubtful. These figures have to be explained. They can only be explained by answering

Mr. Marshall.

the questions that have been placed time and time again before this Government. It is very doubtful whether ERCO actually used its entire contractual allotment, It is public knowledge. We all know that there was a tremendous amount of down-time during that particular period as a result of the pollution in Placentia Bay and the shutdowns and that and the problems that they had over the period of time. This Government is bound to account for its \$3 million. The only way it can properly account for this \$3 million is to give us the information we require, to which we are entitled, which the public must know. To use the reply that^{is} against the public interest to give this answer is hogwash. It will not be accepted and will never be accepted from this side of the House. We will never be driven off from that point.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, talking about not answering questions properly, is Question no. 216 on the Order Paper, again asked to the Premier. It is on the Order Paper of March 29th. Can the Premier tell the House the names of the three internationally known firms who have agreed to establish petro-chemical plants at Come-by-Chance, as indicated in his statement to the House on 17 July, 1970? The answer was a smart yes, he can. When pressed further on a supplementary question, will he say? It was an abrupt, no. It was a great joke. We have been told - the people of this Province are entitled to know the names of these petro-chemical concerns. It is to be noted that in December 31, 1970, Mr. Jamieson, in the edition of the "Evening Telegram," December 31, 1970, page three thereof: "Transport Minister Donald Jamieson says the idea that a petro-chemical complex could evolve out of Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery Project is justifiable on economic and scientific grounds." But he went on to say that there is a consensus that there will be, at least, one petro-chemical complex built in Canada's east coast. Whether it will be in Newfoundland or at Gulf Oil's Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia Oil Refinery or somewhere else is not known at the moment.

Mr. Marshall.

But we want to know the situation. Surely, if there were three who were already to come, Mr. Jamieson, the Federal Government would know about it. If they were internationally known concerns, they would have had to make approaches to the Federal Government, through the Department of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Transport would have been the first, probably, to know about it. Regardless of what approaches, Mr. Speaker, the general populace of this Province is entitled to know the names. They are entitled to know the names of these particular companies. Now if it happens that it is the result of the application of the develop or perish attitude by the Government, by their policy they put up a refinery, without the possibility of their being petro-chemical plants - all right. That is the policy of the Government and the public will judge them accordingly. But, at least, the public of this Province is entitled to know what are the names of these petro-chemical companies so that it can assure and give them further faith in the complex itself.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker. There are millions of dollars. The reason why, one of the many, many reasons that we have been unable to put public services up to the height to which they should be, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the millions, upon millions of dollars, untold millions that have been taken by this Government and spent on various aborted projects. Nobody is going to fault them for planning. You will see the huge millions of dollars being paid out in recent years for commissions and when you look at the results from these commissions, most of the recommendations, probably eighty-five per cent of the recommendations have not been implemented. You have to say as a result of the inability of this Government to come to grips with its own critics, its own reasonable critics, and to take remedial steps that a large part of it has been wasted. When you see the amount that has been expended on plans, various plans that have been aborted, aborted plans. You get the plans and you do not pay half millions of dollars, hundreds of thousands

Mr. Marshall

of dollars out on a plan unless you are pretty sure you are going to go through with it. Then, Mr. Speaker, you do not allow yourself to be put off. You are to govern. You do not allow yourself to be put off by your own selfish political interest and see the money of the people of this Province wasted as a result.

Now I have heard references made the other day to the sanity, questioning the sanity of one of the members of this House by the hon. Premier. Well I question and I am sure the people of Newfoundland question the financial sanity of this Government. This is the situation that we have. The Government spends merrily; gets its money from its own private little club, the Cabinet Room.

MR. NOLAN: Jealousy will get you nowhere.

MR. MARSHALL: In the Cabinet Room where nobody knows about it. By the time the Legislature and the people of Newfoundland are told that \$68 million has been borrowed, additional, they find that most of it has been spent. They do not answer questions. Takes the questions that are given and relies on infantile and imbecilic semantics to try and twist out of them. Meanwhile the Province spirals downward. The situation that we have is an unfortunate situation. It should not pertain and cannot pertain any longer. We have to come to grips with the financial position of this Province. They has to be realistic attempts made to fund the debt. Yes, we will probably then, very, very shortly, if we did this in the proper manner - we would probably have a department, which unfortunately as a result of the action of the Government over the past few years, will be the top department by way of expenditure. There should be more provided with respect to sinking funds to repay the debt of this Province. It is a crippling situation. It is one that cannot go on anymore. I do not feel - I have heard from time to time, people in this Province or people on the Opposition side, over the years - there has

Mr. Marshall.

been attempts made to bully them, because they talked about the fiscal affairs of this Province. Do not dare say a, b and c, because the people in New York will hear you. Well I say this that the Government of this Province have our financial affairs in such a condition and in such a situation that good, constructive criticism will cause them not to enter into arrangements with the Government in the future, well this is an indictment of the Government itself. Unless this Government can come to grips with itself and in its few remaining months, when it is going to have to account to the people of this Province. - each day is precious. The situation is urgent, when you have \$68 million extra spent; no budgetary control whatsoever; no attempt to bring in proper budgetary control; monies borrowed in the Cabinet Room; monies taken like little children; spent around the place for the purpose of their own political gain; for the purposes of their own political perpetration and power. When we have that situation, we have a very serious financial situation occurring.

I hear the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation talking from time to time about lawyers. Too bad he does not know more about the law. Because if he knew more about the law, Mr. Speaker, he would not have been a party to that crime in 1966. He would have known that on a contract, it is not a contract until it is signed. Ha! Ha!

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to our budgetary control, with respect to our financial resources is alarming. It is very, very alarming. Unless there are realistic attempts made by this Government in the next budget which comes before this House, Heaven knows what is going to happen. I would have no hesitation whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in supporting completely each and every word that is contained in the non-confidence-motion of the hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that I would be given the opportunity today to speak without the interruptions from the hon. minister of personal publicity.

MR. NEARY: Am I the one you mean? Am I the one you mean?

MR. EARLE: No, I would prefer that the hon. minister stay and go to sleep, because he is quite decorative.

MR. NEARY: Fair enough, and I guarantee you will be uninterrupted.

MR. EARLE: He is quite decorative today.

MR. NEARY: Wake me up..

MR. EARLE: He inspires me tremendously from the other side, but unfortunately this minister of personal publicity, which I have rechristianed him, is probably quite a young man, although he is beginning to look older under the strain over there. He has yet to mature, so if he sleeps well in this Chamber and does not be interfered with too much by speeches such as mine, he may look a lot..

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, this is all, good clean fun, I presume, but still one must remember or recall the fact that we are being paid to serve the people in this House. (This is exactly what I am referring to). If the hon. member would keep quiet and let us get on with the business, we might be able to give the public value for their money. Unfortunately, the public expect something to come from this House, except trash. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, I have touched on a sore point with the hon. minister. Perhaps he will subside into sleep, but anyhow let him gain his personal publicity by other means. Perhaps he could talk a little more about the boys and girls sometime and get his name in the paper.

MR. NEARY: What about the fish merchants?

MR. EARLE: Yes that is quite a good thing. This is always a good one to rehash over and over again. Mr. Speaker, in supporting this motion, I think that something is necessary by way of a prelude in the way in which motions of this sort develop and why they develop. It is quite obvious that the history of this Government, the performance of this Government over the past twenty-two years, as previous speakers have pointed out, has been so remiss in so many instances that it demands a motion of this type to be brought before

Mr. Earle.

the House.

I should like to come up to more recent events which are fresher in people's minds and which, I think, would clarify for them for once and for all the necessity of condemnation of this Government and its lack of attention to adequate improvement of the public services.

If I may refer for a minute to the development conference which was held on the first, second and third days of February,

MR. EARLE: First of all the pre-announcements of this conference were to the effect that several ministers had gone to Ottawa. They received a very good reception there and the Premier and his group returned elated that this was going to be a tremendous conference, which would bring forth some surprising results and some surprising benefits to our people and that Ottawa had agreed to all of this. Well that may or may not be so, but it did not take many remarks by two of the Federal ministers who were there at the conference, in the persons of the Minister of Transport and the Minister responsible for DREE, to set that thing straight, because neither of these gentlemen were obviously prepared to make any commitment whatsoever on the part of Ottawa at that conference. And, I think, it was a tremendous letdown for the Provincial Government after all the built up it had had.

In spite of that the conference proceeded and while my hon. friend the member for St. John's West insists on calling it a "Disarmament Conference," I do not think he has got his terms quite right. I do not think the terms are quite right because it did not disarm the people, from all that I have heard since, armed them, very, very strongly indeed. Because this conference went down with such a resounding plop that the people are armed to expect almost anything this year. The comments that I have heard from all over the Province, Mr. Speaker, about that particular conference, reflect anything but credit to those who promoted it, and certainly to those who participated in it, and gave such wild announcements and such wild statements that it is quite beyond the comprehension of people to believe or feel that such announcements were realistic and would be borne out by fact.

So, while my friend, the hon. member for St. John's West, insists on calling it a "Disarmament Conference," I think that I would prefer to christen that conference "Our Christmas of 1971," Christmas came exceptionally early this year. The Government created a new date for Christmas, because it was just a give-away, for all the goodies were presented to the people. And so they need not expect another Christmas in 1971, they already had one.

MR. NOLAN: Are you expecting the end of the world?

MR. EARLE: No, we will celebrate that by another occasion later on which will be really worth celebrating in this coming year.

However, in the conference which I have referred, there were fifty-eight points reiterated from previous Liberal propaganda bulletins, which have been issued on previous elections and there were thirty-three new items brought into this. Unfortunately the new items which were enumerated were rather insignificant, not of any great lasting importance or of any great benefit to the people of this Province. I will go as far as to say that several of them have good potential but will take a long, long time to work out, and are not something that are going to bring immediate results. I would like to refer particularly to the Rural Development Associations and the encouragement of these associations, that, I agree, is a good plank for any Government because it is most certainly necessary and essential that the people throughout this Province be awakened to the need of helping themselves and not depending so entirely upon Government.

Now, I think the plan is good. I think the plan is excellent. But how it is to be carried out is perhaps another matter and opens up some suspicion, because during the Easter Holidays some of our brethren were in sunny climes, I was on the south coast in my district, and I get the feeling that the development of these associations is quickly turning into a political or getting a political tinge, because, whether it is intentional or otherwise, what is happening in all of these places, the people become enthused when some visitors from Government departments come down and see them. They discuss plans which on the surface are excellent and sort of thing that should be encouraged in any place. But, then the people react immediately, from what I had heard, by saying, "well, this is the year to get it boys. This is the year, we have just got to ask for it and it will be passed out." And I have heard in numerous places where these committees have met, with the discussions among the people

MR. EARLE: a few days afterwards is, we must ask for this, we must ask for that, and we must ask for the other thing. And, if it is only going to be a matter of encouraging the people to ask for things in the vain hope that they will get it, and perhaps with some vain promises that they are going to get them this is pure and simply partisan politics. Because the people again will be led down this this interminable garden path of greater expectations with no rainbow or pot of gold at the end of that rainbow. And this is what these development associations are unfortunately developing into.

Now, if this thing is to work, and if it is to accomplish what I hope it intended to accomplish, they should, as nearly as possible, be divorced completely from politics. They had a poor birth because the Development Conference was so obviously partisan politically that this in turn automatically gave these development groups a tinge of partisan politics.

Now, I would hope that over the months to come, and this, indeed in a year, this there is a vain hope, that that trend could be reversed and that the development or self-help groups will indeed be self-help groups and will not be encouraged in any way just to think that this is just another political handout and something they have only to ask for and receive. I think at the conference itself, when the Premier used such words as "The sky is the limit", as this sets the tone for the whole thing. And when you start talking like that in public before a large conference and it is repeated and repeated over the air and on the airways, this gives the people who are listening and all the people throughout the Province the idea that ^{it} is the land of goodies and there is no end to what they may demand.

I would like to refer just for a moment to that conference again, on the particular aspect of highways. The hon. Minister, at the conference, I am sorry he has stepped out, but his opening statement at the conference was indeed a laudatory and a very, very proper statement. Highway development

MR. EARLE: is a vital necessity to economic development, in all of its aspects. And this is why the construction, reconstruction and paving of our highways is such a very important item to consider. One thing is certain, without an adequate highway system, we can forget economic development or any other kind of development. Well, I do not think that any member who is sane or sensible will disagree with a statement such as that. Because we have lacked so fundamentally in parts of this Province a good highway system, and I refer particularly, of course, to the section of the country with which I am now most familiar and that is the south coast. And I have always supported my friend from the adjoining district of Hermitage in his demands for greater improvements to the highways system in that area, because, while I am repeating myself in what I have said in previous sessions of this House, it is so blatantly obvious that on the south coast of this Province, where there is the only area where you can consistently year in and year out have open ports all the year around. No ice problem. No shipping problem. And excellent harbours and where you have in areas a winter fishery, where there is the least welfare drawn down in any section of this Province, and where these people were some of the foremost and strongest supports of Confederation and voted almost unanimously for it and they were very, very strong in the support of this — getting the benefits of it for Newfoundland.

That coast has, in my opinion, some sections of it in particular, suffered the most devastating and utter neglect of any part of Newfoundland. And now belatedly, after twenty-two years, efforts are being made to bring this up to a par with other sections of the country. I have heard time and time again statements made that, well this just could not be done on the south coast, the terrain is too rough, the hills are too high, the rocks are too hard, the inlets are too deep, all the excuses that can be thought of why roads could not simply be built in that area. This is utter nonsense. Anyone has only to go down around the Clarenville area or down the Baie Verte Peninsula or down other sections of the country where roads have been built

MR. EARLE: the territory is equally as bad, as equally as difficult, and is equally as expensive to build roads in these areas. And I cannot for the very life of me understand why it has not been the policy of this Government over the years to make a circle of this Island, to give it a proper base, to give it a road connection across the south coast, the most direct drive to the mainland and the most directly connecting up all that strong, independent area down there, where the people only needed a little more encouragement, a few more facilities and they will increase their already strong independence from welfare and other degrading experiences which are so prevalent in so many parts of the Province.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: I feel, Mr. Speaker, that those who wish to hear me are listening and probably listening to me very intently, I am not at all dismayed by the fact that some people must have a rest. So I am quite prepared to go on.

I think -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: I think I have a very attentive audience, and I am not speaking against the Motion, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking very strongly in favour of it, because I am pointing out in this one area alone, where there has been neglect in the development of facilities for a great segment of the people of our Island. And, if this does not bear out the provision of this Motion, "adequately maintain and improve the public services," I would like to know what does? This is the point I am talking on at the moment, and I am talking about one particular section of the Province, which most certainly is obvious to everybody that knows that area, just how that has been neglected over the years.

Therefore, in referring to the hon. Minister of Highways and his announcement during the Development Conference, I think the most dismaying aspect of it was the fact that, this of all the announcements that were made at the conference was so blatantly partisan political, the little bits of

MR. EARLE: road, the mile here the two miles there, the five miles somewhere else; the bit of pavement here, the reconstruction there, and spread all over the map was nothing more or less than just vote catchers. His whole statement at the opening of the conference was destroyed by the fact that it was then laid out in this manner and of course at the conference itself the most dismaying, and disgusting thing happened insofar as this minister in particular, the other ministers where not much better, but he had so much to relate there that he got a bit tongue-tied, He could not remember all these items, he had so many goodies to give away that he stumbled and stuck and the Premier kept nudging, do not forget this, do not forget that, say that, repeat this, and this was so obvious over the T.V. that the people around the country where laughing their heads off.

I have heard so many times, in fact, one Newfoundlander with a very good sense of humour, and Newfoundlanders are noted for this, who was sitting next to me in that hall, when this thing became so obviously confused and foolish, he nudged me and said; " Mr., old Joey forgot to wind that fellow up this morning." Well, this just explains -

MR. ROWE, F.W. He was a good Liberal.

MR. EARLE: He was a good Liberal.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: I had a few Liberals sitting around me, some fellows who were former Liberals, and some people who have seen the light. There are some people who have seen the light.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, just to get off of that subject for a moment, I think

AN HON. MEMBER: It really burned you up though.

MR. EARLE: No, this does not burn me up at all. In fact, when the public begin to feel this way about a Government, this is where this particular Resolution is driving home. This is where the people themselves do not have to be told, they realize the foolishness that has gone on. They realize the foolishness that is still going on, and this is what some

MR. EARLE: people are going to find out within a few months, very, very clearly indeed.

I may be getting on thin ice, if I refer to the Auditor General's Report. But, I will only refer to it briefly , if I may. Because this comes before a Select Committee of the House, and I only hope that Select Committee will be permitted to do its work properly. Because this is one of the most valuable and far-reaching efforts which this House have been successful in doing in recent years. It is something which . . . pertains in practically in all other Houses of Parliament. It is an excellent safeguard. It is something that the Opposition has been asking for, for years, and now,if this Committee is permitted to do its work properly and to make its Report properly,this should be of . . . invaluable service to this Province. It is rather strange that this very Resolution in the same wording which was passed yesterday was proposed last year by the Minister of Finance. But,

MR. EARLE: Yet it was not put through.

MR. CALLAHAN: It was obstruction from the other side.

MR. EARLE: It was a question. I just wonder why it was not voted on last year, and it was voted for this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was not brought before the House.

MR. EARLE: It did not come before the House? Well, why was it not before the House last year? Let us stop and think a minute. There are some very touchy things in the Auditor General's report of last year. There were some things that did not bear investigating. This year's report is much milder. Very much milder, but last year there was the scandal of the Atlantic Brewery. This thing never came to proper light in this House last year. The Select Committee could have looked much deeper into that, but a Select Committee was not appointed. There were many other things in last year's report that did not come to light for very good reason. This year it is not quite so stiff, so perhaps a Select Committee will go on. But, if that Select Committee does its job, Mr. Speaker, and does it properly, the Auditor General's Department is such an all encompassed thing, a department which literally sticks its nose into every operation of the Government, that they will have the opportunity in that Committee to ask all the questions they want, and all the most delving questions.

For instance, it is not up to me to direct the committee. They will do, I do not know who is going to be a member of the committee, but the Auditor General has himself complained time after time of lack of staff to do his work. I think one of the first questions which should be asked by the committee is the extent or scope of the Auditor General's work, because, to the best of my knowledge and memory on this, there were certain operations of the Government which the Auditor General did not have time nor staff to properly investigate, I think particularly the operations of Crown Corporations. We have asked the question in the House on several occasions. We asked it last year ad nauseam, we have asked it a couple of times this year, but when the great discussion was on about the oil refinery, I made the assurance, because I knew from first hand knowledge that there was a team of auditors sent to New York to find out how our first \$5 million was spent, the \$5 million advanced. We never did get the answer as to what the auditor's report said on that, or if indeed, there was an

audit, or if the auditors had been permitted to do their work.

This is public money. Whether it is covered up in Crown Corporations or where it is, this is the public's money, the money of the people of Newfoundland that was advanced to this particular concern. The people of Newfoundland are entitled to know just how that money was spent and if it was properly accounted for, but we have not up to this moment received that answer. Then of course, to make the situation even more ridiculous, even more comical, such a pantomime as we saw last fall on T.V. where the \$5 million was passed back, and now we find that Governor's Special Warrants for \$27 million has been requested, for this very self same thing. The total amount is supposed to be \$25 million. Already it is \$27 million, and every indication is that it will go considerably higher. So, this \$5 million that was passed back has gone into one pocket and out the other. It served its purpose, it gave a nice little show at the time. It possibly fooled some people into thinking that this was coming back to the Province right away, but this is the sort of thing which is absolute deceit and camouflage and everything else. I do not know words hardly strong enough to use for it.

This is the kind of thing which indicates that the behaviour of the Government in its financial dealings leaves so much to question that one is aghast as to where to draw the line. This is not presenting to the people the true picture, it is just maneuvering, maneuvering, maneuvering for political purposes all the time. This I think is what has disgusted so many of us so many, many times.

On the matter of improvement to the public services, and this is a pretty wide field, public services include everything which will enable our people to live better lives. One of the large groups in the Province, which to my mind has suffered from lack of real public services, has been the fishermen. Here again, I have said this before, but it bears repeating in the House, the facilities which were built in many cases in Commission of Government days for the fishermen of Newfoundland have been since that time consistently neglected by this Government, to the point that many harbours and many small coves and so on are no longer suitable for the operations of fishing boats and fishing

crafts. I know of places on the south coast where sea walls, retaining walls and so on have just been allowed to disintegrate. Breakwaters have gone, and it is literally not safe for fishing craft to operate from these harbours.

The people have requested time and time again that attention be given to these particular phrases. The thing falls on deaf ears. The plea is that - the statement is that this is a Federal Government responsibility, and not the Provincial Government's business. Be that as it may, perhaps it is a Federal responsibility, I do not know, but if the Government of this Province is interested in the people of this Province, it keeps hammering on the Federal Government's door until it gets essential works done. This is one case that I know of with first hand information. I have seen it so many times that this has not been done, there has been no follow-up on this and no persistence that these works be carried out.

The plan in the development conference about the boat depots and so on is good. I congratulate the Government on it. I think it is an excellent idea, but here again, the proof of the pudding will lie in the eating and we will see what develops in this, because, I think we can be forgiven if we look back to the 1966 manifesto and see things of this nature announced which were never carried out. Will these suffer the same fate or will they not? This is the question which the people have to ask themselves, and this is the sort of question that today the people are asking themselves. They are doubting Thomases. There is more doubt in Newfoundland today with good reason than there has ever been in the long history of this Province. In fact, there must be doubt because many of the projects which have been announced cannot be carried out in the short space of time that has been indicated that they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I am just stopping for a moment to let the conversations go on because,.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Actually, my next item which I wanted to mention will probably arouse one minister from his slumber, so, I should be prepared for the worst.

The Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, of course, he

continually loses no opportunity to state that former ministers, I suppose that includes the present Minister of Health, but two preceding ministers before himself must have been awful dumb bunnies because they did nothing. Perhaps he might exempt the Minister of Health because he is a colleague, but at least the one before that, which is myself, certainly did nothing at all. This is quite obvious, so, so obvious that it needs no comment at all. The only thing that this minister did not do to keep the services of the Department functioning properly, and not disrupt it, was that he under no circumstances at any time, sought out of the operations of that department personal publicity which would upset the whole operations of the department.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member went down, locked himself in, put a dome around the office and did nothing.

MR. EARLE: Yes, I spent the whole time in that department, locked in my desk not doing anything.

MR. NEARY: No clients allowed to come in to see him, locked in the office all day long.

MR. EARLE: Of course the hon. minister has only to ask his staff.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister has asked, do not worry.

MR. EARLE: The hon. minister has asked his staff, and the hon. minister has probably cowed his staff, and the hon. minister.....

MR. NEARY: The hon. member never had an original idea, all he did was keep his seat warm while he was there. He did not earn his pay.

MR. EARLE: I suppose I can claim some gratitude, because the seat was probably warm enough for the hot pants of the hon. minister when he sat down. This is all right, he is one of the modern generation so he needs the seat heated up for him. But, believe me, the seat I heated up is not half as hot as the seat that is being heated up for him at present. He will learn all about hot seats in a few months time. The hon. gentleman is becoming very worried indeed and so are many of his colleagues because, there is to be a hot seat prepared and the hot seat will not be over there.

Perhaps the seats on this side will also feel hot when he gets in them. I think perhaps the seat that I am sitting in now, the hon. member may 120

have the good luck if he is elected to occupy it. Perhaps he will find this one hot also. I do not think he is even going to get that far, so, we will see what happens.

In trying to divert me from a discussion of some of the points of that department....

MR. NEARY: The hon. member invited it.

MR. EARLE: The hon. member relishes it. The hon. member loves it. Would you please carry on, he enjoys this sort of thing. In fact, the rebuttals I think are worthy of the comment.

MR. CHALKER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Ah well! the hon. Minister of Public works who has no sense of humour..... May I carry on Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order Please, we have just seen a demonstration of the way this House carries on business. We do it properly now for a change.

MR. EARLE: I think I was on the Department of Social Services at this particular point. There is not too much I want to comment on in spite of the minister's obvious agitation. I do not make such barbed comments about his department as he made about it when I was there, but still, that is more or less a matter of training I suppose. A man is either a gentleman or he is not.

One point which is becoming increasingly obvious to the people of this Province, is that the hon. Minister of Welfare can do what he likes.

MR. NEARY: Social Services.

MR. EARLE: Social Services, I beg your pardon.

MR. NEARY: You are talking about the old days, when.....

MR. EARLE: That is all right, well, the same thing under another name. Roses smell just as sweet by any other name. However, the hon. minister has announced recently some increases in assistance to certain cases and so on. This is good, and it is overdue. It is a pity they cannot be further increased. I agree with his action in this connection. Unfortunately, what is happening in this Province, which is partially being brought about, the exorbitant debt that this Province is under, an ever increasing debt, is that the cost of living is escalating to the point that the advances that these people get, and all

other people in the increases in salaries and so on, that are of no benefit to them. In fact, what increases they get are eaten up before they ever receive them. This is the complaint that I hear time after time, place after place, and so on and so on.

The hon. member has no qualms whatsoever about merchants.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: I was associated with the mercantile life of the country for some time, and I think that the record which I could produce would not cause the hon. minister any loss of sleep. I am quite sure that the profit picture in that thing, and the losses that were incurred were quite equivalent to any hardships that he may have understood or undertaken in his earlier days.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: No, but I do resent Mr. Speaker, nonsense from those who know nothing about what they are talking about, and this is obvious. To come back to the point, under the Department of Welfare. The fact is of course, that efforts made by the department to pick up the slack, and try to give to the people who need it a helping hand which is worthy in itself, are falling far short of what is necessary because of the constantly and steadily increasing cost of living to these same people.

Here again I find, that with his department generally, and I am familiar with a great many of the people who are the personnel in that department, there is excellent cooperation from them.

MR. NEARY: What about some of the wages that are being paid by merchants in this Province?

MR. EARLE: Oh what nonsense. Mr. Speaker, may I stick to the subject. I was saying that some of the people in the minister's department are some of the best civil servants that we have in this

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear, we have a very smooth running department.

MR. EARLE: Well, I was told that I was taking over a well oiled department. I think the oil has been spilled a little since then. Some of the oil has turned rancid, some of the oil has turned rancid.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

Some of these servants in that department, are some of the best in Government, and they strain their best to do their job properly. Somewhere along the line Sir, there still is, (there was when I was there, and I do not think any - I do not try to escape any blame for it) but it is still quite obvious. One has only to travel around welfare homes in the Province to see that in many of the outlying places there are still exceptional cases of dire hardship and privation, while at

MR. EARLE:

same time there are many who are receiving benefits who even their own neighbours question as to whether they need them or not and I think that the plan when I was the do-nothing Minister, when I was the do-nothing Minister in that department the plan which I originated but unfortunately I had to leave the -

MR. NEARY: The hon. member was Minister when the rates were cut so he was not a do-nothing Minister.

MR. EARLE: The plan which I originated when I was the do-nothing Minister in that department and which the hon. Minister and no Minister since has followed up properly, was to have a proper team of supervisors and people going around, a much built up and strengthened team, to examine some of these particular abuses and some of the particular needs. I know from experience, while I say the staff in his department does its utmost to co-operate and are excellent, very often they fall down because they are short of information. They are very often lacking in information and here again it is probably due to the lack of seriousness -

MR. NEARY: Here are the crocodile tears again.

MR. EARLE: I must be really affecting the Minister. He simply cannot resist it but perhaps -

MR. NEARY: You are really affecting him all right.

MR. EARLE: Perhaps it is developing in the few remarks that I am making that the Minister is not the Almighty expert after all. He is not creating such a tremendously efficient department or have such an efficient job in, time will tell.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I must end of my few remarks now with what I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Still go on.

MR. EARLE: Maybe I will be tempted to go on, I do not think they should clap, maybe I will go on -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Why do you not answer a few of the questions that the people want to know the answers to? The Minister deceived the public last October, tell the public about that, deliberate lies and deception, the Minister and

MR. CROSBIE:

the Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, may I have the floor?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the members would prefer the House to be closed now or can we carry on with the business the way it should be? Would you please carry on.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I just wish to finish off these few remarks with some statements on what I consider to be very, very clearly illustrated here this afternoon. The comments which we are getting about the conduct of this House from the press and radio does not give any of us any great cause for pleasure, of course, on one side the Opposition is blamed for it, on the other side the Government is blamed for it. This afternoon I would leave it to the public in the galleries to judge who started this controversy and who tried to finish it. Well, this item alone is perhaps comparatively insignificant because in politics you expect backfire and chat back and forth in a House. Everyone of us is prepared to take this and prepared to try to answer under it but this is far less important than when the rules of this House are to some degree stretched or extended or flaunted or in some way or other the procedures of the House, because of the arguments which develop back and forth leave the public in a complete state of confusion as to whether or not the Government which they elected and the Opposition which they elected are being permitted to do their work properly, and after all they are the ones who are paying for it.

Now the older voters and the older people of this Province who have gone through twenty-two years of the same type of Government, they have become a little case-hardened and a little bit used to this sort of thing. In fact, it often amazes me that the people of Newfoundland take so much so quietly that they do not protest and storm about the sort of thing they have to listen to and are expected to believe, because they get it from all sides every day over the radio and it is led of by the leader of this Province, the Premier, on his morning broadcast. This programme consists of a very subtle and well handled attempt, day after day, day in and day out,

MR. EARLE:

to tell only the part of the story which will reflect to the credit of the Government and only half of the truth, it is always stopped short of what is necessary to say to really enlighten the people.

Mr. Speaker, with deference to you in the Chair, I do recall that during the leadership convention that you were on the other side of the fence supporting another candidate, so was I, the hon. member for Burin, who is not here, and I was a vocal and strong supporter of that particular gentleman and so were you. Some of the things which were said about the conduct of the Government at that time I had repeated since. Some of the remarks which the hon. gentleman who is now occupying the seat of the Speaker, had not been repeated but you find in his Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne that this great eulogy comes out, this smoothing down of the Government, brushing the hair the right way. Another instance happened last year with two of the senior members who proposed the same vote. One of them was so outspoken when he got kicked out, oh was he bitter and what he said about the Government was quite unprintable but then he gets up and eulogizes the same Government. Now I do not question that. It is every man's right to speak as his conscience dictates. This is quite so, it is every man's right to speak as his conscience dictates but one thing we have to remember in this House is that we are setting an example or supposed to be setting an example to the youth and the people of this Province and the people of this Province who are better educated than we ever were, and the young people are listening very intently and saying as they are saying so often today, "Is this democracy or is it foolishness?"

Are we in this House going about the best possible way of destroying democracy in this Province? Are we fooling the people and are we carrying on with half-truth or semi-truth in public service that will give the young people of today such an utter disgust of their Government and of their Province that they will just say, "what is the use?" I do not think so, I do not think so because I have been speaking to many of the young people around the Province, in recent months and over the past couple of years and before that, many, many opportunities to meet them and these are clear-

MR. EARLE:

thinking, well educated, intelligent young people and they want this Province run on ethical, honest lines and they are going to see to it that it is done. Now I give them the fullest and strongest support as possible and if it results in all members of this House being kicked out because of their behaviour perhaps that is right, but we have to have a Government, we must have a Government. So for Heavens sake, why can we not set the pattern in our own actions, in our own discussions, in our own behaviour, of giving a decent example to our young people.

Thank you!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, in this non-confidence motion, Sir, perhaps we have left something out in this, as far as this Government is concerned, and I think everyone would vote unanimously for this motion if they examine their own conscience and that is to show, Sir, to prove the actual deliberate contempt the gentleman on the other side of the House have for this so-called people's House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have sat through this House the past nine or ten days and never (and I have worked with a lot of youth and children in my day) have I seen such stupid, childish actions been carried on as the members of this House have shown, not only to us as the Opposition but to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, the Chair. I do not know honestly, a few moments ago you suggested you might call the House and call it quits and I would not blame you because what has gone on here in this House, God help us if the people of this Province have to look up to their elected members they do not have very much respect for any of us, you see the clowning that is going on in this House.

It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a few short years ago, where the biggest mouth on the other side made the following statements: "The Premier may have a big mouth but he has a small imagination to go with it. He has bankrupted a positive policy to help make Newfoundland a better Province." These are not my words, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose are they?

MR. MURPHY: These are the words of the hon. member for Bell Island.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh my heavens!

MR. NEARY: I see you have your Minister of Propaganda working again.

MR. MURPHY: No person particularly our one-man Government can command respect or win a fair deal for Newfoundland if he acts like a clown and a front man for a circus. There is what we are putting up with, the same dirty foul language that that gentleman used eight or nine years ago against his own leader today.

The hon. member for St. John's West, the hon. member for St. John's East, the hon. member for Fortune have stood here in their places the past few hours, Sir, to try to bring before the people of the Province -

MR. NEARY: To try to obstruct.

MR. MURPHY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask at this moment if the rules of this House could be enforced and request that that gentleman be removed. I am going to request that, Sir. I am going to ask you to make a ruling, to remove from this House, to carry out the rules of the House.

MR. NEARY: Murphy's law.

MR. MURPHY: A great bunch of jokers. Like the old people used to say, "You are galling now but in a few months time it will be something different." If we can get this out to the people, there is where we are losing out on this, Mr. Speaker, this stuff is not going out to the people because the press cannot get a chance. I wish we did have television here, we would have them over there with their hands joined and eyes, you know, the little saints.

MR. SPEAKER(NOEL): Order please! I wonder if we could get on with the debate

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I am just trying to demand my rights as a member of this House and everybody else's rights and I think, Mr. Speaker must agree with me that we have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: I think the hon. member for Gander is going to speak.

MR. COLLINS: The member for Gander will speak when he wants to speak.

MR. MURPHY: They will all yap in their chairs but not one of them have the guts to get up on their feet and speak.

MR. NEARY: That is the kind of language -

MR. MURPHY: This is plain, down-to-earth language.

MR. SPEAKER(NOEL): Order please! If there are any further interruptions of a speaker the Chair will have to take notice of it. The Chair would request the senior members of the House to please do the Chair the courtesy of making the task of the Chair a little easier.

MR. COLLINS: Surely, Mr. Speaker, you will have to get a gag for those fellows.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, this motion, as moved by the hon. member for St. John's West, I think at this particular point in time is very, very important. It is not a joking matter where this Province today has a debt, direct or otherwise, of over \$1. billion and the members on the other side dare laugh at it. I think it shows the attitude they have towards the people of this Province this past twenty-two years. It is no longer, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal Government we have, it is a little club who do just what they want to with the people's money. I referred, not long ago, Mr. Speaker, to the Province of New Brunswick where we had a change of Government, where a Liberal Government had been in power for ten or eleven years, the new Government, Mr. Speaker, had an independent audit done of the affairs of that Province and they were astounded at the debt that had been accumulated over the past number of years. Since the net increase in New Brunswick, 1970-1971, their debt was \$53. million -

Mr. Murphy.

Here in this Province, it was over \$70 million. The overall debt of New Brunswick, \$354 million. Here in Newfoundland \$1,041,172,000. We have only been at it twenty-two years. New Brunswick has been at it nearly one hundred years. A per capita debt of \$566 in New Brunswick and \$2,041 here in the Province of Newfoundland. We hear statements made by this Government of how good their credit is; how easy it is to borrow money; how easy it is to get loans. The credit of this Province is "A-1." It is tops. I will say this again and it has been said by several speakers but it needs repeating and that is that we pay just about 9 per-cent for our money and Nova Scotia pay 7.5 per-cent - 7.35 per-cent. That is very significant, Mr. Speaker, because as we know that anybody who is in business, anybody borrowing money, you get the best rate for the best risk. Apparently our Province has not got that good a name in the money markets.

Take this year alone. We talked about our borrowing. This year alone, Government debentures, due this fiscal year in June, 1971 (That is two months time) we have a loan due of \$32,260,000; February, 1972, \$10, 850,000; February again, 1972, \$3 million. That is a total of something like \$46 million that we have to meet - the commitment we have to meet. There is no sinking fund - short-term loan. We will roll it over. We will roll it over. What percentage, I wonder, Mr. Speaker? What will the interest rate be on this \$40 odd million? The Government laugh its way through - a great joke!

During the past number of years this Government have complained of tight money. I have said, "Thank God for Newfoundland it was not loose." Over \$600 million of an increase in our debt since 1966. We hear the Government, in their great announcements and pronouncements, telling the people of the

Mr. Murphy.

great schools they have built; the great hospitals they have built; the great roads they have built, with the millions we have borrowed and with the millions that have flowed in here from Ottawa since 1949. Well they might have built roads and schools and hospitals and what have you, but, Mr. Speaker, the spending of money is not an art. Anyone can spend money but spending it wisely, I think, is where the businessman comes in. I would like and I hope the day will come when someone will be in a position to examine very closely just what has happened to our money over the past twenty-two years. Today, we had the hon. member for St. John's East just give us one little instance of where our money is going. This land deal, this real estate deal with the Government's favourite cousin, Lundrigans Limited. I would like to know how much more has been poured into this great firm, without tenders being called. Who worries? It is not the Government's money. It is not Premier Smallwood's money. It is not Department of Public Works. The minister, he does not own the money. Let her go! But the taxpayers of this Province are the ones who are supplying this money. We could go on and on and on. Money spent and no tenders called. A small job on the Eighth Floor, three years ago, \$750,000. We do not call tenders on small jobs - \$750,000. Renovations to the Eighth Floor, two years ago. The answer is on the Order Paper.

Even the hon. Minister of Health does not believe this could happen, sir. He just does not believe that this could happen, \$750,000.

MR. ROBERTS: The whole building only cost \$8 million.

MR. MURPHY: I do not care. Is this not an example I am trying to give to this hon. House? Is this not the message I am trying to project to the people?

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

MR. MURPHY: No, I will not permit a question. Sit down and get up and speak when your turn comes. Check on it! Check on it! Well he has a short memory. He has a short memory. I will have it out of that office in five

Mr. Murphy.

minutes, if you want to.

MR. ROBERTS: Would he? I would be delighted.

MR. MURPHY: Great hands! Look, speaking from the Chair, denying this, when the hon. member for St. John's West asks a question, everybody clams right up. Everybody clams right up. Look, there you go again - look, hands waving, mouths going. When it is your turn to speak, get up and answer the questions directed.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, prove the \$750,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Prove the \$5 million - the 5 million lies, last October.

MR. MURPHY: As I say..

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, ..

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, these are..

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from St. John's West has twice accused me of having lied to the House - twice accusing me of having lied. Now is that in order? I would ask for a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel) The Chair only takes cognizance of what happens in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Then in that case the hon. gentleman has also lied outside the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sue him!

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe I will. No, I cannot sue him for statements in the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I made that statement outside the House. The gentleman can sue me. He definitely can sue me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: That he deceived the people of Newfoundland last October about the \$5 million. I will say in the House and outside the House.

MR. ROBERTS: You said that I lied.

MR. CROSBIE: Deceived, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, we will see.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about this Government and the administration over the past twenty-two years - I will just mention this one particular answer that I received two years ago. I was more or less told that I was, if not telling a lie, very much..

MR. ROBERTS: No, no not lying. I would just like to know the question.

MR. MURPHY: I understand.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to know the question, you know, because my colleague the Minister of Public Works does not know what it is about. I do not know what it is about. It seems like an immense amount of money.

MR. MURPHY: But the Minister of Public Works, if I may explain, is just another minister in the Cabinet of this Government. The Minister of Public Works has some kind of an explanation to give me, why in June of 1970, a certain project was to cost \$1. 5 million and in October it cost \$1,996,000?

MR. ROBERTS: That is another story.

MR. MURPHY: But I have yet to receive anything on it.

MR. ROBERTS: That is another story.

MR. MURPHY: Just let me carry on. Look, we have been waiting here for two weeks for someone on the other side to get up and tell us what is happening.

MR. ROBERTS: You are scared to tell about the \$750,000.

All right, go on.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, as I say what we are discussing, in this non-confidence motion, embraces totally the opinion that we have of the administration during this past twenty-two years. Perhaps, no perhaps about it - definitely the handling of the people's money must be the most important factor in this motion. Anybody who has travelled through this Province, spoken with people, particular the fisheries of this Province, the fishermen, will certainly

MR. Murphy.

know that these people have been sadly neglected. We hear of huge investments in great third, fourth, fifth paper mills: ERCO, oil refineries and here we have fish plants operating with some capital from the Government and more power to them. We have areas of this Province, perhaps the great fishing areas of this Province, I think of the Cape Shore in Placentia East. I think of St Mary's District, I think of a great part of the district of Ferryland. The roads are not fit to travel over by helicopter, not talk about a motor vehicle. In Renews, for the lack of investment of some dollars, jobs are available, if we had the housing there. The same thing applies in Trepassay. I mean, if this Government are concerned, could we not divert some of the hundreds of millions of dollars that were guaranteed in Melville, ERCO, Shaheen and get into these areas, upgrade these roads, do something to provide jobs in our basic industries. The hon. member for Placentia West knows what I am talking about. If there were no fish plant in Marystown, I am sure that he would have a very depressed area down there.

The Burin Peninsula road will be finished, we hope, in a year or two. I think it would be a tremendous boost for that area. There are thousands of people in this Province who would have liked to visit that area, but just would not go over the road that was there. But now, we are getting the road. Now we are getting the road. The money is in Ottawa for it. If we had the N.D.P. in power or the P.C. or whatever Government, this money would still be available. There is no great credit due this administration for the millions of dollars that come from Ottawa. As a matter of fact, they are to be blamed for not taking advantage of a great many more dollars that are available. This great Economic Conference, we heard the great announcement about the Newfoundland Industrial Development Board, that big thing, pie in the sky. This was created by Act of this Legislature in 1967, two different things. We have a new one. We are letting the old one go. No! We have two. That

Mr. Murphy.

is the stuff. That is our Government: "Two chicken in every pot. Two cars in every garage." We heard another man say that about thirty years ago. That is what he was, a Conservative. We hear all the talk, Mr. Speaker, about the great DREE programme. We heard the Premier, a few short weeks before this great conference took place, explaining his definition of DREE. We heard Mr. Marchand telling us the story at the Economic Conference. There were some discrepancies in both their interpretations about preferred areas. We are talking about spending monies, with so many areas of this Province, as I said earlier, without a decent road to drive over. Someone comes up with a great brain storm that we are going to have a \$12 million expenditure on a road, something like ten miles, to help us get into St. John's five or six minutes quicker than we had been able to off the Trans-Canada. It is going to cost \$12 million for an access road.

MR. NOLAN: Same thing in Corner Brook. Are you against that too?

MR. MURPHY: I am not aware of the one in Corner Brook.

MR. ROBERTS: I can believe that.

MR. MURPHY: I am not aware of the one in Corner Brook.

But I am certainly aware of this of what purpose that is going to serve with so many other parts of the Province with nothing - absolutely nothing. Over the years, at least, since I have been here for eight years, we have been bringing up before this House a motion every year for this committee that we are going to have tomorrow or the next day or whenever it is going to be established, this public accounts committee. We were laughed at, scorned to think of this. All right, we are going to have this, but we are going to get into the Auditor General's Report.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Yes, yes. You can be brainy and not sensible.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman is neither.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If I cannot appeal to you. Sir, perhaps the hon. Edgar Bergen could keep the hon. Charlie McCarthy quiet while the hon Leader of the Opposition is speaking.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

I heard this morning, the Premier was asked the reason why this committee was set up. Oh, just to more or less satisfy this foolish Opposition who have been obstructing - obstructing the business of the House. Obstruction! I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if this debate ceased at this moment that there would be one bit of Government business that could be brought before the House. I doubt that. I doubt that. I doubt that. The Budget will not be ready for another week or so. I think the Cabinet polished it off today, according to the latest report.

MR. ROBERTS: There are one or two Bills on the Order Paper,

possibly we could, we could have had them today, we could have had them today. The Leader of the House calls for this, it is not the Opposition. We could have had them today.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is not himself today he is not ready -

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member is so ashamed, so ashamed that he has to share in the blame, as a member of the House, of what has been happening in this House.

MR. NEARY: All you have to do is look to your right and you get the blame.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the spending of the people's money, how wisely has this Government spent it over the past twenty-two years? We heard today again of these great leases, the real estate deals, the deals of buildings for this Government, for the Board of Liquor Control particularly the Liquor Commission. The hon. member has said we will never get the truth of it, we never will, there is a front there for this great corporation that has this deal working very nicely with the Government, very nicely, the highest kind of rents, I think it is to be compared that at one stage, where we paid more rent for some of these places outside of St. John's than you pay in the Royal Trust Building on Water Street. Look at the operation itself, with the Board of Liquor Control, of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission Mr. Speaker. The way this Government has been abusing the use of liquor as far as the public are concerned. Who can get a liquor license and who cannot?

Mr. Speaker, I will say this, unless this House really buckles down and takes very seriously the present financial condition of this Province and if this Government is allowed to continue in power for another four or five years we know what will happen. I would not dare the people, but I dare this Government. I dare this Government to call an election even beginning today.

MR. ROBERTS: (inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Oh, no, my speech does not matter, my speech does not matter.

The hon. joker from White Bay North. I think that is what this Province wants Mr. Speaker, and I think there are the ones we should go to for this vote of confidence, not to us groups here in this House. We can only move these things with the hope that the people on the outside have been made aware of what is happening here. What a great joke this House has become, by members on the other side, not by the Hon. Speaker because I think he has a very difficult job to keep this in order. But, Mr. Speaker, when you get a Government that has been in power for twenty-two years and have run the Government as a closed-shop within the confines of the Cabinet Room, I think democracy in this Province is becoming very shaky.

The latest we have heard is the great oil development that is going to take place off our Province here, and we certainly hope it does. But when you hear statements by the Hon. Premier, such as he has been releasing since the return from Louisiana, and you hear men like Mr. Etchegary and other people speak on this same matter, I think they are a little bit less enthusiastic than the Premier that we will have oil flowing in here in about a month, matter of weeks. When we hear our Premier make these great statements, like Rotary, last year, 15,000 new jobs will be created. I think we are supposed to have something like 1600 people working at Come by Chance now, if we are to refer back to last year's Hansard. There was going to be 300 in September I think and 500 in - this is the type of stuff I think, Mr. Speaker, that our people have been fed over the years and, in my opinion, are being fed up with this. A man cannot put bread on his table with promises. He just cannot do it. He has to have a job, a permanent job, a job that will provide him and his family with the where-with-all to live in comfort, with the respect of his fellow citizens.

The welfare department or the social services department has been referred to Mr. Speaker. Last October or November I made a statement

in view of many complaints I had received about the meagre fuel allowance that our people were receiving on welfare. They had a very hard winter. I think it was December the hon. minister came out and announced an extra five dollar fuel allowance.

MR. NEARY: January.

MR. MURPHY: January - Then we had to go and thaw the people out, bad enough to have them freezing in the first place when you had to spend extra money to thaw them out, ten dollars a month for fuel, ten dollars a month. He advanced it five dollars, to fifteen.

MR. NEARY: Twenty dollars a month now. Fifteen all the year around. It has been increased five dollars.

MR. MURPHY: Increased five dollars. Right. Regarding welfare, Mr. Speaker, over the years I have been bringing into this House, on several occasions, the great difference in a man who has purchased a home, become sick, something happens to him, he is paying off his mortgage, our department will not pay these monthly payments for him, but next door to him there is a man who is living in a rented home, paid the same monthly rate, and we will pay his rent. We will pay the man who has the mortgaged home, we will pay his interest only. I think we are about the only Province, one of the few that has that rule in effect. We are one of the very few. I have them here if the hon. minister wants to check, one of the very few.

MR. NEARY: No, we are not. The hon. member knows that -

MR. MURPHY: In some areas, in some areas. I was coming to that, Sir. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say before I was interrupted, our welfare plans are comparable to any and in some instances much better. I think the hon. minister will agree with me, and I said this to him on many occasions. But there are improvements to be made, there is fuel allowance, another hard winter, it is going to be pretty tough on a lot of our people.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to another matter contained in this resolution, and that is the matter of answering questions. Now, we know that a minister is not compelled to answer any question put to him in this House. But, we asked the questions and I said this not once, but a hundred times, the reason we ask the question is that the people of the Province may be informed of what is happening to their monies, what is happening in the Government departments. The Hon. Speaker has, on many occasions, requested ministers when answering questions to table them and table copies for the Press. In very few instances has this been followed. The Press are very anxious as a part of their function to keep the people informed, to get what they can for the information of the people, what transpires in this House of Assembly. But I would say, in many cases, a great many cases, that information is being denied them, because of the fact that we do not get the cooperation of the Ministers when answering questions, particularly. These questions do not have to be answered in longhand any more. If the Minister had to sit down and write ten or twelve pages you could excuse him but he can get them taken off on a machine. They can supply fifty copies as easy as they can supply one copy.

If this House of Assembly is going to function properly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government as well as we on this side must cooperate in doing the business of the Province, and doing it to the best of our ability. I will say, Sir, that this Government has fallen far short of being responsible representatives of the people. We have had many instances where we, on this side of the House, are not informed as to whether the House meets tomorrow night, tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow morning, I think the hon. member for St. John's West again mentioned that if the Premier decided to take off for two weeks everything stops for tea. We have forty-two members, we are down to forty now perhaps

to thirty-nine, but I feel that the Government, with the majority it has over there, should be prepared to carry on the business of this House. I am quite surprised Mr. Speaker, that this House is meeting tonight because the Premier has to attend a function outside of the House. He will not be here tonight. This is one of the few occasions Sir, that this has happened. The support of our Bill on the Select Committee was another one; this indeed is a day of surprises, I think. .. for all of us here in this House - a day of surprises -

MR. MARSHALL: Who is going to be number one tonight?

MR. MURPHY: It is six o'clock. shall we call it six o'clock Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 17

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER: While calling order I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have in the galleries today two groups of students. The first group is from the Garrigus Pentecostal Academy of St. Lunaire, White Bay North together with twelve members of their teaching staff and their wives and present also with them is Pastor John Welch, Chairman of the St. Lunaire Pentecostal School Committee. The second group that we have are a group of schoolgirl curlers, champions for Central Newfoundland. They are from the Grand Falls Academy and they are the runners-up in the all Newfoundland Championship and they are under the direction of Mrs. Roger House. I know that all members will demonstrate how well this House behaves and these students will not go away with a bad impression.

Presenting Petitions:

MR.T.HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions. One on behalf of some seventy-two voters who live either on or near a road located in the Community of Outer Cove. The prayer of the petition is that the road be widened and upgraded so as to permit the Department of Highways to plough it during the winter months. The Department, Sir, I might add have had some difficulty in ploughing this road because it is so narrow. There has been some problem in the past in getting the people who reside on that road agreeable to give their land. I am told that this has all been arranged and the people ask the department now to proceed with the widening of the road.

Also, Sir, I have a petition signed by more than 400 residents of the Communities of Logy Bay; Outer Cove; and Middle Cove protesting the suggestion that the plant, asphalt plant presently located in Mundy Pond be moved to Robin Hood Bay. The decision Mr. Speaker, has not been made, as I understand, to move that plant but there is every possibility that it will be moved there. My information is that if Central Mortgage and Housing agree to the cost involved in the move, then council will proceed to move it.

There have been a number of statements Mr. Speaker, from the Council one contradicting the other as far as this matter is concerned. I view it as a serious matter and the people that I represent must look upon it likewise. There will be other petitions regarding the matter from residents within the city residing in the East End. People Mr. Speaker, are determined that this plant is not to be located in that part of the district. It is understandable Sir, that Council has a problem. But on the other hand Council was well aware, should have been well aware when they set that plant up in Mundy Pond. That the people of Mundy Pond were demanding services at that time a an urban renewal scheme or something similar to it, would sooner or later take care of the problems in that area. How Council ever envisaged an urban renewal scheme, and upgrading a development of that area with an asphalt plant right in the middle of it I will never know.

People of my area Mr. Speaker, are very, very concerned about this matter. They had the city dump literally dumped on them some six, seven years ago. We are told that there is a rodent programme in effect in that area, City Engineers makes this statement that the situation is under control. Of course one of the reasons for this programme is to control the rats, in that area. I can assure Mr. Speaker, members of the House and the public generally that if there is a programme in effect in that area the rats are in control because the place is alive with them. People in the area cannot hang their washes out. The odours which come from the dump reaches as far as four and five miles, one can imagine what is going to happen if this plant is located and that gets into operation. Mr. Speaker, there is already a plant operated by a private company not too far from this same area. Plans are underway to have that company do something about that. It is the general feeling

April 15, 1971. Tape 258 page 3.

that the people in those areas, that something has to be done in regard to the city dump, eventually to have it relocated, and they are determined to use every possible means to prevent this plant from locating at Robin Hood Bay. I would ask Sir, that both of these petitions be received by the House and referred to the department to which they relate.

MR.A.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the prayer of the petition, I have had several calls myself on the odour from the dump, and the presence of rodents and now, with this asphalt plant, one of the biggest problems will be the problem of fall-out. I am just wondering what department would be concerned, I am just wondering if this new department we have set up, this Clean Air Water, Pollution whatever we have and in doing this Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge Government to put into practice the great philosophies we have been trying to preach here about pollution. I would certainly strongly urge this House to take note of perhaps this one instance, this may be one of many and in an area like Outer Cove, Logy Bay and so on and so forth where there is a lot of arable land I am just afraid that the fall-out from this not only the stench which the people have to put up with but the fall-out from this plant will be a great detriment to farming in the area. I would suggest that whatever department is responsible for this new anti-pollution group would take this matter very seriously and get to work on it and see that the prayer of this petition is answered.

HON. W.CALLAHAN(Min. of Mines, Agric.& Resources): Mr. Speaker, in rising to, in fact support the prayer of the petition because the problem is a very difficult one as far as the people are concerned and it is not, as

the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has said, it is not an isolated problem, it does happen place to place and time to time. For the people concerned it is difficult. We have been, at least the Clean Air Water and Soil Authority which Mr. Speaker, has only been in operation for seven or eight months. It has just acquired a general manager and is just acquiring competent staff, has nonetheless been involved in the problem at Mundy Pond and has been very concerned also about certain aspects of the dump situation at Robin Hood Bay. But, that also is not an isolated problem. We have been attempting to work with the municipality in cleaning up older situations and certainly in terms of insuring that proper standards and criteria are observed in the creation of new waste disposal areas.

The problem very simply, Mr. Speaker, as I found it necessary to remind a delegation who came to see me some weeks ago about the operation of the waste disposal area in their community. What they were in fact doing was complaining to me about how they were dumping their garbage. Now that was not said Mr. Speaker, with a view to avoiding problem or evading the problem but it is nonetheless a fact of life that you must dispose of waste materials somewhere and the difficulty is finding the place to do it where it will not only be properly done and safely done in terms of health and environment generally but also where it can be done economically, because one of the great costs that the municipalities face is the cost of disposing of all manners of waste materials. But having made these few remarks by way of explanation and I hope hon. members have had a chance to look at the first report of the Clean, Air, Water & Soil Authority which I tabled here a couple of days ago. I think they will see from that, that the authority has been reaching out and in fact involved in very very many matters most of them of serious import and that we intend to pursue the whole matter more vigorously as the authority

get experience, as the problems are identified and we are now undertaking programmes in that direction. We, did in fact go to all the municipalities last fall with a questionnaire and with the request that they identify for us their problems and we did not have very good response. But we intend now to pursue it another way and to go and find out for ourselves with our own people during this summer, what some of the specific problems are because until we have identified the problems specifically it is pretty difficult to deal with them. We are aware of the Mundy Pond situation, we have been involved in that and we are quite concerned as to what the solution may be, we have to have asphalt plants. I think the answer is not to close down these plants it is to insure that the stack affluent is controlled and that is the direction towards which those involved are working. We also are aware of the general situation at Robin Hood Bay and I hope we shall in co-operation with the City of St. John's be able to affect some improvement there. But generally Mr. Speaker, having said that I wish to support the prayer of the petition. .

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the prayer of the petition. It is to be remembered that this area is one of the most beautiful areas in Newfoundland certainly in eastern Newfoundland. There has been a park envisaged for the area itself, a provincial park. Unless steps are taken to preserve the beauty of the area this park may not become a reality or may not be able to operate to its full potential. It is therefore very important that attention be paid to this particular petition. I am also delighted to see the Minister's remarks with respect to the attitude taken by the Government with respect to pollution of the areas within the municipalities. I think it is a situation that we will look forward to with great anticipation, that things will be done and because there are many other areas as well, that municipalities are not able to cope with themselves apparently, such as in my district or adjacent

to my district Rennie's River, Quidi Vidi etc.. I would hope that this Clean Air. Water & Soil Authority will pay good strong attention to that as well.

MR.J.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the prayer of the petition. I think that what the hon. minister had to say made very good sense. It is not an easy problem for municipalities to deal with, and it is not a problem that only applies here in Newfoundland. Anybody that reads at all widely these days will discover it is a problem all through North America what to do with garbage disposal and waste and the rest of it.

The Minister mentioned the Clean Air Water & Soil Authority report which I thought was an excellent one. They certainly seem to be looking into the main problems and the authority gives promise of being a very valuable adjunct to the Government. I think they are to be congratulated on their first report. I am sure we will expect that they will be following that up.

As I say it is not an easy problem Mr. Speaker, so the city of St. John's has to have a place for a city dump. It is not easy to decide where is the right place, has to have an asphalt plant, there are economic reasons as the minister mentioned. But on the other hand the rights of people not to be bothered by a public nuisance are also very important. So I would support the prayer of the petition and express the wish that the Government and the Municipality can work this out for the people concerned.

HON.E.DAWE(Min. of Mun. Aff. & Housing): Mr. Speaker, I will be bringing measures, I hope later in the House, a programme will be announced for incinerators to be installed in the various municipalities. We are convinced that this will go a long way in relieving this problem with many of the dumps that we have associated with the municipalities and

April 15 1971 Tape 258 page 7.

I would say within the City of St. John's itself. While it may not relieve the problems to the fullest extent we are convinced this is the answer, we know. We have several of them in operation now and this is the answer to the unsightly conditions we have associated with dumps. It is the answer to the rat menace. When these are properly installed and properly maintained in a suitable location we are convinced this will relieve this problem to a very great extent.

On motion petition received:

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I perhaps missed my turn at the beginning but, with leave, I should like to make a ministerial statement. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the appointment, following consultation with the Wabana Town Council and the Bell Island Association, of a Board of Trustees to administer a community fund founded upon revenues derived from the disposal of the remaining assets of the Bell Island mines. At the Government's request, the Wabana Town Council have nominated Major Frank Pendergast and the Bell Island Association have nominated Mr. Albert Whelan to be members of the Board of Trustees and these two nominees in turn have recommended the Rev. Mr. Donald Morgan to be chairman. The Government have, of course, accepted these nominations and the subsequent recommendation and today have formally confirmed the appointment of the Board of Trustees.

Since it was agreed several months ago to establish the community fund, whose resources would go to finance small development projects on Bell Island, certain sums of money have been received and held in suspense, pending the receipt of nominations and the appointment of the Board. These amounts now will be passed over to the Board. It is anticipated that additional amounts will be forthcoming.

In conjunction with this announcement, I wish to table the financial statement of the mining division, Bell Island, representing a full final and formal accounting of the liquidation of assets of the former DOSCO mining property, for the period July 1st, 1966 to July 31st, 1971. The statement will show that of total receipts, amounting to \$2,019,493.72, the total disbursements came to \$1,972,100.44 for the period with approximately eighty-five per-cent of the expenditures made directly at Bell Island, the largest proportion by far for wages to residents of Bell Island.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I present a petition in behalf of a great number of my constituents, citizens of the community of Harbour Deep? I think that the letter with which the petitioners, who number about 200, which would be every adult citizen in that community, the letter with which they sent their petition, Mr. Speaker, puts their case more eloquently than I can and perhaps in presenting the petition I could read the letter.

MR. ROBERTS:

It says, "We, the undersigned, residents of Harbour Deep in the district of White Bay North do hereby petition Her Majesty's Government through our worthy member and our request is such that the Government of Newfoundland shall endeavour to have the community of Harbour Deep connected with the outside world by means of a dial telephone system to each householders who may require same. We are indeed grateful for the progress which has been made over the past years in the field of electricity, education and medical care and feel confident that the Government will again listen to the humble prayer of our petition and see that our request is granted. Since the parents and others of Harbour Deep have children, relatives and friends scattered all over Newfoundland, Canada and the United States we also feel that it would be a great benefit to be able to talk to them at any time by means of telephone. In addition it would greatly improve direct communications for the business life of our community." It is signed, as I have said, Sir, by every or what appears to be every adult citizen of that community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this petition as strongly as I can. Harbour Deep is now, with the exception of the small community of Great Breat near St. Anthony which will receive a road connection this fall, this coming fall, Harbour Deep is now the only community left in White Bay North without roads. As Your Honour is aware and as perhaps some hon. members are aware, Harbour Deep is going to be a very difficult and perhaps impossible place to build a road into. It lies at the head of a long narrow fiord, a very beautiful but very rough country. The only way we will ever get a road there, that I can see, in the immediate future is if my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources, can persuade Price to part with the two million cords of wood they are letting rot on the Mooney Block. If those can be opened for commercial logging, thus we can support a road for those purposes and then the road, of course, would come across the Peninsula from about Port Saunders in the district of St. Barbe South.

These people, Sir, are among the finest people in the Province,

MR. ROBERTS:

fishermen, loggers, they have sent their children out to be educated, they work as teachers and as nurses, every walk of life, and today they are more isolated than they were fifty years ago. The only communication system now is a telegraph system, which sometimes works, and the radio-telephone, which is sort of over and out, you would almost think you were at sea. C.N.T. who have responsibility for providing communications in that part of Newfoundland have done a great deal in the past few years. They have put modern systems into St. Anthony, in the community of St. Lunaire-Griquet, Raleigh, they have put a systems of sorts, this fall, into Ship Cove and we still need considerable progress even in those areas.

Mr. Speaker, in these areas they have some system; in Harbour Deep they have nothing. They have been neglected - thus I would move that the House receive this petition and refer it to the department to which it relates. Since this may require further representations to another Government, perhaps, if the petition could be referred to the leader of the Government, I will undertake to see if the leader of the Government, the Premier, will forward these representations, with our support, as the Government, to another place. I have very much pleasure in presenting the petition, Sir.

On motion, petition received.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, last week I tabled some documents in connection with the Come By Chance oil refinery project, we only tabled one copy because they were very massive and a great number of them. I said if any hon. member wished to examine them outside the clerks office, if he would let me know, The hon. member for St. John's West, not surprisingly, asked for copies and we have now had these photostated, they are here and if the clerk could come, I will table them and then - but these are not for the clerks office, Sir, these are for use by hon. members. They can take them home at nights and read them and so forth.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House closes tonight at

MR. CURTIS:

11 o'clock, the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at 11 of the clock in the morning.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to questions number 5 on the Order Paper of March 25th asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, question number 311 on the Order Paper of March 30th, asked by the same hon. gentleman, answer to question 402 asked by the same hon. gentleman on the Order Paper of April 2nd and the answer to number 407 on the Order Paper of April 2nd asked by the hon. member for Burin.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. gentleman opposite asked me to forbear from answering some more questions of the many they have asked but I do have some more answers for them today if my shadow is ready. We will take them in numerical order. The first is question number 90 asked by the hon. member for St. John's East on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 25th. He asked, "How many meetings were held by the St. John's Hospital Advisory Council in 1970?" The answer is eleven, four of those were meetings of the whole council, seven were meetings of committees of the council.

Question 91, "How many meetings were held by the Provincial Health Council in 1970?" The answer is none. Question 92 -

MR. MARSHALL: I wonder then is the Minister going to consider abandoning this particular committee because I noticed last year he made observations to the effect that it had not met and he was going to look into it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, the Minister will consider it, I can say that we have agreed upon some changes, and I was speaking to the chairman of the Council just this morning, Mr. French, will be in a position shortly to make announcements but some members have retired and there will be some new appointments and we will be making possibly some changes in the terms of reference.

MR. MARSHALL: Are salaries still being paid?

MR. ROBERTS: The only salaries that are being paid, well, the next question will deal with that. Mr. Speaker, the next question is 92. Members of the

MR. ROBERTS:

St. John's Hospital Advisory Council, as of December 31st, there is a long list and I will lay a table on the copy of the House. There has been no change in the membership.

MR. MURPHY: That is very nice.

MR. ROBERTS: I will lay a copy of the House on the table, if that is what the House prefers, Mr. Speaker. I will lay a copy of this on the table of the House, if that is the way they will have it.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. Minister is like the Premier getting all mixed up in his figures.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is very hard not to get mixed up when I see; "do not forget it I am the leader over there." The hon. gentleman also asked if any salaries, wages, etc. were paid to members of the St. John's Hospital Advisory Council? The answer is that the only member who was paid during 1970 was the chairman, Mr. Ainsworth. He was paid \$3,600. and that, of course, was in the estimates.

There were two other questions dealing with the Provincial Health Council, the answers to which I will have shortly. Question 109 on the Order Paper of March 25th, asked by the hon. member for St. John's East, "What action has been taken on the petition of the residents of St. Barbe South, presented in the House of Assembly on June 12, 1970, requesting improved medical facilities in the Port Saunders, Hawkes Bay, Port au Choix area?" The answer is that discussions have been held with the International Grenfell Association, both by me and by my officials, and further discussions; are to be held with residents of the communities concerned. I have been in touch with the chairman of the community councils and, I might add, with representatives of the Northern Regional Development Association about this. It is our policy, of course, Sir, to involve the people concerned in any decision regarding the medical facilities in their area. I might add that I had hoped to be able to visit the area this week but, to show you the problems we still encounter in this Province, I was speaking this morning with Dr. Thomas, the head of the International Grenfell at St. Anthony, to see if arrangements could be made, because I would like to

MR. ROBERTS:

have the I.G.A. present, as they operate these facilities and would have to provide any new facilities. To show you the sort of problems we still encounter, the weather today on the Northern Peninsula is zero, zero which means no visibility, no flying. There is a helicopter on the way north, because the normal air ambulances cannot operate, it being breakup time, and it is a very serious problem. We have a man in Mary's Harbour who yesterday cut off both his arms with a chain saw, in some sort of horrible accident. There is a nursing station in Mary's Harbour and the man, I am sure, is receiving treatment but to show you the sort of problems that can still come, that man, we have no way at this stage to get him to the hospital, I do not know if the ferry is still operating but we may have to try to move him that way. So we still have our problems.

Question 111, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East, of course, on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 25th, asked what action was taken on a petition from the people of Trinity in Bonavista Bay, Centreville, Wareham and Indian Bay, requesting the purchase of a building for the doctor's clinic. The answer is that the matter is receiving continuing review by me and by my officials and, as we have not yet succeeded in recruiting a doctor for the Centreville area, we have not as yet had to provide accommodation. We are trying to recruit a doctor and when we have one, suitable accommodation will be provided. I might add as well that one of the doctors working in our Cottage Hospital, at Brookfield, is married to a lady who is also a doctor, and that lady is in private practice in the area, at least they reside in Badger's Quay and so that lady is providing medical service for the people of that area.

MR. ROBERTS: Question no. (112), requesting the appointment of a school nurse. It is really a public Health nurse, and as my friend from Bonavista South told the hon. gentleman, the nurse was appointed and is at work. Question (118) Mr. Speaker, March 25th. the answer is sixty. We have eleven students registered in our bursary programme, I assume that is what the hon. gentleman means by subventions. Question (119) asked who are the members of the Board of Directors of the St. John's General Hospital. Under the legislation Mr. Speaker, the Board of Governors remain unchanged from last year, with the exception of two new appointments that were announced by me, Mr. James Barnes and Mr. Vernon Hollett, who was one of the assistant Deputy Ministers in Social Services and Rehabilitation. I will table a list of these people. I have no idea Mr. Speaker what remuneration each director receives, but if the hon. gentleman means wages or remuneration as a director the answer is none. The Government do not operate the hospital, so I have no knowledge of how many meetings were held by the Board of Directors. I would suggest that possibly the Chairman of the Board Mr. Eaton, Mr. Campbell Eaton, could be asked.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that for a minute. I said I do not keep track of how many meetings the board has. I am in close touch with the board, and my officials are in close touch with the hospital, but I have no idea how many meetings of the board are held, and I must say I do not really care. It is up to the board. A similar question, no. (120) was asked about Western Memorial Hospital. I will table a list of the Board of Directors of the hospital. None of them received any salary or remuneration as a member of the board except Dr. Miller my Deputy Minister. He was not paid as a member of the board, but, of course, he is paid as Deputy Minister of Health. There also I have no idea of how many meetings the Board of Directors of that hospital hold. I know of one, because I had one meeting with them. I suggest that Mr. Leonard Martin of Corner Brook could be invited to give the information to that. We look to the boards to run the hospital. We will do two more, Mr. Speaker, and that maybe is enough. The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (my cynical friend, the Premier has cut to the heart of the matter) Question no. (121) Order Paper March 25th.

There have been five separate proposals which could be termed "Architectural and/or conceptual plans" to use the words of the question. They were prepared by the firm of Belange, Roi, Blanchet and Albert, and by the Firm of Lundrigans Limited. Part three; \$512,500.00. Part four, the answer is nothing. I should explain, the final plan adopted by the Government to extend the Western Memorial Hospital by adding 285 acute care beds in a new unit, will make use of much of the information developed in these five separate proposals.

Of the sum mentioned above, the \$512 thousand, an amount of \$140 thousand has been directly credited towards the cost of preparing the plans and specifications for the proposal which is to go ahead. There is another question subsequently, but we have already announced publicly, my colleague, the Minister of Public Works did, the the Firm of Belange and Roi have been appointed as architects. The fifth part of the question is not applicable. It does not apply Mr. Speaker. Question no. (122), we are still on the Order Paper of March 25th. The answer, my officials have no record of this, because, this is not the sort of information that comes in. Indeed, none of my advisers could tell me what registered nursing hours meant. The second part, the answer is 123,300, nearly 125 thousand. Finally, question no. (123) by the indefatigable member for St. John's East, Order Paper March 25th. There are no regional advisory health boards in any part of Newfoundland including the Avalon Peninsula. The appointment of such boards would be a matter of policy, and of course, as Your Honour will appreciate, these are not dealt with in answers to questions. If the hon. gentleman would like a citation, he might try (171B) little (b) in Beauséjour.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, the hon. minister is sharp today.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the hon. the minister in dealing with the hon. gentleman could not help but be sharp. He is in the kingdom of the blind and the one eyed man is king.

HON. S. A. NEARY (Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no. (450) on the Order Paper of Wednesday, April 14th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. I am sure the hon. member is waiting with bated breath for the answer to this question, although he is not in his seat at the moment. The investigation showed that Mr. Pickett was not

involved in obtaining signatures, but was merely acting as a witness to the signatures, in his capacity as Commissioner of Oaths. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pickett was married yesterday, I understand from my seating partner here from Placentia West. I am sure that his new wife will be very pleased to see that he is getting honourable recognition in this House.

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

MR. NEARY: Of course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: In answering another question from the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, concerning the same incident, the hon. minister indicated that disciplinary action had been taken. Why would disciplinary action be taken if Mr. Pickett was acting only as a witness?

MR. NEARY: I am not quite sure if I understood the.....

MR. HICKMAN: In answer to a previous question, the hon. minister indicated to the House, that as a result of the complaint an investigation was made, that disciplinary action, but you felt that you could not disclose to the House the nature of the disciplinary action. Now, my question is, if Mr. Pickett were simply witnessing these signatures, why would that necessitate or demand disciplinary action?

MR. NEARY: Well Mr. Speaker, the only answer that I can give to that question is that I personally pointed out to the Welfare Officer concerned, that the reason he was a Commissioner of Oaths was to do welfare work. He did not understand that. His terms of reference as a Commissioner of Oaths are much broader. I asked him if he would in future confine his activities as Commissioner of Oaths to work involving welfare etc.

MR. HICKMAN: And that was the disciplinary action?

MR. NEARY: That is right, well that was disciplinary action?

MR. CROSBIE: For the minister to speak to him was unbearable action really.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I want to dazzle the Opposition. The answer to question no. (453) Mr. Speaker, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, favourably interested in welfare institutions. The answer to part one, is no special report. The answer to part two, is (a) twenty-eight licensed at present time. (b) twenty-

three boarding homes, four institutions for the aged and infirm, and one day care centre. Question no. (3) asked for a list of the names of such institutions, Mr. Speaker. I do not have copies - the required number of copies, but I can let the hon. member have this copy, if I could get somebody to deliver it over to him, rather than waste the time of the House reading out the list.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the minister says that there has been no special report to the minister, is it not a fact that the legislation requires a report be made to the minister each year, and if so, why has not the board carried out the directions of the legislation?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not aware that the legislation states that it is compulsory for the Welfare Institutions Board to give me an annual report. I get a report from the Welfare Institutions Board just about once a week.

MR. CROSBIE: If the minister is not aware, would he look at the Act and then become aware of the fact that a report is required each year, a yearly report.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will see to it in the future that the hon. member gets a special report from the Welfare Institutions Board.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister should get it.

MR. SPEAKER: . Further answers to questions:

HON. E.S.JONES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I propose to table the copies of answers to several questions because they are rather lengthy. Number (40) on the Order Paper of March 25th. asked by the hon. the member for Burin. No. (42) the hon. member for Burin on the Order Paper of March 25th. No. (82) on the Order Paper of the 25th. of March, for the hon. the Member for Burin. No. (85) on the Order Paper of March 25th. for the hon. the member for Burin (He had a lost weekend) No. (150) on the Order Paper of the 25th. of March, by the hon. the member for St. John's East. No. (201) on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March, for the hon. the member for Burin. No. (202) on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March, for the hon. the member for Burin. No. (217) on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March, for the same hon. gentleman. no. (218) on the same day by the same hon. gentleman. No. (221) on the same day by the same gentleman. (247) by the hon. the member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March. No. (262) on the Order Paper of the 29th of March, by the hon. the member

for Burin. No. (287) for the hon. the member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March. No. (289) Am I going too fast?

MR. CROSBIE: No. (287), the minister is tabling the copy of the lease, or just the answer to a question?

MR. JONES: You will see the answer there, Mr. Speaker, in the answer to the question.

MR. CROSBIE: Then the minister is not tabling the copy of the lease?

MR. JONES: No Mr. Speaker. The reason will be apparent when the answer to the question is read. (289), by the hon. the member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of the 29th. of March. No. (303) for the hon. the member for St. John's East, on the 30th. of March. No. (336) on the Order Paper of the 1st. of April, by the hon. the member for Burin.

MR. CROSBIE: That was (336) was it?

MR. JONES: Yes Mr. Speaker, (336). No. (346) on the Order Paper of April 1st., by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Finally I hope, no. (367) in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of April 1st.

HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answers to a number of questions. Question (439) in the name of the hon. the member for Gander, on the Order Paper of April 13th. The answer is, since caribou hunting has been permitted on the Avalon Peninsula in recent years, licenses have been issued only to persons residing on the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. CALLAHAN.

The reason for this, of course, is precisely the reason that applies in the case of Brunette Island, the Horse Islands and other areas, wildlife areas that are very close to communities. Seven or eight years ago, Mr. Speaker, the population of the Avalon herd was about 200 animals. Hunting was not permitted. The wilderness area there or the special game area was established. Thanks to the co-operation of about well, I suppose, nearly half of the population of the Province who lived surrounding that small area, the herd has increased and increased so that the allowable harvest has grown from forty in the first year to fifty, to seventy-five, to one hundred and this year to one hundred and twenty licences on a sustained yield basis. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is 120 this year.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this is due entirely to the good sense and co-operation of the people of the area surrounding that small area who have kept the law, who have had the sense to see - Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the population of this Province are on the Avalon Peninsula, and I suggest, to my shadow, that it is unique in the inhabited world, within almost jogging distance of a major metropolitan centre, you can have in an area such as this with a growing wildlife population and with obviously a growing sustained annual harvest.

MR. COLLINS: People in Central Newfoundland sustained the moose population. The moose were brought in there in 1920.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the 1971 licences..

MR. COLLINS: A lot of tripe.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the 1971 licences - this is the greatest success story in major wildlife management, Mr. Speaker, in North America, and it is so recognized. The hon. member for St. John's West has just said that it is. There is no question about it. The 1971 licences were issued by a drawing, two separate drawings were held, one, for residents of St. John's, Mount Pearl and the second for other residents of the Avalon Peninsula. The number of licences

Mr. Callahan.

available to the St. John's-Mount Pearl residents was fifty; while other residents of the Peninsula had seventy licences available to them. The breakdown being -

MR. COLLINS: It should have been cut out a year ago.

MR. CALLAHAN : The breakdown being roughly in ratio to the population in the urban and rural areas.

MR. COLLINS: How many did the people of Gander and Grand Falls get?

MR. CALLAHAN: After the public drawing had been completed, the successful applicants were given a period in which to pick up their licences. Four of the St. John's-Mount Pearl residents failed to pick up their licences as did six from the remainder of the Avalon. Another drawing was held to select applicants for those ten licences and these individuals, two, were notified to pick up their licences by a specific time. In this case, all ten secured their licence.

Question no. 25, Mr. Speaker, also in the name of the hon. and valuable member for Gander, on the Order Paper of March 25. Who is the present chairman and who are the present members of the Board of the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation? The answer is Mr. Hubert Sharp, chairman; Mr. D. Pepper; Mr. M. Bray; Mr. J. McDonald; Mr. W. G. Dawe and Mr. E. L. Williams. (2) Who is the manager and what are the terms of his appointment? The manager is Mr. Albert Dunphy. He is manager of the Pleasantville Agricultural Complex. His annual salary is \$10,000.

The Question no. 30, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander. I think it already has been answered, Mr. Speaker, March 31st.

The Question no. 32, on the Order Paper of March 25, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander. What new Provincial Parks were constructed or partly constructed during 1970? (1) one park, Nummichog located beside

Mr. Callahan

Little Codroy Estuary, will be opened for public use in May of this year. This was the only new park constructed. Nine others were enlarged and improved. The expenditure on the new park, \$51,980. Contributions received or expected from ARDA towards the cost of construction, fifty per cent of the cost. Facilities provided in that new park, camp ground with thirty-eight; dual purpose camp sites; day use area with thirty picnic sites; the parking lot measuring 500 by 70; the beach area with change houses and a boat launch. The park has standard facilities such as tables, fire places, garbage containers, drinking water, from serviced wells, and pit toilets. There are 7,145 feet of access road. There is a park officer's cabin and office. There is a workshop and repair centre as the part of the work and maintenance facility of the western region.

A further question, Mr. Speaker, on Provincial Parks, which relates to the one that I have just given. This is Question no. 31, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander, on the Order Paper of March 25th. (1) List, giving total expenditures to date in 1970-71, the Provincial Parks which have been expanded? (2) Giving details in each instance. (3) Does the ARDA agreement continue to apply to such expansions? If so, what was the contribution and so on? The detail, Mr. Speaker, there were nine parks, as I have said expanded being: Barachoix on which the expenditure was \$30,200. Well I do not have copies, Mr. Speaker. I could table it. But I will have to get copies made. Okay. I would be prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. Let me just say that the parks expanded were Barachoix, Bellview Beach, Beothuck, Butterpot Park, Gushue's Pond, Indian River, Jack's Pond, Notre Dame and Square Pond. The ARDA contribution was fifty per cent of that expansion under a special arrangement. We felt the need to expand big parks, rather than build new ones, because these were where the major traffic was. There was

Mr. Callahan.

danger of overuse. So rather than proceed in that year to build new parks, as we had planned, we changed our plans and expanded the nine and built one new park in order to better provide for the forecast traffic in the areas in which these nine parks are located.

MR. COLLINS: Do not go in the wood in Central Newfoundland this fall.

MR. CALLAHAN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman over there keeps mumbling over there this morning, and I cannot understand what he is saying. Perhaps, after I sit down he will stand up and make a speech.

The Question no. 437 in the name of the hon. the member for Gander. He is trying, apparently, very hard to succeed me. At least he gained the knowledge required to succeed me.

MR. COLLINS: It will not be long.

MR. CALLAHAN: In the hon. gentleman's case, it might take quite a long time. No. 437 on the Order Paper of April 13th. I table that detailed answer, Mr. Speaker. Question no. 269, in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, on the Order Paper of March 29th. Has the minister of the Government given approval to Radex Minerals, Limited to prospect for uranium and other minerals on the Burin Peninsula? I would say to that, Mr. Speaker, that this House, in the Act. No. 69 of 1970, ratified, confirmed, a concession agreement to Radex Minerals. I am sorry the number is 269. The Government concluded an agreement, which was brought to this House and approved by this House, I think unanimously, last session. The only other aspect of the question which requires an answer, Mr. Speaker, is part (4): Has the minister of the Government received a request or requests from Radex Minerals, Limited for financial assistance to enable that company to continue exploration work for uranium and other minerals on the Burin Peninsula and other parts of Newfoundland? Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult question to answer. The president of Radex Minerals and the chief geologist have been in St. John's for

Mr. Callahan

the past two days and meetings have been held and, in fact, I met with them for an hour and a-half this morning, just prior to coming into the House. My understanding and impression is that they have not made a request for financial assistance. They have been concerned about certain aspects of the policy of the Government of Canada, some which may exist, and some which may come to exist, which certainly are not directly within the scope of this Government. But at the same time, we have been party to and on our own, unilaterally, made approaches to the Government of Canada from time to time on such matters as taxation on the minerals industry, foreign investment, and we think, quite unnecessary control at the exploration and development stage of uranium production. We quite appreciate that the Government of Canada have international agreements which must bind. Short of that, Mr. Speaker, we have never been convinced and have so, as I have said, unilaterally, and with other provinces, expressed to the Government of Canada we feel that there is not a need, not a legitimate reason for their control of uranium at those stages of exploration, development and production. Perhaps, on export, yes.

But these, generally, were the problems that the Radex people came to discuss. There were some other problems which they felt they had. They mentioned assistance, generally, and my reply to them was that they, as all other companies having concession agreements, have undertaken responsibilities under their agreements to do certain things, how they finance their programmes in order to comply with the Statute Law of this Province, is, I think, and must be their responsibility and the Government should not, therefore, entertain, if such, indeed, come as specific requests for financial assistance.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is a bit of a complicated answer, but I think that it needed to..

MR. COLLINS: The hon. minister can do a pretty good job of complicating..

MR.+CALLAHAN: I think that is about all I have, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table these two answers. One of which there are copies and the other, as I

Mr. Callahan.

said, there are none.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question no. 314, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre, on the Order Paper of March 30th. How many Regional Appeal Boards have been set up and for what area?

At present, we have one appeal board set up for the entire Province. We are presently considering or consideration has been given to setting up another appeal board for the Western part of the Province or we may add to the present members of the board, with representation from the various areas. But at present, we have one board set up for the entire Province. The members of the board are as follows: Chairman, Mr. Leo Stead; Members: Mr. Arch Frost; Mr. Walter Dalton, Mr. Richard S. Murphy and Mr. Graham Martin. The number of sittings during the past year, 26. Sittings for the present board from the period October 1st, 1970 to December 31st., 1970, 19. Remuneration to the board members: Chairman, receives \$50 per meeting; members \$35 per meeting. I would like to point out that Mr. Dalton and Mr. Martin, who are present civil servants, they do not receive any remuneration for their services to the board.

MR. MURPHY: I thank the hon. minister, he is no doubt answering questions. I received the answer a few days ago. Thank you, very much. You are really doing a great job.

MR. STARKES: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 343 asked by the hon. member for Burin on the Order Paper of April 1st. The question is; what is the net cost to Government for each reflectorized validation sticker issued and sold to motorists in Newfoundland this year in lieu of motor vehicle licences? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is of course, we do not sell the sticker, we sell the vehicle licence, and the sticker is given to the motorist as proof of purchase of the licence. The cost of the sticker is 3.7 cents. The name of the company who manufactured such stickers is Austin Advertising Limited. I might say that the material for the sticker is special material that is used in other provinces and in the States, and is recommended for use as a validation sticker on motor vehicle licence plates. The name of the company or person who manufacture the cardboard or like material motor vehicle licence plates for 1971, and the net cost to Government for such plates. This is a temporary licence plate that is issued when a person is purchasing a new vehicle and is replaced by a regular plate supposedly within thirty days. Again this plate was manufactured by Austin Advertising Limited and the cost is fifteen and a-half cents.

I have the answer to Question 419, asked by the hon. member for Burin, and I will table that one, Mr. Speaker, and also I wish to table answer to Question 363, asked by the hon. the member for St. John's West.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Adjourned Debate on the Address In Reply:

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, when this debate adjourned I was still speaking to the House on the non-confidence motion. Just to refresh the memory of the hon. members opposite, who according to the hon. the Premier, nearly collapsed through boredom while I was speaking the other evening: They are going to have to watch out today, because they may get eight hours

MR. CROSBIE: of it.

MR. MURPHY: Have you got to the meat of the subject yet?

MR. CROSBIE: We have not even got beyond the facts yet. We are not into the lean part of it yet, Mr. Speaker.

Now the non-confidence Motion, just to refresh the memory of hon. gentleman opposite is - it is here somewhere. I do not want to worry anyone that I might not come to it or find it.

MR. MURPHY: Did you get one?

MR. CROSBIE: I knew we would find it, all our office files, Mr. Speaker, are in these two drawers here. The complete files and records of the Liberal Reform Group are in these two little drawers. So you see we have not got much to hide.

The Motion is, Mr. Speaker, just to remind the House; This House regrets the failure of the Government since 1966 to adequately maintain and improve the public services of the Province of Newfoundland despite the severe increase in taxation within the Province of Newfoundland, and despite the borrowing by the Government of monies and the guarantee of the borrowing of monies of the Government of Newfoundland at a rate during the last five years, three times in excess of the borrowing of the Government for the previous seventeen years. And the failure of the Government during the same period, ^{to} provide the public of Newfoundland the facts concerning the economic and financial position of the Province, as well as the failure of the Government to answer fully and completely questions tabled in this House by members hereof, touching upon the public affairs of the Province. And, therefore, states that it has no confidence in the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. the Premier several times, since I commenced speaking -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Just in time. On the public airways moaning and groaning and wailing and whining that the House is being obstructed. That the House is being obstructed. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the members of the House of Assembly actually are speaking on the House of Assembly. This House has only met nine days, Mr. Speaker, so far, this is the tenth

MR. CROSBIE: day of this session. Does the Government want the House of Assembly to open on one day and shut a week later, just to whip through all the Government business, without saying a word? It is a hard duty, it is certainly not. Our duty is to discuss the issues of the House, not just to whip through Government business.

Mr. Speaker, all members of this House know, and it is a great shame that the Premier is trying to mislead the people of the Province, that the business of the House is controlled by the Government. And as we have just heard, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House, the hon. Minister of Justice, just had a choice as to what business he could call. He could call the second reading of certain Bills. There are nine or ten Bills there. He could call Second Reading or he can call the Address In Reply. The choice of the Government: The Government have decided to call the Address in Reply. If the Government calls the Second Reading of those Bills, we will discuss and pass those Bills. So the business of the House is in the hands of the Government. The business of the House, so far, as called by the Government, is the Address in Reply.

I also heard the Premier complaining that it is a boring speech, droning, a monotonous voice, obstruction and the rest of it. Well what a pretty pass this House has come to that, now at last, there is someone else making long, boring speeches beside the hon. the Premier. Because in previous years, the previous twenty years, all long, boring speeches in this House used to be made by the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Now the hon Premier cannot take it, when somebody else wants to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are out of order.

MR. CROSBIE: It is boring to the Government, Mr. Speaker, to hear about the \$1 billion debt the Government have built up, about the \$660 million that the Government have incurred in debts since 1966. That bores the Government. It is boring for the Government to hear of the tax increases we have had since 1966. Two percent on the Social Security Assessment Tax, five percent on the Personal Income Tax, five or six cents a gallon on a gallon of gasoline. All of the tax increases, the Corporation tax, the annual return for

MR. CROSBIE: Corporations and the rest of it. That bores the Government. They do not want to hear that. That is very boring for the Government. They do not want to hear about the services that they cutback on in 1966. About the short term relief of the Department of Welfare that was cut in 1968-69, about the cutback on the means test for students, the institution of a needs test for salary and tuition at Memorial University and the rest of it. The Government does not want to hear about that, Mr. Speaker. No wonder they are bored. They want people to forget that. Well, we do not intend to let people forget that, because the same thing is going to be repeated again, next year or the year after, if that Government is returned to power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, something that was mentioned the other evening and which is very important to this Province, it needs to be gone into in more detail. And that is this, Mr. Speaker, that is the contract entered into by the Government (and I have the contract here now) the construction contract between Provincial Building Company, Limited and Procon of Great Britain, Limited, which has been filed in this House, dated August 30, 1970, between Provincial Building Crown Corporation and Procon Great Britain, Limited. As I mentioned the other day in the House, Mr. Speaker, the price under this contract, to construct the refinery, is sixty million pounds, sixty million three hundred and eleven thousand pound, or Canadian dollars, \$155 million. So Procon has agreed to put the refinery there with all the equipment and the rest of it for \$155 million. As I pointed out to the House, Procon has arranged for \$130 million of this money to be financed by English banks, the E.C.D. G. and the rest of it. The Newfoundland Government have agreed to pay in not \$25 million to make up the \$155 million, the balance of \$155 million, no, not \$25 million, the Government have agreed to pay in \$30 million Canadian. The Government have to agree to the \$30 million because the Government had spent \$5 million, had given Mr. Shaheen \$5 million, which Mr. Shaheen spent, we do not know on what. We hope in connection with

MR. CROSBIE: Come-by-Chance. The Government gave it to Mr. Shaheen in 1968, as Interim Financing. Mr. Wells, the former member for Humber East, and I resigned because we said that when that money goes out the Government will be committed and can never get it back until the project is finished and all other indebtedness paid off.

Last October, as I pointed out to the House the other night, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and the Premier pretended, put on a stage play for the people of the Province, falsely pretended that the \$5 million Interim Financing had been paid back by Shaheen to the Government. That was not true. There was not one iota of truth in it. It was not paid back, the cheque passed hands and then, behind the scenes, the cheque went back again, the Newfoundland Government are still out the \$5 million. And I challenge the hon. the Premier to prove otherwise, to bring forth one fact that was different from what I was saying. He was unable to do it. The \$5 million is still gone, and we will not get it back until (1) the \$130 million first mortgage is paid off, in ten years time, if it is. And (2) If the refinery is successful and pays back our \$30 million.

Well, let us be quite clear on that, the \$5 million, and I read the quotations from the newspapers, when this ceremony took place last October 16. The Premier chucking and laughing, and the Minister of Health giggling as he handed over this pretended cheque for \$5 million, and tut, tut, the people that were worried about the \$5 million. You know, how foolish they are, pretending it was paid back, when it was not paid back at all. What a shame for the people of this - the Premier of the Province and the Cabinet Minister to pretend that.

This Resolution says; the facts concerning our economic and financial position are not been given to the people of the Province. That is one hundred percent true, and that is an illustration of it. But to come back to this contract price and this, Mr. Speaker, is important. This is not talking goof, this is not talking bluff, this is talking facts. Here

MR. CROSBIE: is the contract \$155 million. And what does it say, page 17, Article 13. "The contract price is \$155 million" and so on U.S. and whatnot. Then in the next paragraph, "The contract price set out above does not include the cost of any Canadian Federal, Provincial or Municipal taxes payable on goods and services - or Canadian duties payable on goods and services. Canadian duty. Payment of such taxes and duties, if required, shall be paid by Provincial Building Company from its own resources and not from sums made available under the Financial Agreement and/or the Euro-dollar agreements."

In other words this \$155 million does not include, customs duties, Federal sales tax, any Canadian taxes. If they are to be paid, if they have to be paid, they must be paid by Provincial Building from its own resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under this contract \$110 million have to be spent in England, on goods and services manufactured in England by the English. And that stuff all have to be brought out to Newfoundland, it all has to be imported into Canada. Procon does not have - if there are any cuts in duties or Federal sales taxes or Newfoundland taxes, Procon does not have to pay them. The Newfoundland Government must pay them through Provincial Building Corporation, from its resources, or misresources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the people of this Province and the public should be told, is there going to be Canadian custom duties imposed on all of that machinery and equipment from the United Kingdom? We know

know that under the Law of Canada there are tariffs, that there is a tariff, at least ten per cent, on machinery and equipment, ten per cent of \$110 million would be \$10 million some odd dollars.

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that there are provisions in the Canadian Customs legislation that if this is machinery or equipment that could be manufactured in Canada, that the tariff board at Ottawa, or some board at Ottawa can increase the customs duty, can increase it because the Canadian Government want to encourage manufacturing in Canada. So, surely, we have a right to expect the Government of the Province, Mr. Speaker, to tell us, a simple answer; will there be any Canadian customs duties on the \$110 million worth of machinery and equipment or not? Will there be any Federal Sales Tax on the machinery or equipment or not? If there is, and I think there has to be, and the Premier will not deny it, he would not deny it the other night, I will sit down now and let him deny it, if he will deny it - he cannot deny it apparently. Apparently he cannot deny that there are going to be duties and taxes, how much Mr. Speaker? The people of this Province are already putting \$30 million into that refinery, direct. A direct loan of \$30 million! They are guaranteeing in effect another \$130 million because these are Crown Corporations, that is \$160. Surely we should be told, are there going to be an additional \$10 million, \$15 million, or \$20 million that the people of Newfoundland had to put up, for customs duties and Federal Sales Taxes; or is there no amount to be put up for that purpose? Has the Government got assurance that none of that \$110 million worth of machinery and equipment will have to pay customs duties or taxes? One would expect -

Mr. Speaker, it is the rule of the House that when a member is speaking other members are not supposed to interrupt and have loud conversations can I have that courtesy extended?

AN.HON.MEMBER: I hope the hon. gentleman will -

MR.CROSBIE: I hope so, if the hon. gentleman follows the example of the Premier of the Province he certainly will not remember.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please!

MR.CROSBIE: Listen to the hon, the nitwit - it baffles me - Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government has work to do, the work of the Government is to explain to the people of this Province whether there is going to be ten, fifteen or twenty million dollars customs duties and sales tax on that machinery and equipment at Come by Chance, or to tell the people of the Province that there is not going to be. What a sorry record, Mr. Speaker? A government that instead of explaining the facts to the people of Newfoundland tries to hide everything, what is the answer to that question? Can the Hon. the Premier state now that there will be no Canadian, Federal nor Provincial nor Municipal taxes payable on United Kingdom goods going to the oil refinery at Come by Chance and no Canadian duties payable on those goods?

The Hon. the Premier can set our minds at rest with just one simple word. "No, there are none." Will he do it? Will he put us out of our misery and let us have this little bit of information? The taxpayers of Newfoundland want to know whether they are going to have to be gouged for another ten or fifteen or twenty million dollars for Come by Chance, to enrich Mr. Shaheen.

~~HON.MEMBER:~~ The hon. member will be put out of his misery soon enough.

MR.CROSBIE: Is the minister going to speak? Because that will not put me out of my misery that will put me in my misery. It is difficult to make a serious speech, Mr. Speaker, when the jester of the Cabinet is opposite you. I will have to try to keep looking down this way a bit more. Page 17 of the contract, page 17 of the contract that is, Mr. Speaker, that is

customs duty; that is just \$10 million, perhaps \$15 million, what is \$10 or \$15 million to a billion dollar Government? There is a book called "The Billion Dollar Brain." This is a billion dollar debt without much brains being shown in connection with it at all. Now this is another ten or fifteen or twenty million. Here is the contract, tabled in the House. Mr. Speaker, \$110 million, no, sorry, in Canadian dollars Mr. Speaker, \$118, 220,000 Canadian dollars, out of \$155 million, has to be spent in the United Kingdom, so let us call it \$120 million out of the \$155 million. There is only \$25 million to be spent in Newfoundland or to be spent in North America, so there is \$118 million worth of United Kingdom goods and services that may be subject to Canadian Customs Duty and Federal Sales Tax, so that is at least \$12 million, possibly fifteen or twenty. Ten per cent would be the minimum. Well, the Government must know the answer. Surely, when the Government entered into this contract Mr. Speaker, they inquired whether there would be any Canadian Custom Duties. Obviously Procon thinks that there may be, because Procon put in the agreement this clause to protect Procon. So the Government is in directly now for \$30 million. How much is it going to be caught for customs duties and taxes?

In connection with the contract, Mr. Speaker, page - as you look through the contract you see all - before getting into that here is another interesting point - Mr. Speaker, does the House realize that the Government has already advanced the Government's \$30 million. This House was told by the Government, when these agreements were negotiated, that the \$30 million to be put in direct by the Government, would go in as the money from the other lenders went in, pari passu. But here is an answer to a question filed in this House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in connection with Provincial Building Company and Provincial Refining and

what loans they have had from the Government. The Government has advanced, up to March 11, 1971, \$25,544,000 in monies to Provincial Building and Provincial Refining, \$25 million. In other words Mr. Speaker, the money, and the people of this Province has gone into the project presumably before all the money to be raised in the United Kingdom and elsewhere has been gone in. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health admitted the other day that \$13 million, I think it was, he said, has already been paid over to Procon as a down payment, under this agreement the first installment, and that is being paid by the Government of Newfoundland, that \$13 million, before any construction is done on the site. The exact amount is mentioned here in the contract.

Page 17, Provincial Buildings shall pay the sum of five million, five hundred and twenty thousand pounds, being twelve per cent of the sterling price of forty-six million pounds, for United Kingdom goods and services, in cash, to Procon, within thirty days after signature of the financial agreement and EURO dollar agreement. So that the Crown Corporation has had to pay Procon approximately \$13 million, paid Procon approximately \$13 million last October. Here is added proof in the answer to this question.

On October 20, 1970, the Government advanced the Provincial Building \$18,516,000 and Provincial Building had to pass \$13 million of that over to Procon as a down payment on the contract, when this House was told by the Government that our \$13 million would be advanced over the two or three years construction period as the money was advanced from ECGD. Deliberate deception. Not a word of explanation to the public of Newfoundland about it or to the House. This is the Government's record, Mr Speaker, time after time, deception, deceive, calculate to deceive, do not give the facts. What facts do we get about these huge projects? None. You have to dig in to all the details in small print to find anything.

MR. NEARY: The Hon, Minister -

MR.CROSBIE: The Hon. Minister is just so-and-so mixed up, it is not even funny. I did not help to negotiate this rat-trap. That contract there, I never had anything to do with it. I never had anything to do with it and left because I would not stand any more of it, in 1968.

So, there you are, Mr. Speaker, \$25 million of the public's money is gone into that project, without any of the United Kingdom money having gone in, thirteen million dollars being paid to Procon as a down payment. All of this, for what purpose? The main purpose seems to be to enrich Mr. Shaheen at the end of it all.

MR.NEARY: Jobs. Jobs.

MR.CROSBIE: Jobs. Jobs. Three hundred measly jobs, after spending \$160 million plus dollars on it. I

MR.NEARY: Improve the -

MR.CROSBIE: It would improve the Province if the Minister disappeared. It would probably improve our provincial product too. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR.NEARY: Let the hon. millionaire member have his own way.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind being heckled and so on, if I am going on with trash and nonsense, but I am trying to discuss \$160 million contract that matters to the people of Newfoundland, therefore, I do not particularly want to spar back and forth with the minister. We will do that later. I will tell him when I am coming to something sort of light and foolish, and we can have some fun. This is \$160 million plus.

MR.NEARY: (inaudible)

MR.CROSBIE: The hon. member has already took the course, and has had great results. One of the great results is the fact that he bores the Premier now. That is a terrific result, because the Premier has been boring the hon. member for twenty years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at that contract a bit further. Page 17, that is the important page. There are other clauses in this agreement Mr. Speaker. If there is any increases in the contract price, the Newfoundland Government, Provincial Building, has to pay them from its own resources. Here is the clause here. I wish the press would look at it. Article 16: (2) page 20 of this contract. Here is what it says: "Where a variation to the contract has the affect of increasing or decreasing the contract price the party shall agree upon a schedule of payment therefor' Where such variations increase, increase the contract price, such payments shall be made by Provincial Building from its own resources and not from sums made available under the financial agreement and/nor the EURO dollar agreements. So, wherever there is a variation, and in contracts of this nature they are going to take two or three years to perform, there are going to be variations. Wherever there is a variation that results in an increase in price who has to find the increase, Mr. Shaheen?, Shaheen Natural Resources? Not on your life. No, the Government of Newfoundland, the people of Newfoundland will have to find it. That is Article 16 (2) page 20.

"Where any variations substitute other goods or services for United Kingdom goods and so on, payments shall not be made by Provincial Building from the financial agreement but from its own resources" Page 20

Page 20, further down, - I must say that the hon. minister is not too bad after all - the hon. minister is trying to put me on ice, Mr. Speaker. Currency fluctuations Article 17, Mr. Speaker. "If currency fluctuations mean that there is going to be an increase cost to Procon, Provincial Building shall pay Procon out of its own resources. Page 20.

Page 21, "in the event Provincial Building directs work on a overtime basis, Provincial Building shall pay Procon an extra additional amount.

April 15, 1971 Tape 263 page 7.

Such amount shall be reimbursed monthly by Provincial Building to Procon as such costs are incurred, out of its own resources and not from sums made available under the EURO dollar agreement nor the financial agreement." Again, the people of Newfoundland has to pay, this is overtime down there. The people of Newfoundland have to find the money. Not Mr. Shaheen, not Shaheen Natural Resources, Incorporated, not Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited, the Government of Newfoundland, the people of Newfoundland, you and I, we are the ones that have to pay for all the Government borrowing and pay the taxes and all the rest of it. That is page 21.

Next Article, (every Article you look at, we are going to pay) Article 19, changes in the Law: Should there be any changes in the Law and so on and so forth which has the effect of materially increasing or decreasing the contract price (I have never seen the change in the Law yet, to decrease the price). In the event of an increase adjustment, Provincial Building shall pay Procon, out of its own resources and not from any sum made under the EURO dollar agreement of the financial agreement. Again

MR. CROSBIE:

The people of Newfoundland must pay Procon, if there is a change in the law and there is any increase in price. This is supposed to be a turnkey contract. The only key that is being turned here is the key that is being turned around the necks of the Newfoundland people, to squeeze all the additional money out of them. There is not any key being turned that will squeeze one cent or one dollar more out of Mr. Shaheen.

MR. MURPHY: Do not forget about the Provincial chest.

MR. CROSBIE: The Provincial chest, oh the treasure chest. There is not much treasure left in the chest. That is article 18, page 21 and article 19, page 21. Where else? Patent's, if they need patent's we will have to find them. Here is another one, no I will not even bother. I do not want to bore the hon. gentleman opposite, they do not like this kind of discussion. They think it is all wrong to have any of these things even looked at. Then page, that is about defaults, which we hope there will never be. Page 28 has a clause that also involves us in monies, "In addition to all other obligations assumed by Provincial Building, Provincial Building agrees, if necessary, to enter into or cause to be entered into appropriate licence agreements with Universal Oil Products and the Ralph M. Parsons Company or others selected by Provincial Building and be responsible for any royalties or fees in connection therewith."

Now Ralph M. Parsons did certain of the plans and design work on the refinery, Mr. Speaker, and Universal Oil Products have done certain of the plans and so on. If there is to be any other payment to them in connection with licence agreements, who is to pay for it? Is it Mr. Shaheen? Is it Shaheen Natural Resources? No. Is it Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited? Is it Mr. Roy Fermart? Is it Procon? Is it Kleinwort-Benson? No, it is the people of Newfoundland who are going to pay it. Naturally, that is the way the Government approaches it. Why have anybody else pay when the people of Newfoundland and the Government of Newfoundland can pay?

MR. MURPHY: For they are jolly good fellows.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, yes it is really a wonderful contract, this is. It is so open on both ends that it is a wind tunnel, it is a wind tunnel of a

MR. CROSBIE:

contract. Here is something else, there is something else, there is more. Page 30, this is additional obligations of Provincial Building. Now Provincial Building is Government of Newfoundland. Clause (g) on page 30, "the Government is to provide or cause to be provided import licences and other necessary documents and pay all import duties attributable to goods imported under the contract and pay or arrange for all necessary Canadian, Federal, Provincial and Municipal taxes and assessments based on the performance of the work under this contract."

Now I ask the Government to tell us, "Has the Government gotten these import licences? Has the Government paid the import duties attributable or arranged to pay them or will there be any such, will there be any taxes?" Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a non-confidence motion. One would expect that someone will reply on behalf of the Government and that these are some of the questions that they will answer. I am willing for the Premier to answer that point now. Are there going to be any import duties, Federal sales tax and such like on the \$118. million worth of material coming from the United Kingdom? The Premier must know and he can answer, either "no there is not," to set our mind at rest, or he can say, "Yes, there is, gentleman, and we estimate it to be \$2., \$5., \$10., \$12. million or whatever it is." I will now wait and see if the Premier wishes to accept the invitation.

MR. MURPHY: He is busy checking on the meeting at Upper Island Cove.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier is more concerned about the meeting the Progressive Conservatives had in Upper Island Cove, in fact he even dreamed up a meeting that they were supposed to have had in North River that they never did have. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a brief for you. Now this is a contract that should have been explained by the Government last October 16th, when they had the signing ceremony, not the cheap-jack tricks that went on, the pretended passing of a \$5. million cheque to pretend that Newfoundland got back \$5. million. Instead of that there should have been a press conference at which some of these points were explained by the Government, where the Government told the people of Newfoundland what they may be involved in. It is \$130. million plus \$30. million the Government is putting in, plus

MR. CROSBIE:

money most likely for customs duties, plus money most likely for licences fees plus money if there is any increase in the contract price, plus money if there is any change in the law that increases the contract price and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Legal fees.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, legal fees is an interesting question. We are paying the legal fees and the firms involved are well-known firms in this Province. You can ask the Minister of Justice what firms are involved and on behalf of whom?

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member get a job on it?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member had no job out of it, no but there are hon. members in the House who have had work out of it.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member for St. John's East

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. member, you see, wanted to get work from the Government he would just keep his mouth shut, he would be over there today, he would be doing what the rest are doing, you know, and he would be getting everything he wanted, do not worry. That is all they have to do, just a kiss on the hand, but the hon. gentleman disagreed and he is over here and he does not want any of the business, unless the Government feels that they want the services of an impartial adviser.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: On legal matters.

MR. ROBERTS: Surely the hon. gentleman is over there for another reason.

MR. CROSBIE: Surely the hon. gentleman is across where he is for obvious reasons.

MR. ROBERTS: For a number of them.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, for a number of them and that is why this hon. gentleman is here.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and allow the Minister of Health, who is supposed to be the expert on these contracts, to tell us whether there are going to be any customs duties paid on the \$118. million.

MR. ROBERTS: You would have to ask the Minister of Justice about that.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I would have to ask our Government who is responsible to administer this for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: Our Government.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the Government, the Minister of Health, lippy, the lippy Minister. Will the Minister be lippy and tell us about the customs duties? Will he tell us about the sales taxes? Will he tell us about this contract? The Minister is so good interrupting and lipping away, tell us more about this.

MR SMALLWOOD:The unbearable eloquence, the oratory of the man!

MR CROSBIE: There they are, the hon. the Premier and the hon. Minister of Health, not one word about the \$160 million contract

AN HON. MEMBER: How can we get a word in edgeways when the hon. gentleman is on his feet for three solid days.

MR CROSBIE: Look at them lipping away - lipping away.

MR SMALLWOOD: Just too busy to talk.

MR CROSBIE The Government is too busy! The Government is too busy mis-managing the affairs of this Province, trying to hide from the people of the Province the finances.

MR SMALLWOOD: Oh the wit of the man! Oh the irresistible wit!

MR CROSBIE:Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing, as I said, to allow these honourable gentlemen to address the house in their mellifluous (is that the right pronunciation now?), in their mellow tones, if they will tell us about the customs duties, if they will tell us about the sales tax, if they will tell us about the licenses fees, if they will tell us about the change in the Law that may increase the cost, if they will tell us what it is really costing, if the Minister of Health will tell us what he did with that \$5 million cheque, that got prated around last October 16. It is still out. It is still out. Shaheen has it. Why has not the hon. Minister given this House the audit report? The auditors went to New York to audit what Mr. Shaheen spent the \$5 million on, and they could not find any record. They could find no record of what he spent the money on.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Internal documents, an audit of \$5. million of the money of the people of this Province was given to Mr. Shaheen, and the Government will not table an audit report on it. That is not public business what happened to the \$5. million, where Mr. Shaheen spent it or why he spent it.

AN HON. MEMBER: misrepresentation by the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: I am saying now that the Government should table in this House their audit of the records of the \$5. million which they do not have back yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The courage of the man, the courage. What nerve and courage he has, oratory, eloquence, courage, patriotism, what a man, what a man and what an orator he has become.

AN HON. MEMBER: He should enter a public speaking course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is practicing on us. This is the new M.C.L.I.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, normally when a greenhorn member such as myself is speaking to the House, a ferocious word from the Premier would, you know, knock you right down, but I am just going to stumble along anyway. He cannot shut me up. He has addressed the House himself for eight and ten and fifteen and sixteen hours of complete bunkum and bored the House utterly. This is not boring to people who are interested in what the facts are here in Newfoundland. If the Premier would only put us out of our misery by saying, are there customs duties or sales taxes and the rest, answer the question and it would save a lot of talk.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no way to put the hon. gentleman out of his misery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After the convention, the hon. gentleman will never be out of his misery while I am alive. I have to die to put him out of his misery.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to the red herring. I would be very disappointed if the Premier were not around for many years to watch how a government should run the Province, as compared to how it has been run under his direction for the

MR. CROSBIE:

last twenty-two years, to see what is done to clear up the mess, the indescribable mess that the Premier is leaving behind him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you hear the Federal Tories?

MR. CROSBIE: The best thing that could happen to the hon. the Premier is to win the election this year and be here for the next four years, increasing taxes and cutting services and trying to do something with the mess he has created for the last twenty-two years.

MR. ROBERTS: If only we turned it over to the hon. gentleman everything would be great.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to the Minister.

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman would listen to the Minister he would be further ahead than he is now.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the customs duties? Why does the hon. Minister not tell us about that?

MR. ROBERTS: What about the customs duties, what customs duties?

MR. CROSBIE: There is \$118. million worth of duty paid goods and services and under the contract, Mr. Speaker, all customs duties and Federal sales taxes have to be paid by the Government.

MR. ROBERTS: What customs duties? You do not pay duty on services.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the Minister was not here, so he can just check with his leader, the Premier, and if the Premier lets him, which he will not, he can then tell us about those taxes and duties.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: But the Premier will not let him.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The little crackey better relax. The massive bulldog is not going to allow the little crackey to tell us about the customs duties.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Wells said it was funny but at least he got so fed up with the hon. gentleman he left. You know the hon. gentleman's party gets smaller each day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! This is intollerable.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree.

MR SPEAKER: There is no excuse for this demonstration. It does not do anything for the decorum of this House. I have stressed this time and time again, and still we have these interruptions. If hon. members would try -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in your remarks you said this is intollerable. I am the member who has the floor. I am the member, Mr. Speaker, who is constantly interrupted, and, if it is scandalous, it is scandalous by the people who are interrupting.

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

MR CROSBIE: I am the member, Mr. Speaker, who is constantly interrupted.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman sits over there. To a point of order: The other night he made a personal attack upon me. He has been imputing my motives, my honesty and my integrity and everything else, and he complains. Mr. Speaker, surely, surely, if there is any disorder in decorum, and I quite agree with Your Honour's Ruling, and if I am at fault I will try to correct myself. But let the hon. gentleman not draw his seamless cloak about him. You know, if he is going to throw mud, let him not complain if his hands are dirtied. He has more to lower the decorum of this House than any hon. member we have ever had.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker: I will continue, Mr. Speaker, I will ignore that silly little statement of the hon. the Minister. There has been no mud thrown from this side of the House. There are questions being asked about this Procon contract and the Minister -

MR. ROBERTS: Put them on the Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Put them on the Order Paper, what a simpleton. They are on the Order Paper, some of them, and they will not be answered on the Order Paper and they will not be answered in this debate because the Government will not give the facts to the people of Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: Nonsense! Go on, carry on.

MR. CROSBIE: I intend to carry on until I have finished what I have to say and the hon. the Minister or none of the rest of them will stop me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The courage of the man, the indomitable courage.

MR. CROSBIE: What a monkey house we are looking at over across there now,

MR. CROSBIE:

the gorilla cage in the zoo would not match it. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day, when I was speaking, several theories of economic development. There is the Premier's, which is "develop or perish" or "progress or burst," there was the Minister of Health, used to be a year ago, when he said, "this was not going to be another Ruhr Valley" and so on, when he talked sense -

MR. ROBERTS: You are right, nor it will not be.

MR. CROSBIE: He changed his mind a year later.

MR. ROBERTS: No way, no way.

MR. CROSBIE: There was Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, who said that, in his opinion, Newfoundland will never be an important secondary manufacturing centre and he went on to say; "Memorial has the capability to test these conclusions, if I am shown to be right, then we should hasten the demise of these sacred cows. (What sacred cows? The Provincial Government's sacred cows) and put an end to the litter of failures already reported in pursuit of such endeavours." What failures? The Government's failures, a litter of the Government's failures. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only ^{one} way to put an end to these sacred cows, to hasten the demise of the sacred cows, and that is to get rid of the sacred bull that is in charge of the sacred cows that the Minister of Transport is discussing, that is -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The Government opposite. If we are to hasten the demise of those sacred cows, as the hon. Mr. Jamieson says, and put an end to the litter of failures already recorded in pursuit of such endeavours, we have to stop the creator of the sacred cows, the creator of the litter of failures, that is the Government opposite. The sacred bull must go too, Mr. Jamieson might have added that.

AN HON. MEMBER: The bull's product.

MR. CROSBIE: The bull's product is piled high

AN HON. MEMBER: Over there?

MR. CROSBIE: Piled high in this Province, after twenty-two years of it. The Government bull depositing its product all over this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The wit of the man, the irresistible wit.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's report, page twenty-two and twenty-four, points up quite an interesting fact. I have already mentioned the tremendous indebtedness the Government has built up in the last five years.

Do the members of the House know Mr. Speaker, that the fourth biggest spending department is the Department paying off the debt of Newfoundland? The department paying interest and paying payments on sinking funds? If we look at page twenty-two in the Auditor General's report, we will see the gross current account expenditures for 1970, and if you look at page (24) you will see the expenditures in capital account.

In the year that ended March 31st. 1970, current account spending, the biggest expenditure was on education \$73 million, that was the greatest spending department, then on Health \$56 million, then on welfare \$40,800,000. What was the next department in spending? Was it Municipal Affairs? No. Economic Development? No. Community and Social Development? No. None of those, none of the others, the fourth greatest department? Debt charges, interest \$32,068,000. So, in the year that ended March 31st. 1970, the fourth largest spending department of the Government was the department that paid interest on our debt, \$32,068,000. On page (24), when looking at capital expenditures you have to add to that payments of sinking fund, \$7,883,000. That is the payment the Government makes to sinking funds so that there will be some money available to repay bond issues in later years. The two together were \$39 million, practically \$40 million. That was a year ago. The fourth biggest spending department of this Government now, Education, Health, Welfare and debt repayment. That is a great record.

It was \$40 million one year ago, March 31st. 1970. In the year that ended a week ago, March 31st. 1971, the estimates showed that the Government had to pay out approximately fifty or fifty-two million dollars in interest

in sinking fund payments, up about \$12 million over the previous year. In the year that we are now in Mr. Speaker, it is going to go up to about I would say sixty-five to seventy million. Certainly it will be up to sixty-five million. Why? Well, the Government last year borrowed, according to the financial prospectus of the Government filed in New York, borrowed \$125 million. Now, \$125 million at eight percent interest, and the Government had to pay a lot more than eight percent. At eight percent interest that would be \$10 million. \$10 million in interest alone, that has to be paid this year on what the Government borrowed last year.

In actual fact, it is more than that because, the Government was paying 8.90 percent, 9 percent, and higher than nine percent on their borrowings during the year. The Government has to pay out this year at least \$12 million more for interest. In the year we are now in, the debt repayment department is going to be up to about \$65 million. Now that is money that the Government cannot therefore spend Mr. Speaker on improving services or expanding services, or even continuing to operate services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can we have a vote before lunch?

MR. CROSBIE: Before lunch next week sometime there will be a vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): It is nothing but obstruction I would say.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not obstruction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No

MR. CROSBIE: No, the hon. the Premier thinks that the debt position of the Province should not be discussed, or the oil refinery should not be discussed.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot take the hon. member on an empty stomach.

MR. CROSBIE:, I cannot take the hon. gentleman on any kind of a stomach.

It is one o'clock Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call it one o'clock and I leave the Chair until three o'clock.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 19

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CURTIS: The Address proceeds. May I move that when the House adjourns until tomorrow morning at 11:00 A.M., when it does adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the Motion carry?

MR. MURPHY: Let us get this thing right.

MR. HICKMAN: Eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. MURPHY: What was the Motion for today? This morning?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker interpreted it as Notice, from what he said, but I think he was wrong.

MR. MURPHY: That requires twenty-four hours.

MR. NOEL: Anyway the Motion is, when we adjourn, we will adjourn until tomorrow at 11:00 A.M.

Motion carried.

MR. MURPHY: Heavy business over with Mr. Speaker. No jokes about it on the other side, everything is all right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: It will not be long now. Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, I am not going to be too long, I think the previous speakers on this side have tried to put before this House and through the House to the people of the Province some of the main reasons, not all of them. I am sure that some of the speakers could have had gone on for three or four days, if they wanted to bring forward all what is wrong with this present Government.

But I think, briefly, the way this Government have treated the finances of this Province in the past twenty-two years, particularly in the last six years, which we are discussing now, the last five where our debt has risen to the astronomical amount of over \$1 billion, where our per capita debt is now over \$2000 of the hugh amounts of money that have been spent on crazy ventures, such as, Elizabeth Towers, Real Estate deals through the Board of Liquor Control, Holiday Inns deal with Lunderigan's, and a continuing, and I will conclude with this that I started with, the

MR. MURPHY: continuing attitude of Government towards the business of this House, and siphoning, if you like, off the respect due to this House of Assembly, the people's House.

I certainly wish, Mr. Speaker, I know, as far as I am concerned, I plan to be here that I am here for a reason and that is to do to the best of my ability the business that I was sent here for, and not to take part in a three-ring circus. I trust here that those members who stand to speak, and that means so far the members on this side, are treated with respect, that Standing Orders of this House are called for, and I say, Sir, in conclusion, that if ever a Motion of Non-Confidence was justified I believe this one is.

Motion that the Amendment carry

HON. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the Throne Speech, the Address in Reply.

MR. COLLINS: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize the hon. minister has been asleep for most of it, but this is not the Throne Speech Debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I move the adjournment of the debate on the Amendment and carry on with the Throne Speech.

MR. CHALKER: Of course, of course!

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Vote on the Non-confidence Motion. The House is not adjourned.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, during the -

MR. CROSBIE: Thats the boy, hear. hear!

MR. CHALKER: You have got to get him a glass of water to.

MR. NEARY: You see, Mr. Speaker, one minute the hon. member wants me thrown out of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: The Question was put, now are we voting on this Question or are we not?

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL): We are not. I think hon. members know the question was put from the Chair. "Shall the amendment carry?" Then the hon. member stood up to speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out to Your Honour there that one minute the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants me thrown out of the House and the next moment he is making friendly overtones towards me by delivering this speaker's bench.

MR. CHALKER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think that this has been a peculiar session of the House so far. I have been in this House since 1962, This is the ninth session, this is the ninth sitting of the House since I have been here, and I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I can see a deterioration of the proceedings of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to you that it has only happened in the last two years. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that it either has something to do with the aftermath of the Leadership Convention or members on the opposite side of the House are having campaign blues. They think there is going to be an election. They have set out to fight the election on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, may I commence my remarks by asking hon. members on the opposite side of the House to join with us over here in expediting the business of the people of our Province. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is very tempting for them indeed to try for the attention of the news media by carrying on filibustering in the House. But, Your Honour, this serves no useful purpose and all it does is just harass the Government, but it does not get the House anywhere, we cannot get the peoples business done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the member for St. John's West started his remarks the other day, he made quite a bit of reference to welfare. He made a couple of statements, Mr. Speaker, that I think need to be corrected. But, first of all, Sir, I would like to say that, as far as his remarks about the cut in welfare rates which we had to remedy this year are concerned, just who is responsible, Mr. Speaker? Why, the hon. gentleman himself along with the hon. members for Burin, and the hon. the member for Fortune.

MR. EARLE: Fortune Bay, it is.

MR. NEARY: Fortune Bay, Mr. Speaker. These gentlemen were expelled from the Government benches at about the same time, Mr. Speaker, that these cuts took place. These are the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, the unholy three that I just referred to. The merchant princes out to save a few dollars decided to take it away from the working class and people who are unfortunate enough to be on welfare through no fault of their own.

Mr. Speaker, one might of thought that the hon. the member for St. John's West would prefer to hide the role that he played in taking these welfare dollars from our poor. But instead of that, Sir, he wanted to advertise it to the whole world. Fortunately, we were able to restore these cuts, now that these ultra-conservatives had been forced to cross the House to the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, where they weep now with crocodile tears over the ills of the poor, that they themselves manipulated.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this, that Mr. Simmons or Mr. McCurdy had nothing to do with this.

You know we saw what happened, Mr. Speaker, recently in Clarendville to the performance of some of these gentleman. But, the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burin is probably speaking not only tonight but all during this session out of his resentment of the cruel faith that has befallen him. You see, Mr. Speaker, he is probably kicking himself, when he compares himself today to when he was a Cabinet Minister on this side of the House, which was not so very long ago. When he entertained ambitions in his head, Mr. Speaker, that when he retired from the hurly-burly life of political battle, that he then become a respected member of the Supreme Court. But, aye, these visions, all these ambitions now, Mr. Speaker, are the visions of sugar plums dancing in his head. Mr. Speaker, they are all gone now.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: You see how the truth really hurts, Mr. Speaker. No Supreme Court job now, no retirement. The hon. member would have to go and face the people in Burin District that have elected him on the Liberal side of

MR. NEARY: the House, Mr. Speaker, and then he betrayed the confidence that these people have placed in him. And without consulting with his constituents in Burin, who sent him to this House as a Liberal, and Mr. Speaker, his constituents must have been very proud of him, when he offered himself as the Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. But then, when he got defeated he went over and joined the Tories.

But, Mr. Speaker, could I appeal to the hon. gentleman to show at least some loyalty to the people in his district which he misrepresents. And withdraw his opposition from some of the measures that we have so carefully planned on this side of the House to serve the people in Burin District.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few words for the member for Fortune, when he returns to his seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fortune Bay.

MR. NEARY: Fortune Bay I am reminded by my colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order! Order! He just came in through the window.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in his remark the other day the hon. member for Fortune Bay stooped. I think, to about the lowest level that I have seen any member of this House stoop to for a long time, when he tried to drag in the Boys Training Home, tried to make a political issue out of the Boys Training Home.

My hon. friend will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was I who asked the press to layoff the Girls and Boys Training Homes. While we are interested in getting publicity out of the Boys or Girls Training Home, I do not think that I would have taken that drastic action Your Honour. But you see, Mr. Speaker, that he also mentioned the fact that we almost have one staff there for every boy and girl that we have in these homes.

But, Sir, let me remind the hon. gentleman, he should know because he is a former Minister of the old Department of Welfare, the hon. member should know that although we may have one for one, that the staff works three shifts around the clock. And whereas the boys and the girls are there all day long, the staff had to be broken down into three shifts. And you cannot

MR. NEARY: have eighty members of the staff on duty twenty-four hours.

That argument is so ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure the hon. member is sorry he ever brought it up.

MR. EARLE: I did not bring it up. I did not mention it.

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. member is denying that he brought it up now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE: Another member brought it up, not me.

MR. NEARY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member just kept the seat warm down in the old Department of Welfare, that at least he should have learned something from the Deputy Minister and the officials of that Department.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of Social Services, the hon. members from the opposite side were quick to point out that we have restored the increase in short term assistance that they had so much to do with cutting three years ago, and I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Fortune Bay was the Minister of the old Department of Welfare when these cuts took place.

What I also want to point out,

Mr. Neary.

I would also like to point out, Sir, that this is a very important fact that they have seemed to have deliberately overlooked. That not only have we restored the cuts in short-term assistance, but we have also provided as a matter of entitlement, instead of on an existing hit and miss basis, Social Assistance to single abled-bodied males.

We have also, Sir, in the future will permit retention of earnings for those on short-term assistance who can go out and earn a dollar. There was no mention of this at all, Mr. Speaker. It is going to cost the Treasury this year, \$300,000. There was no mention at all, Mr. Speaker of measures affecting the unemployed invalids. There was no mention of the increase in the fuel allowance. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition just in a sort of passing way, made reference or referred to it this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, the most important measures announced at the Provincial Development Conference were measures affecting senior citizens. The hon. member for St. John's West did not think that was important enough to mention at all. Or the hon member for Fortune Bay, or the hon. member for Burin. It is not important at all, Mr. Speaker. Our senior citizens are not important to all members at all. This year we are going to spend \$500,000 in grants to spouses of old age pensioners who are themselves not of the age to be eligible for old age pensions. A measured reform, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Fortune Bay did not think of when he was Minister of the old Department of Welfare, in the old days. Visiting services.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend here from Placentia West reminds me, you do not see these people at the cocktail parties and that is why they do not think of the unemployed invalids or the senior citizens. They do not mix in the cocktail set, Mr. Speaker. They do not go down and sit behind the glass at the Curling Club and sip their little glass of scotch. Visiting Services, Mr. Speaker, to the elderly, who prefer to stay in their own homes to institutional care. And \$210,000 another major reform. The hon. member for Burin, who is so interested in getting a senior citizens home for

Mr. Neary.

the Burin Peninsula, did not even make passing reference to senior citizens on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. HICKMAN: I have not spoken yet and when I do speak, I will tell this House what the ministerial association called you. It will not be very pleasant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can tell me what he likes but one thing the hon. member is not going to do is to pawn derelict hotels on my department.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what he did not want to do.

MR. CROSBIE: The Half-Way House.

MR. HICKMAN: Tell us about the Half-Way House.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the Half-Way House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for St. John's West should be in a half way-house, if he knows what it means?

MR. CROSBIE: The minister should be in the whole-way house.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKMAN: Wait until I get this ministerial association statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the truth really hurts.

MR. HICKMAN: Lay it on. Let us hear it.

MR. NEARY: They are really sitting in the hot seat tonight, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes, we are frightened to death of you.

MR. NEARY: By the time I am finished the hon. member tonight he may not be frightened but he will be so ashamed of himself that he will run away and hide.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Greene did not write that.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker - no Rodger Simmons did not write it either or Mr. Kierans did not write it either.

MR. HICKMAN: Or Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Greene wrote it.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Kierans wrote it.

MR. CROSBIE: Professor Greene.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, another measure affecting senior citizens that the hon. members did not see fit to mention was the new concept we are developing of building residential homes for senior citizens or what they call, in England, purpose built homes. These homes, Mr. Speaker could accommodate anywhere from fifteen to twenty up to fifty or seventy senior citizens. We plan to spend \$400,000 or \$500,000 on that this year, Mr. Speaker. No reference by members who have spoken in this debate - no reference at all; not concerned about the senior citizens of this Province. We also plan on spending about \$250,000, Sir, on converting the existing large institutions for the aged to nursing centres. The total cost of these great reforms, Mr. Speaker would be in the order of \$4.5 million. But all the member for St. John's West could think of was who was responsible for cutting these short-term social assistance allowances three years ago. All the hon. the member for Fortune Bay could think of was the staff at the girls' and boys' training homes. We are not able to cope with the boys and girls or we are not able to be on the job twenty-four hours a day, I think this is what he inferred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to deal with one item on the list that I just gave the House and that has to do with the residential type homes for senior citizens. But before I do that, Mr Speaker, it just occurred to me that there is also another service that we are going to provide this year. We are going to have a corp of workers going around this Province visiting old people in their own homes, for senior citizens who prefer to remain in their homes. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, what we are going to do in the future, and I hate to say this but I think that the whole idea

Mr. Neary.

of caring for senior citizens in the Province has been ill-conceived. There are two former ministers on the other side and they probably had something to do with this policy. But I think, Sir, that somehow or other with these big institutions with the long corridors that when a senior citizen is admitted to these homes that they somehow or other get the impression that they are going in there to die. They are not in there too long, Sir, when they want to get into a wheelchair and the next thing they are in bed and then it is very difficult to get them back on their feet again. So, the new concept, Sir, the new trend right across North America and Europe is to build a smaller type home, a residential home for senior citizens. This would be more or less like an ordinary home, Mr. Speaker. It could be operated by a service club, by an inter-faith group, by a church group. It could be operated by a town council. The cost of operating it would be insignificant because the type of home we are thinking about could be operated by a man and wife team. They could employ domestics by the day, by the hour if they wanted to. But these homes, the residents of these homes would be completely ambulatory. If they wanted to bring in their favourite piece of furniture into their room, they could do it. If they wanted to bring in a favourite picture that they liked and hang it up on the wall, they would be permitted to do it. It would be more like a home, Mr. Speaker.

These homes would be pin-pointed all around the Province.

In each one of these homes would be a day care centre. Because it is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that we have had a tendency to discriminate against senior citizens who wished to remain in their own home. These people who are living in their own homes now do not have the services of the physiotherapy equipment in the institutions; the occupational therapy; the privilege of cheap meals that people have who live in institutions. So what we propose, Sir, is to have a day care centre in each one of these homes,

Mr. Neary.

whether it is a residential home or a larger type senior citizens home; so that the people who live in the surrounding areas can come down to the home by day, and they can sit there and chat with the residents of the home. They can play checkers. They can have a game of cards. They can watch television. They can have a meal, if they want it for the same price that it cost to produce the meal in the home. They could bring down their friends or relatives for a meal, if they want to. What I am trying to say here, Sir, is that we are going to take a more humanitarian attitude towards the care of senior citizens.

When they get sick, Sir, well first of all as I have indicated, our number one priority will be to keep people in their own homes as long as they want to stay there. When they cannot remain in their own homes, and they are ambulatory, they will go to a residential type of home. When they get sick, Sir, they can no longer live in the residential type home. Then we would have no choice but to transfer these people to the large nursing centres. There was no mention of this by the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. There was no mention of it at all. The hon. member for Gander is working very hard to get a senior citizens home in his district, in the community of Gander. The hon. member for Burin is working very hard to try to get a senior citizens home on the Burin Peninsula. But no reference at all, Sir, so far in this House from either gentleman, and they have been on their feet a number of times discussing various topics. More criticism of the Government than interest in the people that they represent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some reference to some of the things in the Throne Speech that would lead me to vote against the amendment that is moved by the hon. member for St. John's West. In drawing attention to some of these issues that have been spelled out in the Throne Speech, Sir, may I express my deepest thanks for the many benefits that will accrue to the masses of the people of this Province that have been

Mr. Neary

blue printed in the most excellent and gracious Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I was born of working-class folk myself. I follow a leader in this House, who, if anything, is more of the working class than I. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the good things in the most gracious Speech from the Throne that are designed to help the masses of people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, even those wealthy representatives of the haves that we see sitting across the way must still, if they have any sense at all or sincere desire to do their jobs well, must really, Mr. Speaker, in their innermost mind agree as I do that many of the things in the Speech from the Throne are not designed to help the classes but are designed to help the masses, to help the fishermen, Sir, to help the logger and the miner of this Province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they can see how the launchways and the slipways and the sea-service stations for the larger craft, industrial marinas, the unloading facilities, bounties and grants for boats and equipment and the financing of collection and storage centres will help, Mr. Speaker, to bring into the Twentieth Century an industry which has been at the mercy of selfish money-grubbing exploiters for over 400 years.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that will hurt my hon. friend from Fortune Bay, but it is a fact. The fishermen have been exploited for centuries. I am not saying that the hon. member was the chief exploiter in the Province, but I think he will have to agree, Mr. Speaker. In his innermost mind, he will have to agree that all these things will help bring the fishery into the Twentieth Century in this Province.

I am sure that my hon. friend from Fortune Bay, Mr. Speaker, will also welcome the Government's action in bringing into our Province a modern,

Mr. Neary

successful, Canadian firm with experts in marketing, which in my opinion, has been the great weakness in our Province's basic industry over the past 400 years. I refer to, Sir, the reactivation of the fish plant, the Ross Steers Fish Plant on the Southside. No reference to that by the hon. member so far in this session of the House, with all his interests or alleged interests in the fishermen of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I say to members of this hon. House, especially the members on the opposite side of the House that even if they have been reared with the proverbial "silver-plated spoon in their mouths" that they will not begrudge the masses of people of this Province the opportunity to earn decent wages now that the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland have finally created the marketing machinery that can bring our fishermen a decent return for their daily battle with hostile seas in this part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to vote against this amendment for another reason.

MR. NEARY: That was the announcement in The Throne Speech of the new Federal-Provincial Development Corporation. To knit together, Sir, to integrate and to lend new drive and energy to local development with resulting increases in the gross provincial product and in employment.

I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Minister responsible for this new Provincial Corporation, on the excellent job that he has done so far in setting it up. No mention of that by the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Speaker. Competition - competition for the empire in on Viking Avenue, no reference to it. Too much competition for the Crosbie Empire on Crosbie Road. Too much competition Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: What about the Bankers' Trust Company? Tell us about that. What about Grand Bank and Placentia. Who owns the B.L.C. leases down there?

MR. NEARY: There we have it now, Mr. Speaker, more interested in the Board of Liquor Control than in the senior citizens of this Province. More interested in booze, more interested in liquor services than in the unemployment problem, no mention of that so far in this Session of the House. No mention at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Estimates showed it.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what they did. The highest in the history of Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, these measures that I just spoke about, the measures which will effect our fishermen and our industrial workers, I can praise very, very highly, especially, Sir, from my standpoint as Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, which I think, is the best vantage point that one could have, to observe the impact and the advantages that these measures will have for our people.

MR. HECKMAN: Why not take a look at St. Lawrence too, while you are viewing the scene.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, from my vantage point, these measures will have the effect to increase our productivity and employment and, Sir, I think that this is the only way that we can resolve our unemployment problem in Newfoundland. We have to increase our productivity, Sir. If we can increase our productivity, our gross provincial product, then we can look after all the people who become unemployed through no fault of their own. We can look after the invalids, and the widows and the orphans and the senior citizens. So you see, Mr. Speaker, for every dollar that we spend there has to be a dollar earned. No suggestions or ideas from the hon. members of the Opposition, of how we can improve our gross provincial product to do this. To enable us to help the people who are unemployed through no fault of their own, and the invalids and the senior citizens. No constructive ideas or suggestions, Sir, just destructive criticism - obstruction.

MR. HICKMAN: How about the \$3 million for the Expo building and have some small fish plants instead? That would be constructive.

MR. NEARY: Now there is a real bright suggestion, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member could only devote more of his energy and offer his suggestions and constructive ideas to the Government, instead of obstructing, instead of trying to delay the preceeding of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: And the crocodile tears streaming down the hon. minister's cheeks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say to the hon. gentleman is that if he is a good boy, when I return to this House again,

MR. NEARY: after the next General Election, then we might consider making him a Judge of the Supreme Court, we might, if he is a good boy.

MR. HICKMAN: I will remember that.

MR EARLE: Can I have a job?

MR HICKMAN: And we can give you a job looking after the people of St Lawrence.

MR NEARY: One thing I will say about the hon. member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Speaker, is that he will not be on welfare tomorrow.

MR EARLE: No thanks to the hon. minister.

MR NEARY: Now Mr. Speaker, we have heard it all here this Session. The hon. member for St. John's West talked about everything under the sun except John Cabot and Mary March and a few other phases of our history, four or five hundred years back. But, Mr. Speaker, did he mention education? Have we heard so far in this Session of the House, any reference from members who have spoken in the debate so far on what is being done for the sons and daughters of ordinary people in this Province in the way of education as compared to the pre Confederation days, not Mr. Speaker, just for the sons and daughters of the wealthy but for the sons and daughters of fishermen, miners, loggers, factory workers, the ordinary people, the masses? Have we heard any reference to what my honourable colleague, the Minister of Education, is doing for these boys and girls, Mr. Speaker? No, no reference at all. Nothing about the doubling of the scholarships and bursaries Mr. Speaker, and the extensions to our institutions, the Vocational Schools and the College of Trades and Technology, and the providing of text books for the children of this Province, Mr. Speaker. And free dental care for school children announced by my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Health, at the Provincial Development Conference, no mention of these important reforms

MR. NEARY: at all, Mr. Speaker. And do you know why, Mr. Speaker?

Because these are for our less privileged citizens, But if they affected the cocktail set, the classes rather than the masses, Mr. Speaker, you would hear about it from the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker. I can see the value of these measures to those families in Newfoundland and Labrador, who want the best for their children in the way of educational opportunity but without help from this people-oriented Government could never do any more than hope for it. I hope, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Gander takes his place in this House, to speak in the Amendment or in The Throne Speech, that he will have some reference to these great reforms to help educate the children, the sons and daughters of the masses of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have his chance to stand in this House and either criticize or commend the Government for what they are trying to do to educate the sons and daughters of the ordinary people of this Province. Because I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is from a working class family himself. He may feel a little bit out of place on the opposite side of the House, surrounded by so many lawyers, so many business people, along with the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, and the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are times when they wish they were on this side of the House. On this side of the House where you have a people oriented Government, Mr. Speaker, because I think that these three gentlemen, these three honourable gentlemen, have the interests of the people of the Province at heart.

Now, Sir, as far as the benefits to our working class people are concerned, whether they are unemployed, through no fault of their own,

MR. NEARY: or they have a personal handicap or are economical handicapped for one reason or another, I think that they have a right to maintain their families in dignity. But my honourable friends, in the speeches that they have made in this House so far, trying to get their little mileage every day, looking for their little four column headline, have not made any suggestions, offered any ideas to the Government, to this side of the House. How we can improve the benefits for the working class people, to the people who are unemployed or handicapped through no fault of their own? No suggestions Mr. Speaker.

My honourable friend, the member for St. John's West, before the House was opened was terribly concerned about day care centres, to look after the children of working mothers. No reference to that in his marathon speech that he made in this House, no reference to day care centres in his speech, Mr. Speaker. But I will not dwell on this item in the gracious Speech from the Throne, Sir, I know it is within the responsibility of my own Department to do something about this and we are doing something about it, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that when we do announce our programme that members on the opposite side of the House would not dare oppose the measures that we will be taking to try to help the working mothers of this Province. Would it not have been much better Mr. Speaker, had the hon. member for St. John's West, when he spoke for seven or eight hours in this House, made one concrete suggestion to the Government of how they could help the working mothers of this Province, instead of his destructive criticism, his obstruction. Would that not have been better, Mr. Speaker? Would he have not - instead of taking the negative approach, if he had taken the positive approach,

MR. NEARY: would he have not created a better image for himself? Would he have not got better headlines on T.V., radio and in the newspapers? I think he would Mr. Speaker, and I have at this point, a suggestion I might make to the honourable member, I think he is rather pathetic because I have never in my life seen anything as pathetic as the honourable member standing in this House, in the process of trying to destroy somebody else, destroying himself. I think the honourable member has some good qualities, Sir, but I do not think he is devoting his energies in the right direction and I appeal to him, Mr. Speaker, that when he stands in his place in this hon. House again, instead of obstructing the progress of the House, obstructing the Government from implementing the measures that are good for the masses of our people, that if he wants to create a good image for himself, that he offer some constructive alternatives in the place of what we are doing, if he does not like it, tell us what the alternative is, do not try to tear down, Mr. Speaker, that never gets anyone anywhere. Tearing down will never do the hon. gentleman any good. I think he should change his tactics and let us get on with the business of the House, and when the hon. member for Burin stands in his place I can probably give him the same piece of advice. Let us get on with the business of the House, we have wasted enough of this Session of the House. We heard the hon. member for St. John's West, I think it was eight or nine hours he spoke in this House, Granted, Sir, he got a few headlines, but, Sir, that is not the kind of headlines that I would like to get, and we heard today Sir, we saw the Leader of the Opposition put on the best act of all, playing to the news-hungry press gallery, by taking his place in this House and demanding, Mr. Speaker, making his own rules and demanding that the Minister of Social Services be removed from the House.

MR. NEARY: That is democracy for you, Mr. Speaker, only a few short days ago, the hon. member was talking about closure. Oh Closure! It frightens everybody. Mr. Speaker, that little act that the Leader of the Opposition put on in this House, this afternoon, got terrific play on television around supper time. Sir, I do not mind what kind of coverage I get as long as they pronounce my name properly, and if it is in print as long as they spell it properly, but Sir, I will tell you this, it is a grave injustice of the proceedings of this House and to the people of Newfoundland. It was a great act on the part of our little friend from Flower Hill, little flower from St. John's Centre. He took his place in this house early and he demanded that I, as Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, be removed from the House.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen of the Press, who reported this great act, have never visited the House of Commons or the House in Ottawa or the House of Commons in England, or the hon. Leader of the Opposition has never visited the House of Commons in Ottawa or the House of Commons in England, because if he did, Sir, he would never make such a ridiculous suggestion. Sir, I have been in the House of Commons in England several times, which is the Mother of Parliament, and I have seen members come in, read their newspapers, then stretch out on the bench, lie down and have a nap on their benches. And Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East may be joking but they have stretched out on the floor and had their nap. As a matter of fact, if all the members of the House of Commons in England came on the same day, there would not be enough seats for them.

MR. EARLE: It must be a lot quieter in that House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is the point I am coming to, the hon. member said it must be awfully quiet in that House, it must be more quieter he said in that House. Sir, let me enlighten the hon. the gentleman, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Fortune Bay were to go there, they would get a good lesson in cross fire, they would find out what it is all about.

MR. HICKMAN: I have been there. You should hear the back benchers on the Government side of the House getting after the Prime Minister. That is what we would love to see.

MR. HICKMAN: Something to behold.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burin was there and he saw it so he must have been ashamed this afternoon to hear his leader, his number two leader, stand in this House and ask that the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation be removed because, Mr. Speaker, I was poking fun at some of the incorrect statements that he was making. My colleague, the Minister of Health, challenged the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon on a \$750,000. figure that he threw out, he throws figures around as if they were nothing. He throws \$750,000. for renovating the eighth floor at Confederation Building, the Minister of Health challenged him to produce this figure and right up to this moment, Mr. Speaker, he has not produced it and neither has he withdrawn his statement.

MR. CHALKER: I will produce it tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: My colleague, the Minister of Public Works, will produce the figure when he takes his place in this House tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Not under the rules of the House, under the rules of the S.P.C.A.

MR. CHALKER: That is not fair, Mr. Speaker, we do not do anything like that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the members of the opposite side of the House interrupting me when I am speaking. I do not mind a little bit of humour, I do not mind it at all but the Leader of the Opposition must have been super-sensitive this afternoon. He must have the election jitters, Sir, that is the only thing I can see. But I would suggest, Sir, that they not fight the next election in this House, let us get on with the business and let us approve or disapprove, as the members see fit, the measures that have been put forward in the Throne Speech by this Government that will help the masses of our people, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just digress for a second, in my acting responsibility for the portfolio that was left empty by our distinguished colleague, the former Minister of Labour; Sir, he who despite all the honours

MR. NEARY:

that were heaped upon him so deservedly through a life packed with activity in behalf of the common people of this Province, the hon. William J. Keough, Sir, in my position as acting for the department which he headed so well, he was the gentleman who is responsible for the measures that we have taken in Newfoundland in the cause of Human Rights and helping towards the achievement of the ideal equality for all those immaterial of the size of their purse or their bank account.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the first opportunity that I had when I stood on my feet in this House that I should pay tribute to our late and wonderful colleague, especially in the bringing into existence the first Human Rights Code in this Province. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I have to vote against this amendment because you see, Sir, I welcome many of the predictions that were made in the gracious Speech from the Throne because I firmly believe, Sir, that these measures will provide employment opportunities for our peoples. I believe, Sir, that there maybe two or three members on the opposite side of the House, especially those in Her majesty's official Loyal Opposition, also believe that a lot of these measures are designed to help the masses of people in this Province and I hope, Sir, that when the hon. member for Gander and the hon. member for St. John's East, Extern take their places in this House that we will hear a little bit of support for a change instead of the destructive criticism that we have had in the last ten days in this House, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another major reason why I have to vote against this amendment and that is in my capacity as the member of the House of Assembly representing my native district of Bell Island, let me give the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, a little bit of background of the things that have been happening on Bell Island over the last couple of years and why, Sir, that I have to report complete approval of some of the measures that were outlined in the gracious Speech from the Throne that will help the people of Bell Island. In the spirit of the most gracious Speech, Sir, we on Bell Island have been laying firm foundations so that we can take advantage of the promises that it holds. With the thought, Sir, that some of

MR. NEARY:

what we have been doing may be of some interest to members on both sides of this House, perhaps I could mention as I indicated some of these foundations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bell Island Association was set up less than eighteen months ago on a firm community base, to develop self-help projects among the citizens of the island who were laid off in a series of DOSCO shut downs that began in 1959. These people, Sir, preferred to remain on Bell Island in the surroundings in which they were born but, Mr. Speaker, once it was demonstrated to them that, despite the best efforts of the Premier and other members of his Government, no company from mainland Canada or the United States or Europe was in the immediate future going to replace DOSCO and duplicate the old life on Bell Island, we set up the Bell Island Association and through it, Sir, initiated a number of self-help projects that depended ninety per-cent on the people themselves, on their courage and their determination for success.

I am very happy to report, Sir, that we have had very definite progress among the groups that have been involved in self-help projects.

This is due largely to the counselling that has been given by the representative of the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, by sending an agricultural student to Bell Island for the last two summers to teach people in agriculture and animal husbandry. The experimental first year, Sir, has proved so great that this year the demand for supplies and training has doubled and I am very happy to say that at the moment the Bell Island Association is equipped with a capable field worker of its own and still able to call upon my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and of my colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development, for experts to help them to develop agriculture and fishing and to raising livestock on Bell Island.

This year, Mr. Speaker, another major push will be applied to another area of activity. Plans are now well advanced for assistance to those Bell Islanders who prefer to work on the sea rather than on the land. The Bell Island Association was able to influence the Federal Department of Public Works to build a fisherman's wharf on Bell Island this past spring

MR. NEARY:

and the fishermen had been provided with thousands of dollars worth of nets and are promised a market for their catch and are at present very busy, Mr. Speaker, trying to solve the problem of how they can get sufficient craft from which to ply their new industry. The latest word that I had from the Bell Island Association, Sir, is that they might have to do this by building their own boats and creating employment right on the island itself, take one of the old buildings abandoned by DOSCO, turn it into a wood making shop and actually build their own fishing boats on Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say here is that the great ingredient in the success of the Bell Island Association came not from external handouts from the Government or from anybody else but from the internal determination of the people to battle the fate that had treated them so unkindly. Now, Sir, I understand from the announcements made by my colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development, at the Provincial Development Conference, that they are going to increase the grants to these associations. So we are looking forward to bigger and better things happening on Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the increase in these grants and the assistance that we are continuing to get from the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and from the Department of Community and Social Development.

Mr. Speaker, did the hon. members who have spoken in the debate so far make any constructive suggestions of how we can solve the Bell Island problem or would they prefer just to criticize me, Sir, as the member for the House of Assembly for Bell Island? I ask the hon. member for St. John's West, as a matter of fact I challenge him right now, Mr. Speaker, to offer me one realistic, concrete suggestion as to how to solve the unemployment problem on Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get a new member.

MR. NEARY: There it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Get the \$90. million contract signed.

MR. NEARY: There is the answer you get. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was a Minister of the Crown when that contract was talked about.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I never saw it.

MR. NEARY: There are a lot of things the hon. member did not see, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of things the hon. member did not want to see and I was going to say something else, Mr. Speaker, but I made a resolution this afternoon, after listening to the Leader of the Opposition in this House this afternoon. Sir, I tell you this that I will never interrupt him again. I thought he had a sense of humour but I can see now that he does not. I thought he was broad-minded but he turns out to be very narrow-minded. I would suggest, Sir, that the next time that delegates go off to a Parliamentary Conference that we might send the hon. gentleman along so he can get exposed to what is happening in other Legislatures and in the House of Commons.

AN HON. MEMBER: London Zoo.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, while I am talking about Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we certainly welcome the setting up, through the good offices of the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, of the Bell Island Trust Fund.

MR. CROSBIE: How much money is in it?

MR. NEARY: Sir, it does not make any difference how much money is in it.

MR. CROSBIE: \$27,000.

MR. NEARY: Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that if present plans materialize that there will be a substantial amount of money in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, could you blame me for wanting to vote against this amendment, could you blame me, could you blame anybody on this side of the House?

MR. CROSBIE: We cannot blame you, we do not understand it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I started to say, before I was rudely interrupted by the hon. member for St. John's West, that the setting up of this fund is the fulfillment of a Government's promise to my people. But it is more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is a means to financing more self-help projects through expenditures needed to get them off the ground. No mention of these things from the hon. gentleman who spoke in the debate so far, Sir, Obstruction, delay tactics, do not let the Government get on with the business of the House, do not let the Government do things for the masses

MR. NEARY:

of the people -

MR. CROSBIE: What is the Minister doing now?

MR. NEARY: If it does not affect the classes, Sir, obstruct it, if it is not good for the classes do not let it go through this House, zero in on the Premier, criticize the Premier, criticize the individuals, personalities, insults, this is what you get, Mr. Speaker. No constructive ideas or suggestions, Sir, no alternatives, just destructive criticism for the last ten days in this House.

April 15, 1971. Tape 282 page 1.

While I am on the subject of Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members of the House that one of the most frustrating handicaps for our Bell Island people and this is caused probably by us being so close to North America's oldest city is the number of hours in a day that the people have to spend in isolation.

Now, Sir, I know that the ferry service across the tickle is a Federal responsibility. I, as the Provincial member Sir, has been able to bring about some relief to the geographic isolation by arranging last summer and fall evening trips over the week-ends, and in the immediate future, Sir, I hope to head a delegation to Ottawa to urge the Government of Canada, Canadian Transportation Commission, to provide round trips for Bell Island citizens every night of the week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the amendment for a few moments, if I may. I want to say, Sir, that most of us in the House of Assembly I feel know something about the Second Industrial Revolution in which we find ourselves today. In the first one, Sir, back in the eighteenth century in England mass unemployment occurred during the adjustment period when machines replaced hands. Today, Sir, in my opinion a similar revolution is taking place right in front of our very eyes when machines and extremely sophisticated computers are replacing the men who run machines and machines are proving themselves able to do all kinds of work more productively and economically than men.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was reading an article the other day in a magazine where you have computers today supervising computers. This is a frightening thought, who knows, some day in this House of Assembly you will have computers and robots instead of human beings. Mr. Speaker, after seeing what has happened on the opposite side for the last ten days that may not be such a bad idea.

April 15, 1971. Tape 282 page 2.

Mr. Speaker, the Government in Ottawa and the Government here in St. John's are all aware, all too well aware of these changes that are taking place and that mean so much to our people. We are undertaking Sir, a two-fold programme to deal with the situation to convert what could be a disaster into an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we need productivity. So this Government Sir, despite the Opposition has brought to Newfoundland and to Newfoundland waters global corporations who will boost their productivity. For as I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is only through the dollars -

MR. CROSBIE: For Mr. Shaheen -

MR. NEARY: I will come to Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Doyle

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister should -

MR. NEARY: Then the hon. member might be ashamed that he brought up the subject at all, Mr. Speaker - What I was saying then when I was so rudely interrupted again by the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Speaker, that it is only through the dollar scheme in the sale of products and services of this Province will we be able to buy the material things, the educational facilities, the social programmes, and the medical health needed to raise the standard of living of our masses of people. You see, Sir, as I said earlier we have to increase our gross provincial products. You see, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we do not believe that there is a Santa Claus, at least we do not believe that there is a Santa Claus for those over six years of age. What we are trying to bring about in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is a method a means whereby we can earn and pay our own way.

Now, Sir, this brings me to the point that was raised by the hon. member for St. John's West. He has criticized this Government on numerous occasions in this session of the House for bringing in

outsiders, what he called foreigners. They would be brought in, Sir, to do the job that I just outlined. Mr. Speaker, what else could we have done? Our native millionaires, Sir, even those occupying the Opposition benches who represent the millionaires of this Province in absentia, they preferred Mr. Speaker, to invest their proceeds of centuries of living off our people, they preferred to invest in gilt-edge security rather than risking their ill-gotten gains in productive enterprises that would create employment and bring new dollars into our provincial economy. What does the hon. member for St. John's West say about that? Nothing. Criticism of Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Doyle -

MR. CROSBIE: Two people to comment on -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was sincere he would try to influence some of his millionaire friends to invest some money in this Province for the masses of the people

MR. CROSBIE: Like Shaheen and Doyle, what have they invested here? It is all our money -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if they do not want to invest their money in this Province that is their privilege.

MR. CROSBIE: They are using our money instead. Where is the money Mr. Shaheen has invested? One hundred and sixty million and all of it ours, the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope Sir, that they are aware of the suffering that they are placing on the masses of the people of this Province. The Government, Mr. Speaker, we cannot force these people to put some of their ill-gotten gains back into productive industries. The dollars that they thumb-screwed out of our people.

MR. CROSBIE: Who are these people that you are talking about?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from St. John's West knows who they are -

April 15, 1971 Tape 282 page 4.

MR.CROSBIE: No, I do not - who are they?

MR.NEARY: They are being represented in this House in absentia Sir.

MR.CROSBIE: Who are they? Who are they?

MR.NEARY: Water Street -

MR.CROSBIE: Water Street is not in the picture.

MR.HICKMAN: We will start at number one. the Banker's Trust -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West know exactly who I am talking about.

MR.CROSBIE: I do. I do indeed.

MR.NEARY: We hear every day about the applying to the Crosbie Building on Crosbie Road.

MR.CROSBIE: We hear about the Lundrigan's, the Noseworthy's, the Ashley's, and all the rest of them - the little millionaires.

MR.NEARY: There it is, Mr. Speaker, there is the only defence that you get.

MR.HICKMAN: Do not forget the Banker's Trust, tell us who is behind the Banker's Trust.

MR.NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say,

MR.CROSBIE: Who owns those buildings?

MR.NEARY: As I say Mr. Speaker, -

MR.CROSBIE: The Board of Liquor Control Buildings -

MR.NEARY: The Government, this Government could not force these people to put back into productive industry some of their ill-gotten gains -

MR.CROSBIE: Who owns the one in Grand Bank? Give us those names.

MR.NEARY: And they were ill-gotten gains, Mr. Speaker.

MR.ROBERTS: Is that the same guy who is yapping all day about being interrupted -

MR.CROSBIE: One in Placentia -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are ill-gotten gains and they may not be

ill-gotten gains as far as the lawyers are concerned in this Province. But as far as I am concerned they are ill-gotten gains and that my hon. friend, I challenge the hon. member for St. John's West in another sitting session in this House, if he were genuinely sincere and conscientious and wanted to help the people of this Province, as a lawyer, lower the charges for real estate transactions -

MR.CROSBIE: Lower the Minister's charges as a Cabinet Minister, what if the Minister would lower his salary as a Cabinet Minister and save the taxpayers a few thousand dollars.

MR.NEARY: I challenge the hon. member now, Mr. Speaker, and I take my seat in this House if he will stand up tonight and announce to the people of Newfoundland that he is going to follow the recommendation of the Kostaszek Report, Royal Commission, and announce to the people of Newfoundland that he is going to reduce legal fees for real estate transactions in this Province. If he does not do it, I challenge the hon. member for Burin-

MR.CROSBIE: Challenge the Hon. Minister of Justice - the Minister of Social Development, the Senior Member for Harbour Main, the Junior member for Harbour Main -

MR.NEARY: The hon. member for St. John's East - or all lawyers Mr. Speaker. Let us see them put their mouths where -

MR.CROSBIE: Let us see the Government lawyers put their mouths where the Minister's is - or would that be too close to the seat of their pants?

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, getting kind of hot over there now, Mr. Speaker, getting kind of hot - the hon. member cannot take the truth -

MR.HICKMAN: Challenge the Minister of Justice -

MR.CROSBIE: I am looking for the truth who owns the -

MR.NEARY: I repeat - I repeat my challenge - either one of the lawyers on the opposite side of the House can accept this challenge

MR.CROSBIE: What about the Minister's side of the House?

MR.NEARY: Either one,

MR.HICKMAN: Legal fees,would you tell us who is behind the -

MR.NEARY: One, two, three., "eenie, meenie, miney, mo,
catch a nigger by the toe,, either one, here it is, here is your
golden opportunity - take your place in this House and announce to
the people of Newfoundland that you are going to reduce -

MR.CROSBIE: Will the Minister permit a question? Will the
Minister give us the names of the owners of the Board of
Liquor Control Stores, Grand Bank, St. Lawrence, and Placentia, who
is getting the \$12,000 a year for a building that did not cost thirty
thousand on a twenty year lease, \$240,000 over twenty year period.
why their names are being hidden behind a - if the Minister will
do that -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question, I will concede
for any of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House
to ask a question. I welcome their interruptions. I do not get
upset nor offended at all when they interrupt me. I have been
speaking now for almost an hour and I have had more interruptions
than any member who spoke on that side of the House so far, and
have I complained to Your Honour? No. No.

MR.CROSBIE: Give the Minister a hand -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have thrown out a challenge, I have thrown
out a challenge to the hon. members from St. John's West, Burin, and
St/ John's East,

MR.CROSBIE: Harbour Main -

MR.NEARY: I am so happy to see the Leader of the Opposition back in
the House. I hope we are still good friends. I hope that never again
will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition make such a holy show of himself

as he made this afternoon in this House.

MR. MURPHY: I will have to go a long way to equal the Hon. Minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - we do not have pages here tonight - if he would run out and get me a glass of ice water because I am getting rather dehydrated

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister this afternoon would gladly do it.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the hon. member for St. John's West will return the compliment.

MR. CROSBIE: I will do it and you had better watch out for that -

MR. NEARY: As long as he does not spike it Mr. Speaker, I do not mind.

An. HON. MEMBER: I would have it analyzed.

MR. NEARY: I will have it analyzed by the Minister of Health Sir, when they bring it in. Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back in a serious vein again I was talking about the ill-gotten goods, the ill-gotten goods of the millionaires who are represented in this House in absentia and while I was talking about the millionaires Mr. Speaker, I could not help but getting back to the high legal fees for real estate transactions in this province. I had no intention of bringing it up but when the hon. member for St. John's West interrupted it gave me an opportunity to do it but I am willing to throw out another challenge, another challenge for the hon. member for St. John's West.

Sir, if the hon. member is really sincere in his criticism of these imports, these foreigners that he talks so much about. Mr. Speaker, if I do nothing else tonight I will clear the air and I hope tomorrow we can get down to some serious business in this House.

MR. CROSBIE: Certainly not serious -

MR. NEARY: I might say I am very serious I am coming to a very serious point Sir, in my remarks.

MR.CROSBIE: The minister's resignation.

MR.NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker. I was talking about ill-gotten gains when I flung out the challenge to the hon. member for St. John's West to set a good example for the lawyers union of this Province but he did not accept the challenge so I will throw him out another, seeing that he is the one who has raised all this criticism about these foreigners and these imports that have come into Newfoundland. Can my hon. friend , who represents these people in absentia in this House, influence some of his millionaire colleagues to invest some of their ill-gotten gains in this Province? Only then Mr. Speaker, will we not have to turn to foreigners.

 Sir, the other day I read in one of the local papers the number of businessmen in Newfoundland who have taken advantage of the grants that are available for expansion of old industry and the creation of new industry in Newfoundland, under the Regional Department of Economic Expansion at Ottawa. I was alarmed,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed to see that so few businessmen in this Province had taken advantage of that very worthwhile programme to create jobs and to help increase the gross Provincial products of Newfoundland.

Sir, apparently my hon. friend is not going to accept that challenge either. He is not going to stand on the floor of this House tonight and tell the people of Newfoundland that he is going out tomorrow morning or tonight, before he goes to bed, he is going to get on the telephone or he is going to sit down and write a few letters, some of these people are probably retired in Florida right now and ask these people who we represent in this House to reinvest some of their ill-gotten gain in this Province. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we do not have any choice, as a Government, but to look elsewhere for people who are prepared to risk their dollars, and who are prepared -

MR. HICKMAN: What dollars?

MR. NEARY: Who are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to create a future for the masses of our Newfoundland people.

MR. CROSBIE: Acting dollars. They are not in the Province long enough to do a toe dance, when they do come here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it was a tremendous disappointment for me, when I read that article in the newspaper that our Newfoundland businessmen had not taken advantage of these grants, and some of them were outright grants, Mr. Speaker, from DREE and invest in enterprises in this Province that would help the people who help fatten their purse down through the years. And those who have been the parasites over the centuries.

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

MR. NEARY: I will permit a question, Mr. Speaker, but not a speech.

MR. EARLE: He is throwing out a challenge, would the hon. minister guarantee that if I apply to his Government for a loan to start a business without putting any capital whatsoever in it, if they will back me to the tune of \$160 million?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if it is a sound idea. It is not really a question, but ^{if} it is a sound idea, I, for one would be prepared to take a good look

MR. NEARY: at it, if it would create jobs and employment for Newfoundlanders and improve our gross provincial product.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am reminded by my colleague that the record of the hon. gentleman may not invite confidence from this side of the House.

MR. EARLE: I did not get that, repeat it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour this point, but I would like to see these parasites who are now criticizing the Government for bringing in foreigners and outsiders, I would like to see these parasites provide some business opportunities, as their own, and invest some dollars and some know-how in this Province in creating productivity and work from which Newfoundlanders could derive some benefits.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, these parasites have now carried their campaign on the floor of this House. We saw it here yesterday and again today. You know, Mr. Speaker, it struck me that these parasites fear bringing these foreigners and outsiders in here because they fear that the masses in our Province might share a little prosperity that will result from these enterprises. And, I think, I get the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that they are afraid that their own stocks and bonds and lease-backs would be a little more precious to them. They seem to fear, Mr. Speaker, lessening the gap between the very rich and the poor. And, I hope, Sir, that never again will I hear an hon. gentleman who is in such a great vantage position to help the people of this Province by getting these friends, millionaire friends, to reinvest some of their ill-gotten gains into this Province. never again will he take his place in this House and criticize this Government for having to go outside the Province and bring in people to do a job that we cannot get our own business people to do in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We go about the task of bringing in dollars and brains to develop the products and services that will bring to this Province dollars that can be put to use raising the standard of living of the masses of our people, Sir. And what do we get from the Opposition? Criticism. Criticism. They have

MR. NEARY: not offered any alternative. Not only that, Sir, but we try to bring in new brains and new dollars into this Province, but we have set up a programme of training for our people, not only for our young people, Sir, but for all the people even those who are not adaptable or not so young to take training. We tried to train them, Sir, to the new type of jobs that are opening up with these technological advances. No talk of that in the speeches by the hon. gentleman.

MR. EARLE: Would the hon. minister tell the House, what no, do-nothing, minister started that programme?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the hon. gentleman's question.

MR. EARLE: No, he would not understand that. Just think back a few years.

MR. NEARY: So, you see, Mr. Speaker, we are carrying on a two-fold programme. We are trying to bring in money and brains into this Province, and at the same time we are trying to train our young people and training our not-so-young people into the fitting in of these new jobs that will result from these new industries.

But, Sir, what about those people whose type of work will be eliminated by technological advance and who are untrainable for the new kinds of jobs? What about the twenty or more bush workers that were displaced by the huge new forest harvester, Mr. Speaker, or the dory fishermen that is displaced by the trawler? A part of the answer to this, Mr. Speaker, will, of course, come with the new fisheries programme announced in the most gracious Speech from the Throne, and one of the reasons why I have to vote against this Amendment. Another answer, Mr. Speaker, is under discussion at the Federal level and that is the Guaranteed Annual Income. Guaranteed Annual Income or to put it another way, a fair dividend from the gross natural product for each citizen, even if technological change or personal misfortune has robbed them of the chance to earn a living for himself and his family. No reference at all, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. members who have spoken in this House about

MR. NEARY: the Guaranteed Annual Income.

MR. HICKMAN: Was that the one that Mr. Trudeau opposed?

MR. NEARY: Or the reverse income tax. No reference, Mr. Speaker. This does not apply to the classes. This is good for the master so therefore they find it very convenient not to refer to this at all.

Another alternative, Mr. Speaker, for these people who will be untrainable because of technological change, and I have seen this work in Sweden and Germany and in some other forward thinking companies, and this is really good for the morale of the people, Mr. Speaker, and this is a nation-wide programme of subsidizing private employers and setting up Government corporations to employ people doing things by hand that could not be justified economically in the open competitive national and world markets of today. These people, Sir, and these special projects will be paid good wages, The jobs would not be competitive with business and industry, and would not conflict with union principles in any way

With this Government, Sir, I can assure you that this is more than an academic proposition. We have already, as Your Honour is aware, presented a brief to the Senate Committee on Poverty asking for new terms of the Canada Assistance Plan to enable us here in this Province, as well as in the other Provinces, to institute such a work programme for those people who are at present and who will be in the future disqualified for work, as we know it today, because of technological changes. We do not think, Mr. Speaker, that these people should remain in idleness, and should not only qualify for Social Assistance but should have a right to earn a decent living for themselves and their family.

Now, what are we doing about this, Mr. Speaker? Well, Sir, I am not sure whether I have it here with me tonight. Yes, I do. I have here in my hand, Sir, a proposal which I call "Operation re-Direct." This was presented to

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Greene.

MR. NEARY: the Provincial Government. Not Mr. Kierans.

MR. CROSBIE: Professor Greene.

MR. NEARY: Presented to the Provincial Government several weeks ago on behalf of my constituents of Bell Island. And the reason it was called, "Operation re-Direct," Sir, it is a programme which involves -

MR. CROSBIE: From Greene to Neary. Redirected from Greene to Neary.

MR. NEARY: Sir, about a hundred thousand man-hours of work on a number of projects that are non-competitive with private industry and capable of being carried out by hands of the unemployables on Bell Island who are now forced to live on Social Assistance.

"Operation re-Direct," Mr. Speaker, and its project have been approved and this summer we should see tremendous improvements in the infrastructure of the Bell Island Community, we hope to get underway this spring. It will provide, Sir, employment for heads of households, who have been severely handicapped since the final DOSCO shut-down. It will provide them with several months of employment and enough unemployment insurance credit, Sir, to carry them through to the commencement of seasonal benefits.

Therefore, Sir, it will relieve them of having to depend on Social Assistance for perhaps a year or so, with advantages in morale for themselves and in tax savings to the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of idea that I would like to hear coming from the other side of the House. That is the kind of a suggestion that I would like to hear from the hon. member for Burin, instead of his destructive criticism. In fact, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKMAN: How about the money for the miners in St. Lawrence, that is a constructive suggestion.

MR. NEARY: In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would go as far as to say that -

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I finally woke the hon. member for Burin up, I think, he was having a bad dream.

MR. HICKMAN: I was having a nightmare, I thought that you were still around, when I woke up it was true.

MR. NEARY: Here it is. There is the humour again, Mr. Speaker. There is the humour.

Mr. Speaker, this "Operation re-Direct," employment opportunities at Churchill Falls and Come-by-Chance, and the erection of our new Immaculate Conception School and other works projects throughout our Province. But, it looks to me like this summer we will see a situation which I never dreamed, not even in most optimistic and hopeful moments had expected to see happen for several more years, and that is, more jobs for Bell Islanders than there are Bell Islanders left to take them.

So, you see, Sir, I would be very, very hypocritical and stupid to vote in favour of the Amendment. I know, Your Honour is looking at his watch, I think my time is just about up. I want to thank the hon. members of the House for their attention. And, I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the days and weeks ahead that the members on the opposite side of the House will take some of the friendly advice that I passed along to them, and let us take off our coats, Sir, and roll up our sleeves and really get down to business in this House, and in the next few weeks show the people of Newfoundland that we are really interested in their welfare and that we want to help the masses of people of this Province and not just the classes. Thank you.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is necessary for me to take my coat off or not.

MR. HICKEY:

I would suggest to the hon. Minister though that there are times around here when it would almost make one take his coat off, some of the things that we are subjected to. He has given a number of reasons why he is going to vote against this motion before the House. I would like to give a few reasons, quickly, Mr. Speaker, why I would support this motion. First of all, Sir, I could not possibly see myself or find myself supporting this Government as long as there is a family in my own district without electric lights. When we hear of all the money that has been spent in the electrification programme throughout the Province and yet find a family approximately four miles from the capital city still using the lamps, I cannot think of a better reason than that, Mr. Speaker, for voting for a non-confidence motion in this Government. I cannot think of a better reason for voting against this Government when I go around my district and find the same fishing facilities that existed twenty years ago are still evident, still can be seen.

I find it rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, to support this Government when I look and find that after all those years and all the talk that has gone on and all the suggestions that have been made regarding the Battery that it is still there without facilities, without normal facilities that all of us or most of us take for granted todayⁱⁿ areas far, far removed from St. John's and the other cities and towns and yet we find right on the doorstep of the city no toilets, no bathrooms and the night carts still going around. Mr. Speaker, as one representing a district wherein those problems exist, could he in conscience support this Government? The answer must be obvious to all. Those are just a few reasons at the district level.

But, Mr. Speaker, when one is subjected to a speech such as the one that we have just heard, one finds many other reasons why one cannot support this Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(NOEL): Order!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, as I came up on the elevator and heard someone

MR. HICKEY:

speaking, if one had asked me who it was I would have never have guessed it was the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. When I heard him speak about the remarks made by some opposition members as being personal and low I would never have expected, Sir, to find that coming from that hon. gentleman for/as I have said in this House previously there is no-one that is a greater offender than the gentleman who has just finished his speech, no-one creates more obstruction in this House than this hon. gentleman. Yet we sit here tonight and we get a dissertation of how we should take our coats off and sit down and really get down to business. The hon. Minister said that he promised himself something tonight that he was not going to continue and interrupt speakers as he has in the past, I hope he follows through that, Mr. Speaker. I find it a bit difficult to accept though, as he has not done it in the four years that I have been around here.

He tells us, Mr. Speaker, about the parasites in reference to millionaires and one obviously has to ask the question, who created the millionaires? If there is a great increase in millionaires in our Province and in a speech of approximately one year ago he made that statement that this Province has more millionaires per capita than any other city in North America, then, Sir, the Government that he supports helped create those millionaires. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister should measure people not by their wealth but maybe measure them by their principles. He criticizes some people because they are alleged to be rich, This is getting away from the business that he tells us we should get down and work at. Is it anybody's business what wealth one has as long as they have obtained that wealth honestly? Can we not differentiate between politics and something personal? The hon. Minister finds that very difficult to do. In my own personal experience with him I find that when he is backed in a corner he cannot seem to get away from personalities.

He talks about millionaires investing their money and this is another good reason, Mr. Speaker, why I could not possibly support the present administration. While someone raised a question as to whether or not they

MR. HICKEY:

would get a loan if they went to the Government with a sound idea, there are people, Sir, in this Province who have gone to the Government with sound ideas, people who have proven their ability to carry on a productive and profitable business. There happens to be one fish plant operator right in my own district who wanted a measly \$3,000. to install a water line in his fish plant, an employer of thirty to forty people as well as the contribution he was making by taking the fish from numerous fishermen in and around the St. John's area, and the same Government, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister supports refused that man. There has been no good reason given because there is not one.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of legal fees were raised and the hon. Minister set himself up a little while ago as a champion of the toiling masses in his campaign to have legal fees lower. I do not know if his efforts had anything to do with it or not but certainly he has not observed too much about this particular project that he was so interested in for it is a fact that legal fees were lower just last year. He talks about real estate fees. Maybe real estate fees should be lower, I do not know but all I do know is that they are not as high in this Province as they are in other Provinces, not near as high but, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that they should not be lower. I have an open mind on the subject. He talks about and in fact he belaboured the point about opposition members making constructive suggestions and, Mr. Speaker, this matter should not be left, just go by the Board without commenting on it. How many constructive suggestions have been put forward by opposition members over the years? It is just not true for any member of this hon. House to say that all they get from this side is criticism without some suggestions. The hon. Minister who made that charge is the first person in the world who should realize it because he himself heads the department and he himself is responsible for implementing several suggestions that came from this side of the House with regards to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, suggestions that were made by myself and my colleagues as far back as three years ago, suggestions which we saw implemented, put into effect, on the anniversary of Confederation

MR. HICKEY:

with regards to welfare recipients and we welcome the news, Mr. Speaker. We are only too willing and too quick sometimes to support measures which are good for our people. We give credit where it is due and we criticize when necessary and that is the role of a member of the Opposition.

The hon. Minister apparently does not know too much about what that role is and I do not cherish optimism in terms of the election that is coming up for if he manages to be re-elected the chances are better than average that he will find himself in Opposition. He will have plenty time to get to know all about it and so it would seem, Sir, that he has a short memory when it is convenient.

We have a report, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Boys' Home and Girls' Home and regarding delinquency in general. We asked that the report be tabled and I have gone through the report and I find it rather strange that there is no signature by Mr. McGrath who was hired to make the inquiry. Usually, Sir, when there is an inquiry into a situation whoever and however many people are involved in making that inquiry they usually sign their names to their reports, to the report outlining their findings but in this report we do not find any signature, in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a draft. It says right on the front page, "For discussion purposes only." I do not know if the hon. Minister felt that by tabling this that hon. members on this side would be just brushed off, that they would not bother to look through it, read it but it has been read, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Minister figures that he is going to smoothen over the situation, the incidents that took place at the Girls' Home last fall by tabling a document like this, he has another thing coming. I renew my request now that the final report be tabled.

MR. HICKEY: The report in which all the recommendations by Mr. McGrath are contained. I suspect Mr. Speaker, I have good reason to suspect that that report does not speak in glowing terms of the department that the hon. minister heads. I suspect that it lays the blame for a lot of the things that have gone wrong in those homes squarely where it belongs. Lays the blame on the department, and subsequently on the shoulders of the hon. minister who is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, how can any member of this House support a Government who will not provide information. Who will not provide information that the public have the right to. That the taxpayers have a right to. As I walked into the Chamber tonight, I heard the hon. minister say in a kind of boastful way, that he was the one who asked the press or told the press to lay off the girls' home and the boys' home. Does he usually feel, Mr. Speaker, that he can boast about that? I would say to him now, this is one statement in his career that he should be ashamed of. There is nothing to be proud about in the statement he made to the press that day.

We can thank the press for bringing a number of things to light with regards to the incidents that have gone on in those homes. Would the public have ever heard about them? Would they have ever been corrected, if they are corrected?

Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations by Mr. McGrath, in relation to the girls' home as well I suppose as the boys' home, but in particular to the girls' home was in connection with proper, trained staff. It might shock this House, Mr. Speaker, when I point out to them that some two months after that, during the Christmas holidays there were people replacing the staff at the girls' home who had never seen the inside of the building before, who did not know what it was all about, who had no idea of supervising those problem girls, who hesitated, Mr. Speaker, even after they had been requested and ordered to go to work at the girls' home. Is this the kind of faith the hon. minister and his staff in the department place in the recommendations by this gentleman who did the investigation? If he is going to pay no more attention to those recommendations than that, then he had might as well not engage the

gentleman at all.

I can tell the hon. minister now that unless strict measures are taken and unless a lot of changes are made in the running of the boys and the girls homes, he can look for more problems. Maybe the next time we will not be so lucky if we have a fire. Rumour has it, Mr. Speaker, that at the boys' home some of the boys are in isolation cells or rooms for long periods. Rumour also has it that there is liquor on the premises from time to time. Is the hon. minister aware of this? If he is, what has he done about it? I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that there has to be a change of attitude on the part of Government, and especially the hon. minister, towards the press.

There is no need for the hon. minister to hide those things from the press or the people of this Province. It is their money that keeps those homes going, pays the salaries. It is their money that pays his salary and mine, and the salaries of everyone else in this hon. House. Is there any need to keep this information from being passed on to the public? The public are reasonable. I think the hon. minister would stand a much better chance of being vindicated in any efforts he would be making to cure those problems if the information ~~were~~ passed on and made public, rather than keeping it secret.

Another recommendation that Mr. McGrath makes, Mr. Speaker, is that the public have a right to this information. The public have a right to be involved, have a right to know what is going on, have a right to be told how their money is being spent. Surely, they are not going to know this if the information is not given to them. Last fall, Mr. Speaker, in a pure, sincere way, not for political purposes as the hon. minister thought at the time, he has to think this, but in a most sincere way I made a couple of recommendations. I asked that the hon. minister provide certain information. It just fell on deaf ears. He tells us tonight that we should make some suggestions. He tells us we should be constructive in our criticism. Well this was one instance, Mr. Speaker, and there are numerous others, as it would apply to each member on this side, where the constructive criticisms and the recommendations and suggestions went unnoticed. It is rather difficult to win, if you make the suggestions they are forgotten about, if you happen to make a speech sometime and not make one you are criticized for doing that.

Sir, I would suggest to the hon. minister that he take a good, long look at the boys' home. He possibly knows well what I am talking about. I think that if he has information with regards to this most serious problem if it is true, and I am not saying that it is, I am passing it along because, I believe that if it is true the public should know about it. Some corrective measures should be taken. If they are already taken, then the public has a right to know that.

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

MR. HICKEY: Certainly.

MR. NEARY: My department has engaged a team of consultants at the university. One from the Department of psychology and one from the Department of Social Welfare to assist us in carrying out rehabilitation programme in these homes. Is the hon. gentleman aware of this?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I am aware of this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I just wanted to make sure.

MR. HICKEY: But that does not justify the attitude that the minister adopts in remaining silent on what is going on. Why not inform the public? Why not tell the people exactly what is going on? Tell them the improvements that have been made.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: There are recommendations contained in this document right here and they were ignored. I do not know if the minister knows it or not, but they were. They were ignored during Christmas. One might say that the department went looking for trouble again, for one of the recommendations spells out the need for trained, professional staff, which we are told we do not have enough of in that institution.

According to my information, and it comes from a reliable source, while the few professional people that are in there were off we had people go in there who had not even been inside the building before. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this in my opinion is just looking for trouble. I think too, as I mentioned earlier, when vicious rumours get around such as the ones pertaining to the boys' home, the one pertaining to alcohol, the one pertaining to some of the children being in isolation rooms or cells for long periods of time, I

think then that it is time for the minister to make a statement, to say something to clear the air. Either deny or confirm, if he has to confirm, say what is being done about it. There is certainly nothing to be lost by him or his department, or the Government when he takes those steps in a situation such as this.

But certainly, if rumours are let go, and nothing is said about them, all they can do is pick up momentum and finally one has a real problem on their hands.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman has information unknown to myself or the staff of the homes, or here in Confederation Building, if he would be good enough to pass this information along to us with affidavits, and not do it-- You know, we cannot accept gossip or rumour. Mr. Speaker, but if he has concrete information that could help us out, I wonder if he would be good enough to pass it along to us, documented with affidavits.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to pass along any such information along with the necessary documents if I had the time to go get them. It is certainly not for any lack of interest that I do not have them. I would suggest that there is no need for affidavits in order to check out a rumour. All the hon. minister has to do really, is to visit the home himself. I am sure, in fact, I know some of the officials at the boys' home are very competent people, but I am sure that it would not take too long, and he would not be all that far out if he investigated this matter on his own, without any affidavits.

The remarks that I have made with regards to the boys' home without a doubt he has already heard.

MR. NEARY: They are not true.

MR. HICKEY: They are not true? Well you see Mr. Speaker, the public does not know this.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman would like to give the idea to the House that the public does not know it, but they do know it.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister now thinks that I am like him. but, that is not so. I do not like to lead this House to think anything which I know to be wrong. I never do. I know for a fact that the public do not

know that those rumours are not true. I have not heard the hon. minister, and the people who have brought it to my attention have not heard him make a statement to the effect that a thorough investigation had been made with regards to those rumours, and it was found that they were unfounded or false. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a fair number of the public feel that there is something to those rumours. This is why I say, Sir, that it does not hurt at all, in fact it helps a great deal when an issue, no matter how touchy it might be, when it is taken and dealt with in the proper way then there is no reason to withhold any information, and there is no reason to hide any. unless someone has something to hide. This is why the hon. minister and I did not clear the air on the girls' home situation last fall. The simple reason was that there were things that it was

MR. HICKEY: convenient for the Government to hide with regards to what was going on.

There is no mention, Mr. Speaker, in this Report about cells, none whatever. Everybody is aware of the fact that there were cells in that home. So I would like very much to see the final report, what the recommendations are and what the department is doing about it. I would suggest, Sir, to the hon. minister that when he receives some suggestions in the future when a member from this side makes some suggestions that he take them into consideration, that he might go to work on his colleagues to do the same thing. I think, if they do they will, either himself or anyone else on that side, will not be so quick to get on their feet in this House and accuse this side of obstructing, of wasting time and criticizing without offering any suggestions or making any recommendations.

It is easy to do that, Mr. Speaker, we can all do that, We can all stand here and deal in personalities, become very personal, but in my view it accomplishes very little and if any member of this House thinks that they make any impression on the general public by attacking another individual by getting away from the political issue and attacking them personally, I have news for them. I would suggest that anyone who resorts to that will find out when they go back to their constituents in the next election.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Motion, and I hope that some hon. gentlemen on the other side will see fit to see the reasoning behind it and maybe a miracle will happen, we just might get one or two people on the other side to support it with us.

MR. W. R. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to stand here, Sir, and look across the microphone at the hon. member for St. John's West. There is a noose hanging around it, which the hon. gentleman put there himself. I almost wonder if it is not perhaps some form of vertigo. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, perhaps should look into the case. He may be able to give the hon. gentleman some help.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just sat down said, in reading last year's Hansard, the hon. gentleman is recorded to have said, I cannot see the date, it maybe March 10, or April 10. The hon. gentleman was reported, Mr. Speaker, to have said, "Mr. Speaker, am I being accused of something? What is it I am being accused of Filbustering? Is that it? Would someone like to make the charge? Would someone like to stand up and make a charge." Then he goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say, "I guess I have not been in politics long enough to master that as yet, but give me time, Sir, give me time." I just found out, Mr. Speaker, that a year has done him a lot of good. He has had time and he has come along way.

Mr. Speaker, the bases for this Amendment, I think, is threefold. It is based on financial claim, of financial mismanagement. It is based on the alleged refusal to answer questions. And it is based on an allegation of reduction of public services rather than improvements in public services. I think, Sir, that probably sums up the Amendment fairly handily.

Now on the question, Mr. Speaker, of financial mismanagement it is very interesting again. I read old Hansards. I happened to be looking through today an old Hansard in which a former member of this House, Mr. Speaker, made a speech which goes in part like this, he says; "it is my sincere opinion that the Provincial Government is heading for financial ruin." That is the first statement. Second statement is, "we have committed ourselves to spending more than we actually have in our Current Account. We have built up services, many unnecessary, far more costly than we can raise revenue to pay for them." That is the second statement, Mr. Speaker, it sounds very familiar. The third statement is, "interest and sinking funds charges are beginning to pile up on money that the Government must pay on, if they are to maintain their present position." The fourth statement, The fifth statement is, "now I cannot feel, I wish I could. I have tried to but I cannot feel too optimistic about what is going to happen when our money is all gone." And then there is a further statement, Mr. Speaker, which says; "we

MR. CALLAHAN: are rapidly heading into a financial mess. The taxpayers of the Province must eventually pay for it in one way or another and the Government have neither the will nor the courage to avert it." And that particular section, Mr. Speaker, ends by saying; "that statement may be wrong, I hope it is wrong, and I will do all I can from whatever side of the House to help make it wrong, but if it is wrong let it be my political epitaph."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest it was the hon. gentleman's political epitaph. It sounds so, so much like what we heard here today, yesterday and the day before, the statement made to this House by an hon. gentleman who like other hon. gentleman, whom we heard yesterday and today and the day before yesterday, who left over here and went to another place in this House. The statement, Mr. Speaker, was not made yesterday or today or the day before yesterday, it was made precisely twenty years ago. And, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it had about as much validity then as the statements of the past two or three days have had now, precisely the same value.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CAELAHAN: No, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a colleague of mine was refused the opportunity to ask a question, by the Leader of the hon. gentleman. He was told to sit down and wait his turn. I make the same suggestion now to the other side. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that the statement that I have just referred to from the proceedings of this House was made in this House when this House was in another place, fully twenty years ago and, as I have said, I suggest has precisely the same validity as the statements referred in the last couple of days.

We will go further, Mr. Speaker, because it is very basic to the Motion which has been made by the hon. member for St. John's West, I believe. That is with reference to a comparison made this afternoon as between the Public Debts of this Province and the Public Debts of the Province of New Brunswick. And I say now, without fear of contradiction, Mr. Speaker, that the comparison we heard this afternoon were absolutely and totally false and without foundation. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his

MR. CALLAHAN: information, but I suggest that he go back and re-check. There is absolutely no resemblance between the figures he gave us this afternoon, either in respect to this Province or the Province of New Brunswick, and the conclusion that he drew from those figures in support of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

It is not a fact that the Debt of this Province is of a magnitude such as referred to by the hon. gentleman and certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is not a fact that the Debt of the Province of New Brunswick is of the particular size referred to by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

So on the question of financial mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, it is a story we have been hearing in this House since this House began. There is nothing new in it, and I suspect that the public of this Province are reacting to it today as they reacted twenty years ago, and we know what the record of their reaction has been. We, also, Mr. Speaker, very easily, without difficulty, can verify the figures put by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon and I am quite sure that, as I have said, if he will check he will find they were lacking very, very seriously in accuracy.

The other thing that needs to be said on this particular point, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the Government could have set out on a course such as suggested by the statement of twenty years ago. It could have set out on a course that would have ensured that it did not commit itself to spending more than it actually had in the Current Accounts. And where, Mr. Speaker, would that have left us or, indeed, where would it leave any other jurisdiction in this nation whether it be the Government of Canada, the Government of the Federal State of which we are apart or the Government of any of the provinces, and I mean any of them. Mr. Speaker, because it simply is impossible, as it is impossible for the average citizen of this Province who wishes, for example, to have a home. It is impossible for him to have a home, unless he incurs a debt.

I have a home, which I call my home, Mr. Speaker, which I consider is mine and which I consider in the ordinary course I own, but it is really owned

MR. CALLAHAN: by the Trust Company that holds the mortgage. And precisely the same applies to the whole range of public assets that we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker, ranging from roads, bridges, right through to schools, hospitals, and the University and everything else that has been accumulated in the way of public assets in this Province during the Interim.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not hear. Mr. Speaker, I say again, the hon. gentleman was not in his seat, that this afternoon when one of my colleagues attempted to ask a question he was told by the same hon. gentleman to sit down and wait his turn. I am sorry, no, I shall not allow a question. But the point, Mr. Speaker, is that we hear of the Debt and we hear it inflated and we hear wild statements and invalid comparison without hearing any reference to what balances the books on the other side.

Now this leads to the matter covered in the Amendment, referred to in the Amendment, the matter of public services and the alleged failure to improve them. While I am on the subject, Mr. Speaker, may I say this? A year ago there was brought to this House a matter, which at the time on the other side. was referred to as trash, as bull, as hoaxes, as bluff, as nonsense. It was fit, we were told, Mr. Speaker, only for the waste-paper basket and the last

Mr. Callahan

people ever to look at it, would be the people to whom it really was directed; namely, the Government of Canada. I simply want to say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that I understand that an hon. gentleman who represents this Province in another place and who is the separated colleague of hon. gentlemen opposite to my right, apparently has announced tonight that he has learned - that he has learned (Mr. Speaker, that is interesting. I find that rather amusing) that there will be expenditure this year, by the Government of Canada on the Bonne Bay, Grose Morne, National Park; that it will, as I have said, although he scoffed at it some weeks ago, involve preliminary work such as the upgrading of roads and the preparation of sites within the national park; that there, perhaps, may even be a bit more spending than the national park branch itself had intended in this present year, which incidentally, Mr. Speaker was in the range, initially, of \$500,000. I suggested eight weeks ago that it would be closer to \$750,000 and the hon. gentleman who sits in another place now has confirmed this.

But a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that was trash and bull and hoax and bluff and nonsense and fit only for the waste-paper basket. I think it is instructive and I think the matter fits very well into the category of improvement, not reduction of public services.

Earlier this day, Mr. Speaker, I tabled an answer in response to a question from the hon. member for Gander on the matter of public services. It referred to the construction of one new Provincial Park and to the major expansion of nine other Provincial Parks in this Province. And this within the past year, Mr. Speaker. I do not know. Maybe I am crazy but it seems to me that that has something to do with improvement in public services. I do not know what the figures are, but I know what some of the work has been during the past year on highways improvement and DREE building and re-

Mr. Callahan.

construction and paving. I know what has been done in my own district. I find it hard to believe that anyone could consider that work done, Mr. Speaker, to be a reduction in public services. It could only be the other way around.

So, it goes on through the piece, Mr. Speaker. Everything that has been achieved in adding to the social capital or to the public assets of this Province over the past year or years, obviously has been an improvement in public services and how could anyone in his right mind suggested that, in fact, there has been a reduction. Have we torn up roads and thrown them into the sea or gone out and torn down schools or burned down Provincial Parks or have we, in fact, added to these public assets? I think the answer, Mr. Speaker, must be pretty obvious.

The other point raised in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the alleged refusal to give information. I have just checked a few minutes ago, and I believe the number of questions on the Order Paper, and there had been numbers not on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, that the numbers of questions placed on the Order Paper so far in this session is 485. The number answered directly, by the count I have, is 226.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 228.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, 228. Which, Mr. Speaker, in not very many days - and let us remember that the hon. gentlemen opposite have had since this time last year to prepare their questions, the answerers have had only a number of days to prepare or be prepared. That represents just about half the total on the Order Paper so far. In addition to that numbers of questions, rather large numbers of questions, I suggest, Mr. Speaker - I know of one instance in which six questions have been asked on a particular subject by different hon. members opposite and all, in fact, requiring the same answer. So with that kind of duplication, with all questions asked and answered and with a further number of questions answered by statements made in the House, and I think I have tabled five statements, which

Mr. Callahan

have answered a number of questions, at least five, I think, in fact, perhaps eight separate questions on the Order Paper. Taking all this into account, I suggest that rather more than half of the questions placed on the Order Paper to date, Mr. Speaker, have in fact been answered.

Now hon. gentlemen opposite will react to that and will say, "oh! no, the answers really were not given. The information has not been provided. The answers are not satisfactory." What they really mean, of course, Mr. Speaker, when they say that is that the answers were not the answers that they hoped they would get. Because and indeed one hon. gentleman opposite made a little slip the other day and inadvertently admitted it, the questions are put on the Order Paper, first and foremost and worded first and foremost to elicit the kind of answer that the Opposition are looking for. That is normal. It is natural. Nobody objects to it. But it is nonetheless the case, Mr. Speaker. It is understandable I suppose, too, that when the Opposition fail to get the answer that they would like to get that they would be annoyed and put-out and feel somewhat frustrated.

The fact is, Sir, that more than half, I suggest, of the questions on the Order Paper - well more than half, have in fact been answered to date. So the question arises as to whether there is validity in the alleged refusal, as alleged in the amendment, to provide information. We are not referring only to questions. We have had tabled in the House, Sir, large numbers of reports and documents. Indeed, I am beginning to think that one of the major pollution problems we have, in fact, and do not realize it, is the amount of paper that is distributed in this House. There have been all manners, Sir, of reports, departmental reports, reports required by statute, reports of Government agencies, the whole gambit, including those important documents required to be tabled such as the Auditor General's Report, the Public Accounts and certain agreements that all have been tabled. So, the question arises, Mr. Speaker, and it is due a

Mr. Callahan

very, I think, firm answer as to whether there is any basis for the allegation contained in the amendment as to the refusal to give information.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to keep the House very long, but I did want to make these two or three points. There is one complaint the Opposition have certainly not been able to make. They have had it all their own way. They have had hours and hours in which to express themselves. You know, Mr. Speaker, I rather have the feeling that there is something akin to, perhaps, a parable you could draw from the nursery rime about "Little Boy Blue." You know how it goes, Mr. Speaker:

"Little boy blue can blow your horn,

The sheep in the meadows, the cows in the corn."

Well there certainly has been quite a lot of horn blowing, Mr. Speaker. God knows there has been lots of corn, hours and hours of it. Frankly, as Minister of Agriculture, I have been a little afraid that the proliferation of bull may have frightened all the cows away. But, Sir, really an awful lot of what we have heard has been about as relevant as "Little Boy Blue."

Now there are one or two points that my hon. colleague the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation raised. We have heard more from the other side in relation to them. My hon. colleague, Mr. Speaker, referred to local businessmen and the local millionaire types, and he has been taken rather to task by the friends of the millionaires for it. There are two kinds of millionaires, Mr. Speaker. There are the kind who are prepared to plunge, to take a risk and to provide opportunities for their fellow Newfoundlanders. I refer, particularly, to one firm that has been attacked here today a number of times - a firm of Newfoundlanders who are, I suppose, one of the two or three major employers of permanent employees in this Province. I know them well. I grew up with them in Corner Brook, and I knew them when they did not have very much, when they were boys going to school together. I know that four years ago the payroll of the Lundrigan Enterprises was then over 2,600 men.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody can show me any of the old wealthy money

families of Newfoundland who have achieved anything like that, I will be very glad to listen. I would also like to say this, Mr. Speaker. About ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, referring now to the other kind of millionaire - about ten years ago the Newfoundland Board of Trade commissioned a report by a then professor at the University, Dr. Percival Coates. Dr. Coates wrote the report which was known as, "An Economic Study of St. John's." It actually went into a wider area and dealt with the Province at large but in a more constrictive way than it did with the City of St. John's. Regardless of Dr. Coates' credentials or abilities or the value of the report, generally speaking, there is one fact in it that bears out what my colleague has said, Mr. Speaker, and that is the section which refers to the negligence of these old-moned firms in Newfoundland, to their lack of interest in doing anything to create productive industry in St. John's or elsewhere by and large. There may be one or two exceptions. But the point was made, and it was made very strongly. The report came out quite strongly and said that the onus was on these particular citizens of this Province to plow some of the wealth they had made, as traders for decades and perhaps centuries, back into productive industry in order to give other Newfoundlanders a chance at a job and a chance at employment, to improve the economy of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this is the first time that that report has been mentioned in public since it was produced. It was put away on a shelf somewhere, indeed, carefully hidden away. Because it, in fact, reflected upon the very people who had commissioned and charged them, within a sense, negligence, neglect of their responsibility to the community which, in fact, had made them rich.

So, Mr. Speaker, the House should not write off out of hand what my colleague has said. There are very large opportunities in Newfoundland for those who have confidence in this Province, who are prepared to invest their money here rather than elsewhere and who are not satisfied to sit back and be simply traders making a dollar off somebody else's product. The opportunities are here, Mr. Speaker, and people are coming

Mr. Callaghan.

not only from the Mainland, not only Mainlanders. You can go up to the Avalon Mall and around other places and see people from all over the world who have come in and set themselves up in little businesses and are doing very well. Perhaps, it is some kind of lack in our total national character. I do not know what it is. But certainly there are opportunities here, if people are prepared to try. Those who are best abled to try, who have the where-with-all to make a valid attempt in helping to develop this Province, have been all too much lacking, Mr. Speaker, in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, we had a pious statement this afternoon from the Leader of the Opposition - a very pious statement relating to the dignity and decorum of the House. This was the same hon. member Mr. Speaker who a few days ago, flouted absolutely the rules of the House by declaring here the opinion of those not members of this House and partisan politicians at that, in the guise of Parliamentary experts in order to place the accusation against Your Honour and Mr. Speaker of complete dereliction of duty. I am quoting the words.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman talks about effrontery to the dignity of the House, he should make himself aware that there is a rule - aside from the dignity of the House, there is a rule that bears on what happened here the other day. There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker. We have heard again tonight the old charge about our money. Now there are a couple of notable lacks so far in this session. We have not heard the pseudo champions of rural development but they will, perhaps, come to the floor. They will pander and whether they wish to or not, they will mislead, I suppose, a few people into thinking

MR. CALLAHAN:

thinking that there is no concern over here for the rural areas of this Province but one of the cries we have heard from time to time from them is that we should take the investment money, say of Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, and we should put it into rural development. It should be used to develop our rural communities and, Mr. Speaker, that argument in the few minutes that are left, I think, deserves a little attention.

What, it is asked, if the \$155. million of what my friend, the learned member for St. John's West refers to "R" money, what if that were invested -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not "R" money, it is "R" Government.

MR. CALLAHAN: "R" Government money, what if instead of investing that in an oil refinery the money were used instead to carry out a rural development scheme in our eight hundred and fifty or so Newfoundland and Labrador settlements and indeed the hon. gentleman to my right, Mr. Speaker, has from time to time and from platform to platform, albeit with very few to listen, have been demanding that this be done.

Mr. Speaker, the sad truth is, of course, that there is no \$155. million and if there was it would not be "R" money. It simply and if I can put it in simple terms, perhaps oversimplified a little, it simply is a credit advanced by financiers to enable a profitable enterprise for their own gain and that is fair enough. Mr. Speaker, anybody who puts money and particularly that kind of money into an enterprise certainly has a right to get something out, but it is not cash money, it is a credit advance in effect and it would never be provided except for two things: the proven viability of the project by virtue of the feasibility studies that have been done, that is one thing, and its proven ability to pay off the debt with sufficient interest to satisfy those who are investing the money.

So that, Mr. Speaker, even if Newfoundland would be able to borrow that kind of money, which we would not, for the purpose for which it is suggested we should borrow it namely: rural development, even if we were to be able to borrow it, and it would have to be borrowed, the question arises as to how it would be paid back. Since it would not be money that

MR. CALLAHAN:

would be productive in terms of being able to generate repayment and interest, of course, nobody would consider for one instant loaning it for that purpose. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not "R" money or "R" Government money, it is not cash, it is not available for so-called rural development, it is put there because the people who own the money, the banks and the financial houses, know that they can get a return from a particular industry that will in fact generate a pretty reasonable profit.

So in the case of Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland will not have to pay it back. It is not ours and we will not have to pay it back because the enterprise itself will generate the monies to do that and if that were not pretty obvious to the people who are loaning those monies the credit would never be advanced. It is being advanced on the basis of three things and three things only: the contracts for the delivery of raw material, the crude oil; the satisfactory design of the process, that is the second thing; and the third thing, the contract for the sale of the manufactured products at an adequate profit. If these three factors were not present, Mr. Speaker, or any one of them, there would be no financing and there would be no industry.

Now surely hon. gentleman opposite should know that. They are not stupid, Mr. Speaker. Whatever else they may be they are not stupid. They should know that and they either know it, know the truth or they do not. If they do not I suggest they should not be sitting here and if they do we have to ask ourselves why they are not telling the people of Newfoundland the difference. Mr. Speaker, that perhaps will help to some extent to lay aside that particular chestnut which is dragged out from time to time and of which we saw the edges again here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing very new, nothing very mysterious about this amendment. We have heard it all before. There is a simple reason for it and my hon. friend again the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation touched on it. It is founded very simply, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that on the other side we have a group of frustrated little men who are hungry for power, who are lusting for power, who are drooling at the prospect that perhaps they may achieve it but the more desperate they

MR. CALLAHAN:

get, Mr. Speaker, the more the people of this Province become determined to reject them as they surely will do at the election that is not far off.

I move the adjournment, Mr. Speaker, of the debate.

On motion, debate adjourned.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice:

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act,"

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Coughlan College Incorporation Act, 1965,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Act, 1966-67,"

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary (Pensions) Act, 1970,"

A Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Judgement Debts (Instalments) Act, 1962,"

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation:

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Minimum Wage Act,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Apprenticeship Act, 1962,"

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Employment (Notice Of Termination) Act, 1969,"

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Industrial Standards Act, 1963," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday April 16th, 1971 at 11:00 A.M.