



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 16

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1975

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment): Mr. Speaker, this is by way of answering many requests I get with reference to credit cards and interest charges on them, so today I will be releasing the following statement. This is addressed to pretty well all the oil companies and the banks and those who are in the credit card business.

"The recently concluded postal strike has caused serious problems for people using your Credit Card Service. Because your customers could not be provided with statements of account, unpaid balances accumulated interest charges during the stoppage in mail delivery. I am informed that you have reached an accommodation with other provinces and waived interest charges accumulated during the strike. As Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs I request that you extend this courtesy to your customers in Newfoundland. An early reply would be appreciated."

I have heard back from some but I just thought I would let the public know just what is happening.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): You informed all the credit card companies?

MR. MURPHY: Pretty well all we know of, the oil companies, the banks and this type of thing. If there is any particular one, they can just contact us, and we will make it promptly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word on that. I think the minister has done a good thing, and the only thing I would ask is whether the government are prepared - assuming some of these charge companies play the game and other do not, because I think there can be no excuse for the charge companies not acceding to the minister's request - would the government contemplate bringing in legislation, in effect,

Mr. Roberts:

to achieve what the minister had asked them to agree to, assuming they do not agree to it?

MR. MURPHY: I do not see there is any reason, Mr. Speaker, why we could not do that. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have already had this understanding from all these companies.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Forestry and Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, Bill No. 13, "An Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Agricultural Marketing Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

HON. R. WELLS (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I undertook, in answer to a question by one of the hon. member's opposite yesterday, to bring him up to date on the position of student residences for the College of Trades and Technology. The preliminary sketches were done - sketches or drawings, but very preliminary ones - they were sent to the principal, Mr. Duggan. They were examined by him, and they have been examined by the students. They have been received back with comments which wherever practical will be incorporated into the design. The final and completed plans they anticipate in the Department of Public Works will be ready within three months.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs, in his capacity as Minister of the Environment. I understand that there has been an oil spill in Conception Bay, somewhere up near the Seal Cove area, Could the minister please tell us whatever he may know about it and particularly what steps are being taken to deal with it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, unfortunately, - I do not know if 'unfortunately' is the word - but up to the present, I have not heard a word, but I will certainly contact the office immediately and find out if we can get right onto it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, Sir. Would the minister inform the House whether Mr. William Millen, former manager of the Marystown Shipyard, submitted a letter of resignation to the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

HON. J. LUNDRIGAN (Minister of Industrial and Rural Development):

To my knowledge, Sir, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the minister table a copy of Mr. Millen's resignation or give the House the date of the letter of resignation?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, there is no reason why I should give that information, but I will look into it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, Sir. In connection with the government's proposed programme to build stern trawlers in Marystown, has the Marystown Shipyard taken delivery of steel or any other machinery or equipment for the construction of these trawlers?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, first of all there is no commitment by government at this stage to build stern trawlers in Marystown. There was a question raised in the House wherein an indication was given that that is an area of exploration on the part of government. As far as steel being available is concerned there is considerable steel at present on site in Marystown, which could be utilized for the construction of stern trawlers or any other ship that might be necessary, which was purchased some time ago and certainly puts us in a good position to be able to respond to any construction requests at the shipyard.

MP. NEARY: Would the minister undertake to give the House the dollar value of the steel on hand that was purchased to construct these steel trawlers?

MP. LUNDPIGAN: Your Honour, there was considerable steel purchased to construct quite a number of steel trawlers. As a result of the ongoing programme of the last number of years there have been quite a number of trawlers, as the hon. member is aware, constructed at Marystown. It has been an ongoing programme and we are very, very pleased with it. We increased the work force from 200 to 450 people as a result of that activity during that period.

As a result of the expected development of trawlers, there is steel now in place. I cannot give the dollar value of it but I believe perhaps it is well in excess of \$1 million, if not approaching \$2 million worth of steel that is able to be -

MP. NEARY: Or \$3 million.

MP. LUNDPIGAN: Or \$3 million the hon. member suggests. Perhaps \$3 million or \$5 million. Maybe in value it might be even \$4 million or \$5 million now if it had to be purchases at today's prices. I cannot give you the exact - through you, Sir - the exact amount of the value that we paid for it at the time, or the yards paid for it. But it might be approximating \$2 million.

Some of this, Your Honour, is being deployed for the construction of the new tug that has been contracted for and has already been placed in position for the construction of that tug.

MP. NEARY: Well, a supplementary Sir -

MP. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman makes his supplementary, I might suggest that this be the last one I would allow on this particular question so that other members may have an opportunity to ask other questions.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if the money, whether it is \$2 million or \$3 million for this steel, if the money was given to the shipyard as a grant, if they were authorized to borrow the money to buy this steel or what financial arrangements were made

MP. NEAPY:

by the government and the shipyards to purchase this steel for these stern trawlers that were supposed to be constructed?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, the Marystown shipyards is an independent corporation in the sense that it is a full-blown corporation which has a credit arrangement and good support from government, and it operates as a normal business. Is the hon. member, Sir, suggesting there is something amiss or wrong or not in order? If he is, then he should lay his case before the House and before the people so that it can be properly explored. He should not be permitted, Sir, to engage in -

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MP. LUNDRIGAN: - suggestions that could result in -

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MP. LUNDRIGAN: - some people getting the impression that we are not satisfied -

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MP. LUNDRIGAN: - with the operations at the shipyards.

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister is in debate now.

MP. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer as given to me by the hon. the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development. I wish to debate the matter at the Late Show next Thursday evening.

MP. SPEAKER: I wish to point out before recognizing the hon. gentleman to my right that, as has been pointed out a number of times, that any form of debate in posing the question or in answering is out of order.

MP. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of something or other. May I ask Your Honour if it is the established, ancient, established principle that when Mr. Speaker speaks there has to be complete silence by all members and all must take their seats? Is that not the established rule?

MP. SPEAKER: It is my understanding of it, yes.

MP. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. If I have over-extended myself in responding, I apologize. That is the established rule which I have practiced for quite a number of years and I would not

want, Sir, to develop any bad habits as a result of some of the examples I am seeing in the House these days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Industrial Development about the same subject, the Marystown shipyard. I wonder if the minister is now in a position to bring us up to date— or bring the House up to date as to what the projected deficit for the current year may be at the shipyard? He indicated sometime ago, I understand, a deficit in a ball park figure. I wonder if he is in a position to update us a little more at this time?

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

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Your Honour, I could not give an off the top of the head indication to the member on that particular question. The present situation shows the yard, to my knowledge, the latest information I have, in a small profit position for the present year. The accumulated losses over a period of, since the government became involved, is not nearly as significant as has been stated publicly. Certainly when the estimates of the department are before the House we are most anxious to share any information necessary to convince the hon. gentleman that we are satisfied with the operations at the shipyard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir, (Mr. Simmons).

Mr. Simmons:

I wonder is the minister in a position now to indicate whether there are any further layoffs in the cards, he will appreciate that term, in the cards for the shipyard say in the foreseeable future, the next two to three months or so?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well it is pretty difficult when you are dealing with the shipyard situation to be able to project definitively what the circumstances would be in terms of layoffs or employment. The shipyard industry is always a fairly dramatically fluctuating situation as far as work forces are concerned. We have already had a layoff of over 100 people which certainly we are not very happy about. We are doing our very best to encourage contracts to be placed with the shipyards to ensure a good work force, so that we will not lose our work force as a result of - what would you call it?-the mobility of the work force to other areas. There is quite an effort being made to look at - we have had some work done with respect to the Board of Directors that will be in place early in the New Year, the hon. member might have heard this statement in recent days, and certainly there has been a tremendous effort by government to ensure that we do not have any displacement of the work force at that shipyard, a work force that we are very happy about. There is a tremendous amount of training and effort gone into this and we want to ensure the continuation of that force.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the minister. Is he aware of any plan to lay off a substantial number of men at the shipyard, 100 or so men within the next month or so? Is he aware of any such plan or can he deny that there is such a proposal or can he bring us up to date on this matter?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, I wonder is the hon. member in possession of information which should be shared with me and the department?

Mr. Lundrigan:

Obviously he is not asking a question just to be provocative and I would certainly appreciate it if he could be more specific in giving this kind of a presentation to the House. There is no specific present plan to lay off people at the yard. I indicated to the hon. gentleman that there will always be fluctuations and if the work is not forthcoming at this point or another point or some other point you will get a change in the work force. If there is work coming on stream, of course, you will get an increase in the employment. And other than making that general statement there is nothing of a specific nature, of a useful nature that I could add at the moment. And we are very anxious that the yard continues to have a good image, a good responsible presentation to the world community, and I hope that all hon. gentlemen share that kind of sentiment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary: Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister to say that there are no layoffs planned in his knowledge as a Director of the corporation. Can he then indicate whether the Marystown Shipyard has been successful in obtaining any new contracts for additional construction at the yard following the completion of the present shipyard?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would like to clarify the point. I think I did make it clear that I did not indicate to the hon. member that at no point in the future there would not be an increase in employment or a decrease in employment. I did not indicate that.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, oh! No, Your Honour, I hope that the hon. gentleman is responsible enough to interpret that comment in the proper fashion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister responsible enough to give it in the proper fashion?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The minister, Your Honour, is going to try to be as responsible as he can, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will exercise the proper restraint in his presentation or projections. In any event, Your Honour, there is no firm contract for the yard at the present moment beyond the new tug that will be constructed. And this I hope will improve and I hope in the coming year there will be work in place. We have had Mr. John Rannie at the yard for a number of weeks right now. He will continue there until we get the new manager in place, who should have been here a week ago except for the complications in immigration which has delayed his coming on stream for a couple of week. Also, Sir, we have had a Mr. Stein from the Maryland Shipyards, a retired gentleman, a Newfoundlander, who served his lifetime in the business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Con Stein?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Stein a man that we have been very, very impressed with, who has been on site there -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good! Good!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: -who has done an assessment of the capabilities and the new type of work that we must attract to the yards in view of the changing ship building industry, He is making a report. We are looking very positively at the shipyards, The future is good for the shipyards, It might not be tomorrow morning, it might not be next month, And we are restructuring our board to bring on stream people who have a background in the industry so that we can ensure that that yard will not only have continuation of a good work force but growth in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question on the same subject, but a little different aspect of it; would the minister lay upon the table of the House at an early date, Sir, the financial statements for the yard, for the most recent fiscal year which, I assume, was the year ended March 31 past? This is December, that is eight or nine months ago. They should be in the minister's hands by now. Would he undertake to lay them upon the table of the House very quickly, Sir?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, whatever responsibilities exist under the legislation in terms of having to provide documentation will be honoured by my department the same as they were by my predecessor, and as far as information which is of a nature that revolves around the internal operations of the shipyard in detail, if that is required, we can make it available. I do not think it is necessary for the House to have any kind of information other than what is required by any corporation to be presented to the House by law.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I cannot debate the minister's answer. I would like to. I think he is arrogant and uninformative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must call to the hon. gentleman's attention as I did previously in this sitting that any form of debate on the asking of questions or the answering is quite out of order, and that the sort of political one-upmanship or any kind of one-upmanship should be saved for debate and not for the question period.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour.

If I fell into the path of temptation, I am grateful to Your Honour for bringing me back on the straight and narrow.

My question is: Could the minister indicate the size of the deficit incurred by the yard in the twelve months which ended on March 31, 1975? After all we are the shareholders, Sir?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I could give a general ballpark figure, Your Honour, but I am not completely knowledgeable as to the round figure, I can get the information, and as I said to the hon. gentleman earlier on, or his colleague to his left or perhaps to his right, the hon. gentleman and other gentlemen will be able to have whatever information is necessary when we debate our estimates and when we are required to make it available to the House by the regulations governing the shipyard incorporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, To the best of the minister's knowledge, could he indicate to the House the reason given in the letter of resignation, if there issued a letter of resignation, the reason given by Mr. Millen for leaving his employment at the shipyard?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, first of all I really appreciate the chance here to get my feet wet in the House. This is a great day for me, I was complaining yesterday about not having the opportunity. But in any event, Sir, I am looking forward to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is like the Great Big Sea Hove in Long Beach!

MR. SMALLWOOD: It landed in the Tory minister's feet.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you. I am sure that is great. Thank you, Sir. I appreciate that.

In any event, Your Honour, the fact of the matter is that we have in place new management at the shipyard. We are very happy with this. The question was about the reasons for the resignation and the letter that came from it. I think it is in the best interest of the shipyard that we not fight old battles, as the hon. gentleman from the area nods in agreement. We have had a new manager in place. The hon. gentleman who did resign his position there did it to pursue his own ambitions and, of course, I think it is a responsible position of a government, responsible for the administration of the economy of the Province, that we not engage in trying to suggest that there is something remiss in government's responsibility or something amiss in the behaviour of an individual. We have a responsibility to

Mr. Lundrigan:

the people of Marystown and that shipyard to ensure that there is no public anomisity and expression of negative feeling -

MR. NEARY: Did he resign or did you fire him?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - which could have hurt us in our efforts to attract new business to the shipyard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I know it has been pretty long-drawn-out, but would the hon. minister tell me if this Conrad Stein - first of all what his function is at the shipyard? Is he the Conard Stein who is the son, first of all, a Newfoundlander born, the son of the famous F. Stein who helped to build a railway across Newfoundland and who was my old school chum at Bishop Feild College? What is his function, and when did he come? What is he doing? He is a famous shipbuilder in the United States, that I know.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, Sir, I am not obviously able to give all the answers to the hon. gentleman's question. I think it is very interesting to hear the background that he has. I have had a sort of brief presentation to me on the background of the particular Newfoundlander. He has had tremendous experience -

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Baltimore or Philadelphia.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - in Maryland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Baltimore.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, in Maryland shipyards, specifically. I am referring -

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Baltimore.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In Baltimore.

- that he ended up his career in the shipbuilding business. He is retired now. He spends half his year down with the hon. gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Florida?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In Florida.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not spend half a year down there. This House stays open too much.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We are very anxious, like we are with the hon. member to have him back in Newfoundland expressing his energies for our people. He is doing an assessment from his own knowledge, an independent look at the yard, to look at efficiencies, how we can modify our approach to attracting new business, because we are in a different kind of a period in the shipbuilding industry than we were, say, three years ago when the trawler programmes in shipyards were of a greater magnitude than they are today.

MR. S'MALLWOOD: Who was smart enough to get it? Who got him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry -

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde. (Mr. F. Powe)

MR. F. POWE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House Leader for the answers to some of the questions I asked previously. Would the House Leader, Sir, indicate what these residences are for, whether they are for the College of Trades and Technology or the anticipated polytechnical institute, and where these residences will be established, whether it is on the acquired land in the area of the Trades and Technology and when construction is likely to take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: They are for the students in the College of Trades and Technology and they will be built over there behind the college on land which was acquired, you know, within the past few months for that purpose. When they are going to be actually constructed, that is something of course I cannot tell because the thing is not advanced that far. A decision will be made as to what funding is going to be in the estimates for the coming financial year.

MR. F. POWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate to the House, Sir, what the status of the polytechnical institute is, whether preliminary plans have been drawn up or whether any detailed plans have been drawn up and where is it expected that the polytechnical institute will be situated, whether it will be close to the residences or not?

MR. WELLS: I cannot give an answer to that at this time. It is not advanced far enough for that yet.

MR. F. POWE: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, is the minister indicating that no action is taking place on the polytechnical institute because of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would consider that question in a form of debate.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier care to clarify to the House, Sir, a statement made outside the House in connection

MR. NEARY:

with the paper workers strike, that they would be forced back to work under certain circumstances? Would the Premier care to clarify or elaborate on that statement?

PREMIER MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, no such statement was certainly made by myself. What I did say regarding the paper makers strike at the present time was that we were waiting to see the result of the Anti-inflation Review Board's decision on the Irving contract settlement in New Brunswick because it has always been the pattern in Eastern Canada that from Ontario east at least there has been a very definite and identifiable pattern between the various mills and the various unions.

Now, the situation is once the Anti-inflation Board has made their position clear regarding that particular contract, I think it is our duty as a government to get together with the union leaders and the companies to see if there is not something we can do to try to bring an end to this particular strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Fisheries care to clear up an incorrect answer that he gave me to a question yesterday in connection with John Leckie, a stop-payment on a bill submitted by John Leckie and Company for \$35,000? The question to the minister was, are there any more bills of this nature, how many, and is this the subject of a police investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CAPTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of having misled the House either wittingly or unwittingly on this matter. I did tell the House that the accounts covering gear replacement under the federal-provincial 1974 gear replacement programme had been frozen by the department pending the outcome of an investigation that is now underway. I told the House too that the department had rejected a statement from John Leckie Limited for \$35,000 to cover a two-dollar-a-pound subsidy that was being given by the department on 17,000 pounds of twine, a two-dollar-a-pound subsidy on twine that was being made available by

MR. CARTEP:

the provincial government at the time. The claim was rejected on the base of information that we received to the extent that Leckie's were selling the twine off at a much reduced price. Despite the fact that they were doing that, they still charged a two-dollar-a-pound subsidy for the twine. That is the basis on which the invoice was rejected, and I might add subsequently withdrawn by that company.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister inform the House if he has instructed his accountants or the officials of his department to go back over old invoices of John Leckie and Company to see if there were similar bills sent to the government and paid to Messrs. Leckie and Company? Is the minister investigating that aspect of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CAPTED: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the officials of my department are checking very thoroughly statements coming in from any fishing gear supply company and the fact that this particular one was detected proves that they are keeping a pretty close eye on what is happening with respect to invoices, bills coming in from fish gear supply companies for payment under the bounty programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism, Sir. Would the Minister of Tourism indicate to the House what action his government have taken on a promise that was made to have and provide water and sewerage in an area called North Pond Heights Trailer Park in the Municipality of Torbay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to answer it. It is not a matter which is under my department but there was a promise made to those people for water and sewer, and tenders were called and were about to be awarded until the Prime Minister announced his anti-inflationary programme, with which the Province co-operated, and this project among others were deferred. So as soon as those projects come back on the rail I am sure that one will be attended to. With regard to the road, I indicated to the people that the road would be paved as soon as the developer and the Town Council got together and determined who in fact owned the road. It is half public and half private, obviously we cannot pave a road which is private.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the hon. the Premier, Sir - and this is in connection with Marystown again - would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if in May of this year he made a statement to the joint town councils on the Burin Peninsula that the shipyards was the best managed in Canada and if the Premier made such a statement why did they accept the resignation of Mr. Millen or why was Mr. Millen's services terminated?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have undoubtedly said that the shipyard was - I probably said one of the best managed in Canada. The yard has done exceptionally good work. The workmanship there is good. The management, which includes, of course, foremen, superintendents, people like that is also good as far as we are led to believe. As far as Mr. Millen is concerned I think it is probably fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the career of Mr. Millen is not unlike that from the member for LaPoile in that he probably saw that in the best interest of his constituents and going to greener pastures was the right thing to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Premier. And it is with regards to the answer he just gave the hon. member for LaPoile with regard to the situation in the paper industry, is the Premier aware - I am not aware and this may appear to be a stupid question, but I am very concerned about what is going on in Central Newfoundland - is the Premier aware that the Irving settlement is indeed under review by the Federal Wage and Price Control Board and has he got any idea or is there any of determining when a ruling will be forthcoming?

PREMIER MOORES: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, I thought I made that clear that we were awaiting that ruling and that it is before the Board. The situation as I am led to believe is that we can expect a ruling either late this week, which is today, or early next week.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Health. Has the minister been in touch with the Board of the Waterford Hospital and with the authorities operating the other institutions, which I believe are all operated by the various departments of government, in respect of the situation which might occur - or will occur, if we wish - assuming the NAPE units involved go ahead and do strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add to what I gave in the House a couple of days ago that we are in constant touch with the

MR. COLLINS: Board. Of course, the whole matter which the hon. member refers to falls under the jurisdiction of Treasury Board.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, I am not asking these questions which relate to Treasury Board, I thank the minister for his answer. Now I have a further supplementary question on this; can the minister assure us that there is a contingency plan ready to cope with the situation which would arise if in fact a strike does go ahead? I am referring, of course, to Waterford Hospital to which he answers to the House, Sir.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that particular hospital is operated by a Board and I have every confidence in that Board to take whatever precautions are necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: But has he been in touch with them on this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the hon. the Premier here, Sir.

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if Mr. Millen's service was terminated to go back to look after his constituents or if he submitted -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - a letter of resignation? And if so,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: which constituency -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - is he gone to look after?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If my memory is correct, and it is not over a very long period of time, I recall that question has been asked in perhaps different forms and with a different introduction but certainly essentially the same question several times and it is not allowed to repeat a question in a different form on a continuing basis. So that being the case I have to rule the hon. gentleman's question out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well I will rephrase the question then, Mr. Speaker, by asking the hon. Premier to which constituents he referred to in his answer he gave me a few moments ago that Mr. Millen was looking after?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier Moores.

PREMIER MOORES: I was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that his interest being the same as the member's from LaPoile's that in the best interest of his constituents from where he was working and where the member was elected, he moved to greener pastures where success would be more available, and that is all I am going to say about it at this time.

MR. NEARY: Where? Where did he move to?

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea. Where do you go when you go?

MR. NEARY: You know where I went -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. I shall point out that this will be the last question and the last answer.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. H. Collins). I wonder whether he would indicate to the

Mr. Simmons:

House whether there are any planned layoffs in any of the cottage hospitals, and in particular the Burin Cottage Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. R. WELLS: Order 11.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 11.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Minimum Wage Act." (Bill No. 11). If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, just a few words to close off the debate on this bill. The debate that went on yesterday afternoon was fairly wide ranging. In many cases, although it was interesting, the comments were not related to the bill as such, so I do not plan to go over that in any detail. I think there are a couple of misconceptions and this is apparent from the comments of hon. members who did speak on it. Some hon. members first of all kept referring to the bill raising the minimum wage. The bill does not raise the minimum wage, that is a function that is carried out by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under the present act. All this bill does is empower the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to provide for a different formula for overtime rates and a formula for basic call-in pay which we determine we will fix at three hours if a person is called to work for any reason.

I know that we will get screams from the trade union movement that we have not gone far enough. But I think this is as far as we can go at this particular point in time. We are bringing the minimum wage up to close to the national average, if not at the national average. Our minimum wage bill is comparable to anything else in Canada. We are later on this year going to bring in another bill relating to all labour standards. This will be more encompassing and will be a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Maynard:

We cannot go up to the amount of \$4.00 per hour which was suggested by the trade union movement. It is going to take some time for us to get up there although I suppose eventually with inflation and all this sort of thing we will get there. But I agree in that regard with the comments of the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the trade union movement should really get out and organize the bulk of the people who are unorganized in this Province, and should get the wage rates up in that manner through collective bargaining, as opposed to having to depend on government to raise the minimum wage and thereby up the salaries of a lot of people in this Province. It is unfortunate that so many employers in this Province consider the minimum wage \$2.20 or \$2.50 or whatever the case might be as the wage instead of considering

MR. MAYNARD: it as a minimum wage. I would like to appeal to employers to look at the minimum wage for what it is, a bare, basic minimum and to try to look at their employees as something more than people who are there for the sake of filling up a chair or a position and try to pay them the wages that they really earn in their work place. I say again it is unfortunate that so many employers will take the \$2.50 an hour as of January 1, and that is all that they will pay and they will try to convince their employees that that is all they need to pay and the government has legislated that amount.

But that is the situation in which we operate and I suppose it will go on for some time but I hope that in time employers will change from that particular attitude. I hope the trade unions will also change from the present attitude regarding minimum wage and labour standards whereby they ask government to do everything and I do not think it should be government's responsibility to bring all the benefits to the labour force in Newfoundland. All we can do is set the basic minimums and hope that employers and the trade unions will bring up the level of remuneration to the work force in another manner.

That is about all that I can say on this bill, Mr. Speaker. If there is anything further in committee stage that hon. members would like to question I would be very happy to answer the questions that are raised.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Minimum Wage Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS:

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure about how much time I have left. Now I understand I have no time left. By leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would request two or three minutes just to try to summarize the points that I was trying to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to continue?

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sir, the other night I attempted to build a case in support of the amendment that we deeply regret the failure of the government to disclose completely and fully the present

MP. ROWE: financial situation of this Province. And Sir, I also gave a number of examples where the administration in the months and years and immediate days previous to the election painted a somewhat glorious picture and raised the expectations of our people with regard to the resource development of this Province and the provision of the social and public services with respect to the employment situation and indeed the very financial stability of the Province, Sir, and after the election we got the full truth in that respect. And Sir, we are deeply saddened, and we take very strong exception to the methodology, the method by which the government or the administration went about raising the expectations of the people previous to this election, Sir, and I think the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy went further than anybody in this debate so far in meeting the request of this amendment. Unfortunately, Sir, the time factor was a little out of place. It is now that we get the full admission of the magnitude of the financial problem facing this Province, Sir, and I sincerely hope, Sir, and I was about to make this point when I ran out of time on Thursday night, I sincerely hope that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy and indeed the Minister of Finance are not

MR. POWE:

trying to employ or use political psychology in this particular instance, that they are trying to paint a very bleak picture, a very dismal picture so that in a year or two's time the people, you know, will say well it is not so bad after all. I hope that they are not trying to use that kind of method.

Because I was about to make the point the other night - and for some strange reason we had a point of order on it - that the Premier is a very astute politician. But we have reason to question the wisdom of the Premier with respect to administering this Province. Sir, I will simply end by saying that we are extremely saddened that the government find themselves in the position that they find themselves in at the present time, and it is a position of their own making. Unfortunately the people of the Province are the ones to suffer. Sir, we are not asking the people to forgive the administration. We are simply asking hon. members in this House to have patience, the people of the Province to have patience, hang in there, Sir, because they simply do not know what they do, Sir, in this particular instance. I am wondering if the administration is capable at all of handling the difficult problem, financial problem that is a creation of their own making. Thank you, Sir.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is an amendment moved by my friend and colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Powe) just referred to it but perhaps I might be allowed to read it so that we are at least all of one mind as to precisely what we are debating and what will come to a vote shortly.

The motion, as I understand it, the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that the budget motion, the motion now before the House, that we go into a Committee on Ways and Means, that that motion be amended by striking everything after the word 'that' and adding the following words in place of it. Those words would be, "this House regrets the failure of the government to disclose completely and fully the present financial situation of this Province and the government thereof."

MR. ROBERTS:

Now, we have heard some magnificent performances, Mr. Speaker, as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and on this side of the House tried somehow to escape from the thrust and the force of that amendment. I do not think anybody on the other side will vote for it. I regret very much that there are some on this side of the House sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, who also have indicated that they are not going to vote for it. They have given their reasons and they speak for themselves and so be it.

The amendment, Sir, really quite simply says that the government have not come clean. I think that the speech made by my hon. friend from Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was a very, very fine speech indeed. I think he made his case amply. I for one intend to support the amendment and I know that each of my colleagues in the official Opposition also intend to support it. We believe—and I have listened to most of the arguments advanced, I have listened to some awfully windy and twisty thoughts put forward — but we believe, Sir, that the government have not given us a full and a frank and a complete financial statement or a statement of the financial picture affecting this Province and the government thereof. We think that the Minister of Finance does not deserve the confidence of this House in respect to the budget which he delivered here on the 24th day of November.

So, I am going to vote for the amendment. So are all of my colleagues on this side, and we are going to vote for it because we think the case is well made and truly made and has not been answered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate began, this debate has been around the budget which the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody), brought into the House about three weeks ago. It was a new budget. It was a Fall budget. We are told — and I believe this to be a correct statement — that it is the only Fall budget since Confederation. It is the only time in the twenty-six years this Province has been a Province, that we have

Mr. Roberts.

had more than one budget in a year. That was put forward, I believe, by one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I made a note of the statement, but I did not note the hon. gentleman's name, or an indication, so I cannot identify him any more precisely, but it was put forward, in any event, as if it were somehow a claim of pride, as if somehow the government had done something good by bringing in a second budgetary statement in the current financial year, the current fiscal year. Well, Sir, whatever the reasons why this budget was brought in, and I will have a few words to say what I think them to be, what I believe them to be, they certainly are not reasons in which the government of this Province can take any pride. I believe that the reason why the Minister of Finance brought in his budget was that the budget statement which was submitted in the House last March, I believe by the then Minister of Finance, Mr. H. V. R. Earle, who met the fate he deserved at the hand of the electorate, although he did not accept that, the budget statement submitted on March 12, 1975 was not intended to be and was not in fact anything like a financial statement of the affairs of this Province for the twelve months beginning on April 1, 1975, the current financial year. I believe that the budget which we now have was intended all along to be brought in after the election. I have to be careful, Sir, and use words that I believe to be parliamentary, and there have certainly been a great number of rulings about words that are not parliamentary, and I shall try to refrain from using any of those words. But I believe that this budget statement, which the hon. Minister of Finance brought in, was intended all along to be the companion piece to the one which the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Earle, brought in March past.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think that the budget which was brought in in March past was not intended to be a budget for the year. It was intended rather as a document which would somehow enable the government to skate past the election, which they believed was coming, which some of them may have known was coming, and which in fact did come.

Mr. Roberts.

That in itself, Sir, I think is a sad enough thing. I believe it is the first time in the history not just of this Province, but of this country. This House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, first sat in 1832, and it has sat every year since then, with the exception of the fifteen years between the time when the House voted itself out of existence in February, 1934 - a Tory Government then, I might add, too - until the Province became a Province in 1949 and the House met, I believe, in June or July or August of 1949. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) would remember as would the hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) because each of them was a member of that General Assembly.

I believe this is the first time we have ever had a budget brought in, in all of the years there have been budgets and even during the years when there was no House, Mr. Speaker, there was a budget speech, as I recall it. I have been told that whoever was the Commissioner for Finance, an Englishman, as I recall it - they would not let a Newfoundlander hold that job - would go down to the Newfoundland Hotel at some place, before a meeting of the Board of Trade, and would read a budget speech. There would be a budget speech each year. I do not know if anybody here recalls it. The Minister of Fisheries is nodding. Is that what was done?

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

The Commissioner of Finance would go and make a budget. There is a budget speech every single year. This is the first year we have ever had two. I think the government of this Province, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite, set out to try to hoax the Province.

The statement which the hon. gentleman, the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Earle, brought in in March, was not intended to be the budget for the year. I think that is now obvious. It was intended

Mr. Roberts.

only to enable the government to skate through the election campaign and somehow to try to fool the people. Well, Sir, they may have fooled the people. They got re-elected, whether or not because the people were fooled or not is a matter which one can argue. They did get re-elected. They may have fooled the people. But there is a very old and very wise saying in Newfoundland, "But fool me once, shame on you; but fool me twice, shame on me." This government may have fooled the people of Newfoundland once. They will not fool them a second time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance himself has admitted the truth of what I am saying. He stands convicted, on his own evidence, on the words in his own budget,

MR. ROBERTS:

The very first opening words, Mr. Speaker, of the budget speech which the minister read in the House. I will read it right from the point where he said, Mr. Speaker, it begins, "On October 10, 1975 in addition to being president of Treasury Board, I took on the added portfolio of Minister of Finance. Having already held the Treasury Board portfolio for more than a year, I was completely aware of the financial situation facing the Province and the need to put together a revised financial plan. Just six weeks after assuming my new duties it comes as no great surprise to be presenting an interim 1975 Fall budget." He then launches into the speech.

Well now what the minister there says, Mr. Speaker, is that on the 10th day of October he had long been aware - I do not want to misquote him, he may not have used the word 'long' - he was completely aware of the financial situation facing the Province, and he was equally aware of the need to put together a revised financial plan. Now, I want to know when the minister became aware of that, Sir. Did he become aware of it - he became aware of it before he was Minister of Finance. He told us that. He was president of the Treasury Board. When did he become aware of it? Was it last March when Mr. Earle, the then Finance Minister, brought in the budget speech? Was the present Minister of Finance who was then president of the Treasury Board at that time aware? Or was it later? When did this great revelation come to him? Was it, as somebody has suggested, at eight fifteen in the evening of Thursday, the 16th day of September in the year of Our Lord, 1975? Or was it before that?

The hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the House Leader, had been going around the Province and portions thereof during the Summer period making speeches which were reported in the newspapers as having said in effect, we cannot go on as we are. We cannot afford to do what we are attempting to do. We cannot financially carry on. Well then if the Minister without Portfolio who was then, I believe, the Minister of Health at that point in time, if he knew it in the Summer, did the Minister of Finance know it? I think he did. I think

MP. ROBERTS:

that this is the shabbiest display I have ever seen any government put on or I have ever heard of any government putting on.

The Diefenbaker administration in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, one year went an entire twelve months without ever getting supply, without ever getting supply! They carried on for the full twelve months on a procedure known as Governor General's warrants. There was no budget. That I had always thought was the shabbiest record of any government. But, Sir, this administration here has reached a new low in its lack of candor and its lack of presenting the truth and the facts to the people of this Province. I submit, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing at all in the budget speech brought in the other day by the Minister of Finance, nothing of any important substance of which he was not or ought not to have been aware when Mr. Earle brought in his budget in March of 1975, eight or nine months ago. It is a serious charge, Sir, but I make it because I believe it to be true. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, is enough to convince me to vote for this amendment.

This government have not been honest. They have not made public all the facts, and they still have not done it. Let me mention now another matter where they have been less than forthcoming and less than candid. The Rural Development Authority, the great Rural Development Authority, in too many ways, Sir, a fraud. I am not saying a criminal fraud but a fraud in that the hopes of many people were invested in that and they have been shattered and destroyed and disillusionment has set in.

Two or three years ago when the late member for Trinity South, Mr. James Peid, was a member of the administration, before he met his come-uppance at the hands of the electorate in his constituency, he tabled as the Minister of Rural Development a list of the loans which had been made by the Rural Development Authority. Since then the government have consistently and constantly refused to make public any updated lists. Now, why? Why? It may be said that we in the Opposition criticized some of the loans, and certainly we did and

December 12, 1975

Tape 585

IB-3

MR. ROBERTS:

so we should have because it revealed, that list revealed that
among the Rural Development projects for which loans had been made -
I suspect,

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, the Auditor General will pick this up and so he should because I think it is without the ambit of the Act, that these loans are probably unlawful under the Rural Development Authority Act - but among the purposes for which the rural development loans were made were such great rural development projects as mortuaries, newspapers and other projects which are anything but rural development, whatever they may or may not be.

Also, of course, in that list there appeared the names of three gentlemen, each of whom had contested an election in 1971 or 1972 as a Tory candidate. And we criticized that. We said, what right have they to get loans, because some of them were of dubious probity.

The hon. member for LaPoile, as he now is, criticized rightly the fact that his opponent, Mr. Bernard Fitzpatrick had been given loans, I believe \$15,000 or \$20,000, for projects on Bell Island, even though Mr. Fitzpatrick was resident at the time and for all I know still is in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: He is over on Bell Island.

MR. ROBERTS: Is he on Bell Island now? I thank the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Excuse me, he got a loan from the Rural Development Authority for \$7,500 I think it was for greenhouses, and then went to the Newfoundland Farm Products and got a loan to buy some farming equipment.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. gentleman, I guess that was a question, Mr. Speaker, and I thank him for the question. I thought it was a good question and it contained some information of which the House should be aware.

So why will they not table it now? All they will say is that you are attacking individuals. The only names were mentioned were three Tory candidates, men who before they went to the Rural Development Authority had already inserted themselves in the public eye and they were not attacked in any way. The government were criticized for making loans to those three, and so they should have been, and so they were and so they would be again. But the government will not make public - a cover-up? What are they hiding? Are they hiding the complete failure of

MR. ROBERTS: the programme? Are they? Are they hiding pay-offs or injudicious loans to friends and allies. I do not know. Nobody in Newfoundland knows. All we know is that we are lashing out money that we, the people of Newfoundland, are lashing out money and there is no accountability for it.

The present Minister of Rural Development who is new, new to this position, new to elective ministerial office, should come clean. He should lay all his cards upon the table face up. And he does not have to answer for it except in the Parliamentary sense. He was not the minister concerned. But what are the government trying to hide? Why will they not come clean? Because if they do not make that list public, Mr. Speaker, then many fair-minded people, most fair-minded people will conclude the government are trying to hide something. It is another instance where there is what appears to be a cover-up, and merely saying that some names were mentioned is not a defence at all. People who get loans from the public, who get loans from the public chest, should not mind in the least if their names are mentioned in a fair and an honourable way. And they were and they should have been and they would be again.

Now let us look at another point in the Budget Speech of the minister where I submit the government have not come clean. And I talk about the projected yields from the tax papers, from the tax sources. Our tax sources as the government of a Province are quite limited, very limited. It is not a difficult art for the gentleman in the Finance Department or the Treasury Board, wherever that function is now located, to make public, to give the minister in preparing his budget accurate forecasts, accurate forecasts of what the revenues will be.

I will come in a moment to talk about equalization. I cannot call it a deliberate falsification but if I could I would. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that the way in which this Budget Speech was put together on that head is very disturbing indeed. But even now let us just look at the projected tax yields on some of our tax sources. The retail

MR. ROBERTS: sales tax: My friend, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, dealt with this in some considerable detail and I do not propose to repeat that. I do wish to refer to them because I think it shows again why this amendment should be carried. It shows again that this government have not come clean.

Retail sales tax, the original estimates for 1975-76

Mr. Roberts:

should a budget, an income, an estimated income from that head of revenue of \$107.6 millions. The revised estimates show \$126.8 millions. Now that is fair enough, Sir, it could be said there has been a tax increase. And there has been. It is the fifth or sixth or seventh tax increase since the hon. gentleman opposite assumed office, But there was a tax increase, The rate has been increased by this House over the votes of everybody on this side, but the government had the majority and so they carried the day, increased by 25 per cent, from eight cents on the dollar to ten cents on the dollar. And that tax is now in effect. If Your Honour goes out to buy a bull's eye, or at least to buy twenty cents worth of bull's eyes, on Your Honour's way to Your Honour's home tonight Your Honour will have to pay ten per cent towards the government as a tax. It started as 3 per cent many years ago, then it went to 5 per cent, then it went to 6 per cent, then it went to 7 per cent, then it went to 8 per cent and that is now 10 per cent.

Now is that figure accurate, Sir? The government were projecting a 27 per cent increase in the tax yields, and yet their own information, their own flash sheets which come flashing out from the priorities and planning department downstairs show only an 11.7 per cent increase in retail sales. It leads one to question, Mr. Speaker, if this were a cookbook it would be a very bad cookbook indeed. Even the economic - not even the figures are consistent, The government's economic outlook showed a projected increase of 13.0 per cent in the retail sales. And the retail sales tax, Mr. Speaker, is related directly to retail sales. It is the clearest and most easily understandable of all our taxes, It is a straight percentage of retail sales in the Province. So how do they explain, Sir?

Was the budget accurate in March? If so, how do they explain that discrepancy. Let us look at another one, Sir, another of the important tax sources for this Province, the personal income tax, a very big yield. It was originally projected for this year, it is here on the books, at \$86 million, \$86.2 million. The revised

Mr. Roberts:

estimates show it at being \$89 million with a very, very small tax increase, very small, one point for half the year on forty, is it? I have not got it calculated out, but it is about that. Maybe it is less than 1 per cent of the tax yields. During the last fiscal year the government's revenues from the personal income tax amounted to \$60.5 million. The figure before us now is a 47 per cent increase, \$60.5 millions to \$89 millions. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a phenomenal rate of increase. The increase in personal income is only marginally above the rate of inflation, and that is about 11.2 per cent, so let us call the increase in personal income about 12 per cent. Now how do the government explain this? I am not saying they cannot explain it. Maybe there is an explanation. But I am saying that the financial advisers to whom I have spoken are unable to understand it.

Now the minister - I regret he is not here today, I understand he is in Ottawa about Her Majesty's business - the minister can solve this quite easily because, Mr. Speaker, that figure in the estimates, in the budget is not plucked out of thin air, it is not even made up by the officials here, That figure, Sir, is sent to us by the Government of Canada, because we do not collect an income tax in this Province. We impose one, but we do not collect it. The tax is collected by the Government of Canada, by the Department of National Revenue of Canada, by the hon. Mr. Bud Cullen and his officials, They collect our tax, it is a percentage of the federal tax, the same in every province across Canada with the exception of Quebec which imposes its own tax and collects its own tax. Every province imposes its own tax but only Quebec collects on its own, The other provinces collect by Ottawa. So Ottawa each year send a note off to the Minister of Finance or the Provincial Treasurer, or whatever he is called, to the provinces, and it says something like, Dear Minister; or Dear Treasurer our mandarins have laboured and we now

MR. ROBERTS:

tell you that the yield from your personal income tax next year will be so many million dollars. That is the figure which the Minister of Finance should take and put in his budget. Now, they are a little more sophisticated than that. They give you, Mr. Speaker, an upper range and a lower range and a likely range. Of course, we as a Province or the government of the Province have to notify Ottawa each year by the 1st of January of any changes in the tax rates. That is so that they can calculate the returns and so they can prepare the collection mechanisms.

So, the minister can explain quite simply why the yield from personal income tax has gone from \$60.5 million to \$89 million by tabling the letter from Ottawa. There is nothing secret about it. It might have been secret a year ago. It does not matter a hoot now. Let him make it public. If Ottawa said \$89 millions or \$86.218 millions then we know where it came from. That is easy for the minister to do. Nothing could be easier than for the Minister of Finance to destroy my entire argument on this point, just destroy it with one document. I challenge the minister to bring that document in and lay it before the House and make it public. I challenge him or any hon. gentleman in the ministry opposite because they are all equally responsible.

But if he does not produce it, Sir, no matter what - there can be no valid excuse for not producing it - if he does not produce it, Sir, I and fair-minded people throughout this Province will conclude that the figure in the budget is not accurate, that it has been inflated. I do not mean by inflation. I mean inflated, deliberately and knowingly for political purposes. We can draw no other conclusion. No change in tax rates and it went from \$60.5 million yield in year one to \$86 millions in year two.

Oh, we can talk about the fact that the income tax goes up with inflation. Of course it does, because the effective rate is the marginal rate, the rate one pays on the last little bit of income. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that that effect can account for that

Mr. Roberts:

change was the inflationary yield. So the question comes up, the question came up last year in our little caucus, what could we expect from equalization in the current year? We had it figured out at around \$200 million or \$205 million. We had all put our heads together, and we prayed, and we thought, and we studied, and we did a little calculations on our fingers and toes. We came up with a figure of - what? \$204 million, Rodger, was it of that order? Two hundred and four million. We were powerfully surprised when the hon. Mr. Earle, as he then was, stood in the House, whatever the date was - March 12 - and said, "Equalization, \$210 million." I became a little suspicious. My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) became a little suspicious. It was too much of a good thing, and we did a little investigation. We picked up the telephone, and we called one or two people in Ottawa, and we were told that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador had made an estimate of equalization that seemed to be new to the people in Ottawa. Now, we were not told that officially. I have no evidence, and beside it is the government's figure, not Ottawa's figure. The government bring in the budget. But it seemed a little strange. Usually the government have been pretty accurate in estimating equalization.

Let me just take the last two years. In 1974-1975: I have given Your Honour the revised figure of \$185 million, the estimated figure was \$185 million, dead on, perfect estimating. The year before that, the 1973-1974 fiscal year, the estimated figure and the main estimates brought in by the then Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), I believe, was then minister, brought him by him in his budget speech, was \$156 million. The revised figure was \$153.6 million, almost dead on about a one per cent error. This year, Sir, we get a \$210 million estimate and \$194.3 million revised figure - a \$16 million goof, an eight per cent mistake.

Mr. Roberts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know who made that mistake. I want to know whether this government put that figure in with no more substance to it than if it were lemon meringue, just froth and air. I think it was. I say quite candidly I think that that \$210 million figure was taken out of thin air and put in the estimates. Again I say to the ministry they can prove me wrong very easily.

MR. ROBERTS: All they have to do, the only thing which they have to do, all that they have to do is produce the letter from the finance officials in Ottawa saying simply, Dear Government of Newfoundland, here is the estimate of what you were going to get on equalization this coming year. It has to be Ottawa's figures. Ottawa make up the equalization formula. They give it to us. It is a form of welfare. The rest of Canada all chips in and I am not sure if it is seven or eight provinces draw out of it, but everybody chips in, all the taxpayers of Canada chip in according to their means and the provinces have money paid out to them according to their needs as defined in a very, very complicated formula. As I recall I think there are forty separate tax yield taken into account now on the equalization formula. There used to be just three. It used to be just the personal income, the corporate income and the estate tax, these were the only ones equalized.

But now I believe forty separate sources, a very complicated formula and there is no need to go into it now. The fact remains that Ottawa each year sends the Government of the Province, whether it is minister to minister or official to official does not matter, it comes from Ottawa to here an estimated equalization. And I say that the estimates sent down by Ottawa in my belief was not \$210 million. That is important Mr. Speaker, because if that figure was plucked out of thin air, as I believe it was, then it raises the question of exactly what the ministry were up to when they plucked it out of thin air. No trouble to table a letter, any hon. gentleman opposite can table it. The Minister of Finance is in Ottawa, fine. The Premier is here. A number of his colleagues are here. The secretary of the Treasury Board would whistle up the letter for any one of them. A phone call down would bring it up. It could be tabled here before six o'clock this day. But I will wager it will not be, Sir. And the people of Newfoundland will be left to ask why. If it is tabled and if in fact it shows me to be wrong, it would certainly explode my whole argument. And you might say I am taking a chance, Mr. Speaker, I am, and let them prove me wrong! I have no right to that document. The ministry would not even table the Ten

MR. ROBERTS: Commandments in this House, with their record.

But, Mr. Speaker, they can get that document and they can table it. Let any one of them stand in his place and produce it. Give it to the press. It would certainly make me look a little foolish or a great deal foolish, but I say that that \$210 million figure was inflated and if it was inflated it was inflated for one reason only, to make the budget presented by Mr. Earle in March past, to make it look better than it was, to present an inaccurate, unfair, misleading picture.

Mr. Speaker, the story is a shocking one. Because what I am saying is that this government, on the evidence that I have, has led a number of us to believe that the March Budget was not an accurate one, that there was what amounted to an attempt to fool. And that then leads to the next question: Are the estimates valid now? Are the figures now accurate? I have very serious doubts. My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir gave the reason behind that in some length, but I think, Sir, there are very real doubts on the validity of these estimates.

I am in the school of thought that believes we have not had all the bad news yet. That is why we moved the amendment in the way we did. We could have picked a thousand subjects to move the amendment on. We could have talked about the Marystown Shipyard, the scandal that the Minister of Industrial Development is trying to hide down there. We could have brought that in as the subject of an amendment and made it a debate. And maybe we shall in due course. I am not saying the minister is implicated in a scandal, by the way, I am saying there is one and he is trying to hide, to suppress, to keep from public view.

MR. CANNING: It happened before he took over.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right. My friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) quite rightly reminds me it happened before the hon. gentleman became a minister. It happened long before his time - not long before his time, but before his time.

MR. LUNDREGAN: Is there a scandal about that?

MR. ROBERTS: He asks if there is a scandal there.

MR. CANNING: I think so, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. CANNING: Before your time.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman agree to appoint a royal commission if I - I will present my evidence, I will present it anyway here in the House in due course and believe me I have got it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that we chose to move this amendment in the way in which we did because we believe these estimates are not accurate.

MR. ROBERTS:

I think that when we get the Auditor General's report in due course, or when we get the budget statement which the minister will bring in in March or in April in respect of 1975-1976 fiscal year, the one which begins on April 1 next, the next fiscal year, we will discover that there are many millions more in the deficit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1976-1977.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. I thank the hon. gentleman, The 1976-1977 year, the one which begins the next year which begins on April 1 next. We will discover there are many millions more that have not become public, that this is not a full and candid financial statement. I do not think the figures are accurate, Sir. I am not sure the expenditure figures are accurate. We do not debate them at this stage. We will get an estimates debate in due course. We will get a supplementary supply debate in due course. But, as this stage, I do not think the expenditure figures are accurate.

Again the hon. member for Burgeo-Ray D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) a number of instances where there are sound questions that have not been answered. For all of the speeches on the other side - there have only been two or three or four - they are not very forthcoming. They are not very anxious to defend this document. They almost seem to wish that it would pass in the dead of night - quickly, quietly, indecently! No minister has stood and has challenged the assertions we have made. I will wager that no evidence is produced in this debate, if this debate ends today or tomorrow or whenever it ends. The letters can be produced and that is the only proof I will accept. I will accept any hon. gentleman's word, of course, Mr. Speaker, of course I will. But I will not accept an assertion that the estimates are accurate, that that \$210 million figure that Mr. Earle - where did he get it? Out of thin air? I think so. Then why did he get it? And the way to prove me wrong is dead simple, just table the documents. No trouble at all, nothing secret about those documents now, not the least bit secret. It does not matter a hoot, not a hoot. There is no reason

MR. DORREPS:

to lock them up. They might have been secret at the time or they might not. There might have been a need at the time or there might not, but there is certainly no need now to keep secret the documents from Ottawa indicating what the revenue yields would be this year, no need now. We are nine months into the fiscal year. We are \$30 million down in the fiscal year. There is no need now to keep them secret. But I will bet we do not see them. I will bet we do not get an answer. We may get an assertion, but I will bet we get no documentary proof.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said in itself, I think, is enough to condemn this budget. It is a shabby document, a shoddy document. It does not give us a full and a frank financial statement. I do not say why it does not. Let the people of Newfoundland judge for themselves. I am not so sure it would be parliamentary for me to give my reasons why. I am not afraid to give them. I have given them outside the House, but I do not think it is parliamentary to give them inside the House and so I will not. But I can say that I do not think that the budget is accurate. I do not think the one last March was accurate, and I wonder why.

I will come back to that, Sir. Let me talk for a moment or two about some of the good things in the budget, because there are some good things in the budget. I am quite happy to see them there, and I am equally happy to point them out and to mention them. The housing - the good things are two in number. The bad things are about 102 in number. The good things are two in number. First of all, the housing programmes. I thank the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) for his applause, muted though it may have been. But I think the housing programmes are good programmes, and I think the sales tax exemption is a good thing as well. These are both very popular, and so they should be.

But I feel I must point out, Sir, that the housing programme is more shadow than substance. The budget on pages 13 and 14 has the references to it in case anybody wants to read along. But of all the

MR. ROBERTS:

programmes being announced only one is real, and that is the \$600 - call it a homeowner grant. I do not know what name is to be put on it, but the \$600 grant which was being paid and will be paid as of the 1st of January to families who are acquiring a home which is their first and which is being occupied for the first time. That essentially replaces the federal grant, the grant which Ottawa cut out which I think was \$500. CMHC used to pay that and they decided, or the Government of Canada decided to cut it out. I am not sure if it is out now or if it is out the end of December but it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: December 31.

MR. ROBERTS: December 31. I thank the hon. gentleman. It is going out. So it replaces it and it improves it a little. It is \$100 up. It is a 20 per cent rise.

MR. PECKFORD: It not only improves it in cost, it also improves it in condition.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. gentleman for pointing out it improves it in condition as well as in cost. So, full marks on both accounts.

The other

Mr. Roberts.

programmes, of course, the other programmes in the housing field which the speech talks about are only at this stage pious wishes. They may or may not become a reality. I hope they will. But as of this point, Sir - and this should be pointed out - they are of no more substance, of no more weight than, say, the example I used earlier, a lemon meringue, which looks big, may even taste nice, but has no nourishment at all in it. It is just froth and air, and it is blown up well beyond what it should be. The sales tax exemptions, Sir, I think that is real. Anybody who goes into the store and buys clothing or all the articles defined as clothing in the regulations is told he does not have to pay his tax, and that is good. That is great. I am pleased as well that the government have recognized the principle that rich and poor alike pay sales tax, and that they have said that a suit or an article of clothing if more than \$300 is not exempt. The only thing I would question is why they put it at \$300. It is a pretty dear suit. I do not know how many hon. gentlemen in the House wear suits that cost \$300, but I will bet very few. I bet very few wear or are even wearing \$300 worth of clothes all taken in, shoes, socks, unmentionables, more unmentionables, shirts, ties, pants, jacket, hats - would you wear a hat in the House, Your Honour? Somebody will before the session is over, because there is one of those Standing Orders that says, you know, that says, a member desiring to speak shall rise uncovered in his place and address the Chair. Somebody will wander in wearing a hat to preserve the principle and have it carry on.

MR. NEARY: We got one already.

MR. ROBERTS: Have we?

MR. NEARY: The policeman.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! The hon. gentleman who guards - I am not sure if he guards us from ourselves or guards the outsiders from us, but the hon. gentleman who is filling in for the Sergeant-at-Arms is wearing a hat as part of his uniform. But if he tries to speak in the House, Sir,

Mr. Roberts.

there has to be a point of order taken. Somebody will wear a hat .
The point that I am making is that \$300 is a pretty generous exemption
and that leads me to the major point I want to make on this whole
sales tax business and this whole exemption business is that they
benefit the wealthy far more than they benefit the less wealthy.
Exemptions are the wrong way to go about administering taxes. It is
far better to adopt the philosophy which the government of Canada have
adopted in their Family Allowance programme. Pay it to everybody,
rich and poor alike, and tax it back, tax it back through the income tax -
a marvellous way to get at the wealthy, a marvellous way. It could be made a
little better, but I think that is a better philosophy than exemption.

I wonder how many of my constituents in the Strait of
Belle Isle wander in and buy an article of clothing worth \$300, not
too many, Sfr, not too many at all or even \$200. But maybe here in St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure they do.

MR. ROBERTS: -people do by them. I suppose if you go down to
the London, New York and Paris or the various stores around town,
Ayres or all the others that you could buy a suit for more than \$300.
I do not know. Maybe you could. I will bet that there are precious
few of them bought, or dresses. Precious few dresses, I will bet, are
bought for more than \$300, precious few. I mean, an exemption is
wrong in principle. But if we are going to have one, if they will not
adopt the principle of grants instead, then why \$300? It is too high.
It should be lower. I think that any man who can afford to pay \$300
for a coat or a suit of clothing or any woman who wishes to spend
\$300 on a dress or a coat or whatever article of wear should be delighted
to pay the tax on it, delighted. Let us bring it down to, maybe, \$50
or \$100, or better still, let us just establish a clothing amount for the
year, maybe the provincial average. It is easy enough to do, and work
out a grant system. It is far quicker, far better. Maybe administering
it would be a little more difficult. There could be a tax on that, but
I am not so sure it is. I am not so sure it is.

Mr. Roberts.

In any event, those are the good things in the budget as I see them, and I commend them. I am delighted the government have brought them in. I am pleased. I am happy, and when I can afford to buy a new suit I will go down and buy one, and it will be well under \$300, but at least, as I do not pay the tax, I will record mentally my pleasure. I may

Mr. Roberts:

even go out and vocally record my pleasure. You may hear a yell from the middle of Avalon Mall saying, "No tax on a suit!" And that would be me.

MR. NOLAN: Put a sign on your lock!

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

MR. NOLAN: Put a placard on your back ...

MR. ROBERTS: My hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) suggests a placard on my back. Well other people have tried to put other things in my back so maybe a placard will be a pleasant change.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be thought, though, that these goodies in the budget are anything more than what they really are, which are a little cosmetics, a little rouge, a little lipstick, a little face powder to try and dress it up, to hide the reality. It is only cosmetics, it is not the thrust or the force of this budget speech. The budget is about two things only, and two reasons in that budget, two things that it accomplishes, two things it is meant to accomplish, and neither of them is a housing programme or neither of them is a sales tax exemption on clothing or on anything else. One is to reveal the fact which the government could not keep hidden any longer, that there is a huge deficit on current account this year. I do not think they have revealed all of it yet. The second thing the budget is suppose to do and does is lay the ground work for the imposition of swingeing tax increases, absolutely cruel tax increases on the most regressive tax of all. That is all the budget does, Sir. While I am quite willing to point out the good things and quite willing to give credit for them, because I believe they are worthy of credit, I do not think any of us, Sir, should get carried away for one minute and think that we should feel that the government have done something that somehow merits praise.

Since this government came into office, Sir, the sales tax has gone up by 42.9 per cent, 43 per cent increase. It was seven cents on the dollar when they became the government. It is now ten cents on the dollar. And that, Sir, is an increase of 42.9 per cent.

Mr. Roberts:

And I bet there is more to come, more to come. Next year or the year after we will see more put on that, or we will see the gasoline tax go up, or we will see the corporate income tax go up, or the personal income tax go up, up and up and up. That is the way the taxes will go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great national breast-beating in this budget debate, a great bearing of the soul, more or less, a great gnashing of teeth and wailing and somehow wringing our hands. To hear some of the hon. gentlemen in this House talk we might as well throw the keys on the middle of the table now and tell the banks and the bond houses they can have her; we might as well ring up some trustee in bankruptcy and say, "Boy, have a look at the act to what it takes to put a province under;" we might as well get out the Amulree Report and reread it, that charter for bankruptcy which we had in 1933. To hear some hon. gentlemen talk that is what we might as well do. Just turn her in now, get it over with, do not prolong the agony, she is gone belly up boys, get out from under as quick as you can. There is no doubt at all though, Sir, that this Province, and every province, but let us be concerned only with this Province is in a serious economic situation. No doubt at all. You do not need the hon. minister's budget speech to know that. You do not need to hear the constant renegeing on promises day in and day out, this cut, this cutback, this deferred, this put off, this cancelled, You do not need that to know that we are in a serious economic situation. No member of the House needs to be convinced of that. None of us is stupid and none of us is lacking in patriotism or in good motives, We are all trying to do our best, as we see the light, to state the problem and to try and solve it. That does not need really to be discussed a great deal now, who are we trying to convince? Ourselves? The outside world? If we need to convince ourselves, Sir, we do not have much belief in what we are doing, and if we try to convince the rest of Newfoundland and Labrador, they will ask, what are you going? It is not enough to just beat your breast and order up a large number

Mr. Roberts:

of sack cloth and a large quantity of ashes.

What we are lacking, Sir, is not an appreciation of the problem, Whatwe are lacking is leadership!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: What we are lacking is a government that states the way, A government that says,

MR. ROBERTS:

here is the way out of this. Like a crowd of doctors, they have got the patient out on the table before them. They all agree on the diagnosis. They all agree that the patient has a very serious illness. Some feel it may be terminal. Others feel it is not that bad but it is certainly very bad. They agree on the diagnosis but they cannot agree on the cure. One lot are for cutting off the poor patient's right leg and another one would cut off his left leg. Somebody else wants to cut off his head. Somebody else suggests that they take out his heart. Somebody else says, let us give him a pill. Somebody else says, no, let us bleed him, and the patient could be lying there dying, certainly suffering while the doctors haggle around and argue around and discuss and take second opinions and third opinions and fourth opinions and heavens known how many other opinions.

We have got all these schools of thought in now. We have the gloom and doom crowd. If ever politics made strange bedfellows, Mr. Speaker, it is an old saying but, you know, it is a true one. When I heard the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) praising the hon. gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I thought the world had come to an end! When they all agreed together, I wondered what had happened. There have been some mighty changes of mind or changes of heart on somebody's point. I am not going to try to find out where. It is not the point of this debate. Each of these hon. gentlemen has stated his reasons. But what a strange world it is when all of these four men together who before this, Sir, could not have agreed on the wording of the Lord's Prayer, when all these hon. gentlemen together agreed, and each praising the other's speeches! How marvellous it is, how wonderful it is, how interesting it is, how new it is, how different it is, and how unreal it all is!

But, Sir, they all agree on the - you know, these four gentlemen all agree on the, not only the terminal condition but the immediate expiration of the patient. They are practically ringing up

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Geoff Carnell and making a reservation. They do not say how to get out of it. There is wide disagreement on that. We have some of them saying, cut her to the bone or into the bone. They are about the only hon. gentlemen by the way who have spoken in this debate. We have the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) saying, do not cut social services. We have other hon. gentlemen saying, do not cut resources. We have others saying, do not cut. The government are remaining mute and silent, giving no leadership at all. There is no evidence, Sir, that the government are doing what they say they must do, which is to develop our resources. There is no evidence at all.

What we do hear from the government is much talk about retrenchment and the need for restraint. That is their answer; talk, no action. There is no real evidence in these estimates, Mr. Speaker, of any restraint, not the sort of restraint that Ontario is showing. I do not think it is very popular in Ontario. It certainly would not be popular here. But I have not heard the opposition parties in Ontario criticize it even though there they are all in a pre-election situation and you might think, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some merit in trying to make a few political points, if that was what a crowd of men wanted to do.

But I hear in Ontario, I hear on the radio and see in the newspapers, that they are cutting down on hospitals, not deferring new ones but orders are going out from Mr. Frank Miller, the Minister of Health, the Jolly Miller, an old teacher of mine at St. Andrew's. I do not know if he was there when the Premier was there. Was Jolly Miller there in the early 1950's?

PREMIER MOOPES: I think so.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he was the chemistry teacher in the middle 1950's at St. Andrew's College in Ontario. He has now gone on to be the Tory Minister of Health in Ontario. But he is saying to the hospitals, close beds, hold the line. No evidence that that is being said here. Maybe it is. I am not suggesting it, but I am saying if the thing is as bad, if we are going to have restraints, that is the sort of thing

MR. ROBERTS:

that other places are doing.

Ottawa, we hear rumblings coming out of Uncle Ottawa now that the OFY programmes are going to go the way of all flesh, and a number of other plans are going to disappear. That is what cutting involves. That is what restraint means. All that we have here so far is talk.

MR. ROBERTS: And if the economic problem is as bad as the government would indicate it is then let them act, let them be men about it, and I think this House will support them. I think it will. They will have to be honest about it. They will have to say, "Boys, the situation was not as Mr. Earle said it was. It was not all peaches and roses and honey." Let me say as well, Sir, that if this government is truly concerned, they will not solve any economic problems that face this Province today by cutting on capital account. That is all they have done so far. They have said they are deferring some new teachers on the education thing - another 200 or 300 teachers, is it? - will not be hired or the expansion will not go ahead. But that is not restraint. That is not cutting back. That is not even holding the line because the teacher salary vote for next year naturally and rightly will be larger than this year. And the number of teachers will probably be more next year, even though we are not going into phase three of the teacher-pupil ration improvement programme.

Mr. Speaker, all we have done is defer on capital account. All the hospitals which the Premier flippidy-flopped around the Province starting this year, turning sods, driving bulldozers, cutting trees, whatever was involved, they have all been put aside. All the water and sewer projects, many of them for which tenders have been publicly called, put aside. Recreation programs, put aside. Capital projects - and maybe we have to cut on capital account although my economist friends and the advisers I turn to tell me it is an inappropriate way to fight the situation we face. They say the reason why the government is doing this is entirely different than fighting inflation. That is not the reason the government are doing it at all. They say the government would have had to put off capital account because of their mismanagement. They would have to put it off whether Mr. Trudeau had made his Thanksgiving Day statement or not. But it was coming and all that happened was the government latched onto Mr. Trudeau and said, "Praise be, Pierre! Thanks for trying to give us an out - or thanks for giving us what we believe to be an out. We will try to ride on your coattails and make it wash that way."

MR. ROBERTS: If we have a problem, an economic problem with the government of this Province, if we are worried about inflation, and I am not so sure we should be in that sense, we should be worried about it, but this government did not cause it, and this Province did not cause it. We are such an insignificant part of the economic picture in Canada, you know, without putting us down at all, what we do is not going to effect in any way the economic picture of Canada, all it will have is a public relations value, a cosmetics value. But, Sir, if you are going to cut the only way to cut is on current account because that is where the money is spent. That is where the increases come, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health, all of the ministers send their requests into the Treasury Board. That is where the money is spent, and I say to the Premier that if in fact this administration wishes, if it feels the problem is as serious as they say it is, if it really believes that, and if they wish to do something about it, then it is on current account the cuts must come. And let him not think that he will get cheap political cracks from this side of the House, Sir, at least from this group. I do not think that the people of Newfoundland are in any mood to trifle. If they believe that it is a serious situation then we will see the cuts. And I believe the people of this Province, Sir, will respond to that kind of leadership, leadership that frankly and honestly and honorably lays the full situation before them, and says, "This is what we must do and we are going to do it."

I do not expect this self-abnegation that comes from the hon. gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), who says, "Oh, we do not care if we get elected or not!" This is the same group of men, Mr. Speaker, who before the election were lashing it out and if the people of this Province today have rising or risen aspirations and expectations it is because hon. gentlemen opposite rose them. The reason the people on the Burin Peninsula are expecting a new hospital is that this government promised it, and went down and went through the whole charade, even to having the stage put up for the opening. The reason the people on the north

MR. ROBERTS: side of Trinity Bay and on the south side of Trinity Bay and on the northern part of Placentia Bay are expecting a new hospital at Clarenville is that they were promised it. The Premier went out and cut down a tree - was it? - to start the project. That is why they are expecting it. The reason the people in Happy Valley and Goose Bay and Northwest River and Mud Lake are expecting a hospital is they were promised it, not five years ago, not today but during the election and the period running up to the election campaign. The reason the people in Baie Verte and expecting an expansion to the Boylen Hospital is this government promised it. The reason the people down in Lewisporte district are expecting water and sewer programmes is they were promised them. Tenders were called. During

MR. ROBERTS: the election you could not get into the newspaper, Mr. Speaker. The poor Evening Telegram and Daily News, it was all they could do! They had to keep their presses going twenty-four hours a day to print the tender calls. Then, of course, when the election was over it was all called off, but only on capital account. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if this government believe there is an economic situation they have not yet come to grips with it. They have not, And putting off capital account is not the way to do it. We may have to cut capital account, we certainly could only borrow a certain amount, We must be prudent, we can borrow only what we can borrow safely, But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we should fight inflation. It is not our role as a Province, as a people to fight inflation the way this government is going to, to make people go on drinking polluted water and drinking - that is not parliamentary - but Your Honour can imagine what it is because many people in Your Honour's district are doing that. We are driving on bad roads while at the same time the Norma and Gladys that - of all the insanities, madcap, foolish stundnesses - goes on here merry way. A small thing, true it is small, the whole Norma and Gladys together would not provide water and sewer to much more than Embree or Stanhope or Comfort Cove or anywhere in the Lewisporte district, but by God it would show the people in this Province that the government is serious and dealing with it realistically.

Mr. Speaker, the government must not only come to grips with this problem, and they have not come to grips and this budget does not come to grips with it. It does not. It is a shoddy and a shabby attempt, it is a cosmetic attempt to paper over the true situation. The government have mismanaged the economy and that is why we are cutting off capital account. They have mismanaged their own affairs and that is why the great cutbacks are coming, not any economic reasons. Let the word go forth to the people of this Province that if we do not get schools and water and sewer systems and hospitals and recreational things it is not because of inflation! It is because the administration of this Province these last four or five years have not run affairs properly. They have not told the people the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: This budget now is a grudging admission of part of it, just part, Sir.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the government must state their priorities and then they must act on them. It is not enough to say we talk of resource development - ah! we are hearing that before - and I could go through the Throne Speeches of this administration, Mr. Speaker, and I could find in each Speech from the Throne and probably each Budget Speech since this administration took office, words just the same as the words in this budget. Yet I cannot find 1,000 jobs in this Province that have been developed in the resource industries by these hon. gentlemen during their time as the ministry. It is only talk, Sir, misleading piffle with not a jot or a tittle of substance in it.

Let me just look at one department - the Fisheries Department - to show how much emphasis this administration are placing in resource development, in what we all agree is one of our great resources. In the Spring budget, Sir, the Fisheries Department was budgeted to spend a total of \$5.6 million on current account and \$12.6 million on capital account. Of that Ottawa was to contribute 15 per cent on gross current account and Ottawa was to contribute 56 per cent of gross capital account. The figures, if Your Honour wants to memorize them, are \$850,000 from Ottawa on the current account and \$7.1 million from Ottawa on capital account.

The Spring budget, Sir, was one thing. Now we get the Fall budget, a little closer to the truth a little closer to reality. Now, Sir, what has happened? The expenditures are down from the Province, they have been reduced. What has happened in Ottawa have gone up and of the total expenditures Ottawa are contributing 58 per cent of the current account expenditures, and 57 per cent of the capital account expenditures. So what little has been done in the fisheries Ottawa has done. This government have done nothing, absolutely nothing. This year on the fisheries they have spent less than they undertook to spend when they came before this House, Sir, originally. Shoddy! Shabby! Misleading! Wrong! Wrong for this Province, Sir. We all believe that the fishery can be developed. This group of

December 12, 1975, Tape 596, Page 3 -- anb

MR. ROBERTS: men, this ministry talked that they are going to develop it, they pledged again to do it but all is wind and sound and fury signifying nothing.

MR. POBEPTS:

Now another point, one I have seen so often from gentlemen opposite I believe it is probably deliberate. That is their complete abdication of responsibility, this tactic they get off with, well, we are only here - the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is the man who most often voices it. It obviously represents his thinking or what passes for his thinking. But minister after minister stands to parrot this and says, we are not here to do things, we are here to respond, we are here to take the suggestions from the people. So I put them to the lie on that by putting a resolution down to enable them to do that. Of course they are going to turn that down and be exposed for what they are. But they seem to feel their job is not to lead. They are not a government. They are not governing. They are not trying to get ideas, not seeking out opportunities. They are not showing the way to go. They are just there like a bunch of caretakers. If somebody happens to wander in and say, you know, Sir, I got an idea, how about a few dollars, then they may or may not do it. But where is the drive and initiative?

If this group of men, Mr. Speaker, were determined to do something for this Province they would be out scouring night and day looking for ideas - some are good, some are bad, some are mediocre - but looking for ideas to try to develop this Province and to get things going. They have not created, Sir, 1,000 permanent jobs since they are in office, the whole group of them together have not, Sir. They spent millions but they have not created 1,000 permanent jobs. All they have done is knock, knock, knock!

MR. SMALLWOOD: The civil servants.

MR. POBEPTS: Ah, they have not even created a permanent job - I do not count a civil servant as a permanent job. The civil service has grown. But not 1,000 productive jobs. Not 1,000 new jobs. Not 1,000 resource-based jobs. All they do is talk and we get the same tired old excuses. I regret this, Sir. The council of hon. gentlemen opposite one of defeat, despair. They have given up. They just want to hold on to office, that is all they want. They do not want to do anything

MR. ROBERTS:

with it. That is no way to develop this country. If the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), if that is his philosophy as it seems to be, then I think the Premier should move him out of development, put him into some portfolio where his negative philosophy will be useful, like the Treasury Board or the Finance Department where it helps to have a man who can say, no, no, no, no.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is a failure. It is not a full and a frank statement of the affairs of this Province. It does not tell us where we are. It does not explain how the situation arose. It does not tell us what went wrong with Mr. Earle's budget. I regret this. It does not give me any pride at all or any pleasure at all because there is throughout this Province, Sir, a growing cynicism about government, not particularly about this government, but about the governmental process. The budget was a great opportunity to do something about that, to help to dispel that feeling. But, Sir, it is an opportunity lost, an opportunity forfeited, an opportunity missed.

The government, Sir, promised much. There was no indication up until the 16th of September that anything was wrong. The roads, the water and sewer, the hospitals, recreation, all were going ahead, all Summer long. Ministers were out lashing it out, promise after promise. Candidates were out announcing things. Mr. Sam Saunders, late, a Tory candidate in Terra Nova announcing roads down to Salvage. Over on Fogo Island Dr. Manning, the Tory candidate announcing \$1 million worth of roads over there. Down in Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir promising the fish plant. Now it is all deferred or called off. No wonder the people are cynical! No wonder this government is not believed! No wonder they believe there is a breach of faith with the people of this Province!

The government now talk of rising expectations as if somehow our people are to blame. Newfoundlanders are to blame because they believed the crowd of men who came to them and said, we will do this for you if you make us your government. The Lower Churchill - we will have a time to debate that and so we shall - but I say there was nothing

MR. ROBERTS:

in that statement made here in this House the other day by the Minister of Mines and Energy, nothing which the government ought not to have known or did not in fact know, one or the other, before the election. But did they tell the people? Not so. The people in my district were lining up in Yankee Point and across the way in Point au Amore on the Labrador side expecting jobs. That is what the Tories told them. You know, of all the callous, calculated acts!

Now, Sir, the Province, we are told, is in a parlous state. The minister comes in and he talks of, boasts of, cutting the deficit to \$11 million as if somehow he had done something good. He set up a straw man of \$30 million and he boasts of cutting it to \$11 million,

Mr. Roberts:

and of cutting the capital account, the borrowing, the net borrowing, the credit we are going to pledge to a mere \$220 million; a third of what it was, in total when this administration took office. Sir, the only cutting involved is from arbitrary totals, totals without substance, without meaning or without reality. I am not allowed to say they are fakes so I will not. But the totals, Sir, that were arbitrated - the minister put up and he said, we were going to have \$30 million account deficit, but it is only \$11 million now. How do we know? How do we know? The figures in the budget nobody can rely on. They are not accurate. They are wrong. Let the government, let the government -

MR. WELLS: That is a serious charge.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a serious charge. Well let the government show us the truth if what I say is wrong. But I say the figures are wrong. And let it be recorded as well, Sir, that this budget does not cut anything. Current account spending is up by \$23 million. The current account deficit has gone from a total of 11. - I am sorry - from a \$1.5 million surplus in March to \$11.3 million deficit that they admit now, a total change of \$12.8 million. Now, Sir, who do they expect to believe that? Who do they expect to believe that has all occurred since the 16th. of September, whether they did not know about it or they could not have known about it? Do they really think Newfoundlanders are too green to burn?

Capital account: No cutting there. It is up by \$3.4 million. Debt retirement is up by \$1.1 millions. And the result of it all is a total deficit, the total amount that we have to find this year is \$17.3 million greater than it was when Mr. Earle brought in his infamous budget. And the minister boasts that he somehow achieved something good. I think, Sir, that it is the most cynical budget speech that has ever been made. I think it was made, Mr. Earle's budget speech was brought in to try to get them over the election. I think so. I think the facts support that. I think the people of

MR. ROBERTS:

Newfoundland know that to be so. This is not the record of a prudent government, of careful management. This record is one of a mismanagement and bad handling. And then on top of it all, Sir, the government attempt to hide it.

You know, the figures do not support them, Mr. Speaker. Their record has not been too bad over the years in predicting things. I gave the figures on equalization. The government have not been too bad in predicting their revenues. All of a sudden this year they go wrong. Why? No explanation given. The Minister of Finance's explanation would not satisfy the merest child. No, Sir! And I say again unless they produce the evidence that I am wrong I shall believe, as I do now on the best evidence that I can get, that the government - I am not allowed to say "cooked the books," am I? *Okay*, I will not say it - but the government, Sir, put in an estimate that was inflated, an estimate that was not the estimate that they got from Ottawa, that somehow they dreamed it up, the minister, Mr. Earle, who was then Minister of Finance, communed with nature. I can see him perched on a flagpole communing, thinking, saying, "Ha, ha!" I do not care what Ottawa said. What do Ottawa know about equalization? They only pay it to us. I will make it \$210 millions because that will enable me to balance my budget and to boast that there are no tax increases." Shoddy! Shabby! A sadistically cynical performance.

The government's record - look at the public accounts, Sir, compared to the main estimates. Almost inevitably - well I will read the figures for the last three fiscal years, the only ones of which we have records, the three since this government has been in office. In 1971-1972 fiscal year, the estimated total current account revenue was \$268 million. The public accounts reveal that the total figure in fact was \$283 million, and in each case I am excluding grants in aid for specific departments, but the revenue sources as opposed to shared costs. The main estimates the next year showed \$311 millions and the public accounts reveal that the total in fact when the

Mr. Roberts:

Auditor General audited it, it was \$309.8 millions. The year after, main estimates \$361 million, the public accounts revealed \$390 millions but there were significant increases in that budget.

So normally, Sir, if they err, they err on the side of caution. This year it is the other way around.

MR. ROBERTS: Now how could any fair-minded man believe that the government have been candid and honest and open with the people, how could he? How could any person, with all the good faith in the world, believe that this administration levelled with the people of this Province—on that sort of shoddy, shabby record? There has been not a word raised in their defence, not a word of explanation. Perhaps some hon. gentleman—the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) is over there giggling cynically. But I say to the hon. gentleman, would he table the document showing where the \$210 million equalization figure came from? Would he agree to table it? I get no answer. I get no answer, Mr. Speaker, and I say no hon. gentleman up there will table that. Or if they do not want to table it will they agree to let the government at Ottawa make it public because the government at Ottawa, I asked them, and they said, "No, we cannot make it public." I accept that because it is a government to government communication. So I do not know what Ottawa told them. But I will wager it is substantially less than \$210 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You have it from Ottawa?

MR. SIMMONS: We have an idea.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I say I do not. I asked them and I was told that it is government to government and I accepted that. I did not go any further. But I will wager it is considerably less than \$210 million. I will wager a great deal on that, Sir. I will wager the amount of the current account deficit that it is less than \$210 million. No, that figure came out of thin air, the other revenue, the personal income tax figure, I believe, came out of thin air, and pretty thin broth it was. It was put in just to inflate the revenues. Your Honour, they could not hide expenditure. They say they goofed on salaries. Well there is about \$30 million not accounted for there, leaving that aside.

The government, Mr. Speaker, the way they attempted to do it, simple, was to influence revenues and say who will ever know whether equalization is \$210 million or \$205 million or \$195 million, and what we will do is we

MR. ROBERTS: will get through the election and when it is all over we will go in and tell them and they will not know anyway.

That was their whole approach. That was what went on. That was what Mr. Earle said in his mind. I do not think the hon. gentleman as he then was from St. John's South (Mr. Wells), was in the House at that time. I think he was just an ordinary member, a backbencher, a humble supporter of the government. I think when he got in the Cabinet he got shocked and that is why he got halfway out of the Cabinet as a minister without portfolio, no longer having the responsibility with administering a portfolio. But perhaps the hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), as he now is, will give us the facts. It is very simple to do that, Sir, very simple, appallingly simple, outstanding simple, no trouble at all. But if it not answered, if the documents are not tabled, Sir, the charge stands as proven and I make the charge now. I make it here as publicly as I can. I make the charge that this administration have not come to grips with the economic problems of this Province, that the remedies they propose are not designed to counter with our economic problems. They are designed instead to try to remedy and to rescue the government from their bad management of the public affairs of this Province. They have taxed and taxed and taxed some more and they can try to cover it over with the rouge, with the lipstick, the facial powder of cosmetics, with exemptions, but that does not meet the fact that today we are paying the highest sales tax in Canada, we are paying it on the least incomes, the lowest incomes. The government have not made a clean breast of things.

Where is the story of the Marystown Shipyard? Hidden, covered up, trying to be swept under the carpet, that is where it is! Where is the story of the Rural Development Authority? Hidden under the carpet, trying to be covered up. Where is the story of the taxed revenue estimates? Hidden, covered up again! And finally, Sir, there has been a failure to lead, a complete and utter failure by the government to provide the people of this Province with leadership, some empty words without actions and not even new words, the same tired words that we have heard

MR. ROBERTS: time and time again. Words without substance, words without meaning; not leadership, not an answer, not saying to the Province, "Here we are, and this is what we are going to do."

It is a very sad day, Sir, to see a government come to this and the saddest part of all is that they boast of it. To hear the Minister of Finance read his speech, and he had weeks to prepare it and all the officials in the world to help him, and he put the best face he could on it, to hear him talk you would think he was proud of it, almost glorying in it, almost pleased to be the man who came in and said, "This is the first time that we have ever had to bring in a budget in the Fall." A second statement, "The First time we have had to say that everything we said in our Budget Speech was wrong, that all the good news is suddenly bad news."

The government ran up a deficit, Sir, and they knew it was coming. They had to know. If they did not know they are

Mr. Roberts.

guilty of negligence without equal. They ought to have known it, and I believe they did know. I do not know when they knew. They may have known before Mr. Earle made his budget speech or they may not have known until a little later, but they knew well before they went to the country. There was no chatter about it, no talk about it, not coming clean, and not even today have we got the truthful story, the full story. We have not got it.

Now they are forced to tell at least part of it. The bond market made them tell part of it. The minister - did you ever notice in his television speeches and elsewhere how often he refers to the bond market? The government cannot sell their bonds with the facility and at the rate that they feel they should get. The bond market is beginning to wisen up and ask questions. Of course, the government can sell bonds but not at the rate they should, not with the facility, with the ease they should.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They may come to the point where they cannot sell them at any rate.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), who has a long knowledge of public affairs in this Province, and a ready memory I would think of the 1930's, as he tells us, the government may come to that point. I hope they do not. It could happen. If it happens it will not be because of any failure by Newfoundland and Labrador or by the people of this Province. It will be a failure by the government, failure by the government to be forthright and to give leadership, and to take the steps that must be taken, and I say again to the Premier and to the government, I do not care how tough the measures are. We do not care how tough the measures are. If they are the right measures, we will support them. But, Sir, if they are not the right measures, we oppose them, and we oppose this budget, because we do not believe they are the right measures. They are not designed to deal with inflation. The measures are not, Sir, and no hon. gentleman opposite can be heard to say with convincing conviction that they are. They may believe that they are, but

Mr. Roberts.

let them talk to any knowledgeable people. These measures are not designed, they are most inappropriate. they are wrong, they will hurt Newfoundland, not help it! And if the savings are to be made, they must be made on current account, not on capital account. No sign here of any leadership by the government! No sign of any willingness to do what must be done! We will support tough measures, of course, we will, and we will answer to our electors in due course, and we will accept their verdict. But let the government be honest and tell us what they are going to do, and let them lay out a credible and a creditable programme.

The Minister of Finance, Sir, boasts for this budget. It is boldness beyond, it is cheap. There is no better word for it, it is cheap. He reminds me of the man who murdered his parents, and then when he was up in court on a charge of murdering his mother and his father, he pleaded for mercy, he pleaded with the judge and the jury for mercy on the grounds he was an orphan. It is the only sort of thing the Minister of Finance can do now. The government created this problem. The bad management we have had the last three or four years is what has led us to this state. Let the government show the leadership, Sir. Let them not say, oh, let the people send in suggestions. What do we want, a post box down in the lobby so the people can come in and put in suggestions? Maybe we should take those telexes that Information Newfoundland have, the manure spreaders, and have them made two way so the people can go in and send in their suggestions. No, that is nonsense! I say to the government, let them lead, let them govern, let them state a programme, let them bring in their priorities, let them say, here we are! Words are not enough. Words are not supported by substance. To talk of resource development is nonsense. Where is the resource development? Where are the jobs? Where are the projects? Where are the thoughts? We are down now to blueberry wine and blueberry pie fillings, useful, maybe a few

Mr. Roberts.

jobs in it, certainly not to be ignored and neglected. But all we get from the Minister of Mines and Energy, who most people consider to be a man, as I do, who thinks and who cares about this Province even if he is bullheaded and wrong most of the time. All we get from him is a council of despair. Any Newfoundlander hearing him the other day or reading of his remarks or hearing of his remarks would promptly go out and put in to emigrate to anywhere, Ireland - you know, even Ireland with civil strife looks better than the sort of Newfoundland that that hon. gentleman sees. Where are the men of vision and of courage? They are not in this crowd, Sir. They have not shown it in this budget. It is a shoddy, a shabby and a cosmetic performance. It does not give the people of this Province a full and an accurate and a complete statement. I am going to vote

MP. ROBERTS:

against it, Sir, and I would urge every hon. gentleman in this House to vote for this resolution, for this amendment, because that way, Sir, we will show that this government has not done the job which they ought to have done. There is nothing more important, Mr. Speaker, to a government, nothing more important than if the people of this Province, of a province, believe in their government and believe that they are getting the full story, the true story, the complete story, instead of what they have had, Sir.

I think the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has done the people of this Province a service in moving this amendment. I am going to vote for it, Sir. I ask every hon. gentleman in this House today to do likewise. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, although the amendment presently under debate leaves much to be desired in that it has failed, in my opinion, to deal with specifics, and it has failed, Sir, to expedite and to bring into this House measures that would be aimed at answering the two most serious problems that we have in this Province at the present time, namely, record unemployment and rampant inflation. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, even with the imperfections of the amendment, and unless I am swayed by future debate from the benches opposite, Sir, even with the imperfections of the amendment I am afraid that I am going to have to vote in favour of it.

But let me say, Sir, that in the speech just given to this hon. House by the Leader of the Opposition, after listening very carefully to what the Leader of the Opposition had to say - and obviously, Sir, he was putting forward, putting forth in this hon. House his party's views on why members of this House should vote for that amendment - listening to him very carefully, Sir, to the Leader of the Opposition, I am afraid that he did not use one single argument that would persuade me to vote for the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Sir, one thing that I agree with the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), Sir, one thing I agree with in his statement the other day, although there were lots of things in his remarks that I disagreed with, the thing that I agree with him on was this, that it is about time that this hon. House rose above partisan petty politics and got down to brass tacks and tried to do something about growing inflation and record unemployment. I agree with what the member said, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). That was probably the most significant thing that he said in his remarks that he received so many compliments for outside the House from the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). No doubt it was a frank and honest speech that the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) made, but it sounded, Sir, like the Alderdice days. It sounded like 1934. That was the part that I disagreed with the hon. member on.

But I certainly, Sir, have to hold with the hon. member that it is about time that we in this hon. House rose above party politics, partisan, petty, nit-picking and rolled up our sleeves and got down to brass tacks. Because in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, it is not the government that the people are looking to to solve the problems of this Province, it is every elected member of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Every one of us, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Every member of this House has an equal responsibility. You cannot pawn the blame off on the government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not all of it.

MR. NEARY: Not all of it, Sir. They have to do whatever they can. When they make a boo-boo, we condemn them for it in this hon. House. When they bring in something like a piece of legislation yesterday brought in by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, you praise the government, you praise them. You may be praising them one

day - I find myself in almost an identical role as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) except the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) can be an elder statesman with no strings attached - and he objects to elder.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. NEARY: I can be a statesman, Sir. I can be a statesman, but I also have to be a bit of a maverick, and that is an unusual combination to be a statesman and a maverick at the same time. The member for St. John's West, in his remarks the other day, said that I am the best sniffer in the House. Well, Sir, I would say - I do not know if the hon. member was paying me a compliment or not - but when I find the government doing something wrong, Sir, I am going to zero in on it. When they do something that I approve of and that I deem to be in the best interests of the people of this Province, I am going to praise them. I do not care how some members of this House interpret that particular position, but I think in these very difficult times in Newfoundland it is the only responsible position to take, and not to get up and make a partisan political speech.

You know, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the speech that we heard this afternoon, you would not know, Mr. Speaker, but all the bad guys were on that side and all the good guys were over on this side. That is the impression I got, Sir. I was expecting - I am not trying to defend the government - I do not have to take the position where I have to speak for the government - but I was hoping, and I was bitterly disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition did not get up and put forward his party's platform, throw out some suggestions and ideas to the government that they could get their teeth into, and yes, that is a good idea, and we are going to do something about that. I have tried myself in this session of the House, and I have thrown out several suggestions and ideas to the government. They have not been acted on yet. I am hoping that eventually that some of them will be implemented. That kind of attitude, Sir, will get us nowhere except to get my dander up. Mr. Barrett out in British Columbia learned his lesson yesterday for the same kind of attitude, the same kind of negative attitude. Each one of us, Sir, has a very, very heavy responsibility in this session of the House not to play around with partisan politics, not to clown around, not to try to blame the government for all

Mr. Neary.

the ills of this Province at the present time, although they certainly should accept some of the blame. Praise them when they are doing something right, and condemn them when they are doing something wrong.

Now I am going to outline my reasons for voting for this amendment. Some of them I have already stated in this hon. House, and I cannot help but getting back to one of my old pet peeves again. The amendment has to do with disclosure. One of my pet peeves, Sir, is that the university, Memorial University, is passed over \$32.5 million in this budget, and they do not have to account for it. They do not have to tell the House, tell the members of this House, the elected representatives of the people, of how they are spending that \$32.5 million. They do not have to give us, in the same detail as all the departments of government have to do, they do not have to give us in any detail how they are spending that \$32.5 million, neither do they have to give us that little book on classifications and on salaries. And, Sir, I will not rest in this hon. House - and the hon. Premier would be surprised at the amount of support that I have in this Province for advocating that the university not get another red cent until they disclose in every detail of how they are spending that money. Even on the faculty, they call me up at home! People from all over this Province in every walk of life, call me up and tell me they agree with me! They are wondering why the government will not do something about it!

MR. SMALLWOOD: The president announced on television that he would be granting it.

MR. NEARY: The president announced on television that they are already disclosing their -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no!

MR. NEARY: Well he went so far as to say that the Auditor General -

MR. SMALLWOOD: But he went further.

MR. NEARY:

Well, maybe he did but well why does he not do it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, why does not the government-

MR. NEARY: Why does the government not take him up on his offer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

PREMIER MOORES: He did not put it that way.

MR. NEARY: He did not? Well, I mean, I do not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I heard him.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, yes but he said it is his burden.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear, Sir, that I am not talking about interference in the academic training, the scholastic affairs of that university, not in the slightest, although I have heard it said outside that, oh, no, you know, why should the House of Assembly run the university. That is not what I am talking about, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You just pay and shut up.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They are asking us to pay, as my friend says, pay and shut up. All I am asking for is that the details of their budget be laid on the table of this hon. House. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed - and I will say it now - I do not care what President Morgan says, and maybe he inherited this - I am deadly opposed to this campus of the university over at Harlow over in England. That was some illusion of grandeur that Lord Taylor had, I suppose. Why do they not close it down, Sir? What purpose is it serving? All it is providing is my lord with an excuse to pop over to Newfoundland four or five or half a dozen times a year and to give a lecture over at the university. He could tape it over in Harlow, put it in the mail for fifty cents and send it over to us, and then have the tape self-destruct when it gets here. Why should he have to fly over four or five times a year? Why should we have three or four convocations a year?

I would recommend to the Premier that he not put that cap on anymore. My God! I could not help but when I saw the picture - and I said it the other day, thought the Premier was not in the House - it looked

MR. NEARY:

like a big, flat, dried-up cow's dung just plopped down on the top of his head.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sounds like Jamieson to me.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have the same cap.

MR. NEARY: My God, my hon. friend looked bad enough but the hon. the Premier was never built for that cap, Sir.

Three or four convocations a year in little old Newfoundland. Let me see what else there is about that. These are the main things. Oh yes, the travelling of the faculty, travelling all over the world. You could slash 50 per cent off it, Sir, and it would never be missed. Right now I would say there are several dozens of them, either on the Mainland or en route to the Mainland or over in Europe, in Amsterdam or in England or down in St. Pierre wining and dining. That is why, that is one of the reasons, Sir, that I approve of and I am going to vote for this amendment, because it has to do with disclosure and the university has not disclosed its record of expenditure in this Province.

Then, Sir, there is the matter of the linerboard mill at Stephenville. I am not going to go into any great detail about it except to say that the government have not so far to my recollection in the last two or three years given us a full disclosure on the affairs of the linerboard mill at Stephenville. We were told the other day by the Minister of Mines and Energy that they are having their difficulties out there. Then another hon. gentleman in the House suggested that the management of that mill is about the worst in Newfoundland, it is in bad shape, the management. Well, Sir, we want all the details and we want the government to give us all the facts about the linerboard mill at Stephenville.

Then I would like to find out a few things about the Churchill Falls Corporation. I remember when my good and learned friend, the former Minister of Mines and Energy, was a member of this House. I must

MR. NEARY:

say I was bitterly disappointed to see him defeated although I am glad to see the present member in the House. I suppose I cannot have it both ways. If I was backed up in a corner and I had to make a choice, I would do it. But I was awfully disappointed to see the Minister of Mines and Energy go down to defeat because one thing, Sir, that he had mastered his department. He reminded me of Bill Callahan when Bill

MR. NEARY: Callahan was a member of the government. When you wanted an assignment, when the Premier wanted to give somebody an assignment that involved a lot of tedious details and a lot of study and a lot of research and hard work, he would give it to Bill Callahan. And my God, you know, in the Cabinet sometimes when he was giving his report - it would take hours and sometimes days - you would almost get to hate him that he had mastered it so wonderfully and he was so right. I remember the former Premier saying to him, "Would you get to the point, quick". He was driving everybody out of their minds and you would almost get to hate him for it because you were so jealous and envious that he could take his homework home with him or down in his office and master it and do such a wonderful job.

If there was a man, Sir, in this Province who ever deserved to be re-elected it was Bill Callahan. Unfortunately he, I suppose, did not have the other qualifications of a politician that are so necessary, but he was a hard worker. The former Minister of Mines and Energy reminded me of him. He managed to master the Mines and Energy policy of this government and of this Province and he did a wonderful job, and, Sir, he managed to surround himself with a group of good people, good advisers. I remember once I put a question to him in this House about the Churchill Falls Corporation of why it was necessary for them to have an office in Montreal. The minister who was a pretty honest chap, in my opinion, almost came out and levelled with me and said, "Well, I do not understand why we have to keep an office in Montreal either but I will find out." Then he came back, Sir, with a feeble excuse that the reason they had to keep an office open in Montreal was because that is where the contractors were and so forth, but I do not think he was really sold on the idea himself. So we have never been able to get full disclosure about the operations of this Churchill Falls Corporation and why it is necessary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Here is one boy who is not sold on it either.

MR. NEARY: Another boy not sold on it. My friend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: There you go, I have agreement already in the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, that operation in Montreal - look! We own it, it cost us \$160 million to take it over, to buy it out and the head office of that company, Sir, should be right here in this Province. Churchill Falls Corporation should be right here in Newfoundland - the head office - and not have an office up in Montreal and Newfoundland as just a branch. All we have here is a branch office.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend says it should be, I am glad I have one supporter, Sir, in the Cabinet and I hope that it will be but so far we have not been able to find out too much about the operation and that is another reason, probably, that I will vote for the amendment, unless I am persuaded to do otherwise and I have an open mind.

Then, of course, Sir, we have the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation and we have not been able to get very much information on that. Oh yes, they put out a little publication showing us the amounts of money that were loaned out for tourism, the amounts of money that were loaned out for factories, the amounts of money that were loaned of for that, but we cannot get any details. We cannot get a list of those who received loans, we cannot get a list of the uncollectable debts of the Corporation, we just cannot get any information, Sir. I am looking for a publication that they put out recently but I cannot seem to lay my hands on it now.

AN HON. MEMBER: We cannot find it either.

MR. NEARY: Well if somebody comes across it they will find in that publication, Sir, that there is a mistake of \$1 million in one of the figures on the back cover. But, Sir, we must have these figures in front of us. We must have the facts and the figures in front of us, Sir, in black and white so that we will know how the taxpayers' money is being spent. What kind of enterprises the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation are supporting and then it will be much easier for us, Sir, to analyse the Newfoundland Development Corporation and to determine in

December 12, 1975, Tape 604, Page 3 -- apb

MR. NEARY:

our own minds whether they are doing a good job or not and whether
or not anybody is ripping off the Corporation. We must have

Mr. Neary:

the figures are in front of us in black and white. And that is another reason, Sir, this amendment has to do with disclosure. That is another reason that I would, I am afraid, have to vote for the amendment.

But, Sir, my chief reason for voting for the amendment about disclosure, and I hate to have to do this to my hon. buddy, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), the present Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, but, Sir, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) said, it is the duty of the Opposition to sniff out things, and he said that I was the best sniffer of all. Well I have sniffed out something now that I am afraid involves the Department of Industrial and Rural Development, but have to say in all fairness that this did not happen when the present member, the present minister, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was minister of the department. Although I did put a question to the minister today during the Oral Question period and I was grossly disappointed, Sir, with the answer the minister gave me. Because to my knowledge, Sir, after very careful research and after my usual source of information which is most reliable-although the other day somebody thought they shot me down on Mr. Doyle's \$28,000 a year, and the Premier said, it is only \$18,000. I have it, Sir, from the most reliable source that Mr. Doyle will get \$28,000 a year, maybe not all of it in salary now, maybe not all of it in salary now, but he will get his \$28,000 a year, Sir, from the public treasury. It may not be directly paid out in a salary, maybe the salary is not.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Get back to Marystown now.

MR. NEARY: I am getting back to Marystown, Sir, and I know I have a limited time. But my hon. friend during the Oral Question period when I asked him if Mr. Millen had submitted a resignation? My hon. friend said, yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be picayune - or whatever the word is - or small about this, and I am very interested in

Mr. Lundrigan:

the remarks of the hon. member, but I said, to my knowledge, that the resignation had been in order. I have not seen an actual slip or a letter or a statement along the lines that the hon. member suggested in the Question period. I was careful, too, not to make that kind of a declaration. I am also suggesting, Your Honour, that I am certainly willing to share any information on the situation in Marystown for the public's interest and for the public good.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman has made an explanation of his point of view and clarification or explanation of an answer he gave earlier. I do not feel there is anything which needs to be decided.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had not made any charges against the hon. member, I merely said during the Oral Question period, Sir, and I still stick by my words, that when I put the question to the hon. minister, and Hansard, Sir, can bear me out, the minister said, yes, there was a resignation. Well I am -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Not to my knowledge.

MR. NEARY: - well okay I am not going to play with words. I am not going to play with words, but I am going to tell the minister right now that there was not a resignation from Mr. Millen, even though the hon. Premier had gone down on the Burin Peninsula in May and praised up Mr. Millen and the operation of the shipyards and said it was one of the finest operations in Canada. And then several months later Mr. Millen is made a scapegoat for the government, and I will prove why he was made a scapegoat. And this is one of the reasons I am voting for the amendment because there has not been disclosure on the affairs of the last few months of the Marystown Shipyards. Mr. Millen, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, has been made the scapegoat. Mr. Millen, from what I can learn, is one of the most able men in his business. I would say he is one of the top men in his business in building ships. He came to this Province highly recommended, and now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that was refused, rejected, turned down, who did not get the job when he applied for it, the gentleman who is taking over the shipyards, is now going to get the job. He was considered to be too young and inexperienced before,

Mr. Neary.

and so the job was given to Mr. Millen, and we have Mr. Rennie down there, Sir, and I would recommend - Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I will have time to read it before I finish my debate, but I have excerpts from a book written by Jack McGill entitled Crisis On The Clyde, and I would recommend it. As a matter of fact, I will send a copy over to my hon. friend so he can read all about Mr. John Rennie, who is supposed to have such a worldwide reputation in shipbuilding. Take that and have a look at it, because I may not have time to read it, but I am going to read a few things that I feel, Sir, are the reasons that Mr. Millen is no longer with us, and it has to do with this trawler programme that was announced by the government, and it has to do with tendering in the Marystown Shipyard. I have got the facts and figures in front of me. I am not going to beat around the bush. If we have to sniff things out, we sniff them out. I got a pretty good track record of producing the facts. Very seldom have I been wrong in the last three or four years.

Sir, I have here in front of me a document dated September 13, 1974 sent to the hon. Minister of Fisheries at the time, my hon. friend's predecessor concerning the government's trawler programme. It says, "Hon. minister, the Minister of Fisheries, your predecessor, announced in March 1974 the cabinet decision that the proposed new stern trawlers were to be built in Marystown. We were naturally pleased about this decision, and worked enthusiastically with the consultant naval architect to get the programme underway as the required delivery of September 1975 did not give us much time. The cabinet had required some changes in concept and layout - " I might say, Sir, for the benefit of the House, in case the hon. Premier is getting suspicious, I did not get these documents from Mr. Millen. I do not even know the gentleman. I never laid an eye on him in my life. "The cabinet had required some changes in concept and lay out of the vessels, but the consultant naval architect was able to give us sufficient guidance for steel requirements to be evaluated."

"The conditions of the steel industry required our immediate entry into negotiations with possible suppliers who could

meet our delivery requirements. Ultimately, only one - that is one steel supplier - could satisfy us and in July 1974, with the consent of the Department of Industrial Development - that is very important, Sir; with the consent of the minister's department, his predecessor - we entered into a contract for steel materials. The consultant naval architect's subsequent work on the revised design showed unforeseen problems and the development has virtually ceased. The yard is now taking delivery of this steel. This is back in December, 1974. - "The yard is now taking delivery of this steel for its programme and is finding itself in a very embarrassing position." I am quoting directly from the document, Sir. "The contract is not yet signed due to the lack of information of the vessels, but the material for their construction have entailed our borrowing 5,304,000 Deutsche marks. That is the equivalent of over \$2 million. This situation - according to the gentleman who was manager of that yard at the time - is severely straining our resources and is endangering the continuance of other contracts."

Mr. Speaker, does the hon. House get the significance of this statement? "Endangering

the continuance of other contracts. A parallel with this situation has occurred before and was overcome by the shipyard drawing to an account from the department - from the minister's department. They got the money from another department after they ran into that kind of a situation before. - I believe that a provision for these contracts must have existed in the department's budget. I respectfully ask that we be allowed to draw to account against it."

They borrowed the money, Sir, and there was no way for them to get it back, over \$2 million. The steel that is down there now - and the hon. minister can tell us all he likes about how some of it will be used in this tug. Sir, I have very grave doubts about whether we will break even on that tug. I would say the taxpayers of this Province will be called upon to heavily subsidize that tug. Let me show you, Mr. Speaker, an example of the kind of bidding that goes on in that shipyard. This all happened in Mr. Rennie's time, by the way. I do not know if we gave him a big pension or not, but he had a big party, had thrown a big party before he left this Province. No doubt he had the charisma, Sir, but let us see how much we paid for that charisma.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEAFY: October 14, 1975 has to do with draggers that were being built at Marystown.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What date was that?

MR. NEAFY: October 14, 1975. I do not know if the minister has gone to his files to read the correspondence since he became minister. I am not blaming that minister, Sir. That minister inherited this and I hope he can haul it out of the hole. But I want to show why we are in trouble, the kind of trouble we are in in that shipyard. These are Atlantic Hulls No. 10 and 15. I presume that they were being built for Atlantic Processing or for one of the fish companies.

It is written to Mr. Roche. "Dear Mr. Roche, I discussed with the minister on Wednesday the 8th of October, 1975 the existence of a considerable inherent loss in the makeup of the tender for these

MR. NEAPY:

vessels. The minister was surprised that this was so. Therefore, to amplify explanations given previously to yourself and Mr. E. Patey, I am setting out in detail the manner in which this resulted. The estimate was prepared in late 1972 - That was the term, tenure of office of Mr. Rennie. - Two relevant items were, labour, average rate \$3.66 per hour for a total of \$438,500. The overhead of 100 per cent, another \$438,000 for a total of \$877,000. This is shown on the estimate summary sheet which is appended.

"The labour rate used being representative of rates actually being incurred at the time of the estimate. The hourly rate being paid to a class A tradesman then being \$3.75. The estimate was prepared at a time when the negotiation of the next labour agreement was approaching. The possibility of an increase should have been very much in mind as the Atlantic vessels were programmed to be building from mid-1973 until 1974.

"An agreement was signed on May 31, 1973 which gave Class A tradesmen hourly rates of \$4.20 and \$4.60 for each of the two years ahead. An increased hourly rate approximating to the mean value of \$4.40 cents would have been more correct than the \$3.66 used and the \$4.58 was actually incurred. The overhead value of 100 per cent of labour used in the estimates was entirely against best practice. Nothing less than the then incurred overhead rate of 134 per cent should have been used.

Listen to this, Sir. I will show you how much that cost us, this great shipbuilder." Applying these amended figures, the estimate appears as follows. - If they had applied a labour average rate of \$4.40 an hour which they should have done, that would have amounted to \$527,000, slightly over. Overhead at 134 per cent, \$706,500. Revised total, Mr. Speaker, \$1,233,852. Remember the original total Sir, \$877,214. The difference per ship, Mr. Speaker, \$356,638. There are five of these ships, Sir. So the difference

MR. NEARY: in the contract, the loss, the amount the taxpayers had to cough up, \$1,783,190. That is what we paid for charisma, going around telling everybody what a fine crowd they are.

"This indicates, as I say, a maximum loss - and I am quoting from the document - on the contract of \$1,783,000, but in practice - it goes on to say that some of this later - by careful planning and tight managerial control it was reduced slightly."

"A similar but less expensive error was made in the estimates for hulls seven, eight and nine - but I do not have these figures before me. Then he goes on and says, "I am concerned, however, that the resultant prices were presented to the client and to the board as realistic figures for these vessels. Whether through ignorance of the estimator or policy of the management, the board were induced to sign contracts which had no hope of being profitable. To further compound these errors the latter decision to proceed with the yard expansion scheme was based upon the premise that these contracts would be profitable."

"These results are disturbing in the extreme" - so the gentleman says - "but of even more concern are the thought processes which formulated the policy and the advice to the board. The whole episode underlines my belief that the success of this shipyard depends more on a systematic approach to business and on consistently applied sound policies than it does on charisma!"

Sounds to me like the words of a gentleman who would have the interest of that shipyard at heart. But for that kind of attitude I am afraid that he has paid the price and is no longer with us.

Now, Sir, let us get back to how the purchase of this steel came about, and I am referring to a document I have in my hand dated June 13, 1974, written again to Mr. Alexander Roche, in his - re long term supply contract for steel.

"Dear Sandy, The yard is favourably placed at this time for steel supply for contracts up to and including hull number seventeen, the second National Sea Products vessel. Quantity purchases have

MR. NEARY: been made and most of the material is now in the yard at prices which while seeming high at the time of negotiation are proving acceptable in the present market."

"The outlook for future supplies is worsening. As you know we have no allocation from Canadian mills, and British mills are subject to exorbitant control and will not back orders in excess of six months in advance."

This is where he is asking - I am not going to read the whole thing, it will take me too long and my time is running out. He said, "In the former incidence an early contract signing would approve us with the necessary funds to finance the steel purchase but the latter circumstances will cost us a considerable amount in borrowed capital. I think some form of contract should be negotiated rapidly."

The man is asking the government, look you have announced this, you have asked us to go ahead and set it up, now will you give us a contract, give us the orders to build them.

"I know that the Department of Fisheries people will be reluctant," he says, "to commit themselves to a contract while the design is still under development. But I trust to your powers of persuasion in presenting our case."

Now, Sir, let me point out to the hon. House that from the information that I have that the Board of Directors of that shipyard during this whole time had not held a single meeting, that they had been negligent in their responsibilities and they should have resigned. They did not hold a single meeting. They did not give the shipyard, Sir, any direction whatsoever except that they told them to go ahead and purchase the steel, borrow the money and sink her in the hole.

And I could go on and on, Sir, I have all kinds of other information in connection with the shipyards, Mr. Speaker. So that is why, Sir, that is why, not through anything the Leader of the Opposition said because he did not influence me one bit, but because I feel myself

Mr. Neary:

that in certain matters relating to this budget that the government, Sir, has not levelled with the people of this Province, and they have not disclosed the facts. I have thrown out a few facts in connection with the Marystown Shipyards. I could throw out a few more, Sir, in connection with the Health Sciences Complex over at Memorial University. I have been working on that one for some time, and I guarantee you when that gentleman over there, Mr. Pardy, called his press conference and called me, practically, in the eyes of the Newfoundland people, a liar, he did not realize what he was taking on. And I have got men, Sir, I have foremen on that job who are prepared to appear before a public inquiry into that house that Mr. Pardy has down there near St. Phillip's. I have not seen it myself. I am told it is - on the Tote Road - valued in the vicinity of \$250,000. Not bad for a little fellow who came over from Ireland a few years ago! And I will lay the charges when the time comes, and all the government has to do, if they want to call my bluff, is to set up a public inquiry and I will bring these men, these plumbers and these carpenters that were sent from the Health Sciences Complex down to work on that house, and now working on another house. There is another contractor over there now representing a big contractor who thinks he is going to do the same thing. He saw what a bonanza it was for this other gentleman, Now he is doing the same thing. He is sending down the material and workmen from the Health Sciences Complex to build him a big home, trying to outdo one another now. And the hon. Premier - I have been talking with his Minister of Public Works about it. Unfortunately the minister had to leave and go away to Toronto, but I am going to continue my discussions with the minister when he gets back. I am going down to find out why this gentleman left Scrivener and then went off and formed a consulting company and then hired himself back to Scrivener again, why that was necessary. Earning more now than he would if he were on a salary. And I will get to the bottom of this. All they have to do is set up

MR. NEARY: an inquiry so I can protect these people who are giving me the information. They are prepared - I say to every one of them, the last foreman I spoke to, "If I can get a public inquiry will you appear before it to give evidence that you had to send carpenters down to build that house?" "Yes, Sir," he said, "and I cannot lose me job. I have a family to look after." Neither would I ask them to. And then, you know, you are likely to pick up The Newfoundland Herald and it says, "Oh Neary is at it again, you know. He will not name names." How can you name names when you do not have the protection? I will name the names, if we could get at the consulting fees over there at that Health Science Complex. I will continue my discussions with the Minister of Public Works (Dr. Farrell) when he comes back and between the two of us - I think he is as much interested as I am. I am sure he is, Sir. I am sure the Premier is. I am not saying that the administration is in on it or anybody over there. I am sure they would like to see justice done the same as I would. Maybe they do not like the way I bring it to their attention. Maybe they do not. Maybe I should go straight to the Premier or to the minister with these things when I get them. Maybe I should. I do not know, but this is the way I have to do it in the House. And certainly, Sir, I am sure, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, as sure as you are sitting in that Chair there are hon. ministers and hon. members sitting on the government benches that I have spoken to who want to get to the bottom of some of these things. Hon. members who agree with me that the University should disclose its budget. hon. members who agree with me that this house situation - sending materials and labour down from the Health Science Complex - should be investigated, consulting engineering fees in Burin and other places should be investigated. I am the only one who agrees with that. The trouble is that I just cannot get it done, that is the whole trouble. And so, Sir, these are the reasons, these are the reasons, Sir, that I am going to vote for this amendment. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, maybe I could be persuaded to vote against it, I doubt it very much. Maybe if I could get a combination

MR. NEARY: of eloquence from the government benches and common sense statements from not only the government benches, but maybe this side of the House.

You know, we heard the other day - I heard a little namby-namby, wishy-washy member on this side, you know, I do not know what I could call him, twinkle toes or - I heard him get up and say, oh, you know, why do not the government members, why do they not, the ones who feel like voting against this amendment vote against it. Well I say the same thing to this side of the House. It is about time we gave up being partisan. If you do not like an amendment I am afraid my hon. friends down here will have to toe the party line just the same as they will over there. That is the way it works, unfortunately. And one is just as bad as the other in that respect. I am in the happy position now where I can vote for or against. I was never in a better position in my life. But maybe, Sir, I could be persuaded by statements from members on either side of this hon. House who could engage in the debates of voting one way or the other. But right now I have no alternative, Sir, for the reasons that I have given, and I wish I had more time, the reasons that I have given and I have no alternative at this moment, Sir, but to pledge my support to the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, if there are no further speakers on the amendment could we consider the clock stopped at 6 o'clock and perhaps put the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? Those in favour 'aye'. Those against 'nay'. In my opinion the nays have it.

MP. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, since we have divided the House - I hope that two of my colleagues will rise with me - could we have a recorded vote? That is if I can persuade two of them to stand.

MP. SPEAKER: Let the House divide.

DIVISION:

MP. SPEAKER: The three minutes have elapsed. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Canning; Mr. White; Mr. J. Winsor; Mr. Flight; Mr. Lush; Mr. Mulrooney; Mr. Nolan; Mr. Neary.

MP. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise.

The hon. the Premier; The hon. the Minister of Tourism; The hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations; The hon. the Minister of Health; The hon. the Minister of Social Services; The hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment; The hon. Mr. Wells; The hon. the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development; The hon. the Minister of Fisheries; The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; The hon. the Minister of Education; Dr. Collins; Mr. Cross; Mr. Power; Mr. Young; Mr. Goudie; Mr. N. Winsor; Mr. Dinn; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Carter; Mr. Woodrow; Dr. P. Winsor; Mr. Marshall; The hon. Mr. Smallwood; Mr. Dawe; Mr. Callan; Mr. P. Moores.

MR. SPEAKER: Affirmative, ten. Negative, twenty-seven. I declare the motion lost.

MP. WELLS: I move that this House now adjourn until three o'clock Monday.

MP. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the motion to adjourn, may I just have leave to answer a question submitted earlier by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), with regard to an oil spill in Conception Bay, I think, was the question asked. I have contacted my department and the department

MR. MURPHY:

has been in touch with the federal Department of the Environment and they received word that an oil spill amounting to approximately fifty barrels was wasted at the thermal generating plant of Newfoundland Hydro at Seal Cove in a pond called Indian Brook Pond. It is being contained by a boom erected by the federal authorities and they say now that there is no concern of the oil spill getting out into the Bay.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until Monday, December 15, 1975, at three o'clock.

C O N T E N T S

December 12, 1975	Page
<u>Statements by Ministers</u>	
Mr. Murnhy informed the House that he had contacted the major credit card companies suggesting that they waive accumulated interest charges technically incurred because accounts could not be paid during the mail strike.	1453
Mr. Roberts commented.	1453
<u>Notices of Motion</u>	
Mr. Rousseau gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce Bill No. 13.	1454
<u>Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given</u>	
Mr. Wells replied to a question asked the previous day concerning residences for students attending the College of Trades and Technology.	1454
<u>Oral Questions</u>	
Oil spill in Conception Bay. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Murphy.	1454
Letter of resignation of William Millen. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1455
Tabling of the letter. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1455
Delivery of steel or machinery to the Marystown Shipyard for construction of stern trawlers. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1455
Dollar value of the steel on hand. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1456
Financial arrangements for the Shipyard to obtain the money to purchase the steel. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1456
Mr. Neary expressed dissatisfaction with the answer, and gave notice that he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment.	1457
Projected deficit for the current year at the Shipyard. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	1458
Layoffs at the Shipyard. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	1459
Ministerial awareness of plans to lay off 100 men at the Shipyard. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	1459
New contracts for the Shipyard. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	1460
Tabling of the financial report of the Shipyard. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lundrigan.	1462
Shipyard deficit for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lundrigan.	1462
Mr. Millen's reasons for leaving. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1463
Conrad Stein. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Lundrigan.	1464
Residences for the College of Trades and Technology. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Wells.	1466
Polytechnical institute. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Lundrigan.	1466
Papermill workers strike. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	1467

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>Oral Questions (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
Stop-payment on a cheque to John Leckie Ltd. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	1467
Payments to the Leckie firm being re-examined. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	1468
Installation of water and sewer systems for a trailer park in Torbay. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	1469
Efficiency of the Marystown Shipyard management as of last May. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	1469
Query as to whether the Premier is aware that the Irving settlement in the papermill workers strike is under review. Mr. Flight, Premier Moores.	1470
Possibility of a strike at the Waterford Hospital and other institutions. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Collins.	1470
Contingency plan to cope with the situation. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Collins.	1471
Mr. Millen's resignation. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	1472
Layoffs in the cottage hospitals, especially at the Burin Hospital. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Collins.	1473
 <u>Orders of the Day</u>	
Second reading of Bill No. 11.	
Mr. Maynard.	1473
On motion, Bill No. 11 read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.	1475
Committee of Ways and Means (Budget Debate, specifically the amendment.)	
Mr. Rowe	1475
Mr. Roberts	1477
Mr. Neary	1528
On division, the amendment was defeated, with affirmative 10 - negative 27.	1550
Mr. Murphy replied to a question asked earlier by Mr. Roberts concerning an oil spill at Indian Brook Pond, Seal Cove.	1550
Adjournment	1551