



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 17

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome all visitors to the gallery today but especially I would like to welcome twenty-two short-hand typing students from Seal Cove Vocation School, Seal Cove, with their teacher, Mrs. Harbin. I trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, Sir, arising out of a story published in the "Evening Telegram," the weekend edition of the "Evening Telegram." Sir, I wish to, if I may, read that particular news story and then relate to it.

"Transportation and Communications Minister, Tom Hickey, says: 'Charges by opposition members that highway and snow clearing equipment on the Great Northern Peninsula is inadequate and in poor working condition are unfounded and unjustified.' Mr. Hickey said that the policy of his department is to take equipment off the high-roads when operators cannot see what they are doing or when equipment cannot cope with prevalent weather. He said this policy is not only for the safety of the operators but also for the public.

"The minister noted that since the present government assumed office two years ago, the amount of money allocated for equipment for snow clearing operations has almost tripled from the previous administration. He said the first year the P.C.'s. were in power they allocated \$2 million and \$2.5 million the following year. He said, referring to Mr. Hickey, that the figure this year is expected to be another \$2.5 million. He said that the most the Liberals ever allocated for snow clearing was \$1 million."

Now, Sir, if you look at the public accounts for 1970 - 1971, under winter maintenance -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (Minister without Portfolio): Your honour, I cannot get the point. If the honourable member would state his point of privilege -

He is reading a newspaper report and disputes between two members as to allocations of facts and an attack on the newspaper, etc. - I refer you to page 19. Mr. Speaker, if he has a genuine point of privilege by all means proceed with it.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I do have a genuine point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: He should at least state the nature of the point of privilege before he goes into details.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the House Leader's point is well taken. I am coming to the point of privilege of the House, Sir. In 1970-1971 the winter maintenance estimates were \$4.4 million and the winter maintenance of equipment was just over \$2 million which totals \$6.5 million, Sir, 1970-1971. In 1972 these two, total winter maintenance, came to \$5.5 million and the winter maintenance of equipment came to just over \$2 million for a total of \$7.5 million.

Sir, in 1972, the first year of this present administration, the winter maintenance programme came to \$4.5 million and the winter maintenance of equipment came to \$1.9 million for an approximate total of \$6.5 million.

Sir, if the minister is quoted correctly, it is totally false, Sir, and I ask the minister to rise and apologize to this House and to the people of Newfoundland and to the people of the Northern Peninsula in particular for this inaccuracy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel that the statement as just made by the honourable member for St. Barbe North is not a point of privilege at all and I refer him to Beauchesne, page 96, Standing Order 105, Subsection 3. The last paragraph of that states; "A dispute arising between two honourable members as to allocations of facts hardly fulfills the conditions of a privileged question. If deemed to be a matter to be at once entertained, it is more convenient to postpone other business rather than extend the area of privilege." So I submit that it was a difference of opinion as regard to facts and not really a point of privilege.

MR. T.P. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION): Mr. Speaker, I think I should rise on a point of privilege in relation to the same matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Speaker has made a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have made my ruling re that point of privilege and unless the honourable Minister of Transportation is rising on another point of privilege, I think the matter should end here.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. The information that the honourable member read out in terms of winter maintenance has nothing to do with the figures that I quoted as given me by my staff in relation to new equipment, money spent for purchase of equipment each year. That is the point, Sir. That is the only point I made and that is the point I am making now.

MR. W. ROWE: I wonder if I may be heard, Sir. Well, my point of order is that the honourable minister is obviously appealing Your Honour's ruling and I would say that there is a well-known procedure for doing that, not merely standing in your place and talking for a half of an hour. If he want to appeal Your Honour's ruling, let him make the proper procedures.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not appealing Your Honour's ruling. I am not appealing Your Honour's ruling at all. I am merely clarifying the information as given by the honourable member. The honourable member asked me to apologize to the House. I have no reason to do so. The information he has given is incorrect, not mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The same section of Beauchesne which I just quoted to the honourable member for St. Barbe North I am sure pretty well applies to the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications. It is really not a matter of personal privilege nor privilege, it is a difference of opinion between alleged facts as obviously given in a newspaper article on the weekend.

PETITIONS:

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to introduce a petition

on behalf of 155 fishermen from Margaree to Rose Blanche in my district of Burgeo and La Poile. The prayer of this petition is that gill netting be outlawed completely on the Southwest and the West Coast of our province. We have had experience enough - I had personally, back forty years ago, to see what gill netting did in Fortune Bay. Last year, in just one year, that cleaned up every fish was on the edge over in Sydney Bight. One boat from Nova Scotia fished in Bay St. George and it was no trouble to notice and appreciate the difference in the fishing there.

Now, I hope no one gets the impression that I am trying to make an imposition on our

Provincial Minister of Fisheries because as everyone knows that is in the realm of the Federal Government, administered by Jack Davis, Federal Minister in Ottawa. I have already contacted the Federal Department of Fisheries on this matter. I would suggest that since Mr. Davis has made so many enemies in the fisheries by acts that have been of no benefit to the fisheries in the long term that it would probably be all right if he made a few enemies by doing something useful for a change.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is another carry-over from the former administration in giving the bounties for gill nets - that is saying that we burn our boats, but for forty people to burn them.

I refer this to the department to which this belongs.

MR. A. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the Member from Burgeo on behalf of the people of the Rose Blanche, Margaree Area, the southwest and west coast of the island here. I can certainly appreciate the feeling of the fishermen in that area by having gill nets used in that area and particularly in the Bay St. George Area.

I think the gentleman from Burgeo makes much sense when he wishes, on behalf of his people, to have these gill nets condemned because over the years they have been detrimental to the fishery in many, many areas. Fish have rotted in the nylon. Fish have been there for days and days before weather permitted them to get the fish and it was far from being in good condition. Generally speaking, it has created chaos with operators and processors everywhere along the coast. I certainly go along with this petition and hope somehow through our own Minister of Fisheries that this message can reach the proper authorities in Ottawa and something be done about it.

I take great pleasure in supporting that petition,

Sir.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of over 550 fishermen from twenty-two communities in the District of St. Barbe North. Mr. Speaker, actually there are two communities included from the District of St. Barbe South which contains fishermen who do fish in the St. John's Bay Area.

Sir, the prayer of the petition reads as follows:

"We the fishermen from the Northwest Coast and especially from your riding of St. Barbe North request your assistance to intercede on our behalf to both the Provincial and Federal Department of Fisheries to have the area from La Fontaine to Cape Norman closed to all seiners." That is herring seiners, Sir. "We emphasize the St. John's Bay Area which is a breeding ground for herring.

" At present there is a fleet of seiners in the bay,"

(Sir, this obviously was written during the fall herring fishery. I just received the petition this morning.)"and we feel that as well as depleting the herring in the area and damaging many lobsters, they have also caused us to lose very valuable dollars by having in some areas to take our gear from the waters for fear of having it destroyed by the present seiners."

Now, Sir, in speaking in support of this particular petition, I might add that the fishermen in these twenty-two communities are inshore fishermen and they are extremely concerned over the interference or influence of the herring seiner fisheries on the inshore herring fishery as well as other species.

Sir, these fishermen are extremely reasonable people. They realize that many fishermen are employed on the herring seiners

and they also realize, Sir, that many people are employed in herring plants, further to the south. But, Sir, I am told that if the present situation continues, if the herring seiners are allowed to fish inside of the St. John Bay Area, that the herring fishery will be wiped out altogether. Sir, I am also told that there are a great number of tons of small herring caught in a small mesh size seiner, that are brought aboard the seiner and are actually dumped back in the bay because they are too small for processing and that, Sir, this will cause extreme damage to the lobster fishery since this herring will rot on the bottom and pollute and contaminate the water and the fishermen are very fearful of the loss of the lobster fishery as well as the herring fishery through depletion.

Sir, another point that the inshore fishermen have brought to my attention on a recent visit to the district is that they feel that the herring fishery has been depleted in the Bonne Bay Area and in the Port Saunders Area because of the over-activity of the herring seiner fisheries.

Now, Sir, my own personal word; I am not suggesting for one minute that the herring seiner fishery be wiped out. I think boundaries can be drawn to the mutual benefit of the inshore fisheries and the herring seiner fisheries. So, Sir, I ask that the honourable the Minister of Fisheries bring this matter up with the federal authorities and try to determine some kind of a formula whereby the inshore fishery can co-exist with the herring seiner fisheries, because both of these types of fisheries do bring great benefits to not only the people in the District of St. Barbe North but also to the economy of the province as a whole. So, Sir, I ask that this petition be placed ~~on the table~~ of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. F. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of St. Brides on the Cape Shore. The prayer of the petition is twofold. First the petitions request an immediate upgrading

and eventual paving of the Cape Shore Road, particularly from Point Verde to St. Brides and indeed Branch.

This particular piece of highway from Point Verde to St. Brides is approximately twenty miles. It is the only piece of road on the Avalon Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, that has not been attended to in the past ten or fifteen years. In fact this particular piece of highroad has had no actual construction work of a substantial nature done since 1949. In fact every dollar spent on this road was spent by the Department of Highways by their maintenance unit and as any member who is aware of road construction and what is involved can certainly appreciate that it is impossible to expect this particular piece of road to be improved while the only money spent on it are from maintenance. Some of their petitions have been presented to the House before.

The present Minister of Transportation and Communications, at my request, accompanied me over this road last fall. He met with the Community Council at St. Brides and other representatives of the various communities from Point Verde to St. Brides and he indicated to the residents of this shore that something would be done on this particular road this year. Also, Mr. Speaker, I had his predecessor, now President of the Council, visit the area with me and his then Deputy who

is now retired.

So the officials of the Department of Highways as well as the present minister and indeed I am sure the government must be aware of the desperate plight of the people living on this shore. So the main concern of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is the road up the Cape Shore and in addition the paving of the road within the Community of St. Brides itself.

Reference is made in the prayer of the petition to the recent agreement made by the province with DREE whereby certain funds it is anticipated will be available for improvements in communities similar to that of St. Brides.

The petitioners point out that the conditions in the community in the summer are desperate because of the prevalence of dust. The women find it practically impossible to keep their wash clean. They hang it out on any fine day in the summer, when they take it in it is as bad as when they put it out because of the dust which is stirred up by the traffic in the community.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, comes to me from Sister Patricia King, one of the sisters at the convent in St. Brides, so I doubt whether any prayer of any petitioner has every been presented to this House from such a person so capable of praying. I sincerely trust that the prayer of this petitioner as well as all the other individuals who signed the petition will obtain favourable response, first with respect to the road on the Cape Shore itself and secondly, that funds will be made available to pave the road in the Community of St. Brides itself.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I may say that this road up the Cape Shore I feel would be a wonderful contribution to the Tourist Industry in that anyone who is familiar with the excellent bird sanctuary on the Cape Shore - people visiting the province, and they come from all over the world really, to see this renowned sanctuary they find it necessary to travel this road. In addition, to accommodating the residents of the area who use it to transport fish, it is used to bring patients to and from hospital in Placentia and generally for trade and commerce as well as ordinary means of transportation.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I beg leave to place this petition on the table of the House and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates. I sincerely trust this petition will at this time bear fruit in the funds that will be made available to upgrade the road from Point Verde to St. Brides and as well funds to pave the roads within the Community of St. Brides itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, more things are wrought by pray than this world dreams of. Well, Sir, I hope that the good sister who was responsible for circulating this petition does not lose her faith while she is waiting for this government to upgrade and pave that road on the Cape Shore. It is not the first time, Sir, as the honourable the Member for Placentia East pointed out, that a similar petition was presented in this honourable House. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that in the last two years that road has deteriorated considerably. Now it was never

the best, Sir. It is probably the worst piece of road in Newfoundland, bar none, including the road down in the honourable member's district of Labrador South from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay. I would almost venture, at best, Sir, that it is even worse than that. It is certainly, Sir, the worst stretch of road on the Island part of our Province. I hope that as a result of the plea and the appeal and the begging and the badgering of the honourable member for Placentia East that this Government, Sir, that can spend \$1.8 million of the taxpayers money on booze parties and flags and -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member for Bell Island is not now being relevant to the prayer of the petition.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I sincerely hope that a government that can spend \$1.8 million on a silver anniversary celebration will be able to find a few paltry dollars to take some of the dangerous curves out of that piece of road, to upgrade it and to throw down a bit of pavement on the Cape Shore, and this would be the first time in the history of Newfoundland that the residents of the Cape Shore would have any paving, to my knowledge. I think that is correct. Is that not correct? They do not have an inch of paving on the Cape Shore yet, to my knowledge.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am told that the equipment, I am told that the equipment down there has deteriorated in the last two years and the road is in worse condition now than it has ever been in. I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Finance, although we have already had a hint of a tax increase this year, that the Minister of Finance will be able to find a few dollars, supposing he has to steal it away from Nutbeam, to try to do something with that road down on the Cape Shore.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services.

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in not standing to support this. I have been doing it since 1962. I can see the honourable Dr. Frecker here, who was member for that district, almost getting on his knees for a great number of years, pleading

for something for that district. Also the member for St. Mary's at the time when there was not one inch, not one inch of pavement, Sir, and to hear this great plea now from the other side, you know, perhaps it is for the joke page of the papers rather than anything else but driving over that road, Sir, in itself is an adventure I would say rather than an experience because I have done it for many years down there and I feel sure, Sir, if ever there was a chance to get that done, it is now when we have a good sensible government who will look after the interests of the people.

So, I heartily support, Sir, that petition, notwithstanding the good Sister who was there. She must have been the guardian angel for many people many times who have driven over that road at the risk of their lives. So, it is quite an area, Sir, not only from a tourism point of view but an industrial. It is a good area there and has a good economy. So, I feel, Sir, that in fairness to these people, after trying since 1949, I would say, for a bit of pavement that this Government will be the one to do it.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to present a further petition. I ask leave, Sir, to present a petition from Quirpon in the constituency of White Bay North. It is signed by thirty-four of the citizens of that community. These are people who live along one of the three main roads through the community of Quirpon. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is really quite straightforward. It is quite simple to state and I would hope that it would be quite simple to grant. Of the three roads in Quirpon, Sir, two are opened. The machine resides at Quirpon, the snowclearing machine for that branch of the highways network resides at Quirpon. It is based there and two roads are opened and then the machine goes on and clears part of the main road and then clears the roads up through the communities of Noddy Bay, L'Anse-au-Meadow, Hay Cove and Straitsview and then comes back and does the remaining road in Quirpon. These thirty-four people, Sir, who live along this road ask if the machine could be instructed to clean the three roads in Quirpon before it goes on the main road to clear the roads up to L'Anse-au-Meadow, Hay Cove, Noddy Bay and Straitsview. I think it is an

February 25, 1974.

Tape 430

RH - 3

eminently reasonable request, Sir. There are thirty-seven children living along the road who are served by a school bus, carried either to St. Anthony or to Gunners Cove or to St. Lunaire. The three schools serve children in the area. If there is a snowstorm the children are made to walk because there is no way the bus can come on the

road. In addition, of course, Mr. Speaker, these people look to oil for most of their fuel for heating and that is delivered by truck. Again, if the road is not open it is a grave inconvenience to them.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is a very simple one. I think it is a very reasonable one. It would in no way reduce the snow clearing services elsewhere, it would be merely a re-allocation of the order, the priorities of this machine. I think all concerned would be very happy if it could be done. I present the petition and would urgently ask the minister to have a look at it and with the hope that he will instruct his officials to take the appropriate steps. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations:

HON. J.G.ROUSSEAU (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations):

Certain acts in the administration of the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations require the minister to table certain information. Accordingly, today, under section (79) of the Labour Relations Act, I am tabling a report on the labour situation in the province in 1973, which includes the disposition of all conciliation requests to the government and their eventual disposition. Request for arbitration cases, requests for permission to prosecute from the minister and also, the request for industrial enquiry commissions.

Under section (43) of the Public Services Collective Bargaining Act, I am tabling information concerned with that act and under section (35), information concerned with the Newfoundland Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act. In addition, this report also include the reports from the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board as to the disposition of each of the cases referred to it during 1973 year and also the annual report of the Minimum Wage Board.

I have a number of copies for the House and I have a number of copies for the press. Very interesting reading.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Bell Island:

MR. S.A.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the honourable Premier back from the delights of Quebec City and New York.

I wonder if the Premier would be good enough to tell the House what arrangements, if any, or what agreements, if any, his government have entered into with the Trizec Corporation that is going to build this big skyscraper downtown?

HON. F.D.MOORES (Premier): I will take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will try again. Will the honourable the Premier inform the House what role the George McLean Public Relations Firm is playing in the Silver Anniversary of Confederation?

MR. MOORES: I will take notice of that question too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not getting very far today. This is the crowd that were going to give all the information to the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Tourism inform the House if his department has yet signed an agreement with "Horizons Communications?"

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question was asked a few days ago at a session and at that time I directed the honourable member to place it on the Order Paper and I shall do the same now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Tourism, because there may be something improper happening here, Sir, and that is why I want to get the information from the minister, because the minister stated a few days ago, Your Honour is quite right, that this "Horizons Communications" had no dealings at all with the minister's department. What I would like to ask the minister now, Mr. Speaker, is if "Horizons Communications" are actually issuing press releases in behalf of the Silver Anniversary Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that question is another way of asking the original one put by the honourable member for Bell Island and that too

can be placed on the Order Paper.

The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable the Minister of Finance. I would ask the honourable minister to table for the House copies of all agreements made between the provincial government or any of its crown corporations and Leaseback Projects Limited, and to identify the company or companies into which Leaseback Projects Limited has been subsumed and to state the amount or amounts paid to such company or companies during the past fiscal year in lieu of earlier agreements made with Leaseback Projects Limited.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, that is obviously a question for the Order Paper and it should go on the order Paper. There have been no agreements between this government and Leaseback Projects Limited at all, that is since January 1972 when this government entered office and there have been no payments made by this government to Leaseback Projects Limited. Any agreements that the honourable member is referring to date back to the 1960's sometime.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table them.

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable gentleman should want to table a question, sure! There is no problem getting copies but these, I think, go back to 1965 or 1966. If the honourable gentlemen should want to table a question we will table them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services who just got back from one of his jaunts across Canada. I would like to ask the minister if this province was one of the provinces that did not support the principle of the guaranteed annual income at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference on social assistance?

HON. A.J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): I thought I attended

every minute of that conference but I never heard the guaranteed income come up at all.

MR. NEARY: The minister was either asleep, Sir, or -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Or there was something radically wrong, because -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the minister if he is aware that
Manitoba -

if he is aware - What is wrong with "Witch-Hunt Willie," today Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if he is aware of an experiment going on in Manitoba on the guaranteed annual income and that was certainly reported at the conference that was held out west?

MR. MURPHY: Unfortunately, Sir, I did not get to Manitoba, I had to come back to Toronto for a couple of days so I was not in Manitoba but I will certainly find out what the gentleman is talking about. If anybody is aware perhaps he is and someone in Manitoba.

MR. NEARY: Yes I am, more aware than the honourable minister. He should have taken his deputy minister.

MR. MURPHY: The deputy was with me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Minister of Finance adjourned the debate last day.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE, Minister of Finance: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman stayed in that he might learn something but on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: Not while the honourable gentleman is speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, this crowd does not want to learn anything. They want to obscure all that they can. Could I have one of those stools?

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, on Thursday, in his usual trenchant way, suffering from trenchant mouth moved a non-confidence motion, and I spoke for I think it was five minutes on Friday in connection with it. In the non-confidence motion he makes three points and I am now dealing with the first point. The first reason why the Leader of the Opposition wants the

members of the House to carry this motion and defeat the government:

His first point is that the House is supposed to regret our failure to introduce adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living. I said last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a foolish point for any member of the House to agree to chastise his government about because firstly the rapidly rising cost of living is entirely outside the control of this government and of the members of this House.. Just to repeat the reasons why, to summarize for a moment, the question of inflation and the question of cost of living and increases in it is within the power and control of the Government of Canada only, so far as it can be controlled. Insofar as it can be controlled, it is in their hands. It is in their hands because they control the Bank of Canada which is the central bank, because they control the amount of the money supply in the country, because they control the currency, because they control inter-provincial trade and commerce and international trade and commerce and movements of agricultural goods between provinces and the rest of it.

No province of Canada can control inflation nor the cost of living. Interest rates are also a matter within the power of the Government of Canada as are custom duties, tariffs and excise taxes. So we cannot control these matters, this government cannot, the Government of Ontario cannot, the Government of New Brunswick cannot control this inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cast our minds back to 1968, 1969, 1970, We will remember that the federal government then led by Mr. Trudeau said that their first object was to control inflation and increases in the cost of living, and for three years they attempted to do that with the various means at their disposal. But that was an unpopular move because the unemployment figures rose during the period and they eventually changed their policy and since their near defeat in the fall of 1972, in the election at that time, they have adopted

policies that are not policies to control inflation but policies to increase employment only. Insofar as they are able to do anything in connection with inflation, they have decided that they are not going to control inflation, that they are going to promote instead full employment.

So this is within their hands. I agree that they are not in entire control of the cost of living. I bet a lot of this was caused by events in international affairs that they cannot control either but certainly if the Government of Canada at Ottawa cannot control the inflation with the means they have at their disposal, we have no chance whatsoever to do so.

Newfoundland cannot control prices of the goods that go into the international trade and commerce. We import into this province just about all our food, building materials, cars, clothing. All of these items are imported in this province and we have absolutely no control over what prices are charged for them. So, we have to say that insofar as the rapidly rising cost of living is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition should direct his plea and his attention to Prime Minister Trudeau and should request him to adopt anti-inflationary policies if we are to control the cost of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the increase in the cost of living is not only harming the people of the province. the people who live here, it is also harming this government and every provincial government because the effect of the increase in all of these costs is to greatly increase the estimates of expenditure that we will have to put before the House for the coming fiscal year commencing April 1.

The cost of operating every institution has gone up tremendously. The cost of purchasing food, of heating oil, the cost of the things they consume in these institutions and hospitals have all gone up. The cost of operating school boards has gone up. The cost of operating every service we now have is gone up and this will be reflection in the estimates.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we could do anything to persuade the federal government to do something to stop this rapid increase in prices we certainly would. We would be right behind it but we have no power ourselves to do it. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Government of Canada has very flexible revenue resources. Its revenues next year are going to increase by 19 per cent. The Government of Canada has been able in the last two years to reduce taxes while at the same time they vastly increased their spending.

This province and the other provinces are not in that category at all. Our revenues are not rising at this rapid rate, as the federal government's revenues are rising. They have the flexible tax sources we do not, the provinces do not.

In the last two years they have been able to pay out over \$1 billion more a year to offset the unemployment insurance deficit. They are paying out about \$800 million additional this year for family allowances. They have been able to decrease taxes by about \$1.3 million. They provided new corporate income tax write-offs that are going to decrease their revenues \$600 million to \$700 million and they have indexed the personal income tax so that this year they are going to decrease their income tax returns by about \$350 million.

So the Government of Canada in the last two years has been able to implement major new spending programmes and at the same time they have been able to decrease federal taxes. That is what the federal government can do because of their buoyant revenue position, because of their excess fiscal capacity compared to the provinces. That is why, Mr. Speaker, when dealing with Ottawa we have taken the stand we are taking, because if this trend continues, the provinces will become so weakened that eventually they may very well vanish. The provinces have not got the fiscal capacity to meet their spending responsibilities; health, education, roads, welfare, municipalities and the rest of it. We just have not got the fiscal capacity and we have asked Ottawa to give us some room, to let us take up some of their tax room, but instead

of doing that, no they have chosen to go on tremendous spending programmes and to reduce their own taxes because obviously it is more politically popular for them to do that and that is their deliberate choice, but they are strangling all of the provincial governments except one or two of the very wealthy ones. We are being strangled by this increase in the cost of living and by the fact that our revenue capacity only goes up each year by some 10 per cent to 12 per cent while our spending on items that are beyond our control altogether is rising by a much greater percentage.

So we want the cost of living controlled. We want the Government of Canada to do something about inflation and we want them to give us some tax room because if they do not, we may as well face the fact that we may have to pack up shop sometime in the next four or five years.

I gave an example last time, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to repeat: The federal government last year, unilaterally, without any consultation with us, indexed the personal income tax to take the effect of increases in the cost of living and inflation out of the income tax returns. Your exemptions will go up as the cost of living goes up and so on. They did not consult us. They consulted none of the provinces and they are going to lose \$350 million this year because of that, but they can't stand the loss, Mr. Speaker,

because of these flexible revenue resources, it is fair to say it is going to cost Newfoundland this year \$2.8 million less in income tax that we will receive because of indexing and another \$2.2 million equalization loss, because the other provinces are all going to lose income tax.

Ontario, for example, will lose \$65 million this year because of that federal government unilateral decision. We ask the federal government to make up the difference to us. They instituted indexing, would they make up the revenue that we have lost as a result, would they give the provinces revenue to make it up? They said flatly "no." That means, Mr. Speaker, that next year we have to find \$5 million that we would not have had to find if they had not done that. When I put that to Mr. Turner at the Finance Ministers' Meeting, when the provinces put it to him, his answer was if you need more money raise your own tax rates, we are not going to do it. If this causes you to lose revenue, raise your own tax rates. That was their attitude.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we do not accept their position and that is why at Federal/Provincial Conferences we are not accepting the kinds of positions that they outline, because the result of all these actions is that the federal government becomes stronger and stronger and the provinces are becoming weaker and weaker. If we are to meet our constitutional responsibilities this attitude has got to be changed by the federal government.

One other illustration, the federal government wants to - they want to put a ceiling on what they spend on health expenditures. They propose for the last several years this Lalonde formula. They are in an open-ended situation, they pay roughly half, let us use that as an example, of our expenditures in hospital insurance, medicare and so on. Half the national per capita or half the actual, it depends on the programme. They want to put a ceiling on it so that they will know what expenditure they are sharing in and the ceiling would be, for example, they would pay what they paid in the base year plus a percentage increase equal to the increase in the gross national product. There are a few

variations on that formula.

But they want to put a ceiling on what they will contribute to health, hospital insurance and medicare expenditures in Canada. We have refused to accept that, Mr. Speaker, because the result would be that all of the risks of increases in the cost of living, wages and inflation and the rest of it would be left with the provinces. The federal government that initiated many of those programmes, initiated medicare and health insurance and the rest of it would be getting off, not scot-free but would have a ceiling beyond which they would not have to share these expenditures with us.

As we pointed out to them, for example, in hospitals the wages are traditionally low. The time has come, we had to do it last year and this year, where wages and salaries are rising rapidly in hospitals. We cannot be put into a position where the federal government will not have to share those rapidly increasing costs with us. Still they will not accept that position either.

After initiating those programmes they now want to put on a ceiling so that all of the effects of inflation and increases in cost are left with the provinces. That is another example of a federal attitude that we cannot accept.

One other point while I am on the federal situation: This is another thing that is annoying. Last year it was announced by the Minister of Finance in his budget, Mr. Turner, that Newfoundland would receive \$24.2 million, I believe the figure was, in increased tax equalization because they were going to include school taxation in calculating the formula - \$24 million. Members on the other side, wanting to create mischief of course, howled that this was a great windfall and it should be spent on this and it should be spent on that and we now have \$24 million, it should go on mothers allowances, it should go in schools, it should go on everything under the sun. As it turns out, Mr. Speaker, that figure has now been revised downwards by them to \$19 million.

So the figure they used originally and publicized across Canada last winter, \$24 million, after all revisions had been made and after

they changed the formula this has become \$19 million, it was never \$24 million in the first place. Just a week or two ago, Mr. Speaker, we discovered, we get notice from Ottawa that in 1971-1972, the last year the honourable crowd opposite were in, they overpaid tax equalization to Newfoundland by \$5 million. They paid the province \$110 million - this is two fiscal years ago, and now their final calculation show that it should have been \$105 million. (I am using the round figures), so that we owe them \$5 million for this extra amount they they transferred down here in 1971-1972 and that the honourable crowd opposite spent.

That \$5 million has to be deducted next month from our tax equalization payment for this year. That was two years ago. But this year 1973-1974 we are going to have to pay back this \$5 million to Ottawa for the overpayment they made in 1971-1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it was reduced to \$19 million, now we take off another \$5 million and you have \$14 million. So if we had budgeted for the year and spent the \$24 million on mothers allowances and schools and the rest of it, we would be in a pretty pickle.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So, Mr. Speaker, to get back to my theme, to get back to my point: These are matters within the control of the Government of Canada and in our view the Government of Canada are behaving poorly in relation to the provinces both through failure to attempt to control inflation and through failure to give us the additional fiscal capacity we need.

Now what have we done to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living? Remember this is one reason now why the Leader of the Opposition wants to boot us out. This is why he has not got confidence. He says that we failed to introduce adequate programmes to lessen this severe impact. Now No.(1) you will have to remember our financial capacity and our fiscal capacity, which I will not go into in any more detail. It is in the budget for all to see. We are under severe constraints in rapidly rising costs and the rest of it. What

have we done that we get no credit for from the honourable gentlemen opposite or anyone else in the province, if they can have their way?

Since taking office we have increased the minimum wage to \$1.80. Now surely that helped lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising costs of living when you will remember the minimum wage two years ago was \$1.10 an hour, that in six months time it is going to \$2.00 an hour and then after that to \$2.20. That was one step that was taken. When the honourable gentlemen opposite left office the minimum wage was \$1.10 an hour. It is now \$1.80. So that is one step. That came into effective January 1, it was raised also two years ago.

We removed the sales tax from childrens clothing. Childrens clothing used to carry seven per cent additional price but in 1972 the sales tax was removed from childrens clothing. That is another step that this government have taken to lessen the impact of the rapidly rising cost of living.

Thirdly, on January 1, this year, the government removed the Liberal seven per cent imposition of sales tax on stove and furnace oil, on heating oil - seven per cent was removed on January 1, this year because of the rapidly rising cost of living, on the rapidly rising cost of heating oil. So we took that seven per cent off. That seven per cent was imposed by previous governments. It was removed by the present government to help meet the rapidly rising cost of heating fuel but the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not mentioned that.

What else have we done? We brought into effect, full effect, the principle of equal pay for men and women in the government service throughout this province. That is costing us several millions of dollars a year. So that every women in a comparable job to a man in the government service of this province, of this province, or in hospitals and so on receive equal pay. That was not in effect when we took office. That has been put into effect. We are responsible, Mr. Speaker, for the wages of approximately 27,000 people in this province, directly in government service or teachers or hospitals, institutions financed by the government. So that is something we did for the women of the province when they are looking at the cost of living, equal

pay for them if they work in the same classification and the same kind of work as a man throughout the service. That was brought into effect.

We increased and made uniform the Labrador Allowance, in Labrador, about six months ago. There used to be a hard-lying allowance in Labrador or a Northern allowance which was only received by about twenty per cent of the permanent employees working in Labrador who receive this hard-lying allowance. We have changed that, Mr. Speaker, and made it fair and we now pay to every employee of the government who lives in Labrador and works there for the government the Northern Allowance. That allowance is \$600 per annum for a single person and \$1,200 per annum for a married person. So that certainly assists our employees who live in Labrador with the cost of living. Now that is a Labrador Allowance. A hard-lying allowance in Labrador was introduced about 1959 by the Liberal Administration. It applied only to people working in Labrador and then only to certain people who worked for the government in Labrador. If they were in

one Labrador community but worked in a second community for the government then they did not get it. There are all kinds of queer anomalies like that. Only twenty per cent got it. Now one hundred per cent get it, including all the teachers who work up in Labrador. It does not matter whether you were born in Newfoundland or born in Labrador, you get this northern allowance. It is a Labrador allowance. It only applies in Labrador. It only applied there when the last administration introduced it. It only applies there now. There is no way we can see of applying it to the island because there is no way when we get to the island that we can say one area is more isolated or different from another area. It is a Labrador allowance and it is to help and assist people who work for government or teach or whatever up in Labrador. That has been vastly improved. I will write the honourable gentleman in due course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else did we do? Last year in our Budget Speech we increased the pensions of 1,137 former civil servants and teachers or persons who were pensioned by the Government of Newfoundland. I will not go into the formula. It is in the Budget Speech. It was so much a year. I believe it was \$360 if your pension were, I think, \$2,000 or \$3,000 and less. It was \$240 if it were between there and \$8,000 or \$9,000 and then a lesser amount if the pension you were receiving was over the higher amount of money. We increased the pensions paid to all government pensioners or for whom government are responsible - 1,137 of them. That was some assistance to them during this period of the rapidly rising cost of living. What else did we do?

We have introduced, Mr. Speaker, in the Civil Service, in the government service, for the first time, a group life and health insurance plan under which the government pay fifty per cent of the cost of premiums. That applies to all those who work in the Civil Service. That is something entirely new. That certainly helps with the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, the last time when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition introduced his motion of nonconfidence, he was sarcastic about the wage increases that we paid in the last two years. He sniffed at them and said what a hard attitude we took and we did not give large enough increases. I pity the poor honourable member if he ever gets into power. If he ever gets into power and people point out to him what he said when he was out of power, he is going to suffer the crucifixion. He was over there bellowing that we should give more; we should have paid out more in wages and salaries to the hospital workers and so on, knowing that these were the greatest and highest increases ever paid in this province in any one year to those categories of workers. Just listen to these figures, Mr. Speaker. I will show the honourable member about wages and salaries.

From 1949 to 1971 (an invidious comparison, I know) during that twenty-three year period, the previous Liberal Administration awarded eight salary increases to public servants, totalling seventy-seven per cent or three and one-half per cent a year, if you take it over the twenty-three years. In addition they got annual increments of between fifty dollars and one hundred dollars, depending on the category of employment. That is over a twenty-three year period, a seventy-seven per cent increase. Since we assumed office, the increases for the year 1972-1973, 1973-1974 and with the second half of the collective agreements being next year, there will be increases in 1974-1975. Those increases in any one year have ranged from a low of eight per cent to a high of twenty per cent. The people who got the high were the lowest paid workers, particularly in the category of hospital workers. In one year our increases have ranged from eight per cent to twenty per cent each year. I have a whole summary here of each bargaining unit for the three year period, which I will not go into.

Mr. Speaker, open-vote workers, i.e., in 1972-1973 got nine per cent, including the five per cent increment. In this

present financial year they got ten per cent and next year they get eight point three per cent or \$560 whichever is the greater and another \$200 in September of 1974. There is no point going into all the details. The wages and salaries paid to teachers, government employees, hospital employees, government agencies have increased vastly in the last two years. Now we do not have the figures for 1971-1972.

Mr. Speaker, in the first year in which this government were in office, 1972-1973, we paid out a total of \$173,700,000 in wages and salaries to teachers, government employees, hospital employees and government agencies -- \$173,700,000. In the present financial year, 1973-1974, as a result of all the negotiations in which I received nothing but abuse, as you would expect when you are trying to hold the lid - I do not mind that, that is the job. It is not pleasant. Somebody has to be the villain. It has gone to \$207,400,000, wages and salaries this year to government employees, teachers, hospital workers and the people who work for government agencies. We estimated in the Budget Speech, \$200,000,000. It looks like it is going to be \$207,400,000. Now that was an increase over the previous year of about \$34,000,000. Now is the Leader of the Opposition justified in getting up in this House and trying to pretend that the government have been very niggardly and stingy in the wages and salaries that it is paying to its employees? It is ridiculous.

To state the facts, it shows conclusively that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking through his hat. Next year, Mr. Speaker, and the year coming up, 1974-1975, our estimate of the cost of wages and salaries alone is \$236,000,000. In the two years we have been in office, it will have gone from \$173,000,000 to \$236,000,000. That is a \$63,000,000 increase between the end of March, 1972 and the coming financial year. If you want to take it from the end of March 1975, that would be a three-year period.

The Leader of the Opposition says that he regrets how niggeredly we had been and how we tried to hold down the poor government worker or the poor hospital workers, when they have received the greatest increases since Confederation in the last two years. Now when it comes to bargaining, Mr. Speaker, we are certainly not going into bargaining, attempting to give away the Treasury. We have to try and hold the line. We have to do what is right, reasonable and proper and keep in mind that all of this eventually has to come from the taxpayer. Despite our best efforts, this is how wages and salaries have increased in the last two years. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition regrets and says that we have been niggeredly, mean and it was shocking how we handled and treated the public servants, teachers and hospital workers of the province. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but we brought in the Public Service Collective Bargaining Legislation which now gives them the proper right to bargain and to strike if they want to take that final step for both the public service and the teachers. This was legislation that was lacking when we came into office. When we came into office, one was not allowed to strike at all if one were a teacher or if you were a civil servant in this province. That is the social advance.

What else has been done? Now I am not going to mention everything that has been done in connection with the cost of living. I am just giving some illustrations. It is the technique of the honourable gentlemen opposite, with the exception of the Hon. Member for Labrador North, who spread about this province a web and tissue of deceit, of obfuscation, of attempting to give a picture, an impression that this is a government that has done nothing; that is screwing the poor people of Newfoundland down into the ground; that is hammering them; that is treading on them with a hard heel; that has done nothing, and nothing could be falsier. They are on

the media; they are worming their way; they are squirming and inching through the province, raising their beaks with every offered microphone, with this kind of scurrilous story, with this false, malicious and tenacious story. There is not a word of truth in it.

Now what else? I will mention one other thing. I will mention the new revamped Social Assistance Programme, introduced by our honourable friend, the Member for St. John's Centre, who has been maligned, slandered, abused

calumniated by the Liberal campaign over the last six months, a man with a bigger heart and a kinder disposition never trod the floors of this House of Assembly.

So, let us look at the social assistance programme. The rates for social assistance recipients between 1966, I believe it is and 1973 increased a total of seven per cent. Between 1966 and 1973 the rates paid to social assistance recipients increased seven per cent only over those seven years. When did they increase? They increased basically by the present government in April of 1972 when food and clothing allowances were increased. The last increase under the previous administration was in 1966 when a Canada Assistance Plan was introduced.

So, these honourable gentlemen on the other side, the ones who have been on the airways, making the airways reek, rock and roll over the last six or twelve months about the social assistance recipients - with Mr. Peter Harrington and the other action groups that have come up in the last couple of years, it is a pleasure to have them and listen to them and see what they say - the honourable gentlemen opposite, these paragons of virtue who have attacked and maligned and maliciously insulted and said everything under the sun about the present Minister of Social Assistance, while they were in from 1966 to 1972, no increase in the social assistance rates except in 1966.

An increase in April of 1972, that is where most of the seven per cent increase came from 1966 to 1973, under the present administration. Then in January, 1974, the minister introduced a major new programme, co-ordinated with the new family allowance programme which conservatively means an increase of twenty per cent in the rates and so on received by people on social assistance, conservatively. Ninety-one per cent of everyone on social assistance will receive more, some much more. Five per cent will receive the same amount and four per cent, those

with very large families, a slight decrease. So, there has been a major increase in the monies paid to the recipients of social assistance. It has been made to appear as though the recipients of social assistance were being beaten with whips and that they had received a cut in what they receive instead of what is actually the truth of the situation.

So, there is another major attempt to help alleviate the effects of the rapidly rising, rapidly Liberal rising - by the Liberal Government at Ottawa - rising cost of living. That is another step we have taken to try to counteract what the Liberals in Ottawa are doing. They are pushing the cost of living up and they are going to bring us all to financial ruin in our attempts to alleviate the effects of their loose policy in connection with inflation in Ottawa.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The most generous cruel men in Canada. Look at the cost of living.

MR. CROSBIE: The cost, I almost cry when I see the estimates and see the cost. Usually I am trying to jack it all up but -

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. Now, this resolution asks the gentlemen of the House here to kick us out because we have not introduced adequate programmes to lessen this severe impact of the rapidly rising cost of living. Pitiful! I am sure there is no honourable gentleman in this House foolish enough to vote us out of office for the weak reason given by the Leader of the Opposition who should be ashamed to put such a ridiculous proposition before the members of the House.

What did the honourable gentleman talk about the other day? What points did he make? What would he do? What did he say he would do if he were in power? Not what would he do? Because he would not do these things. You know, he is shrewder and smarter and more intelligent than that. He has got some intelligence, that honourable

gentleman. He has a nasty way of displaying it but he has got it. So, what would he actually do if he were in power? Well, according to the "Evening Telegram" which I always read for their reports and they are usually pretty factual, a pretty good coverage of the House, he made three main points about the cost of living. He wants us to investigate it. He wants us to investigate, appoint an enquiry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could appoint a Commission of Enquiry if we wanted just to pretend, you know, to gloss things over. That was a device much loved by his former leader, Mr. Smallwood. In 1965, I think it was, he appointed about ten or twelve commissions of enquiry. We had a commission of enquiry headed by the former mayor, Mr. Adams, which just reported just three or four years ago on the cost of living in Newfoundland. They could not conclude anything. They could not point their finger. They could not pinpoint anyone as being a profiteer and so on. They pointed at transportation costs and inventory costs and this cost and that cost to explain why the cost of living here was higher than it was in other places.

So, what is the point in appointing a royal commission to enquire? That is just a political dodge and we do not accept it and we are not going to do it. We know the Federal Government has a Prices and Review Board and we know they come to this province to look into it and we know the Minister of Provincial Affairs has a Consumer Affairs Department. If there are any serious charges of profiteering or tremendous profits being made, with the limited staff he has got, they will certainly do their best to look into it. So, let us forget number one because number one is just a piece of political quackery, not made to be taken seriously.

What was his second suggestion to solve it? Well, he suggested that public service pay scales be tied in with the cost of living. He wants us to put our pay scales and tie them on to the cost of living and as the cost of living goes up, pay the increase

in salaries and wages and then bargain with the employees also for the additional amounts they are going to want. Well, I know no government in Canada does that, Mr. Speaker. It would put you in a pretty hard position if you ever agreed to do it. The whole process of collective bargaining takes place within the background, the fact the cost of living has increased. Conciliation boards hold hearings. This is one of the major factors they look into when you cannot agree with your employees as to what the proper increase should be, this cost of living. We cannot tie our hands behind our back and just say automatically ; if the cost of living goes up ten per cent, we will bounce all wages and salaries up ten per cent. The honourable gentleman opposite would not do it if he were in office either and we do not intend to do it.

He suggested social assistance payments should be adjusted to meet cost of living increases. We have done that. We have said, I believe, that in future when the cost of living goes up, we are going to look at adjustments. This is part of a scheme that there will be adjustments with the cost of living in connection with social assistance. So, that was his other great point which we have already said that we are going to do.

Finally he made some noise about Nova Scotia and the fact that up there a Public Utilities Board has some power to check increases in oil and gas prices. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was decided by us weeks ago, several months ago, that we were going to look into this. It has been looked into, what our constitutional position is, can we control wholesale prices as well as retail prices, what the best approach would be for regulation. That is being done by the Minister of Mines and Energy and when he is finished and when he has reached his conclusions, the House will be informed and measures will be brought before the House. That is the only other suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition had on that point.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition tries to make out and

honourable gentlemen opposite try to make out that the people of Newfoundland are now worse off than they ever were. They are crippled and crucified by the cost of living. They are crippled and crucified by this government and they are worse off than they ever were before.

Now, here is the picture, Mr. Speaker, and it is a very interesting one. Now, I am comparing the years 1971 at the end of which we assumed office, to 1973, the year just passed. The per capita personal income in Newfoundland in 1971 was \$2,188. That is the per capita personal income. In 1973 it was \$2,760. That is a percentage increase of 26.1 per cent over these two years. We calculate that in 1974 the per capita income in Newfoundland will be \$3,112 or another 12.8 per cent increase.

I am not saying that this is all due to the Progressive Conservative Administration although we certainly feel that we have helped here, that we have given, that the people have more confidence in the province because we have taken over, that we have done certain things that have helped. I do not claim that this is all a result of a change of government. I am showing what it was like at the end of 1971 compared to now. So, the personal income is up twenty-six per cent in two years.

Over the same period the overall consumer price index has increased by 13.7 per cent. In other words, if you take the cost of living, the overall consumer price index in 1971 and then you look at it in 1973, the cost of living index overall increased 13.7 per cent. Since the per capita incomes increased 26.1

per cent, the real income growth in the province over these two years is very significant. 12.4 per cent in the last two years or an average of 6.2 per cent per year. That has been the real growth in income. When you take out the inflation and the cost of living, the people of this province in the last two years have had a 12.4 per cent increase in their real income. 26.1 per cent total income, 12.4 per cent real income. "An extremely high rate of real growth in historic terms." I am quoting now, the economist that prepared this. "This is an extremely high rate of real growth in historic terms. Despite the inflation the increase in personal income has been so great. Food costs have had the greatest increase. They have risen about 25.5 per cent since 1971." Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we cannot and have no control over these prices because our food is virtually all imported.

Able-Bodied Relief: "In 1971 the average number of families on short-term assistance was 7,300. In 1973 the average was 4,500 for a percentage increase of 38 per cent." Some of this is due to action taken by the government, some of this is due to steps taken by the Minister of Social Assistance, some of this is due to the new expanded unemployment insurance scheme but the fact remains that the average number of families on short-term assistance has decreased by 38 per cent. From 7,300 to 4,500 last year.

Gross Provincial Product: "Our gross provincial product in 1973 was \$1.7 billion. That is the total value of all goods and services in the province, \$1.7 billion, last year."

AN HON. MEMBER: Billion.

MR. CROSBIE: Billion. \$1,733,000,000 to be exact, a 25.8 per cent increase from what it was in 1971. In 1971, \$1,378,000,000 last year, \$1,733,000,000 and in 1974 we expect it to increase by about 13 per cent to \$2 billion. We will be in office when Newfoundland for the first time has a \$2 billion gross provincial product.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Now if I were something like my predecessor, I would

really speak on that \$2 billion. It would not be one and three-quarter billion it would be \$2 billion and -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: What?

AN HON. MEMBER: What Minister of Finance?

MR. CROSBIE: My predecessor, the Minister of Finance, the honourable Mr. Smallwood.

Retail Sales: "In 1971," Mr. Speaker, "In 1971 retail sales in Newfoundland totalled \$533 million." \$533 million. "In 1973 it totalled \$687 million, an increase of 28.8 per cent." A very rapid rate of increase. New Car Sales: "In 1971, 16,300 new cars sold. In 1973, 24,000." You know, Hoover said: "A chicken in every pot." That was his slogan. The Moores' slogan should be; "A car in every garage." 24,000 in 1973, sold, as compared to 16,300.

Pulpwood: "In 1971, 536,000 cunits," c-u-n-i-t-s (I do not want any accusations of improper language) cunits - 536,000 cunits. "In 1973, 915,250 cunits for a percentage increase of 70.6 per cent." We have increased the pulpwood production 70.6 per cent in our two years in office. Where is the Leader of the Opposition? He does not want to hear this stuff. No, he is covering now in his office. He does not want to listen to the facts. No, Sir! He is over there thinking up something nasty and vicious to say when he comes back.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hiding under the desk.

MR. CROSBIE: Fish Landings: Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. "The value of fish landings has increased 32.6 per cent from 1971 to 1973. The value was \$35.5 million in 1971 to \$47.2 million in 1973."

Average Weekly Wages and Salaries: "In 1971 the average \$124.00 per week in 1973, \$150.00 per week for an increase of 21 per cent." If I wanted to build all this up I could talk, I could talk the whole week on what has happened in this province in the last two years. Two years of Moore's prosperity.

The Labour Force: "The average size of the labour force in 1971, 158,000. In 1973, 180,000." A tremendous increase in the labour

force, 13.9 percent, one of the highest rates of increase in the world. I am not going to deal with employment and unemployment - that can be left to another speaker. There has been a vast increase in the number of those employed but unfortunately, the labour force is increasing so rapidly that it is difficult to keep ahead of it.

DREE Spending: No, that is another thing, I am going to deal with DREE spending in a few minutes. What do all these indicators show, Mr. Speaker? They indicate a very prosperous economy indeed and no amount of talk from the opposition about the increases in the cost of living and the rest of it can undo the fact that the people of this province, today, are tremendously better off as compared to two years ago. Every indicator shows it and that does not mean to say that we claim the credit for everything that has happened. We do not, we cannot, but we can certainly claim the credit for a good deal of this, for a proper climate in the province, for good administration, for some attention to sound financial principles, to putting Newfoundland back on the map again as a respectable place to belong to and the rest of it. A lot of the credit we can take although we cannot take all of it.

There are some of the facts, Mr. Speaker, and when we are talking about this resolution and the rapidly rising cost of living and the severe impact, the real nub of the matter is the increase in real income in the last two years and that has gone up over 12 per cent despite the increase in the cost of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said all I need to say on the first part of this resolution. I have shown beyond a doubt that it is one of the silliest, most ill-founded motions of non-confidence brought into this House of Assembly in a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: No wonder the Leader of the Opposition is not here. He is! He is! He just came in! I hope he is going to be properly ashamed. He has been listening to me on his earphones out there and he has these facts.

What is the second point that aroused the wrath and the ire and made the hackles of honourable gentlemen opposite rise and increase their non-confidence in the government? I will tell the House and the world, Mr. Speaker, we have no confidence in them. Not an iota of confidence do we have in honourable gentlemen opposite, not one drop. We fear that if the province ever gets in their hands it will be desperate times indeed for Newfoundland to have the province's affairs in the control of the honourable nine gentlemen opposite, excluding the member for Labrador North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: South.

MR. CROSBIE: South. South, not North. Sorry! If it got into their hands, God help us! Mr. Speaker, God help us! I could move a motion of non-confidence in those gentlemen opposite that would curl your hair. However, that is not our function. We are trying to govern the province harassed and assaulted on every side by honourable gentlemen opposite who care not what tactics they use. I am going to come to them later.

Now the second part of the non-confidence motion. The honourable gentlemen regret the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high numbers of our people who are unemployed.

Let us deal with some of the programmes that we have introduced, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of them, some of these programmes. We have the Federal Winter Works Programme that we are participating in to the limit of the money that they lend us.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Well it is called the Capital Works Employment Programme now. It is still in operation. Not LIP and LEAP and not FRIP and FRAP and MAP and all that stuff, this is the Winter Works Programme, Mr. Speaker, the old Winter Works Programme which is now I think called the Federal-Provincial Capital Works Programme, where they loan the money to the province to spend.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: They loan the money, Mr. Speaker, to the province to spend. They do not even spend their own money on it, the crowd at Ottawa who honourable gentlemen opposite are so proud of and are always boasting about. This federal government which has this big flexible reserves of revenue, they do not grant us the money for our Winter Works Programmes. No. They lend it to us. Well, we borrowed and are borrowing all we can under it, I think it is \$12 million over a three-year period and we have to pay it all back to Ottawa. This is the big, generous Ottawa employment programme. They do not even give us a grant of the money they lend the province the money and they will forgive us the interest if the work is done in a certain period, for the province has to pay the money back.

Well, we are in that up to our necks. We borrowed that, we have to pay it back to "Pierre the Ogre" or his Finance Minister. We have to pay that back, the people of Newfoundland and the government. That is one of the great acts of generosity of that great government.

that great Liberal Government in the great city of Ottawa, the great Country of Canada. They are crucifying us with inflation. They are crucifying our fiscal capacity and then they loan us a few measly bucks for Unemployment Capital Works in the winter but we are participating in it. We are borrowing all that they are offering us. We will have to pay it back later. Where is it being spent? It is being spent in forestry. It is being spent in developing excess roads. It is being spent in cutting, in the winter time. It is being spent on the Arts and Culture Centre at Stephenville and a number of other projects. We are trying to spend it in areas where there is a heavy labour content and where the work can be done in the winter time. So, that is one programme.

What else have we done? We are charged with failing to introduce adequate programmes to employ people. We have established and now have operating Labrador Linerboard Limited at Stephenville, that project which is providing employment for a considerable number of people, both directly and indirectly, and we have it on the road and we brought it from the brink of disaster to where it is now and it has been a tremendous struggle and has required a lot of money but that is underway. That certainly is a programme to help with employment and if it were not there, there would be considerably less employment in this Province, both on the West Coast and in Labrador.

There are construction programmes, massive government construction programmes going on. In addition to the legacy left behind us, that we had no choice about, a lot of which we would have to do in any event, some of which we might not have, in addition to that legacy there is the Health Sciences Centre at Memorial and the Carbonear Hospital which was almost started in a very queer way before the Minister of Health, the present minister, got that salvaged and on the road and Twillingate was started in a shakey way before the last election and now it is fully underway, and an extension to the Western Memorial Hospital.

In addition to that, there are large construction we have

initiated, all of whom are employing people. There is a Science and Engineering Building at Memorial, not fully underway. There is the extension to the Mental Hospital. For twenty-three years, it was pointed out by the authorities that there should be an extension to the Mental Hospital. Honourable gentlemen opposite did not care about the Mental Hospital. They had other things on their minds. They knew nobody in there could vote, I suppose, so it was left to us to start the badly needed extension to the Mental Hospital and that is underway.

Student residences at Memorial University, you can see them out there now, they are under way, another employing several hundreds of people. There is assistance granted the Newfoundland Forest Products. Honourable gentleman helped that originally. They let that bobble and collapse. We have got the Newfoundland Forest Sawmill at Hawkes Bay underway again by a loan of \$1.75 million. That is providing employment to people. There is the Canada Bay Lumber Company at Roddickton receiving a small amount of assistance from the Government to have their mill start up there in Roddickton, providing a lot of employment in the Roddickton area, and there are other sawmills that can be mentioned, the one that Roy Asmond is associated with; the new mill being established in the Bay D'Espoir area, George Sexton and other people.

There is a vast, expanded programme of forest access roads. Millions of dollars have been spent in the last two years on forest access roads, a huge programme, and all through the forestry department it is the same.

In agriculture, \$9 million spent in agriculture, assisting farmers around the Province. In the fishery, \$10 million, over \$10 million. Who made it possible for fishery products to expand their operations at Catalina, an all-year-round programme? The Provincial Government. Who helped them order and acquire the new trawlers they have got coming on? The Provincial Government through a guarantee of half the lease payments. Who saved the fish plant at Burgeo, no matter what the cost was? The cost was high. Honourable gentlemen opposite left office with that plant having been down

for six months. The workers would not deal with Spencer Lake. We all know the chaotic situation. They had no solution. They had done nothing except make murmurs about expropriation when they knew that expropriation could not work. Expropriation would not solve the problems. That plant was purchased by the Government, operated at heavy cost. It is now going to be operated by National Sea Products and hopefully is going to be a success. That is creative employment and the new arrangement that brother Doody worked out is going to see that plant become a success. That is something done by this Government. I am only giving a few examples.

The Grose Morne Park: the Grose Morne Park is now providing employment for many, many people and next year there will be a vast amount of money spent on the Grose Morne Park. When honourable gentlemen opposite left office it was at a stalemate. They were getting nowhere with it. It was Silica. Silica was holding up the Park. We all remember back in those days of Silica Bill and all the rest of it. Nothing was being accomplished in the Grose Morne Park. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has dealt with that situation. He got a much better deal from Ottawa and there is a large expenditure and large employment in the Bonne Bay area and you can look all around the Province and see the same thing.

The Rural Development Authority: Mr. Speaker, one of the most scurvy points that the Leader of the Opposition attempted to make the other day was an attack on the Rural Development Authority. Honourable gentlemen opposite are jealous about the Rural Development Authority. They are angry that this was started and created by this administration because what was their rural programme? Their rural development programme was doom the outports, resettle them, move them, whether they had jobs or not just move them on. There was money from Ottawa to move people so, by golly, they were going to move them! They were the biggest movers in the history of the Province except they did not move the hearts of the people who got moved and the Rural Development Authority is a direct contradiction to that. It is one hundred per cent opposite to their philosophy of doom and gloom for the outports. One hundred and eighty degree change, turnabout.

The Rural Development Authority is to lend money to people who want to establish some industry or business, small as it may be, in a rural area, not in St. John's or Corner Brook or in Grand Falls, in the rural areas and there has been 753 loans approved and 550 completed in the two years that that programme has been going on and 2,100 jobs apparently is the number of jobs created. That is not the point I want to make here now. There has been \$5.2 million allocated and spent in creating those jobs. To date I think they have paid out \$3.4 million and the rest of it is in the pipeline. \$5.2 million over the two years spent on the Rural Development Authority, 753 loans approved, 550 completed, yet the other day the Leader of the Opposition singles out three people and tries to allege patronage about this programme, tries to knock it, tried to allege scandal and of course, embarrasses and so on the people involved. I have not been speaking to him but that is what it is supposed to do.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that this is a pork barrel and patronage because three loans of the 550 completed and 753 processed have gone to people who were P.C. supporters or P.C. candidates, two of them candidates.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: All right, three of them. Bernard Fitzpatrick, Bill Patterson and Wallace Maynard. Is a man not to be eligible to receive a loan from the Rural Development Authority or any assistance from Government if he has ever been a candidate for the P.C. Party or if he has ever been a candidate for the Liberal Party or if he has ever been a candidate for any party? Is anybody who runs for office in any party, is he thereafter to be refused all assistance from Government? Is he cut off? Is he finished? Because if that be the case, how are you going to find candidates who got any get up and go or any vim and vigor or people who want to accomplish or do anything, if that is the criterion?

Now, Bill Paterson lived in Placentia and made a living in Placentia and fought the battle in Placentia for ten, twelve, eighteen, twenty years and he survived whether he has a loan from the Rural Development Authority or does not have one. So, he got a loan to help in his auto body shop or welding business. What is wrong with that? Is Bill Paterson to be sent to Coventry and to be allowed to wither on the vine because he once ran for the P.C.s? There is nothing wrong with that loan at all, nothing, absolutely nothing wrong with it and he is employing a few people in Placentia and he has a business there and that is a rural area and he is eligible.

Bernie Fitzpatrick got a loan for green houses on Bell Island.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, no, he does not live on Bell Island. He lives in St. John's, that is where he lives.

MR. CROSBIE: He lives in St. John's. He lived on Bell Island for years and he is interested in establishing some employment on Bell Island and has a green house project into which he is putting money himself and in which he is also getting a loan from the Rural Development Authority. Nothing wrong with that, absolutely nothing wrong with that at all. The honourable gentlemen opposite, if one of them has a good suggestion, he wants to create some employment, perhaps say a manure spreading pile or something like that in one of the districts, he wants assistance on, he will be eligible for a loan. The mere fact that he is a member of the House should not stop him, if it is right and proper.

Finally, Wallace Maynard was mentioned. Well I am told, around the last election, I did not realize it, in St. Barbe North, was it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, well the people up there now realize their mistake. They have got the honourable gentleman's brother here and they realize their mistake. They wish to God that they had Wallace Maynard here representing them because he is a man with some get up and go. He is not in this House here just bellowing his lungs out, ciritzing the Government, being negative, destructive,

yelling. I mean they know on the Northern Peninsula the honourable gentlemen opposite are finished. Wallace Maynard is not here doing that, Mr. Speaker, he is out trying to create employment in Newfoundland and to expand his business, I think it was a pulp-wood operation that he got a loan for up in St. Barbe North. What is wrong with that? Yet the Leader of the Opposition gets up in the House and tries to make a big issue, attack the Rural Development Authority because three former P.C. candidates got assistance and loans.

Well we say quite flatly, Mr. Speaker, no one is barred from a loan from the Rural Development Authority if he has an idea to create something in a rural district, Whether he is Liberal, P.C., N.D.P., New Labrador or whatever it is, they are eligible for loans if they meet the criteria. It is not going to be run on any other basis.

There are dozens, hundreds of more programmes I could mention that are contrary to this to this extremely high, you know lack of introducing adequate programmes to reduce the number of people who are unemployed.

We expanded the technical training school programme for this year. It is designed exactly to help overcome that. The whole operation of the trade schools is the same purpose and all of the assistance to all of the educational institutions. What are we trying to do? Mr. Speaker, in two years, you cannot correct and create the millennium in two years.

Look at what is being done in connection with the Lower Churchill. When the honourable gentlemen left, when their government was turned out of office they were just about to sign a lease with BRINCO on the Lower Churchill and the Lower Churchill would have gone ahead under fantastically ridiculous terms and conditions similar to the Upper and the power would be gone out of Newfoundland and all we would have the right to reclaim would be a very small amount. We would get no sales tax. We would get no gasoline tax. We would have

no good out of the power. It would all go to Quebec, following on the Upper Churchill.

Now the Upper Churchill, a number of years ago, and looking back at that era in time perhaps there could have been a lot of excuses found for it, but not for the Lower Churchill. But when the honourable gentlemen left office they were about to give the Lower Churchill away to BRINCO, to sell the power at a cheap rate to Hydro Quebec. We stopped that. We stopped that. We have had the matter properly studied. We said the power is to come to Newfoundland if there is any way in the world for that to happen, and that matter—

MR. MURPHY: What did we lose on the Upper Churchill?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! We are only losing \$165 million a year there.

MR. MURPHY: That is nothing.

MR. CROSBIE: But we would have lost the Lower Churchill if there had not been a change in administration because they, Mr. Speaker, would have gone ahead at the Lower Churchill on BRINCO's terms and would have signed the lease that we refused to sign. What is happening now on the Lower Churchill the honourable gentlemen will know a lot more about before this session is over.

We put the interests of Newfoundland first and applied some intelligence to the situation. Found out first what happened on the Upper Churchill, what exactly were the terms and conditions and what would happen to us and what was happening and the Lower Churchill will go ahead, make no mistake about that, but when it goes ahead the power will be coming to Newfoundland, except for any surplus that might temporarily go somewhere else for a few years until we can use it all.

That is our policy. That is creating employment. We have not seen the jobs yet but that will create, that decision will create, in this province, jobs from here to eternity as a result of the bringing of the Lower Churchill power to this province. There will be jobs from here to eternity caused by that decision. You do not see them yet but you will. You will and they will be here forever, permanent jobs, the creation of industry because we will have power.

It is the same situation with oil and gas and the situation we found on oil and gas and what the present policy is and what we hope the future will be. The new forest policy, which is going to be talked about in another debate: For twenty-three years honourable gentlemen opposite could come up with nothing on the forests, nothing. They had several royal commissions, the last one a slieveened, weasel document done by a Mr. Rousseau, no connection with the member for Labrador West.

Now in two years there is at last before the House a plan for the control and development of our forests that makes some sense and should lead to their proper utilization. That is a job creator. There are jobs already created by that, by our forest policy, but even more in the future. These are the things. You cannot look at just two years and say; "What has been done in two years?" Wait and see what is being done in five.

More important, wait and see what the effects are in twenty-five years and thirty years of the kinds of things we are doing. Honourable gentlemen opposite are weasling around the province mingling, cringing, crying and complaining and trying to create an impression that nothing is being done. Just look at the money spent alone. Honourable gentlemen opposite used to be known as pretty free spenders. You know they spent a lot of money.

In 1971-1972, the total spent in Newfoundland on current and capital account revised - \$535 million, a considerable sum of money. At the end of the end of the year they had not spent enough. All the stuff they dumped and slashed out and fired out and wasted in 1971-1972 still did not save them, \$535 million.

In 1972-1973 - \$589 million we have had to spend, maybe a bit in excess of that, That is the original estimate.

In 1973-1974 the original estimates are \$674 million. \$139 million more than the amount spent by the government in 1971-1972; \$139 million more this present year's budget was than the budget of 1971-1972 and the

money spent a lot more wisely.

Yet honourable gentlemen opposite try to pretend and go around the province pretending that nothing has happened and nothing is being done. The people know that this is not true. My guess is, Mr. Speaker, an election called tomorrow and we have all been trying to hold the Premier back, an election held tomorrow would see the wipe out of honourable gentlemen opposite, wipe out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Annihilation.

MR. CROSBIE: Annihilation, with the exception of the member for Labrador South. He would get back in. He is an honourable, decent fellow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: He might get back in. He would have a fighting chance.

So these are some of the programmes that we have introduced that have to do with employment and the employment of people. Now what about the third nonsensical provision of this non-confident motion that is supposed to knock us to our knees, stunned by the brilliance and the audacity of the concepts contained therein.

Let us look at the third point. What is the third point? The honourable gentlemen opposite regret our failure to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this province. They must have been looking at Term 29. Term 29 read like that. We failed apparently to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this province. What tripe! What guff!

Mr. Speaker, in the year 2000 people will still be looking at this province and we will be saying there is not an acceptable level of public services in this province. There will never be a time when people are going to say there is an acceptable level of public services. You go to Ontario now, they do not accept that they have got an acceptable level of public services even in Ontario or British Columbia or wherever. So an adequate level of public services is a bourgeois concept anyway. There will never be an acceptable level of public services.

But you would think, Mr. Speaker, looking at that and reading it that this crowd over here, the government here, had done nothing in the last two years to raise public services. I just pointed out that our budget this year, the year now ending, had \$139 million in it more than the budget in 1971-1972 and that \$139 million is being spent in the province. What is it being spent on? It is being spent on wages and salaries and carrying on the government and in trying to establish public services throughout all parts of the province.

I could spend the next five hours, I will not but I could, outlining where the money is being spent - in Highways, in every department of government. Just look at Highways; the Burgeo Road, the Bay D'Espoir Road, roads on the Burin Peninsula, roads in the District of White Bay South, the District of Green Bay and every district in the province, money being spent. \$43 million last year spent on Highways throughout the province. Is that not raising the services? Does not \$43 million spent raise the services a bit?

The Twillingate Causeway, the honourable gentleman's causeway opposite, completed and finished and so on. In every district you look, the District of Ferryland, tremendous road building; the District of St. Mary's ignored for twenty-three years. You can hardly move down there but they are paving around down in St. Mary's District because of the member for St. Mary's. He agrees. Every district of the country, Mr. Speaker, we have spent money. \$43 million last year on highways.

Regional colleges - you know the implication must be, "Look they are discriminating against the rest of the province. They are giving it all to St. John's." That is the implicit thought they want to give. Regional college in Corner Brook underway this year; Arts and Culture Centre at Stephenville underway this year. Everywhere you look around the province there is something being built or some money being spent on public services.

MR. CROSBIE: What about hospitals? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to make a great point about hospitals, about what was being done in hospitals. Twillingate and Carbonear were not really started when we came in. They were a fantastic mishmash. There was an attempt to get them going just before the election. There were no proper contracts awarded and the rest of it. Both of them are now well and successfully underway. I turned the sod on the Carbonear Hospital in 1967, one of my first acts as the new Minister of Health. It was to go with the then Premier, Mr. Smallwood, to Carbonear and we heaved the old sod over in 1967. I was a spectator. The act of sod-turning was committed by someone else. It took the Hon. Minister of Health, the Member for Carbonear, to get that off the road and on the road in 1972, five years later. One thing the Minister of Health likes is hospitals. God! He loves hospitals! He wants more hospitals. Every time you turn around the son-of-a-gun is up with another hospital under his sleeve. That was Twillingate and Carbonear.

There is a huge extension to Western Memorial underway. Hospital Sciences, we know about that. What else is happening with hospitals. I mentioned the Mental Hospital extension that we have started. The planning is being done for Clarenville. Unfortunately from the financial point of view a big regional hospital is going to Clarenville. Fortunately for the honourable member that is underway. That was never started before. That was started and is underway now by this government. "Oh Promise Me" used to be the slogan from the honourable gentlemen opposite. That is Clarenville.

Mr. Speaker, there is a twenty-five bed hospital recommended for Bonavista. The tenders were called. Twenty-five is what is recommended by the people who are knowledgeable in the

field of health, twenty-five beds, the recommended hospital for Bonavista which is now connected by paved road to the rest of the island.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSSIE: Thanks to Rossie Barbour. It is thanks to Rossie Morgan, not Rossie Barbour. There is recommended a twenty-five bed hospital. The extension to the outpatient facilities were to start last year. Tenders were called and there were no bids. The contractors are all too prosperous. They will be called again this spring. The outpatient facilities will go ahead, then the twenty-five beds will be built. The Hon. Member for Bonavista South will go down there with his hammer and saw putting in free labour and everything else on the place. Do not worry about Bonavista. That is in the cart.

In Grand Falls the planning is underway for an extension which is needed in the Grand Falls Hospital. All these things are new things, very expensive financially. What else is being done?

Community Health Centres: We are not providing adequate services at all around the province. These are all just things that are not providing any service at all. There is a hospital extension under construction at Come-by-Chance. There is a community health centre completed at Port Saunders, nearly completed at St. Alban's. There are community health centres completed and opened now on New World Island, Terrenceville and Grand Le Pierre.

Mr. Speaker, there is a new programme for physiotherapy in operation. It is starting now around the province in the rural areas. It is the Rural Physiotherapy Programme. My golly! I see a chicken scratch here about other extensions that are planned.

Doctors' Residences: There are doctors' residences completed at Western Bay, Codroy and so on and so on it goes. That is just health but still the honourable gentlemen opposite want to

pretend that we are failing to bring public services up to an acceptable level. We plead guilty to that, Mr. Speaker, in a sense, because it will take twenty-five or fifty years at least to bring the services up here to an acceptable level. Even if you had all the money you wanted in the world to do it, it would take physically and constructionwise and so on somewhere between ten and twenty years even to be on the conservative side, even to be careful and cautious in what you are estimating.

There are new programmes, air service subsidies to Fogo and St. Brendans subsidizing the fares for the people who have to travel back and forth to Fogo Island and St. Brendans and Change Islands. There is no thanks to the honourable gentlemen opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The Labrador subsidy is carried on, Labrador Airways is carried on.

Recreation services have been assisted all over the province. There has been a new electric subsidy scheme instituted for stadiums.

Senior citizens homes are being assisted to get underway in four or five locations around the province. I think one is in the Grand Bank Area. I forget where all the others are. There are so many: St. Anthony, Lewisporte, Stephenville Crossing; these are senior citizens homes being assisted to establish -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Schools, DREE schools, non-DREE schools, all kinds of schools. Marine Service Centre at Harbour Grace and in other areas. Gigantic housing programmes - I am not going to take the time to give all the statistics. We just had a tremendous year in housing. When honourable gentlemen opposite see the estimates for housing this year and the new programme is explained, they will be delighted with the extension of the housing services about the province.

There is a reintroduction of the Provincial/Municipal Street Paving Programme, the fifty/fifty programme stopped by honourable gentlemen opposite in 1968 and resumed again by the present administration in 1972. There is the service they stopped and did away with. It is now re-instituted. I could go on and on. I am going to conclude this part of my remarks by giving a bit more information on Municipal Affairs. Municipal Affairs are always hiding its light under a bushel.

Now I am not going to say anything about what is in the estimates for Municipal Affairs. I just want to explain (I hope the press will cover it. It is a little known fact) some of the things that have been done as a result of the policies of this government in Municipal Affairs in the last two years, not done through the estimates at all, done through the guarantee of loans for municipalities. First, water and sewer projects: In 1972-1973, we guaranteed bank loans totalling \$10,058,000 for water and sewer projects and street reconstruction and paving. In 1973-1974, we guaranteed an additional \$10,195,000. In the same year we continued with additional guarantees that had to be given to continue and finish projects, \$5,840,000. The total amount of money provided through the credit of the government to municipalities for water and sewer projects and for paving and road reconstruction in the last two years is \$26,093,000 of which \$5,840,000 was additional costs to projects started before we came into office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we look at water and sewerage alone and if you look at the figures spent between 1960 and 1973; we spent in 1972, water and sewerage alone, \$7,198,000, guaranteed loans. In 1973, we spent \$12,720,000 for water and sewerage alone. These are the two largest amounts spent on water and sewerage projects in the province since 1960. I have the figures here for every year, with one exception. In 1971, a total of \$20,485,000 was started in water and sewerage projects, because it was election year and honourable gentlemen opposite went berserk. They were terrified

that they were going to lose. They did lose. They were properly terrified. They tried to cling on, of course, as we all know for three or four months afterwards by the toenails and the fingernails and the hangnails. They tried to stay into offices. Except for the year 1971, when \$20,000,000 was authorized (We have had to raise the money to pay off that \$20,000,000. We have had to go to the bond market and we are going now to repay those banks loans that were guaranteed) the greatest amounts ever spent in water and sewerage projects throughout the province was 1972, \$7,198,000; 1973, \$12,720,000. In the same two years in 1972, we spent \$2,860,000 in guarantees for street paving and \$3,315,000 in 1973 in guarantees for street paving work. As I say the total of the water and sewerage, paving and street reconstruction, over the two years guaranteed by us, \$26,093,000. I have lists here of who were assisted by these amounts.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972-1973, in that financial year, forty-one municipalities received guarantees for these worthy purposes from the government. They go from Milltown to the head of Bay d'Espoir, \$1,000,000; Corner Brook, \$1,000,000 and then they go right across the island - I do not have the time and it would bore honourable gentlemen to hear every name. Forty-one municipalities received assistance

from the government, most of them for water and sewerage projects, some of them for street paving and reconstruction. Lumsden, Grand Bank, Goose Cove, Deer Lake, Fortune, Carbonear, Harbour Grace, Bonavista, Whitbourne, Twillingate, Port aux Choix, Seal Cove, White Bay, Musgrave Harbour, Port Saunders, Fleur de Lys, Crowhead, Howley, Coachman's Cove, Marystown, Burin, Corner Brook, Upper Island Cove, Cooks Harbour, Hants Harbour, Lawn, Botwood, Dunville, Bellburns, Daniel's Harbour, St. Albans, Hare Bay, Nippers Harbour, Stephenville, St. Lawrence, Carmanville, Badgers Quay, Valleyfield, Pool's Island, Wesleyville, Wareham - forty-one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, if he wants to scrutinize I can send him a copy.

Then last year, not a jic or a tottle for Harbour Main. Last year, not last year, the financial year that is just ending, the total amount \$10,195,000 guaranteed for water and sewer or street reconstruction and paving to thirty municipalities. Now these are public services all across the province never normally considered as something the government have done, not in our estimates. Corner Brook, \$1 million; Botwood, Glenwood, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Springdale, Deer Lake, Twillingate, Happy Valley, Peterview, Mount Pearl, Kings Point, Hants Harbour, Grand Falls, Badgers Quay, Valleyfield, Wesleyville, Appleton, Whitbourne, Stephenville Crossing, Bishops Falls, Victoria \$500,000 the start of a water and sewerage system in Victoria, Placentia \$1,100,000 - the necessary extension and expansion in making safe the water system in Placentia; Lewisporte, Grand Falls, the Goulds, Port aux Choix, St. George's \$2,800,000, St. George's who for the last five years has been begging and pleading for a water and sewerage system because of the sewerage problem and all the problems in St. George's. That was authorized and started now in St. George's; Hearts Desire, Flower's Cove, Gander, thirty of them in the year that is now coming to an end. And in continuing loans that were started two or three years ago and will still continue because of increased costs another \$5,840,000 - Bonavista, for example, being \$1 million - I could read the rest of the names but it is not necessary. All over the province we are

doing what we can to assist municipalities to establish public works and services to an adequate degree. So that is \$26 million that is not in the estimates at all.

Then the Hon. the Leader wants the members to kick us out and throw us out because we are not doing what we can to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout this province. What absolute tomfoolery! You know, what does he expect the people of Newfoundland to believe? I will tell him what the people of Newfoundland believe. They believe we now have the most negative, obstructive and destructive opposition, using the most vicious tactics of any that we have ever had in our history. That is what they believe and they are on to it and they know what it is all about and they know what is happening. If we are not out, Mr. Speaker, on the "Open Line Programmes" and the rest of it, it is because we are too busy in here trying to get on with the job to clear up the Augean stables they left behind and bring this province forward into the Twentieth and the Twentieth-First Century; two things that are in our long range that will be good for this province.

So all three of the reasons advanced by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition in his non-confidence motion are laughable. They are a joke. They are poor jokes. We should not have to spend our time knocking down his specious reasoning.

Now what about DREE? Every now and then, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a little murmur from the Member for White Bay South who thinks he knows all about DREE. "Hee! Hee! Hee! I know all about DREE. That little Wille-e-e. He knows precious little about DREE. Precious little." Now let us get DREE. Let us look at DREE. The honourable gentleman every now and then alleges that there has been some lack of spending by us on DREE, in the last two years. Look! Look at the figures! In 1971-1972, the two years combined, the honourable gentleman opposite spent \$53.1 million through DREE, \$53.1 million, 1970-1971-1972, or an average of about \$27 million per year. That is what was actually spent. Not what was in the estimates, what was actually spent? In 1972-1973 our DREE spending, this government's DREE spending, and the honourable

gentleman alleges we are not spending the funds that we can get from DREE, of about \$37 million. That is last year. In the present year it will be about \$36 million.

So there has been a significant increase in DREE spending in the last two years, Mr. Speaker, compared to the previous two.

Now what about dropped balances and DREE spending? In 1970-1971, when the honourable gentlemen opposite were in power and when the now Member for White South was the minister in charge of this department, the Cracker Jack from White Bay South, we had a huge amount of money put in the estimates for DREE spending, a big block vote. At the end of the year \$31.5 million of that was not spent, was a dropped balance, it had to be dropped because it was not spent by the end of the year \$31.5 million. That is the honourable the Member for White Bay South's record in DREE spending. This self-styled expert in DREE, Hee! Hee! Ho! Ho! This is what happened to the honourable member's spending in 1970-1971, \$31.5 million. In 1971-1972 we had a dropped balance of \$11 million. He was less ambitious in 1971-1972. In 1972-1973 the drop balance was about \$10 million, less than the honourable gentleman's. This year as far as we can see it may be about \$5 million. In other words, we are spending more and more and the reason why there may be a drop balance of about \$5 million are the DREE schools. The honourable gentleman knows the tremendous difficulties in getting them going and getting them through to school boards, the authoritizes and all the business that has to go on with DREE schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: Port Saunders.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, yes, the marine science centre in Port Saunders was never in the DREE.

So when the honourable gentleman opposite talks about DREE just remember those facts. His dropped balance in 1970-1971, \$31.5 million. In 1971-1972, \$11 million. Last year it was \$10 million and this year we expect it will be about \$ 5 million. Then remember his spending record in DREE. More money has been spent in the last two years from DREE than was ever spent by the honourable gentleman opposite, who is suppose to be the Prince Charming of DREE. He is not quite the Father

of DREE, the Father of DREE was, I suppose, Mr. Smallwood or his father or someone. The honourable gentleman is always acting as though he had a great DREE record. His DREE record was shameful. It was an atrocity, it was atrocious, it was disastrous. That was his DREE record. The honourable the Member for Grand Falls when he was in the portfolio and the honourable Member for (I do not know who looks after it now) Rural Development looks after some and the Hon. Brother Doody, the honourable junior Member for Harbour Main, that is who is seeing that the DREE funds get spent and the better organization of the government.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak much longer. I do not believe in long addresses. There is so much against this resolution that it is impossible for me, I have skipped a lot, I have skipped data that I could have expanded but I want to come to one final point, Mr. Speaker, and that is the attitude of the opposition, then I will conclude.

One of the attitude's of the opposition, is well illustrated by the Member for White Bay South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman cannot hurt my feelings because I expect no better from him than he deserves to have expected from him and that is more negative than zero, so he never hurts my feelings.

Now the honourable gentleman the other day in an active, destructive and malicious, in a malicious and destructive act sent a letter to the municipalities of Newfoundland alleging or stating that \$100 million a year was available to be spent in DREE in Newfoundland and for them all to get their projects in and get a crack at this \$100 million.

MR. COLLINS: He wrote that letter of apology I presume, did he?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know if he has written the letter of apology yet or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the position as I understand it and I can be corrected, is that DREE, in the new arrangements, the general development agreement and the new arrangements under it want to confine their

expenditures to expenditures that relate to a development opportunity. It has to relate to an economic development opportunity. There is no great DREE pile of money in the skies for schools or technical colleges or water and sewerage or roads or anything of that nature, it has to be related to the development opportunities. We have no pledge, Mr. Speaker, from Ottawa that there is \$100 million a year available and no one in this government have ever said that there is \$100 million a year available. Am I correct in that, Mr. Speaker? Never once has anyone in this government said that there was \$100 million available because we have never been told that. It has never been stated to us that there is \$100 million of money available from DREE every year for us to spend in Newfoundland. It is not true. There is not. Their guidelines to us are a lot less than that, considerably less. In the new arrangements it all has to be related to the development opportunity.

So that the letter that the honourable gentleman wrote to the municipalities of Newfoundland is an incorrect letter.

He did not check his information with the Minister for Industrial Development or anyone else in the government. He did not want to check because he thought he was on a good point, that he could embarrass the government, that by exciting the hopes of all the community and town councils on the island with the hopes that there was \$100 million a year fund, he hoped to get them thinking that if their projects were not accepted that we were turning down their projects or that we would not spend some of this mythical \$100 million on their project. Now, if that is not one of the meanest and most despicable acts of a public man in the last few years, I would like to hear one that tops it. He does not check his information with the government because he does not want to. He wants to circulate throughout the country an untrue rumor that there is \$100 million a year in here and they can all get their water and sewerage and stadium and public facilities and services if they just write in, that this great Uncle Ottawa in the sky is providing this \$100 million.

It has never once been stated by this government or a member of it that there was anything like \$100 million available. It has been stated repeatedly in this House that it all has to relate to development opportunities. That is the position on DREE. We have a general -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who lays down that criteria?

MR. CROSBIE: The criteria is laid down by Ottawa and we do our best to deal with them and see what we can get.

MR. W. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The special areas, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable gentleman knows, are gone. There are no special areas. You can have a development opportunity in any area of the province. If you do, then you can get services that associate with the development opportunity, including Labrador. The special areas are gone but that does not mean to say -

and the honourable gentlemen opposite well knew it - that there is \$100 million spondoolicks available for water and sewerage and everything else. There is not. There will be available money for matters of infrastructure that Ottawa agree upon, that they put into an agreement with us that relates to a development opportunity. That is why all this argument about DREE schools in a large sense is arguing about nothing because they are only going to finance a school on a very rare occasion. That is if you can tie it directly to a economic development opportunity. That is very difficult to do with schools.

Now, the honourable gentleman deliberately misled and tried to mislead viciously the people of this province. That is why I come to my final point: The attitude of the opposition. From the start, two years ago, Mr. Speaker, they have been negative, destructive and malicious, careless of the truth, cynical and abusive, for two years. Now, I was in this House from 1966 onward and in 1971 and 1972 we had some fierce battles in this House with the last administration, particularly the Premier. There was never in the House in those days the poor spirit that I have seen exhibited in this House since the election of January, 1972. The spirit here today is completely unlike to the spirit when we were hacking with Mr. Smallwood who was a doughty fighter and when we did not hold back and there were no words minced. There was a different spirit in this House. Nothing went on in this House such as the Leader of the Opposition the other day saying, "Oh, how many scotchs, Premier?", when the Premier made an interjection. Never in all my life or experienced in any Parliament or House of Assembly have I ever heard, Mr. Speaker, or heard of a remark of that nature, that insulting nature, being made to any member of the House by any member in the House. It is just not done. It is despicable, it is completely despicable.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: When was that done?

MR. CROSBIE: Look at your Hansard. Never mind where it came from. It is a despicable comment. Never has that kind of personal comment - the honourable member for Bell Island with his constant talk about - well, you know booze parties and this kind of thing. Personal abuse and insult use are the most contemptible tactics. It has been the principle of the operating, modus operandi of the members of the opposition opposite with some exceptions. The honourable member for Twillingate does not lend himself to it. He is certainly one that does not, nor does the honourable member for Fogo, nor, for the most part, the honourable member for Bonavista North, nor, for the most part, the honourable member for St. Barbe North. The other honourable gentleman from Hermitage we do not know yet although his open line performance the other day gave me cause to think that he might slip into bad ways himself.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition, the member for White Bay South and the member for Bell Island have adopted the most unscrupulous tactics in this House of personal abuse that I have ever seen. There was nothing like it in the two years when we had the battles here in the old days when Mr. Smallwood was riding tall in the saddle. That kind of thing never went on here. I hope that it does not go on any longer in this session, Mr. Speaker. There is lots to debate about. Now, we can be criticized and criticize the opposition for lots of matters apart from these kinds of insinuations and statements that have been made repeatedly in this session. I can assure honourable gentlemen that the reputation of this House across the province could not be lower. It could not sink any lower than it is now. The people of the province are fed up and disgusted with it. There is a limit to what they will put up with. They are paying no attention to this House of Assembly. The House of Assembly is becoming entirely irrelevant except when somebody picks up the paper and says, my God, look what they have

done today, I would not believe it!

The coverage of the House is not very good anyway across the island except for the "Evening Telegram". It is the only news media that really covers it. It is not the nature of the others to cover it in any depth. They do not cover it at all in the "Western Star" as far as I can see or very little of it. The reputation of this House across the island could not be more dismally low because of this kind of personal abuse and insult.

Another tactic, Mr. Speaker, that I decry in the opposition is that every group that calls for more is receiving their support no matter how irresponsible the call is or the group is or the persons are. It does not matter if one person in one area or one place in this island bellows out for more, that there should be more for this and there should be more for that. God knows there should be. If the school boards ask for more and the school boards go public -everybody is going public these days. The Reverend Harvey is on or the reverend this or the reverend that or the Denominational Education Committees say that \$10 million a year for a school construction is not enough, we have got to have more, we are going to go bankrupt, we will not build any more schools, You can depend upon it, right hot on their heels, baying in chorus is the member for Bell Island, the member for White Bay South and the Leader of the Opposition, baying and howling in chorus with any group that looks for more from this government and this House of Assembly no matter whether their pleas are justified, no matter what our financial situation is, no matter what the facts are. Any group wanting more, we will hear them baying in chorus on the opposite side of the House that they should have more. Whether it is Peter Harrington, the Citizen's Action, any group you can name, anywhere, you will hear them baying in chorus.

Mr. Speaker, if there has to be a tax increase to meet all of

these increasing costs and programmes that people are demanding, the school boards and the rest of them, you will not hear the opposition then baying and supporting the tax increase. No, you will hear them out baying, bellowing, bluffing, buffaloing, moaning, groaning, criticizing, whining on open line programmes and every media they can and attacking the government because they have had a tax increase.

When all the previous year this group of odd fellows opposite, honourable as they may be, has been out bellowing, roaring and chorusing for increased expenditure, if you add it up for the increased expenditures that they have supported and asked for this year, I dare say it would total conservatively at least \$250 million to \$300 million. Every paper you pick up they are roaring and shouting for more.

What is going to happen to them if they ever get into office? I do not think that that dreadful catastrophe will happen to the province but what will happen to them if they ever get into office and all of these groups come in to collect on their IOU's and their promises? What will happen then? I would feel sorry. When I think of it sometimes in the evening, Mr. Speaker, when I am having a nightmare, I visualize the Leader of the Opposition becoming Premier. My heart starts bleeding for him because he will be assaulted and he will be called on to answer his IOU's that he is building up in his period in opposition.

The member for St. Barbe North the other day had a disgraceful incitement in his speech, a disgraceful incitement describing what would happen, that the people of St. Barbe North were going to revolt if such and such did not happen. They were going to block off the roads and so on as though he were reporting to us their attitude. The only reason for making statements like that is to try to induce them to do that, plant the idea in their heads that this is what they should do. That if the road is not plowed as quickly

as it should be or if it is not paved as quickly as someone wants it to be, you spread the idea around that the thing to do, you will get results if you block the roads, block the traffic, turn over the trucks, that this is the thing to do. That is a very dangerous precedent. I hope we will hear no more of that in the House, inciting the public to demonstrate in that way, planting the idea in their heads.

I had some other points to make here along these lines but I do not think I need to go on too long about it. We heard, for example, in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, a while ago, charges made about an unpaid bill, that the Progressive Conservative Party had not paid a bill to the Power Commission. It turns out on open line the other day a gentleman calls up from Hermitage District who had not been paid his telephone

bill seven hundred dollars that he had been promised payment of by honourable gentlemen opposite and was not paid. Ron Pumphrey, that famous protector of the people of Newfoundland, got on to the honourable member for Bell Island and the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that relevant?

MR. CROSBIE: It is relevant. I am directing myself now to adequacy of services and the adequacy of the payment of telephone bills around the province is obviously low.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir. Our bill has been paid, unlike the Tory bill. My point is this, Sir, that Your Honour is not loath nor need Your Honour be loath to call - I was on Friday called to order a number of time, quite properly - I suggest the honourable gentleman is straying a little far, even from the adequacy of public services. If he would like to debate the financial state of the Liberal Party - we have paid our bill and I would like him to answer whether the bills of the power commission owed by the Tory Party have been paid?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, point of order. This seems to be very well founded and I am not going to discuss this item any longer. I do point out, however, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander and an unpaid telephone bill is the same as an unpaid anything else.

MR. ROBERTS: Ours has been paid, has the Tory Party's?

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to discuss N.S.F. cheques nor anything else I could discuss.

Mr. Speaker, in ending my remarks - I will end them now unless honourable members indicate they want me to continue -

MR. ROBERTS: Sure! Carry on! Carry on! Let us have a night session.

MR. MURPHY: Most comfortable day we have had in the House in years.

MR. CROSBIE: In ending my remarks, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. I really hope that we can all bring ourselves to improve our performance in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Because we are reaching a very low level of public esteem. The House has never been as degraded as it is today. There has never been such personal abuse. Abuse of the question period and abuse of all the institutions of this House is rampant in this House now. There is a question period now and the question period should be properly used in accordance with the rules for matters of current moment. Other matters that should go on the Order Paper should be put there instead of this silly charade we have every day in the question period which is ruining the question period which could have some point if members opposite wanted to use it properly.

In ending the speech, Mr. Speaker, I feel myself this year and the next two or three years is a time of crossroads in this province. In the next two or three years it will be decided - all the great issues are going to be decided. The Lower Churchill, reform of the forests, the oil and gas situation off the coast. These are the great issues as I see them and they are going to be decided in the next two or three years. Whether this province can ever get on its own feet or whether it will continue to be a dependency of Ottawa, at the mercy of Ottawa, receiving transfer payments and equalization and the rest of it and our people receiving social security, transfer payments, unemployment insurance and the rest of it, whether we are going to remain that way forever, whether that is our fate or whether there will come a period in the next eight or ten years when with the Lower Churchill Power, oil and gas discovered and in our jurisdiction or a proper system of sharing administration with Ottawa and with the forest properly administered and with the other possibilities in the fishery and so on, but these I think are the three important things, if they can be accomplished for the benefit of this province, if we can accomplish them, then

this province will in eight or ten years be able to stand on its own feet. It will be a have province, we will have some independence and that is a state very much to be desired. These matters are going to be decided, Mr. Speaker, before the next election.

The next election is not likely to be for at least two years and the important things are going to be done. It will be a pity if all we can expect from honourable gentlemen opposite, while these great things of great moment are being decided, is not helpful or constructive criticism but just the kind of negative and destructive criticism that we have been receiving.

I personally often start out listening to the Leader of the Opposition. He starts making very good sense, he is making a good speech and then something nasty occurs that spoils the whole thing. I therefore suggest that we concentrate on the issues, forget the personalities and the abuse that has been going on and get on with the work of this province. I am certainly going to vote against this non-confidence motion. I will vote against it three times, Mr. Speaker, one in each branch of the non-confidence motion. Let us dispose of this and let us get on with the work of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Fogo and seconded by the member for White Bay South District. The reason I rise to support this amendment, Sir, which really amount to a vote of non-confidence in the government is because on at least two previous occasions, Sir, we tried to, on this side of the House, raise the matter of high unemployment, record unemployment in this province. Your honour in his wisdom ruled the motion that we thought was a matter of urgent public importance out of order.

Well, Sir, we accepted that in the spirit in which Your Honour made the ruling but, Sir, we felt that this matter of record unemployment in Newfoundland and the spiraling cost of living were two matters that had to be raised in this honourable House at the

earliest possible opportunity. So, Mr. Speaker, the only procedure that we had open to us on this side of the House to get these bread and butter issues before the House was to move a vote of non-confidence in the government.

Mr. Speaker, this House has now been sitting, I think this is the sixteenth sitting of the House and so far in the current session of the House the government have introduced eighteen bills I think it is. At least that is what is on the Order Paper, Sir, eighteen bills. They have introduced a bill, Sir, respecting the pension of the chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, and they have introduced a bill. "An Act Further To Amend The Change Of Name Act." They have introduced a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Pesticides Control Act," and so on and so on, Mr. Speaker. So far, to date, Sir, the government have failed to bring constructive measures before this House that portray the real needs of the people of this province.

We have talked about in this session so far, Sir, about all kinds of trivial matters. Those of us who have participated in the Throne Speech debate so far, especially on this side of the House, have thrown out a number of constructive ideas to the government that would improve the lot of the people of this province. These suggestions, Sir, have fallen on deaf ears. All we have had from the speakers on the government side of the House so far, Mr. Speaker, is abuse, character assassination, negative speeches, malicious attacks on the Leader of the Opposition and members on this side of the House. The former Smallwood Administration have been held up to ridicule and so it goes, Mr. Speaker. One after the other they stand in their places in this honourable House and this is the kind of a speech, Sir, that we hear from the government benches.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why but they seem to be completely on the defensive. They should not be that way, Sir, and today was no exception. When the Minister of Finance rose in

February 25, 1974, Tape 442, Page 5 -- apb

his place in this honourable House to state the government's position on three matters that were raised last week when the member for Fogo moved to amend the Address -

in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Now we had expected today, Mr. Speaker, a brilliant performance from the Minister of Finance. We have seen him in action before in this honourable House, Sir. We know he is capable of making a good speech. He is probably the top man on the government benches, Sir, the top man in every sense of the word, of stating government policy. I have said publicly that the minister is the only man who really know what the House is all about. There is not another man, Sir, there is not another member on the government benches can come close to the Minister of Finance. He is head and shoulders above every member over there, Sir, as far as debating is concerned. But, Mr. Speaker, today I was disappointed in the Minister of Finance. The good is gone out of him, Sir. It was sickening to hear the Minister of Finance put up such a weak defence for not voting for this amendment to the Speech from the Throne. It sounded to me, Mr. Speaker, like a swan song. It sounded to me like the minister who was speaking for the government had conceded defeat that they were only going to be over there one term and then the game is over. The minister is a master, Sir, a master at dragging red herrings across the issues that are raised in this House. Today, Mr. Speaker, all he managed to do was to get a little sardine across the path of the real meaning behind this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the people of this province look upon the House of Assembly as a farce? Is it any wonder, Sir, that the minister, in winding up his remarks, stated that the House of Assembly had sunk to an all-time low? One can understand, Mr. Speaker, why the people of the province feel this way about their elected representatives and about the House of Assembly, when the government, Sir, fail to come to grips with the real problems and the true needs of the people of this province.

Only today, Mr. Speaker, we learned of the latest example of extravagance and waste of the taxpayers' money

by this administration. in the disclosure by a gentleman who works for the Silver Anniversary Committee that \$1,800,000 (That was only an estimate, Sir - he expected that to go over \$2,000,000.) would be spent in celebrating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Confederation. Mr. Speaker, an event that everybody in this province, even a kindergarten student knows that this is an event, Sir, that never would have taken place if the Tories had to have their way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of taking \$1,800,000 and spending it on recreation or youth or spending it on health services or education or water and sewerage projects, instead of spending it, Mr. Speaker, on something that would benefit the people of this province forever how are they going to spend that close to \$2,000,000, Sir? Well the Minister of Finance criticized me for referring to booze parties. Well, Sir, a large chunk of that money is going to be spent on banquets and refreshments. What else are refreshments but booze parties? They are going to spend more on song contests, beauty pageants, bridge tournaments. How many welfare recipients will participate in the bridge tournaments that this honourable crowd are going to have. The latest, Mr. Speaker, are bonfires. They are going to have a big bonfire sometime in March. Well, Sir, I would suggest that all the reports of the planning and priorities committees, task forces and all the other task force reports and all the propaganda pumped out in the last couple of years by Newfoundland Information Services be taken out and thrown into that bonfire. If we are going to have a bonfire, let us make it a good one.

Mr. Speaker, of course, a large chunk of that money will also go to our old friend that we have heard so much about on the floor of this honourable House and that is Mr. George McLean of Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, after two years in office and after much ranting and raving by the various ministers in the government about planning and priorities is it not hard, Mr. Speaker, for our Newfoundland people to believe that this is the same government, Sir, that could not find enough money to pay out the mothers' allowance? They are going to spend the equivalent this year, Sir, in Silver Anniversary Celebrations - the equivalent of what was being paid to mothers in this province to put clothes and shoes and a bit of food in the stomachs of their children going to school. Is this the same government, Mr. Speaker, that is going to spend almost \$2,000,000 on these foolish celebrations? Is this the same government that put the blocks to the students over at Memorial University? They told the students that they would have to cut down their allowances and that the government could not find the money that was originally planned for the students to attend Memorial University. Is this the same government?

Mr. Speaker, despite what the Minister of Finance said in his remarks today, boasting about all the water and sewer projects that had been undertaken since the Tory Administration took over in this province, despite that, Sir, I would like to remind honourable members that most of these water and sewer projects were merely extensions of the water and sewer projects that had been built by the much maligned Smallwood Administration. Despite that, Sir, I would like to ask the minister how many delegations had been told in the past two years that the government were unable to find a few thousand dollars to run a water line into a community or to provide a community with badly needed recreation facilities? I would like to know how many were turned away, Sir, and told that we cannot find the money. We do not have the money. But, Mr. Speaker, we found out today, when it leaked out in Grand Falls, from that poor little innocent member of the Silver Anniversary Committee, that their government were going to lash out \$1,800,000 and it would probably go over \$2,000,000

for Silver Anniversary Celebrations. I say God help that poor little civil servant! He was probably on the carpet this morning, Sir, first thing. There was a hot line to Nutbeam's office. I doubt if anybody could get to see Mr. Nutbeam today. They were all in conference and the poor little old civil servant that leaked that out was probably hauled over the coals.

Now we know, Mr. Speaker,

what are the real reasons behind these refusals and the lack of progress during the last two years. The Government was too busy, Mr. Speaker, saving up for a big party and a party, Mr. Speaker, that comes unfortunately at a time when we have record unemployment in this Province and the cost of living completely out of reach of the ordinary Newfoundlander.

Mr. Speaker, one would hardly believe that this honourable crowd are going ahead with silver anniversary celebrations and trying to keep the man who lead Newfoundland into Confederation, the honourable Dr. J. R. Smallwood, trying to keep him in the background, trying to keep him out of the celebration, Sir, trying to keep poor old Mr. Smallwood under wraps. How can you celebrate twenty-five years of Confederation in Newfoundland, Sir, without Joey Smallwood playing the leading role? Even the member for St. John's North agrees with that. How can you, Sir? How can you be so hypocritical?

This whole matter, Mr. Speaker, of Confederation celebrations is just a big Roman circus. It is just a political toy, Sir, to distract the people of this Province from the ills of unemployment and inadequate housing. The only difference today, Sir, the only difference between what is happening in Newfoundland and the entertainment that took place in the Roman Colosseum is that the Christians were tossed to the lions but, Sir, this time there is no colosseum, just endless George MacLean commercials on the idiot box.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a clipping and a note from a gentleman in Badger. The member's district is so anxious to present petitions in this honourable House from other member's district. Mr. Speaker, there is the clipping showing the honourable member for Burgeo but it has to do with the cost of living, Sir, has to do with the cost of living. This gentleman apparently read the remarks, read the report of what the honourable member said in this honourable House. Not seeing anything in there, Mr. Speaker, not seeing anything in there that was constructive, worthwhile, that was in the best interests of the people of this Province, the poor gentleman in Badger sat down and scribbled a note on this clipping.

It says, "It is too bad under P.C.s you have to pay \$1.20 a dozen for rotten eggs. The dictionary says rot is a disease. This man is full of it. If you and I have to pay taxes for such," and I could not use the rest of it but Mr. Speaker, it is unparliamentary but I think the House -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: ..but accurate.

MR. NEARY: But accurate, and I think the House will get the message, Sir, and then the gentleman goes on to give me examples of prices in the Millertown area but this is typical,

Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the re-action that we on this side of the House are getting so far in this session of the House of Assembly. The government, Sir, are either unable to cope with the high unemployment in this province, they are either unable to cope with the high cost of living or, Sir, they are just not interested and just do not care about the real needs of the people of this province. So far, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, we have now been sitting sixteen days and up to the time that this resolution, this vote of non-confidence was introduced by my colleague, we have failed in this House, Sir, to deal with the real problems and the true needs of the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now that we have an opportunity to discuss these matters all our citizens, Sir, both on the island and on the Labrador and the mainland part of this province are looking to this House for at least partial relief from these great problems. We were expecting that when the Minister of Finance rose in his place today to address this honourable House that he would have been more positive in his approach to these serious problems, that the minister who was speaking for the government, because I am sure we will not hear from the Premier on these matters, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has not made a major speech in this honourable House yet. As a matter of fact, Sir, I would say without fear of contradiction that he has the record so far this session for non-attendance in this honourable House.

Members forget, Mr. Speaker, members forget that when people go to the polls in this province they elect members to sit in this honourable House and the first obligation and the first priority of any member elected to the House of Assembly, Sir, is right here on the floor of this honourable House, not down in his office on the eight floor. Premier Smallwood, I would say, had the record for attendance in this honourable House. I can see Premier Smallwood sitting over there now, where the present Premier sits, and he would

never leave his seat, Sir, never leave his seat. We wondered sometimes if his kidneys were functioning at all. He would sit there day in and day out, never miss a word, always involved in the heat of battle, always willing to stand up on the floor of this House and tell us just what his government planned on doing when the issues arose.

Today, Sir, it is a different matter. We have the poor old Minister of Finance coming into this honourable House to try to fill in for the Premier. He has to carry the whole crowd of them on his back but today, Sir, he made a very poor job of it. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the good is gone out of him, Sir, and I am sure when the reports of today's session of the House of Assembly filter out through radio and television and the newspapers and Newfoundland Information Services, the manure spreaders. - Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how many of these manure spreaders are still left around? I understand that some of the media issued an ultimatum to the government to have them removed from their offices, from their newsrooms because they were just creating a public nuisance.

and I think one of the news media was threatening to take action against the government if they did not remove it in twenty-four hours, the manure spreaders. I wonder how many are still left around. Sir, when the reports of today's session of the House of Assembly filter out to our Newfoundland people, will they be able to sit in their living rooms tonight, Sir, and in their kitchens or in the little store down on the corner, will they be able to sit there and say, by golly, our government today stood up for the ordinary citizen of this province.

"The Minister of Finance did not try to make excuses. The Minister of Finance did not try to drag a red herring across the issues. The Minister of Finance levelled with the people of this province and told us that his government was going to do so and so and so and so and so and so to try to help the people of this province." No, Sir, they will not be able to say that. That will not be able to say it and the minister will probably be reported widely tonight in the press that he and his colleagues have criticized so much, in his attack on Ottawa, another attack on Ottawa, unjustified, Sir, and unwarranted.

The minister told us the other day in this honourable House when he gave us a hint of an increase in taxation this year, softening up the people of this province, softening up the people, Sir, for an increase in taxation, that if there is an increase, blame it on Ottawa. Today - and, Mr. Speaker, I predicted this over the weekend - I predicted over the weekend, Sir, that in this debate the government would not try to come to grips with the issue, would not face up to the issues but would attempt to blame it on Ottawa. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to pick up a copy of today's "Daily News" - it came out this morning before this House sat this afternoon - and you will see in the "Daily News", Sir, where I forecast, I had predicted that the government would try to blame this high cost of

living on Ottawa.

Now, Sir, a few weeks ago I did some rough calculations. I think, Mr. Speaker, there are about seven or eight Federal Government departments involved in my research. Mr. Speaker, do you know that out of the figures that I received from these seven or eight or nine Federal departments that Ottawa, Sir, that has been so abused by the Minister of Finance and the Premier, the Premier over in Halifax telling us that Confederation is not working, while at the same time approves an almost \$2 million budget for Nutbeam to go out and celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Confederation. Yet it is not working. Poor old Ottawa only pours, Mr. Speaker, over \$500 million into Newfoundland annually. It will probably go closer to \$700 million or \$800 million this year, Sir. Well, that is more than the total budget of this province.

Well, the Minister of Finance must have a face like a robber's horse to stand up in this honourable House and criticize Ottawa.

I think it is the other end of the horse we are looking at, Mr. Speaker. I have seen horses come into this House, Sir, but it is the first time I saw one come in back foremost.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the huge amount of money poured into Newfoundland and Labrador by the Federal Government, Sir, is responsible for the Province being able to maintain the highest material standard of living in its history while at the same time, Sir, we lead Canada in total unemployment and Mr. Speaker, as I stated outside of this honourable House and I repeat again that it is phoney, Sir, for the Tory administration to try and take credit for what the Liberal Government up in Ottawa is doing.

Mr. Speaker, National Health and Welfare lead the parade of aid in this Province with a whopping total, Sir, just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, a whopping total of well over \$150 million, \$150 million, Sir, and part of that, Mr. Speaker, part of that is helping to finance the Health Science Complex that the minister tried to claim credit for today, a project that was started by the former Liberal administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with what is happening over there at that Health Science Complex. The project has only created a measly handful of jobs, Sir, but they tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the cost has escalated, the cost has escalated, Sir, away beyond the original estimates and as a result, Mr. Speaker, I shot a wire off the day before yesterday to the honourable Mr. LaLonde, the Minister of the Department of National Health and Welfare, to find out, Sir. I want to find out from Mr. LaLonde if the Federal Government, if it is their policy that public tenders be called for contractual services on all construction projects, either wholly or partly financed by funds from the Federal Treasury. I wanted the minister to tell us what care his department has taken to insure, Mr. Speaker, that the awarding of these contracts on the construction of the partially federally financed Memorial University Health Science Complex has been preceded by the calling of public tenders.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am asking questions. I am asking questions of the minister and when I get the answers I will lay the charges.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are making insinuations.

MR. NEARY: I am not making insinuations, Sir. Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge from the information that I have at my disposal, the cost of that Health Science Complex, that multimillion dollar project, Sir, has gone completely out of control. Mr. Speaker, public tenders are not being called.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, does the honourable gentleman permit a question?

MR. NEARY: No. Sit down.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: On the Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the honourable member ... (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: You had your day. You had your day in court. You had your day in court.

MR. CROSBIE: I gather you do not want the facts, you just want the insinuations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The minister had his day in court, Sir and I will have him up a half of a dozen more times before I am finished speaking.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I ask the minister of the department responsible in Ottawa to investigate the escalating costs over on that Health Science Complex. I also suggested to the minister that he withhold any progress payments on that project until a thorough investigation, Sir, was carried out concerning reports that we have of favouritism, patronage, waste and extravagance

and donations, Sir, from -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Order and a point of personal privilege, I am not at all going to sit here and listen to the insinuations of the honourable member for Bell Island with respect to a project presently being carried out in this province under my jurisdiction.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege Your Honour, but just for the benefit of the honourable minister, let me restate my case. We have heard reports about that project, Sir, and we are trying to get the answers and the only way that we can get the answers is through the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have asked all kinds of questions but we have been accused of abusing the question period in this honourable House by the Minister of Finance but we are not getting any answers, Sir, and so I have appealed to the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, Mr. LaLonde, to provide me with the information.

I have asked the minister to investigate certain reports that we have concerning favouritism, alleged patronage, waste and extravagance, and above all, Mr. Speaker, above all we want the minister, if he will do it, and if he will not do it we might find some other way to do it, to tell us about reports of unusual donations by Scrivener Newfoundland Limited.

Mr. Speaker, truth is the best defence in this honourable House. So, Sir, we saw the -and the minister knows I think what I am talking about- the Minister of Finance, Sir, the Minister of Finance, when he has a strong case he will come on strong in this House, when there is no defence, when he has a weak case, Sir, he falls flat and this is exactly what happened to him today in this honourable House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I do not think that was the minister falling, there would be a bigger thud than that, Sir. So, Mr. Speaker, we want to get that information.

The Minister was boasting about this project, and rightly so because it is a good Liberal project, Sir. What we want to find out is if the taxpayers' money is being spent wisely on that project over there at Memorial University and we want to find out if tenders are being called by the project managers in keeping with stated policy of the present government and we want to find out, Sir, if the people of this province, if the taxpayers of this province will have to finance the escalation in the cost or will it be partly financed by the Government of Canada. We want to know what protection our people have against such alleged abuses, Sir, if in fact they are taking place. Will we call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker? I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island has adjourned the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 P.M., this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, at 3:00 P.M.