



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 17

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. E. S. JONES (Min of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I ask the concurrence of the House to make a public statement, a ministerial statement on the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I find it necessary to reply publicly

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that I would not be making this statement today and that there would have been no public discussion in the House of Assembly on 5th and 6th May last year, when the House met in Committee of the Whole to consider the Auditor General's report, if the Auditor General had complied with the reasonable and normal request made of him by the Comptroller of Finance, that he (the Comptroller) be allowed to see a draft of the Auditor General's report before it is tabled in the House. Mr. Speaker, it is unprecedented for an auditor to include in his report qualifications relating to his audit without first discussing the proposed qualifications with management - in this case, the Comptroller of Finance. Apart from common courtesy, it is obviously a matter of good sense to do this as no auditor would want to make any remarks which are inaccurate, incomplete or which might be capable of misinterpretation.

Mr. Speaker, if Honourable Members would bear with me, I would now like to go through the Auditor General's report on the accounts of the Province for the year ended 31st. March, 1969, paragraph by paragraph, and to comment on his remarks.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 require no comment.

Paragraph 4 - the Auditor General points out that he is faced by an unrealistic requirement in the Revenue and Audit Act, Section 59(3). Section 59(3) states "Each of these accounts shall be examined under the direction of the Auditor General who shall certify that the account has been examined under his direction and is correct".

Mr. Speaker, the point being made by the Auditor General is quite obvious and quite simple. The word "correct" means one thing and one thing only - it is not a word in which there is any "gray" area. Either something is correct or it is not. It is well established practice that no auditor checks 100% of the entries and transactions in the course of an audit; he relies instead on an examination of the systems and procedures, or internal controls and he tests the effectiveness of these by examining a limited number of transactions, in depth. At the conclusion of his examination, no auditor will be prepared to certify financial statements as being "correct". He will, instead, normally be prepared to certify that they show a "true and fair view".

on the R.C.M.P. service rental contract for the period 1st. October, 1968 to 31st. March, 1969, reflects the normal situation, as payments are always made at six-monthly intervals.

Paragraphs 28 and 29 refer to the valuation of investments shown on Schedule 2.

The practice of the Province over the years, has been to show all assets at cost and items are only written-off after all efforts to recover the full amount have failed. The Balance Sheet of the Province has never purported to be a balance sheet, in the commercial sense of the word.

The Comptroller and his officials, in consultation with the Auditor General, have been discussing changes in the format of the Public Accounts of the Province and have undertaken a good deal of work in this connection. In fact, reference to this is made by the Auditor General in paragraph 67 of his report. It is the Comptroller's view, and I support it, that piecemeal changes in the format of the Public Accounts should not be made and that any major changes in the format should be delayed until a decision has been taken regarding the overall method of presentation to be adopted. In the meanwhile, the accounts have been prepared on a basis consistent with previous years, except where otherwise stated.

I feel, however, that the Auditor General may have inadvertently suggested that all the investments, listed on Schedule 2, totalling \$22,273,678, are of doubtful value, by the use of the example of Newfoundland Asbestos Limited in paragraph 29 of his report. In fact, the only investments in that list which are worthless, are Newfoundland Asbestos Limited and Placentia Bridge Corporation Limited, for a total of \$78,000. The remaining investments are not presently expected to result in any losses to the Province.

Paragraph 30 refers to the amount of \$1,467,980 representing other accounts receivable, shown on Schedule 3. My earlier remarks regarding the valuation of assets relates to this item - several of the amounts making up this figure may ultimately have to be written-off but, in the meanwhile, efforts to collect are being made.

legislation will shortly be introduced which will clarify the situation. Following the enactment of this legislation amounts which are legally due will be collected.

Paragraph 32 of the Auditor General's report refers to the fact that no valuation has been made of loans, advances and other assets totalling \$123,038,000. This matter is, once again, a question of reporting practice and in the event that it is decided to make changes in the format of the Public Accounts then, possibly, it may be decided to show the items at their realizable value. Meanwhile they are shown at cost, less amounts written-off, which is consistent with previous years.

Paragraph 33 refers to an improvement in the methods of recording inventories for which I would like to express my thanks to the Auditor General.

Paragraphs 34 and 35 refer to the Province's practice of capitalizing all fixed assets and extraordinary expenses. This, too, is a practice which may change, if it is decided to change the format of the Public Accounts. Many provinces include fixed assets in their balance sheets at a nominal value of \$1, so it is apparent there is a good deal of difference of opinion regarding the treatment of these assets in government balance sheets.

Paragraph 36 refers to the question of bank reconciliations, which is again referred to in paragraph 66 of the Auditor General's report. I will deal with this item in my comments on paragraph 66.

Paragraph 37 makes reference to the value of welfare orders issued and outstanding at 31st. March, 1969, of \$924,611. This is a repeat of information which is given in the Public Accounts on page 119. Welfare orders paid in 1968/69 total \$13,863,466, so there is nothing unusual about an amount of \$924,611 being outstanding at the year end, representing the value of approximately one month's welfare orders.

Paragraph 38 refers to payments which have been made in respect of bank loans or debentures, under government guarantee, since the close

and in future the two amounts will be shown separately.

Paragraph 47 (iii) refers to a grant of \$10,000 which was made to the Wabana Recreational Commission. The position here is that Cabinet, in November 1967, ordered that a grant of \$10,000 be made to the Wabana Recreational Commission and stated that the grant was to be made on or before the 31st March, 1968, from the proceeds of the sale of the Dosco assets. The Directive further stated that the Bank of Nova Scotia, Bell Island, was to be advised of the Cabinet decision.

On the basis of the Directive, the Wabana Recreational Commission obtained a temporary loan from the Bank of Nova Scotia, pending receipt of the funds from the government. A difficulty arose, however, in that to have charged the \$10,000 against the proceeds of the Bell Island assets would have been to make an illegal revenue refund and accordingly, it was decided that the only appropriate subhead against which this charge could be made was the Department of Finance - General Contingencies Account. The repayment of the loan to the Bank of Nova Scotia was not, however, made until June 1968 and in my opinion the only criticism which can be levelled at the Department of Finance is that they should have obtained an amending Cabinet Directive, changing the date of 31st March, 1968 to 30th June, 1968.

In this case the payment of the \$10,000 was in accordance with Cabinet's expressed wishes and had it been made before 31st March, 1968, the only question would have been the account to which the expenditure should have been charged. In not seeking to have an amending Cabinet Directive issued, altering the date of 31st March, 1968 to 30th June, 1968, the Department of Finance was, strictly speaking, acting without authority. In this instance, however, it is quite obvious that the desire of Cabinet to make the grant had been stated and there can be no suggestion, therefore, that any loss of public funds resulted from the action of the Department of Finance in implementing Cabinet's decision.

Paragraph 50 (iii). The Auditor General is merely providing additional information - both items referred to are correct charges to this subhead,

Paragraph 50 (iv) refers to an irregular charge of \$40,837. I regard this statement of the Auditor General as being very misleading as it could suggest that a loss of Government funds has resulted. Nothing of the sort has happened,

As Honourable Members know, the Revenue and Audit Act permits payments to be made in respect of obligations incurred during a particular fiscal year and for a period of 30 days after the close of the year. Any funds not utilized then lapse and have to be re-voted in the Estimates for the following year.

In this particular case the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources had entered into a contract for the construction of a building to be used for egg-grading and vegetable storage, at Bishops' Falls. At the year-end, the work was still in progress and the contractors had been paid a total of \$85,884, against the certified value of work done and materials provided of \$107,392. The contract was for a total of \$135,000. With approximately \$50,000 still to be paid on the contract, when it was completed, the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources was faced with the problem of a lapsed balance in 1968/69 and no funds available in 1969/70 to pay for the completion of the contract, the necessary funds having inadvertently been omitted from the 1969/70 Estimates. In order to overcome the problem a cheque, in the amount in question and payable to the contractors, was drawn but this cheque was not, however, handed to the contractors until 23rd, July, 1969 (their receipt of this date is on file), by which time the value of the work done and materials provided totalled \$135,249 and payments totalled \$126,721 (the \$85,884 paid prior to 31st March and the \$40,837 referred to by the Auditor General).

969

Assistance vote. Funds are allocated by the Legislature for this purpose.

In instances of this type the difficulties faced by the municipality in question may have arisen as a result of debts due to the Government or may have arisen as a result of debts due to other persons.

The other way of giving assistance, and the one advocated by the Auditor General, is that in respect of debts due to the Government, assistance should be given indirectly by way of seeking permission to write-off all or part of the debt due by the municipality to the Government.

In my opinion, either method is quite proper.

Paragraph 52(iii) refers to an amount of \$170,661 which should not have been taken into account as an appropriation-in-aid. The Auditor General's statement merely repeats a note which appears on page 125 of the Public Accounts. The error was discovered too late to adjust the figures. The amount involved is, however, not significant.

Paragraph 53 (i) refers to an amount of \$10,000 which was not charged to subhead 1412.05 during 1968/69. This was the result of an oversight and the necessary adjustment will be made in 1969/70.

Paragraph 53(ii). The question here is merely one relating to the description of a subhead as "fixed assets". The items referred to are a correct charge against this subhead and the subhead would obviously be better described by the use of some other title. The point is relatively minor, however.

Paragraph 53(iii). The Auditor General's comment must have been based on an earlier draft of the Public Accounts as the copy which has been tabled reflects what he is in effect suggesting (see page 127 of the Public Accounts).

Paragraph 53(iv). The point made by the Auditor General here concerns a matter of presentation. The amount of \$347,456 has been shown as an appropriation-in-aid under subhead 1413, Fisheries Development and Assistance but, in the opinion of the Auditor General, should have been taken into account under Head 1, Consolidated Fund Services, as a non-revenue item. Either way, the funds get into the Exchequer Account, which is the main point.

Paragraph 53(v). This is a minor matter relating to presentation once again. The expenditure was shown as a current account item because it was voted in the Estimates for 1968/69 as a current account expenditure. The loans which have been

purposes and in relation to total government expenditures, which exceeded \$300 million, they represent less than 1/50th of 1% of total expenditures. While it is technically correct that they do represent over-expenditures, the amounts involved are relatively immaterial.

The second point made by the Auditor General relates to the fact that the failure to transfer expenditures has "frustrated" the objective of showing the costs of various activities. The total of the expenditures not transferred from the Department of Public Works is \$232,328 and from the Department of Supply \$44,718. Together, they amount to \$277,046. The desire of the government to show all costs associated with each activity is to enable Honourable Members and other persons involved in the administration of government to see the actual costs involved in each programme or service. To suggest that the non-transference of amounts totalling \$277,146 has frustrated this objective, when total expenditures of the government exceed \$300 million, is obviously to exaggerate the situation.

Paragraph 60. A writ has been issued by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for the recovery of the funds due by Atlantic Drilling Company Limited and steps to effect recovery of the amount due will continue.

Paragraph 61 refers to the difficulties which the Department of Finance is experiencing in enforcing the provisions of the Insurance Companies Tax Act, 1957, against a certain hospital service association. The matter has been actively pursued by the Department of Finance and has culminated in a formal demand for returns to be filed, being sent to the association in question on 4th February, 1970.

Paragraph 62 refers to a small matter regarding arrears due under a lease totalling \$4,100. The facts are as stated by the Auditor General and I do not think I need comment further on this paragraph.

Paragraph 63. I do not propose to deal with the Auditor General's comments here as they relate to a Crown Corporation and should be dealt with by the directors of that corporation.

Paragraph 64 refers to the Hotel Port aux Basques. The Auditor General has stated that accumulated profits, totalling \$215,613 at 31st March, 1969, as shown by the accounts of the hotel, have not been recorded in the accounts of the

and Audit Act. As I mentioned, when dealing earlier with paragraph 4 of his report, I have no arguments with him on this point.

- ii) The second point made by the Auditor General is that he has "been unable to establish that there has been any legislative or executive directive on the basic principles for an accounting system for the Province and the form and content of the statements to be produced".

While the preparation of formal instructions regarding (a) basic principles for an accounting system and (b) the form and content of the statements, is obviously desirable, the absence of such formal instructions does not, in itself, make the accounting systems any less effective or the statements any less meaningful. It is unfortunate that in making these two perfectly valid points, the Auditor General has combined them in a manner which gives the reader the impression that the absence of such instructions has resulted in his being unable to certify these statements as being "correct".

Paragraphs 68, 69 and 70 do not require any specific comment from me.

MR. SPEAKER, I apologise for having taken so much of the House's time to review, in detail, the comments of the Auditor General. However, I feel that it has been necessary to do this and I am sure that in the light of my comments, Honourable Members must now feel confident that control of government finances, which is entrusted to the other servant of this House, the Comptroller of Finance, is in good hands.

MR. SPEAKER, before closing my remarks I should like to make a couple of observations. Firstly, the total dollar amount of receipts and payments in the fiscal year 1968/69 is approximately \$700 million. These receipts and payments are represented by hundreds of thousands of entries, reflecting hundreds of thousands of transactions. I personally think that the fact that the Auditor General has found so little to criticise and to comment upon in his reports on the Public

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, before Your Honor calls the next order, I should like to express on behalf of the House a very cordial welcome, indeed, to some twenty-four students of Grade VI, in the Eugene Vaters Pentecostal Academy. They are accompanied by Mr. Clayton Rice, their teacher, and also by the Principal of the Academy, Mr. John Whalen. I have particular pleasure in welcoming these students today because I believe, I believe that I had the honour to open that school in the first place. They are, I suppose, paying their first visit here to the Chamber and I do hope that they will find it quite interesting to be here.

Now, the statement they have just heard from the Minister of Finance is not, I suppose, well, I am not sure but I would imagine is not the kind of thing that the students would be fascinated to hear. They would need to have been here for some days past and they would need to be much more familiar than they are in all probability with the public finances of the Province to be able to enjoy the statement of the Minister of Finance.

However, it is a very important and necessary part of the business of the House and from this I suppose the students from Eugene Vaters Pentecostal Academy will understand that here in the House it is not always auditory and is not always speechifying and that it is not always exciting and that business is done very often, quietly and without any inflammatory oratory.

I am glad to hear - I hope they enjoy it and I want to say too, while I am at it that I am so proud and happy to welcome the Leader of the Opposition back here today.

These students of the Pentecostal Academy and the Leader of the Opposition have come in here together. I do not know if there is any particular significance in that, but the Leader of the Opposition has been away from here for quite awhile and he is here today. The students are here today and I do not know if there is any connection, but now that he is here, and I have welcomed the students, and I have welcomed him, I throw a stern challenge across the floor at him, not an accusation, not a charge, I am not going to condemn him or anything like that. I am just going to challenge him to get up and make a speech and agree with every word I have said: that these students are bright, intelligent, good-looking, splendid young Newfoundlanders and I defy the Leader of the Opposition

However, Mr. Speaker, the name of the game has changed, and what has changed it has been the Trans-Canada Highway. That highway from Port aux Basques to St. John's is, I suppose, the, well, certainly, one of the best things that has ever happened to Newfoundlanders. It is possibly, one of the worst things that has ever happened to the politicians, because in cutting up the cake across the past twenty years, as was inevitable, some districts have received a larger slice than have some other districts.

Now, this did not matter twenty years ago when a district in one place did not know and had no idea of what was going on in a district half a province away.

Today, the Trans-Canada Highway enables the residents of the underprivileged districts to get into and see what goes on the district that has been more fortunate and when in some of them, they see that some districts have been paved from end to end with some of the other goodies thrown in, and when they compare these circumstances with the less fortunate circumstances by which they had come by, they most inconsiderately blame it on their member, give him bejeffers and want to know why they cannot have an equal portion.

The way they see it, after all a vote is a vote is a vote or is it not? In any case, Mr. Speaker, right now in the Codroy Valley the name of the game is paved roads.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this petition received at the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. W. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg permission to present a petition on behalf of the people of Petites. Petites is a small settlement four miles to the east of Port aux Basques. Their only connection is by radio-telephone with Rose Blanche. In the town, there are two telephones: one at the post office and one in a telephone booth in the central of the town.

When a call comes through for any resident, the Post Mistress has to go around and notify the person concerned. Then, the person has to go to either the post office or the telephone booth to put through the call. This is very inconvenient, especially in bad weather and unsuitable conditions.

WHEREAS, it appears that the Government of Newfoundland will have to expend some \$3 million to acquire title to all the land within the boundaries of the proposed National Park and,

WHEREAS, it is desirable that members of the hon. House of Assembly and the public of Newfoundland be fully informed of the position with reference to the establishment of the Bonne Bay National Park.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House regrets the failure of the Government of Newfoundland to proceed expeditiously with the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay National Park and the failure of the Government to report fully and completely to this hon. House of Assembly and to the public of Newfoundland, the facts with respect to the proposal to establish a Bonne Bay National Park and directs the Government to table in this hon. House of Assembly, all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada relative to the proposal to establish a National Park in the Bonne Bay area.

181

the Harmon Base closed. And this resulted in the loss of the Military Police. As a result of the base's closing there were 350 buildings left vacant. And there were a considerable number of break-ins, and an increase in vandalism. Many of these buildings are now occupied. I may add that the detachment has been increased to sixteen, after the base closed, but is now manned by a staff of fourteen.

The last part of the Question - Does the Minister think that the present size of the Bell Island Detachment is sufficient to perform all the necessary police duties on Bell Island? In the opinion of the Chief Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. the size of the present detachment on Bell Island is sufficient to perform all the necessary police duties. And in view of the fact that they have men that can be called from St. John's at very short notice. I agree with his opinion.

HON. WILLIAM R. CALLAHAN: (MINISTER OF MINES, AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES): Mr. Speaker Question 142 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's Centre, on the Order Paper of Wednesday, March 4th. The question is in two parts - (1) Who or what firm does the maintenance work on Government planes? The answer is Eastern Provincial Airways. And (2) Is this work done on a contractual basis or in what manner are charges assessed? By negotiated contracts.

Question No. 164 in the name of the hon. member in the name of the hon. member for Gander on the Order Paper of today, Thursday, March 5th. What is the total number of people employed at the Agricultural Grading and Storage Facility at Bishop's Falls? I have to say Mr. Speaker, that this complex which was built by the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation none the less, is leased to the co-operative which is a private company, and I think it would not be proper for me to give, indeed I do not have really, or officially the information. I think the same answer would have to apply to the second part of the question, this facility is operated by the Farmers Co-op and other than leasing the building to them and seeing that the conditions of the lease are kept, we have actually no part in it.

Question No. 168 on the Order Paper of today Mr. Speaker asked by the hon. the member for St. Barbe South. It is in three parts - the first part - Does Bison Petroleum and Minerals Limited or Canadian Javelin Limited have oil exploration rights within the proposed boundaries of the National Park at Bonne Bay? Strictly, Mr. Speaker, I could answer no to the question. But I think

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a question to the Minister - supplementary funds granted was this granted in supplementary supply or in regular votes of the year?

MR. DAWE: Will I am not -

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (MINISTER OF HEALTH) Mr. Speaker, if I may I will check in the absence of my colleague, I believe, this in the mainrestiamte approved by the House last year.

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, is there any comparsion of cost made between the cost of these houses and I would accept under normal methods?

MR. DAWE: In answer to that question, I did discuss this with the officals of my department, and they advised me that these costs compared very favourably with the erection of houses in the normal manner.

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY (MINISTER OF WELFARE): Mr. Speaker, I have part of the answer to Question No. 161 asked by the hon. member for Burin. First of all, Mr. Speaker part no. (1) What are the numbers of persons on short term assistance as at 31 January, 1970 for each electoral district in Newfoundland? This information is not readily available. And as my hon. friend knows it would take sometime before we could get it run through the computers. But. if he wanted to Mr. Speaker, when I give him the answer to part two of the question. He could just by doing very simple mathematics divide \$22.58 in to the figures that I am amount to give him because that is the average assistance given to each individual, \$22.58. So, if he would nod his approval, Mr. Speaker, or if the wants me to get the information for him, I will be glad to get it for him. I will table this, so I will table the answer to part (2) of the question. And just to repeat, Mr. Speaker by dividing \$22.58 into it, my hon. friend could get the number of persons.

March 5, 1970

Tape #222

Page 2

was incorrect, namely the question concerning a letter to Atlantic Brewery. I wonder Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would now advise the House whether or not any such letter was sent to Atlantic Brewery or any of the promoters of Atlantic Brewery, that indicated in any way there might be exemption from the profit applied under the Alcoholic Liquors Act, and whether such a letter will be tabled?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question was in order but if Your Honour does not mind, I do not mind answering it. The matter is to be looked at if the Motion of my hon. friend the Hon. Minister of Finance is adopted tomorrow, and if a Select Committee is appointed. But in case it is not adopted, I have to say that the answer I gave in this House was strictly correct, literally and strictly correct. And the question was: had I sent a letter exempting the Company, the Brewery from the payment of the profits of the Board of Liquor Control. Did the Premier inform the Atlantic Brewing Limited that they had an exemption or concession granted by the Government exempting them from paying the profit of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission on sales of beer as claimed by the Atlantic Brewing Company Limited, and as reported in Item 60 of the Report of the Auditor General to the House of Assembly for the financial year ended March 31, 1969, to which I answered in one word: No. And the "no" had reference not to their being informed, because they were informed, but to their being informed that they would not have to pay the Liquor Board's profit. I repeat that answer now.

MR. WELLS: Will the letter be tabled?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the House adopts the Motion of which the Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice today, and the Select Committee be appointed - of course that is where the matter will be fully ventilated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. J. C. CROSSIE: Mr. Speaker, I just spoke for a few seconds a night or so ago to start my address on the Speech in reply, and before getting on to other matters, I would like to comment on this business of Public Accounts, and a statement made by the Minister of Finance today. My point is Mr. Speaker, that consultation such as last year's, when the Comptroller general was brought

March 5, 1970

Tape #222

Page 4

in this honourable debate, because we roamed in many directions during that address. And if Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is - the voting populace of Newfoundland could have been present in this Chamber to listen to that ten hour address, we would no need to fear what was going to happen in the coming election. We on this side of the House, and those who run with us would be on the other side for certain after that address.

Before getting to more pressing things I want to deal with some of the points the hon. the Premier made, and first I want to deal Mr. Speaker, with the taunt about crossing the floor three times - the Hon. Minister of Social and Rehabilitation thinks roller skates are needed and so on. I want to address myself to that first.

Mr. Speaker, apart altogether from personalities, we are in this House, or we are in the Government to do what we think is right for this Province, and for our Party, if we belong to a political party, so that comes second. In May of 1968 Mr. Speaker, I found myself forced to the view that I could no longer accept responsibility for the actions of the present Government, because I considered to be headed in a disastrous course. And when I resigned at that time Mr. Speaker, my letter of resignation was tabled in this House. I want briefly to refer to it. That resignation Mr. Speaker was not, I repeat, not just over some little issue of interim financing on an Oil Refinery at Come-by-Chance. That was the immediate matter before the Cabinet that precipitated the resignation. As far as the project at Come-by-Chance my position then was and is now, that there is no one in Newfoundland at all who is going to be against having an Oil Refinery in the Province. That is not the issue. My position has always been Mr. Speaker - what do the people of Newfoundland have to pay to obtain that Oil Refinery? Is the Government acting on their behalf having too much for it? Are the promoters of the project retaining on to themselves too much of the good things that are going to come out of that Refinery? It has been my position. it was then - it is now - that this Refinery or any other Refinery Mr. Speaker, is welcome in Newfoundland. My position is and has been and continues to be that the promoters of the project are not giving to the Government of Newfoundland and through it to the people the benefits they should be receiving for what we are contributing to the project. And what we are contributing is the credit

that was the position I took Mr. Speaker, when that further concession was asked for. And I said, no, no further will I go and giving concessions, concessions, concessions to these people who want us the people of Newfoundland to take all the risk while they take all the profits if it is a success. That was my view then, and that is my view now. And if Mr. Speaker, they are now going to ask for even further concessions I will not agree to that either, unless there is going to be a substantial quid pro quo for the people of this Province and some extra benefit that we are going to get out of it. That was the immediate cause Mr. Speaker, the interim financing. But only because, because that was the immediate issue that we could no longer go along with. In addition to that my letter of resignation Mr. Speaker dealt with these other questions and I am not going into them in detail. I did not agree then and do not now with the way the Government is going about economic development in this Province.

Yes, we need jobs in this Province and everybody in this Province knows it. But the point is Mr. Speaker, that this Government is not effectively creating jobs it is not properly organized to go about the job of economic development, industrial development. It has not been successful with the kind of methods that are in use now. And if we do not adopt in this Province a proper organization as they have in other provinces the approach of feasibility studies and cost benefit analysis and a properly organized department of economic development and a small industry of business section and the rest of it. If we do not adopt that approach we will not be successful Mr. Speaker. I did not agree with the present approach to economic and industrial development. I brought up the issue in a letter of the so-called cheap power policy, this was in May of 1968, and said I had serious reservations on that. These reservations Mr. Speaker, are not answered today, two years later. A whole host of studies have been done, according to an answer to a question in this House, by the power board of Canada, and seven or eight other consultants and government departments, to determine whether this Province can afford to sell power at less than cost or half cost to industrial users in this Province, and those studies are in the hands of the Premier. We do not if all members even the Cabinet have seen them. But we are not being given the copies and that issue has not been gone into in detail in public. And that Mr. Speaker I repeat is an issue that can make or break this Province, because if the policy is carried out, carried out foolishly and recklessly and we cannot afford it, the Province can not, we could end up in a financial disaster even though we have got a few ^{heavy} industries here in Newfoundland. That was another issue.

that it would come within the Liberal Party there would be a new leader. I certainly did not expect it would be myself in view of what had happened. But a new leader with a different approach, I could live with. So when I was invited to go to this original meeting at Grand Falls Mr. Speaker, I wrote the Premier when he invited me and outlined the basis I would go on. I would go as long as it was understood I would, did not, that my letter of resignation stood and I still believe those matters would not vote against the matters expressed in my letter of resignation. I went on the basis that he was resigning and so on. The letter is in the public record anybody wants to see it.

I knew Mr. Speaker, when I accepted that invitation to go to Grand Falls that I was endangering myself politically. That the members of the public, how a lot of them would feel that I have gone back on what I had done, or that was some personal advantage of my own I was after or there would be some suspicious, there would be a lot of suspicion. Because whatever a man does in public life there are thousands just waiting to say: "ah he is a rogue. See what he is up to now." Never give you the benefit of the doubt that is not something you experience in public life is the benefit of the doubt. I went back Mr. Speaker, and hon. members can believe this or not as they choose - because I felt that this was the quickest way to get a change of administration and because I was interested in staying in the party in which I had been a member from 1949 before I came back here to Newfoundland. I made my own choice of the party that I was going to join, in 1949 eight years before I came back here, to Newfoundland. That is why I went Mr. Speaker, because I thought the change was going to come in our own party. I knew that political risks, that I would be better off last year if I was on this side of the House where I am now. Free to express my views as to what this Government is doing wrong and I should change as I can now. I knew that. And I went back. And a certain hon. gentleman, who now jeers about somebody crossing the floor three times changed his mind again. After telling all the Liberals and the people of Newfoundland that he was retiring, and it would be a free convention to pick his successor changed his mind again. I took him at face value Mr. Speaker, I took the hon. gentleman at face value when he made his announcement. And so I ran in the Leadership Convention Mr. Speaker, because I was and am convinced there must be a change, now, in the approaches of the Government of Newfoundland in the problems of Newfoundland and if there is not we are headed on a course that threatens disaster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the results of the convention are known. We have all heard in the House the hon. the Premier jumping with joy, roaring how I was licked

interest not at all. It was against my own personal interest. It was against the interest of my family, particularly one's engaged in business where the Government of the Province has such a tremendous effect on all business activities, against all their interest. I did it because Mr. Speaker, I felt I had no other course and because I felt it was in the best interest of the Province. Now I do not doubt for a moment that the hon. gentlemen opposite are where they are because they think that is the best course for the Province, and I will grant them that as long as they grant me the same. And if it is political blunder or if it is political suicide I go willingly Mr. Speaker, down to defeat^{if} what is the price of it because it is not going to bother me. I will certainly miss it if that is what happens. I like public life I am interested in this Province I will not kill me. Another day will come, these are blunders, are suicides because of a regard for this Province and where it should be heading.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before pressing on, some matters I want to bring before the House a few items of rebuttal. The members over here Mr. Speaker are not united by a common dislike of the hon. the Premier. That is such a juvenile way to look at these matters. What we are concerned about is this Province, not whether we like or dislike any individual. Most of the members on the other side

be given, Mr. Speaker, let us get the facts, not half facts and part of the facts. The fact is that the Holiday Inns' chain across this Province is costing the public of Newfoundland a substantial amount of money yearly.

MR. STRICKLAND: Giving a lot of service to the people though.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly, perhaps it is justified. They are fine hotels and we need them, and a nice hotel to stay in. Whether or not the deal entered into is a good one is another question, but when the facts are supposedly be given the House, Mr. Speaker, let us have the whole rounded picture, just not some estimated profit for a Holiday Inn at the end of March 1970 and then forgetting all of the other costs involved and as a matter of fact, I think we have had to pay them - meet deficits in the years previous to that. It is in the public accounts. They have had deficits in the two previous years. Pay no municipal taxes. That is all part of the picture.

The hon. the Premier mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the increase in consumption of power in Newfoundland in the last three years. Well that sounds wonderful just said by itself that Newfoundland has had a greater proportionate increase in power, consumption of power than any other province - wonderful. Until you ask the question, to whom and at what price? Then you get a tremendous consumption of power by ERCO at Long Harbour. I am not sure of the amount. I believe it is 200,000 a year at 2½ mills per kilowatt hours, which is perhaps half the cost and that is included in the increase. Well is that so wonderful, Mr. Speaker? That is what we have to ask ourselves. Increase the consumption of power is grand, if it is economic, but if the increase in the consumption of power is having the result of impoverishing the Province, the Government of the Province. then that may well be something else again. To subsidize the cost of power to ERCO, as the hon. member from Fortune says, is costing the Government around \$3 million a year. Now there was a question on the order paper asking for the exact cost. The Government will not give the answer, but we say it is at least \$3 million - that is \$3.5 million a year. The taxpayers of this Province are paying to ERCO so that they will get power at two and a half mills per kilowatt hour to employ perhaps 400 Newfoundlanders, an annual subsidy of \$7,500 or \$8,000 a year for every Newfoundlander working at ERCO, every year for twenty-five years. The 400 down there would not get the \$7,500 or \$8,000 a year each in wages. Does that make any sense? With nothing further to come out of ERCO, the phosphorus

consumption, but what advantage is it going to be to us? We want some facts, something to get our teeth into just to see where the oil refinery is now. If we are going to perform any useful function that way, Mr. Speaker, we will have to have copies of those agreements, copies of the feasibility report, copies of all that material days before we meet with Mr. Shaheen and his assistants so that we can ask him a few sensible questions and just see where this thing is.

It should all be done by a committee, much more sensible by a committee who would report back to the House. That is the sensible way to do it, not a big production in this House like Mr. Groom and Mr. Howley last year. That is the way I hope the Government will do it. It is all useless. We cannot perform our function, Mr. Speaker, as members of this House to give some opinion on where that oil refinery project is or whether it is really all go and at what cost to the people of Newfoundland, if we are not given all that information well ahead of time. I am not going to be any party to any nonsense here or be forced into saying that everything is alright, if I am not given ample time to have a darn good look at it. Although some will try to interpret it, and that is not being against the oil refinery. That is being interested in obtaining the facts for the people of Newfoundland about this project for which so much is being done by the Government of Newfoundland and for such a small return, at the present time unless changes are made.

Announcements, Mr. Speaker. It was announced in the Fall of 1968 about this \$305 million FRED plan, in Western Newfoundland at Trout River. There was another case where the Government of Canada had not agreed with the Government of Newfoundland on this FRED plan. The Government of Newfoundland has submitted a suggested plan to Ottawa. They had taken a long time to prepare it and spent \$300,000 the Premier said. They submitted it to Ottawa, but Ottawa had not said this is approved by us, but despite that, the hon. the Premier goes to Trout River in the Fall of 1968 and announces it as though it is a fact and what is going to be spent, and then it turns out that Ottawa has changed its mind. It no longer wants that approach or else it did not approve that plan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Ottawa gave us the \$300,000 to spend to make the plan. Every nickel of it came from Ottawa and the plan was largely made by their own men whom they sent down here to join with our men. It was a joint plan paid for by Ottawa, but it was Ottawa in the end at the last minute

familiar with it and here is an announcement of \$135 million housing project for Newfoundland. Now, the truth of the matter of that is, that I think in the fall of 1966, or early 1967, when I was Minister of Housing, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Commission negotiated with CMHC to start investigations in St. John's and Corner Brook to develop satellite towns, and I am quite willing to say that the hon. the Premier was the initiator of it or certainly was a hundred percent for it if not the initiator.

That was in 1966 or '67 and studies have been going on ever since then. I do not know what the present status of it is. But why there would be a dramatic announcement on June 11, 1969 a fact, there was going to be these tremendous developments - 5200 houses and the rest of it - not a joint announcement made between St. John's and Ottawa which is a normal thing because there is going to be seventy-five percent finance by CMHC. Why that announcement would be made, I do not know, Mr. Speaker. There must be some political reason, but I say that that kind of announcement is very dangerous and when made in connection with industrial development projects for this Province, serves us ill because the promoters we are dealing with are going to savage us to get every concession they can and they use the premature announcements to do that and I have seen it happen when I was in the Government, time and again, for that weakened our bargaining position.

The other night, Mr. Speaker, we heard an interesting discussion of the question period with references to all kinds of authorities - Alpheus Todd, Chinese gentleman even, and many others for the question period in Parliament.

And, Mr. Speaker, that was wonderful and we are learning how to ask questions over here. What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government might very properly start reading some books on how to answer questions, because we are not getting the full and complete answers that we should get in response to our questions.

There has been an improvement since the House opened. Since our debate of last week, there has been an improvement but not a sufficient improvement, Mr. Speaker. There is still too much twisting around to avoid answering

/001

All of this racket we have heard this session about Cabinet oaths and Cabinet secrecy is so much done, Mr. Speaker, to help prevent information getting out that the Government does not want to get out. It has been overdone.

My hon. colleague from Humber East and myself left the Cabinet almost two years ago and have never divulged as far as I am concerned any Cabinet secret except in connection with the matter that we resigned on which is perfectly proper and I do not think that the other hon. gentlemen have either.

So, let us stop stressing that, Mr. Speaker. It is being overdone. The Cabinet is said to be a unity the hon. the Premier said. The Cabinet must have teamwork. Very true. Very true, Mr. Speaker. That is what it must have. But a teamwork implies a team. It does not imply a set of a master and slaves and that should be remembered, too.

The hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker, mentioned some things of which he was proud, the other day, including the Fisheries College and the Janeway Hospital. Quite properly so, these are good things the Government has done. In some cases, there might have been - it might have been better value for the money but, nevertheless, these are good things for the Province - solid achievements.

The Premier mentioned the Marystown shipyard. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is matter^a/that needs looking at. The hon. the Premier suggested that the Government constructed a shipyard at Marystown because it felt that - or had figures to show 175 draggers had to be built in the next few years, and why should not these draggers be built in Newfoundland. But, unfortunately, he went on to say, the fish companies got into trouble and the draggers were not built or have not been built.

In answer to a question earlier in the session, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries answered, I believe, that no feasibility study was done before the Marystown shipyard was constructed and you had to ask the question, "If 175 draggers had to be constructed for the Newfoundland Fisheries? Not by the Government, I think you said by the company. Is that the one?"

MR. MALONEY: -- said that no feasibility study had been made in connection with the shipyard. I do not think that question was asked. The question was asked about the fishplant.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! All right, I withdraw that. It was not pertaining to the shipyard.

1003

today, Talking about jobs, talking about jobs. Newfoundland must have jobs industry and we are all practically crying listening to it and it is very convincing. It does not help us get jobs, Mr. Speaker, and covers up the fact that they are not being created as they should be and what is being created is too expensive.

The hon. the Premier criticised the Opposition members over here. He said, not fifty words spoken about DREE by the other side. Well, what do you expect, Mr. Speaker? How can we talk about DREE when we do not know what DREE is? We have no facts to go on about DREE. We know there is DREE, DREE, DREE, DREE. We have heard about DREE for months now, but nothing solid.

There is going to be a plan to come into effect April 1 for one year and then a five year plan and millions. We are waiting for the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development to outline for us what this DREE is. The facts. What DREE is and what it is going to do for Newfoundland and when the hon. minister does that, we will discuss DREE. We certainly will, but how can we get up here today and discuss DREE not knowing a darn thing about it.

Now, we expect a lot/ ^{from} the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development. We expect a lot from him and we certainly give him fair treatment when he outlines DREE, but he had better not try to baffle or bluff us. We want to hear what DREE is. The facts. What DREE will do for Newfoundland next year coming up and the next five years and not the pipe dreams about the billions that are going to be spent in the next fifteen and twenty years and the piffle and propaganda, but if that hon. gentleman gives it to us straight, we will give it back to him and then we will discuss DREE.

We are not discussing it now; the fact that we are not discussing it now does not indicate we are not interested in it, Mr. Speaker. We are. We are just waiting for the facts.

Well, there are a number of other items rebutted. I am not going to get a chance to make my speech if I do not stop rebutting, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the member for Humber East was held up to ridicule because he praised the Premier several years ago. It is easily understandable why he

MR. SMALLWOOD: I gave the figures.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Premier gave a per capita debt figure and then he never had the comparisons for 1969. That is all I am pointing out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Take \$3.1 billion and divide it by ---

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to take \$3.1 billion and divide it by anything. This is my speech, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to make it. I am not going to spend my time dividing \$3.2 billion by anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: On with the speech, then. Sail on!

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you. Sail on, oh ship of faith. So I just point that out lightly and --

Well, I had better leave the rebuttal and get to the point of my address.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might do better.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know if I will do any better, but I could do much worse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the Speech from the Throne. It is not the usual cinemascope production - the technicolor, not at all. It is a different kind of speech for the hon. the Leader of the Government. It should really be called the 'Whisper from the Throne', not the Speech from the Throne. Not like previous full-throated blasts that we have had from the Throne.

Page 2 - My Government has decided to call a conference of persons and organizations to whom the economic future of our Province is a particular concern. A valuable, perhaps, information device, if the facts and information are going to be given. I suspect, however, that they are not because already, in this House, the Government has refused to let us have all the reports of those power studies, which is --

1027

speeches during the year. last year Mr. Speaker, pointing out or asking a question why they had given up our rights in that connection?

The speeches goes on to describe the possible development^{ment} in the Lower Churchill of power, Mr. Speaker. Yet the Government will not give us the reports that indicate whether or not power developed on the Lower Churchill can be brought to Newfoundland and used here at an economic price. Is the power on the Lower Churchill all going to have to go to Quebec? That is the question that those reports answer. Yet the Government will not give the public of this Province the information.

The Government mentioned development of American policy. The Armed Forces Base at Argentia, and the close down there Mr. Speaker. Well the Government cannot be blamed for that close down naturally. And the Government appears to be doing what they can to organize to overcome the situation.

The point I raise, Mr. Speaker, is this, surely the Government of Canada principally the Federal Government of Canada should have some plan ready or some policy of assistance to one-industry areas, when the one industry of that area disappears or has to close down. In this case it is Argentia. There was Bell Island. There was Elliott Lake, where the Government of Canada did a considerable amount for Elliott Lake when it closed down. The member being the Right Hon. Mr. Pearson. Why is there no such plan to take care of these eventualities all over Canada? There should be. And we can only hope that the Government of Canada as well as this Government are going to give a lot more assistance to help out in the situation at Argentia.

Central Purchasing System is mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne. We reserve judgment on that, until we hear more about it from the hon. the Minister. On how it is going to operate. And how this tender system is being operated and all that business, the hon. minister I am sure will be quite ready to give us all details. The hon. gentleman is quite an authority on all things Mr. Speaker.

Then the ombudsman is mentioned. There will be a chance to debate some of these things later in the session, Mr. Speaker. But the ombudsman is not the answer to many of the political wrongs in this Province. This is not the answer. He could not get us an office, for example. There will be resolutions coming on

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why this Government although it is not within its constitutional jurisdiction, why the Government of this Province is not helping represent, make representations to Ottawa in connection with the longshore men in St. John's, and their position with reference to the C.N.R. and the decrease in the freight operations in St. John's this winter? Because a group of workers in the Province do not come under the constitutional jurisdiction of the Province, does not stop the Province making representations in their behalf. But, we have not heard of that being done. And the longshore men of St. John's are a vanishing breed. And many of them unemployed. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of our Government to try and help them, make representations to Ottawa to counteract this.

And there is another problem, Mr. Speaker, that if it is not dealt with by some one is going to cause a lot of trouble in the future. Perhaps, the Government ^{is} dealing with it. And that is the problem that the Truckers of Newfoundland are going to face from competition with the C.N.R. who are now entering the trucking business in this Province in a major way. Is the Government doing anything about it Mr. Speaker? Because this is going to be a big issue. And there is going to be a lot of trouble about it.

Mr. Speaker, since I represented St. John's District, St. John's West, I would also like to say a word about the police force in recent events. I have not come across a citizen of St. John's or the Island, who was not proud of how the St. John's city police force conducted themselves during their recent strike. A strike that was brought about by mishandling of a situation. A shocking display of how not to handle a body of men in the year 1970. The old days of giving orders in Labour Relations is gone. I do not know why Chief Pittman adopted the hard line he did? But I am quite convinced that he did not suspend thirty-two men without authorization from someone further up. And the police have the sympathy of the public almost unanimously on their side. They conducted themselves well, and did not capitulate Mr. Speaker when the carrots and the sticks were held out to them. They did not capitulate. And they are waiting now for a new Police Act, and a new salary scale. And we are waiting too, Mr. Speaker, to see whether the promises are met with performance. A magnificent display of men refusing to be intimidated, knowing their position was just and holding with steadiness and coolness to the end when they had a complete victory.

taking the contributions and putting them in the general revenue and spending the money of the civil servants and teachers of this Province every year. It is a scandal in my opinion Mr. Speaker, that a civil servant and a teacher or policeman who pays six or whatever the percentage is of his salary every year into the Government's Treasury does not have his contribution put into a trust fund. The Government does not match it. At the very least it should be put into a trust fund and held so that it can only be spent on pension. Yet, in this Province the contributions, pension contributions that are owned by the civil servants and teachers and the police are going to our general revenue, and the Government is spending it every year.

The Government in my view should be matching their contributions each year, the plan should be funded. If they do not do that Mr. Speaker, surely they should not take and spend that part of the civil servants and teachers salary which he contributes towards his pension each year. Mr. Speaker, when I was mentioning, mentioning questions, mentioning information one thing I might mention now is that how questions have been asked in this House. My hon. colleague the member for Humber East, asked today a question about - question 136 on the Order Paper where the Premier was asked to inform the House whether Atlantic Brewing Company had been told that they had an exemption or concession granted by the Government, exempting them from paying the profit to the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission and sales of beer as claimed by the Auditor General. That question was answered "NO"

Well Mr. Speaker, the question perhaps can be answered literally "NO" but quite obviously Mr. Speaker, there is a letter from the hon. the Premier to somebody connected with Atlantic Brewing Company Limited leading them to believe that they are exempt, that they were exempt from paying this profit of \$2.49 per case on the sales of beer. That is just to illustrate the point Mr. Speaker, that questions are not being answered in the right and proper spirit in this House. They should not be answered literally. If there is a letter to that effect, and we all know that there is it was mentioned last night why was the question not answered? The letter was not addressed to Atlantic Brewing Company Limited, it was to so and so, and it said such and such, which led them to believe such and such. That is the kind of answer we should have in this House Mr. Speaker. Not having to frame the questions so exactly to catch every possible ^{twist} that there might be to get an answer.

If a certain motion is passed we will know more about that later in the session. But in my submission the House was misled when that question was

administration to industrial development. If we had gone a little slower it might have been there in a different form, and a more successful form. We are not getting Mr. Speaker value for the money it is costing this Province and for the credit that we are tying up.

Erco, I have mentioned before that is the most glaring example of the wrong kind of economic development for this Province. Absolutely glaring.

The steel plant Mr. Speaker, at Donovans. That steel plant was originally supposed to cost \$2 million or \$2.5 million and the Province originally was supposed to only be involved in it I think to the amount of \$1 million. What has it ended up at? \$9 million, because of errors made when the plant was designed and other results of rushing into projects before the proper study and investigation is done. \$9 million, what is \$9 million? We might have had a steel plant there Mr. Speaker, a satisfactory one for one third of that price had we gone at it the right way.

Erco I mentioned. A \$15 million bond issue we guaranteed. Around \$800,000. we spent on the access road there, about \$7,500. per year per Newfoundlander working there in power subsidy and so on. How could that money have been better spent to create more jobs? That is the issue Mr. Speaker. Not that Erco is there, and creates 400 - if we were using all the money we are using now on the Erco situation on other development there could be two or three times as many people employed.

Mooring Cove Fish Plant. This is another one that cost almost twice as much as it was supposed to, and now after the hon. minister has had Kates, Peet, Marwick investigate it - it appears that that is running alright at the moment the prices of fish are up, are high. But will the operation

MR. S. A. NEARY: We were aware of that the investigation just confirmed it.

MR. CROSBIE: Very good. The hon. minister knew it before I am glad to hear him say that and that Kates, Peet and Marwick went down there and confirmed it. Anyway Mr. Speaker, it looks as though it is alright at the moment although whether or not the operations is paying principal and interest on the loan I do not know yet. It may be meeting it's operating expenses, but that should be alright if fish prices stay up.

But Mr. Speaker, why do we not get the facts which brings me to the third mill. The third mill that is supposed to be located at Come by Chance. When is the Government going to give this House a full - no the fourth mill is at Stephenville, the third mill is at Come by Chance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just do not miss a mill that is all

1015

March 5, 1970

Topic 228

Page 1

I asked a question about it on the first day. Question No. (46) Forestal Forestry and Engineering International Limited were retained to conduct a survey to confirm or otherwise the availability of an adequate timber supply for the proposed Newfoundland and Pulp and Chemical Company Limited Mill at Come-by-Chance. We were to pay half the cost and they were, the Province and the Company. I asked did the Government receive an interim report. And it was answered yes that an interim report was received. Had there been a final report received Mr. Speaker? The answer first given was yes, and then changed to no; and we paid apparently \$20,000 towards the cost.

Now Mr. Speaker, why has not the final report of Forestal Forestry and Engineering International Limited been received? Have they been told to forget the final report because someone did not like the interim report? What did the interim report show was the situation with respect to that third Mill? This House, this Province Mr. Speaker, has advanced in connection with that third Mill over \$2.5 million - are the Government guaranteed a loan for that amount in connection with the third mill several years ago? What has the \$2.5 million been spent on? What are the prospects of that third mill? What was in this Forestal report? What are the costs benefits - what is the cost benefit analysis of that project? Is the Newfoundland Government being asked to do so much for us that any analysis of the cost to the people of this Province as compared to the benefits to them if it goes ahead - does it come out on the cost side?

I understand Mr. Speaker, that it has been suggested that the Government of Newfoundland should have to build all the roads in connection with the cutting of pulp for that project. Thirty or forty miles of road a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not true -

MR. CROSBIE: And it has been suggested Mr. Speaker, that the Government was asked - well we know that the Government is required to pay the difference in cost between wood cut on the Island of Newfoundland, and wood cut on mainland of Labrador for that mill -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the Labrador wood will be cheaper than the Newfoundland wood -

1017

If these reports are there and they show all these things to be feasible, Mr. Speaker. What is the danger in producing them? They are not produced because they do not exist in my opinion. They do exist. The hon the Premier would only be too glad to produce them and to produce the people who did them so we could question them and examine them and satisfy ourselves on them.

Still on that third mill - when are we going to hear about that. What is the situation, Mr. Speaker, with respect to water at Come by Chance? Water for the oil refinery. Water for the third mill. There is great difficulty in getting water down at Come by Chance. Has the Newfoundland Government agreed to pay for half the cost of the water system down at Come by Chance or half the cost of the company of it? Is water available down there? What is it going to cost? That should be answered.

It is suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the third mill project involves this Government, if it is to go ahead in such a yearly expenditure, that anyone who knows anything about cost benefit analysis, repudiates the idea that it should go ahead immediately when they see those suggestions.

Well, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, all we are asking for, and all I am asking for, is for the Government to see the announcements and the propaganda and to put before us or a committee of this House, the reports and studies and facts and produce the witness in connection with this third mill. The fourth mill, the oil refinery and other major projects like that, so that we have got the basic information and can decide whether or not these things have any chance of success. That is all we are asking for. It is what we are not getting, Mr. Speaker, and that we must ask this Government to give us on behalf of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much time at this time before the evening session, so I hope that I would be permitted to reserve the bulk of my remark for the evening session. There is one thing that I would like to do, of course, as is customary and that is to extend congratulations to the hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply to the Gracious Speech from the Throne. I refer, of course, to the hon. member for St. Mary's and the hon. member for Trinity North, who I think have enhanced the prestige of this House on many occasions in the past with sincere auditory and I

Can anyone really imagine the hon. member for St. Mary's, who was in the Cabinet for many, many years, as you know, being merely a 'yes' man for anyone? You can.

Or the hon. member for Trinity North, being a slave with no mind of his own?

It is a terrible insult.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member for Trinity North is here.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The 'yes' came about a ^{member} who is not here.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, of course.

I still maintain that it is an absolute insult to the men concerned. An insult, Mr. Speaker. Such mealy-mouthed mutterings by the Opposition officials, non-official in betwixt the two, is on a par, to my mind, with the myth of the Newfoundlanders who cower in fear every election time, and this, too, has been mentioned on more than one occasion here in this House.

How often do we hear it? 'Fear and trembling, stalks the land'. Newfoundlanders returned their Liberal Government in six successive elections because they were afraid to do anything else.

Tell me this. How do you intimidate a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker? I know a lot of them, I think. I have gone out and I have asked for their votes, as you have. I do not know how you would scare one vote out of them, frankly.

Oh, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: I certainly do know.

MR. NOLAN: The hon. member should remember that the people of this Province and the Province and also the Liberal Party are not for sale.

If anyone doubts my word, go out sometime and try it and see what happens to you.

Well, I mean, if the hon. member is apparently familiar with forms, threats, and so on, perhaps he speaks with some authority. I am in no position --

AN HON. MEMBER: Experience.

MR. NOLAN: Experience. Well, I am glad that you admitted it, sir.

I still maintain that it is a terrible insult to Newfoundlanders for



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 18

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Met at 8:00 P.M.

HON. JOHN A. NOLAN: (MINISTER OF SUPPLY): Mr. Speaker, before closing time this afternoon I had an opportunity to refer to the two hon. members who moved and seconded the Address and Reply and to the fact that I felt they were fine and honourable men who had, in my estimation, and I would say in the estimation of many hundreds of people in this Province, represented the Province well and faithfully for many, many years.

Now, I would like to go on to something else, if I may. And that is that one of the, I believe honestly the Premier's great accomplishments since Confederation has been to instill in Newfoundlanders a great faith in their Province and a faith such as they never had before. I do not think there is any doubt about the fact, that there was void in Newfoundland prior and pre-Confederation, I think it is unthinkable that anyone, especially anyone within the Province, who calls it their home should do anything to impair that faith. Yet, that is what is being done. When an intelligent member of this House goes back to report that describes Newfoundland of the depression years, and tries to make is this the Province today. I think he is doing a disservice to his fellow citizens and he knows it.

All we had to start with twenty years ago was faith. We had nothing else. We had only the belief that we could achieve some measure of greatness.

Before he died, Mr. Speaker, members of this House may recall, the great Empire Poet, Rudyard Kipling was asked what part of the world would bring forth new marvels in the future? He replied: "Newfoundland, a magnificent place, full of the poorest and the richest stuff. Mark my words! Keep your eyes on Newfoundland." Kipling had nothing to go on but faith, and so had we; and now I think that faith is paying off, and we still have need of it.

But on all sides there is this tendency to tear down Newfoundland and Labrador, to down-grade everything that we do. All to what purpose? For political gain, Mr. Speaker. No matter how they deny it nor what they say, what party tag you put on it or where they sit, they are motivated by one thing and one thing alone and that, obviously, is to get rid of one man. That is the great challenge in Newfoundland today. Do that and our future is secure. They deny hatred but it is there. They deny their venom but it is there. They deny spite but it is there. They deny their desire for revenge but it is there.

Some people have mouths like a fifty-cent fish, Mr. Speaker. It was an old 1023

and the list goes on and on. The opposition was fierce and terrific. Today we see it in connection with the Come-By-Chance Project.

The sad part is that much of the opposition comes from within, from Newfoundlanders who are so bent on gaining their own personal objectives, of satisfying their own quest for power that they are willing to sacrifice even the interest of the Province to do it. Instead of pulling together for all we are worth to try to get projects that will create new jobs and strengthen our economy, we fight and quarrel among each other and do irreparable damage to Newfoundland in the process.

There are those who know only how to tear down. They rise to great heights of oratory in an effort to destroy, never counting the cost to this Province that is dear to us all. It is no surprise, therefore, that the new Department of Regional and Economic Expansion would come in for sneers and jeering. There are those who have taken DREE, as it is known, and instead of trying to assess its worth intelligently and reasonably they have been playing around with the names, doodling with the fate of the Province, turning DREE into DREEM, as they try to show their contempt for it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter far too serious for this sort of thing. DREE, I feel, is the first great attempt in history to do something about regional disparities in Canada, the first real effort to try and make sure that no matter where you live in this great nation there is at least some semblance of equality, of opportunity, for at last Confederation does mean something.

I think we will all admit that we were so intent in the first twenty years of Confederation on grabbing a share of the good things of life, filling some of the gaps that had existed for centuries, that we had time for little else. Now we can get down to the serious business of making Confederation what it should be, and that is an assault on regional disparity on the top of our list. For those who want to get their priorities straight, this is something that we should aim for. And we are all very proud of the role that the Premier has played in seeing that this matter got the top billing that it did.

Now let us make DREE or DREEM our dream, if you wish, for dreams do come true, especially if we all work together. That is what we have to do. We cannot be continuously fighting each other for political gain for, if we do, the people of this Province will, beyond the shadow of a doubt, make us pay for it.

I know the work that has been done by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development. His officials and people, both provincially and nationally, have been working on this project. And I know that sometimes it is perhaps to him discouraging when he hears some of the remarks and the

sneers and the jeers that are passed out so frequently but I hope that in the not too distant future he will be in a position, when everything is ironed out, and it is only when he is in a position to do so will he bring in the plans and statements that he has mentioned earlier; so that we can all make our own decisions.

Now no doubt we are all going to feel that we know how the Province should go in the future. Many of us will not have had opportunity, or everyone, of participating in the discussion, because that could not happen up to this time. As the Minister has mentioned earlier, in a little while we will be in a position to learn just exactly what has been done. But a tremendous amount of work has been involved. How many people and how many hours and days and weeks were spent in attempting to come up with a plan that would be a beginning, to solving some of the problems that we have here in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there should be counsel before any undertaking; and this Government does take counsel. But Newfoundland is not the most attractive place in the world for those looking for new sites for industry, as has been mentioned before on both sides of the House. We have to try and work harder than most provinces in order to get anywhere. Sometimes we have to go on faith and imagination. We just cannot wait for everything to be copper-fastened before we move. If Sweden had waited for a technologist, for example, scientists and engineers to plan her progress to the last detail, she would still today be a mining - lumbering economy instead of the leading industrial economy of Europe, with a standard of living second only to that of the United States. It was people with imagination. If Japan had waited for a technologist to map everything out in advance, with one hundred per-cent guarantee back, she would still be struggling to stay alive, as after the war, with a peasant economy, instead of being the third greatest industrial nation on the earth.

Dr. Heinrich Nordhoff took over the Volkswagon Factory, which had been bombed out, in the forty's when he had nothing but faith to go on and his dream of a German equivalent of Henry Ford's "Model T". He could not find anyone in Germany to go along with his mad scheme. Many of the hon. members will no doubt remember that the British Occupation Authorities helped him only because they felt he would not succeed. We all know the Volkswagon success story.

Closer to home, I think we have many, many success stories, stories of men, of Newfoundlanders with courage, enterprise and faith. For example:

pressing problems in this Province to day. Man has certain basic rights. Just as important as any of them is the right to adequate housing. Everyone born in this world has a right to have a roof over his head and yet we have denied this right to thousands of people. What chance has a family with modest income to get the kind of house that today requires a crippling CMHC mortgage in many cases? What chance for housing exists for low-paid clerks, for example, who have to cope with the need to find \$4000 or \$5000 just for the land on which to build a house. It is just criminal that a piece of unproductive land just a place to put the house should cost so much when we have so many people in need. They are licked before they start. They cannot afford the land let alone the house. I have talked about this before and I will hope that I will continue having something to say about it. And look at much of the housing we do have it is just desperate, people are living in places that are not fit for human habitation. And these are not people that have created this mess themselves. They are good clean decent families trapped in the quagmire of high prices and simply unable to get their head above ground. Is there one among us who does not hope that the shell housing mentioned in the Speech From the Throne will be a good part of the answer to this problem.

There has to be an answer somewhere no one suggests that this is the total answer it is not. But people are not going to wallow in poor housing forever Mr. Speaker, They will insist on treatment as human beings by a society that so far has only priced them into slum conditions.

Mr. Speaker there is another right, that I think is in danger in Newfoundland and Labrador these days, and just as it is everywhere else. We have got to watch the tendency to rob people of whatever privacy they have left. It is just disgraceful what is going on in some places. The invasion of privacy is enough to make your blood boil. What is the world coming to when you are no longer safe from prying eyes and ears in your own home. Is there no truth anymore in the time-honoured belief that a man's home is his castle? Perhaps it is not all that bad in Newfoundland, not yet, but it is coming unless we are on guard against it, and it is getting closer all the time. There are news items now which talk of telephones being tapped and homes being bugged as if it were a perfectly natural thing to do. Well they are not natural, they are anathema to any thinking person. They are against everything that we hold dear. Is it going on in Newfoundland? A number of people Mr. Speaker have told me that it is. A well-known business man

ombudsman in this Province is a major step forward though there are those who will try to hold this up as just another ploy of Government. We have already heard some criticism of the Throne Speech reference to this proposal on the a basis that would be a Government appointment. Mr. Speaker, all ombudsmen are appointed or approved by legislatures on recommendations of Government, only the Government can be expected to approach suitable qualified persons and secure provisional acceptance of the post. There is no question that the ombudsman is an officer of the legislature appointed by the legislature and subject to dismissal only by the legislature. This is one of the essential features of the ombudsman system. There are three main features if I may list them.

1. The ombudsman is an independent and non-partisan officer of the House who supervises the administration.

2. He deals with specific complaints from the public against administrative injustice and maladministration.

3. He has the power to investigate, criticize but not to reverse administrative action.

Mr. Speaker, if I may move on to another point until there is a universal franchise in municipal elections in St. John's there will always be people who are being denied of basic rights. During the last session of this Hon. House I had the honour to bring forward several major changes in the city of St. John's Act, we abolish the corporate vote that distasteful system whereby one person had more than one vote. We extended the franchise to the wives and husbands of taxpayers thereby doubling the number of people eligible to cast ballots. And now we must take the necessary steps of going all the way of extending the vote to all residents of the city of St. John's. Perhaps we should do it at this session even though the next municipal election is four years away or perhaps because it is that would give us ample time to make any necessary changes and improvements rather than to leave it at the last moment. Mr. Speaker, one of the most terrifying problems facing us today is the non-medical use of drugs. I know that we associate the problem mostly with young people that makes it all the more horrifying. But let us not confuse the two so that a whole generation is condemned for the sins of the few. I just happen to think that the majority of young people in this age make up the most exciting and best educated and the most intelligent generation we have ever had. Of course you will get the extreme opposite of this opinion but listen to this young people today do not want to co-operate they do not want to listen we do not know what they want as a matter of fact now who said that

is this, and this is barely a scanty outline which would, of course, be elaborated on and planned in great depth and come up with, perhaps, better ideas than I may propose.

Why could we not take one of the ponds. Just one out of the thousands we have in the Province. Just one and stock it with fish. Let us make sure that the fish get the kind of food and water conditions that will allow them to flourish and grow big. We would have to put a fence around the darn thing, but have it so the pond is available for special things and I will tell you what I have in mind.

For instance, we could arrange fishing competitions so that young boys and young girls - not the adults. They have got their own transportation and there are lots of other ponds and so on. I am thinking of the young boys and young girls who might never get away to the country - can fish to their hearts content under controlled conditions and controlled in such a way that as they fish, they can be taught conservation lessons.

At other times, the pond reserved, for example for senior citizens that could ^{be} brought out to the pond. Other~~s~~ that I think of, for example, the young people, down at the rehabilitation centre, who could be taken on a fine day up to the pond. Let them fish. It is not going to cost all that much, but give them a chance because if we do not, they are never going to have a chance.

More and more we are moving to an area where the best sources where people can go to fish. (I have never caught more than a dozen trout in my life, so it does not make much difference to me, and they were tied on.)

But, the fact is that more and more people with their own planes and so on, who can afford to go to the far-off places and move inland, are the ones who are going to have the best opportunity to fish. Perhaps, someone might give some consideration. Maybe the press. Someone - to the idea that I suggest. Perhaps it has some merit. I would think that other members in the House and the press and citizens, generally, could elaborate and enlarge and improve on what I have suggested, but just do not throw it away because it came from this side of the House.

The main point is, this project would be, I think, extremely useful in many ways and be taking advantage of a natural blessing that many other cities

accommodations, generally, there are outside the Avalon Peninsula?

MR. NOLAN: Right offhand I cannot give you the answer about the number of homes, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that there is not enough. There is no question about that.

The fact is whether they are or they are not and I am not, for one moment, arguing with the hon. member opposite that there is not a need for other such homes. No dispute.

MR. WELLS : Dire.

MR. NOLAN: Dire need. Okay. I will agree with that also, but this is not the total answer and if this is the major concern of the hon. member opposite, then he has missed my point completely and I failed. I do know there is a need for this type of thing, obviously. No one will dispute that.

MR. WELLS: That comes first and what the hon. gentleman is talking about is necessary, too.

MR. NOLAN: It is the recognition of a person, Mr. Speaker. We are living in a society where more and more when you reach forty or forty-five, you might just as well put a sign up on their back and say 'finished'. That is what we are moving into. That is exactly what is happening.

Now, it may be that some parents can plan for old age and are independent to the last. Certainly, they had a better chance of doing that now in the days of generous social assistance and old age pensions, but how many old people in this Province have that opportunity in the years that we can remember. Only the very few and the very fortunate and it still does not get over the gap in their lives created by the feeling of now being wanted.

What a heartache it must be for a father and mother when the children they love and the children for whom they sacrificed so much to see that they were fed, clothed and educated, now turn their backs as they strike out on their own. What heartache there must be for parents who are told that young people have their own lives to live and there is no room in them for doddering old people.

How many elderly people die of broken hearts?

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact. This is based, I must admit on an article from the U.S. by a doctor that I read. The people over sixty-five is the only group who is life expectancy is not increased since 1900. At any age up to sixty-five you may expect to live longer than an individual of the same age seventy years ago, but not if you are over sixty-five.

Why is this? Surely the advances of medicine in controlling disease

1035

I know people within walking distance from this building and I learned about that first as a broadcaster and as a DJ, as a disc jockey - late night, and people used to phone up asking for a record of one kind or another. Some were young people. Many were some of the older people, also and after awhile as they phoned night after night, week after week, eventually, like in any other case you get to know some of them and they are in two categories I would suggest, perhaps, more.

One is people who are old with their husband gone, perhaps, wife or their children and their financial circumstances are not the best and they live in dingy, terrible houses. That is one area, and they have a number of problems to live with.

And the other is people who can, as I know and as I am sure hon. members in this House know, people who do have the funds. They have got a nice apartment or their own homes. They have got a car perhaps. Even have the money to go on a trip if they want to.

What in the name of God is the good of it if you are all alone? That is what I am trying to get across here. Big deal. You invite them out for Christmas dinner and you have done your bit for the year. I do not know. Maybe I am - maybe this is just a thing with me, but when someone goes through life, as you know, they have not started any great paper mills. They have not led any political party. They might not have been well-known in public life or in any other way.

All they have done was to work, do their best for their church, for the community. Never see their picture in the paper. Never hear their name on the radio or television. They stay out of jail. They bring up their families and what do we do?

I wonder would it be possible to have a dinner or a banquet or some special ^{award for} whatever year for people in that - who in that year reach their seventy-fifth or eightieth birthday. Maybe it is a crazy idea. I do not know. At least, to give them the memory to cherish in their last days as they pass slowly along that road that we all have to travel and it will be a tribute from society to my mind.

Of course, it costs money to do this or perhaps their might be better suggestions from the other side of the House on this matter if it matters at all, especially if you had to do it on a regional basis, say a dinner

1037

Trans-Canada, which is something that would be very, very useful. The businessmen, truckers, especially, who now find it necessary to come out the Topsail road to Conception Bay to the Kilbride area and then double back towards the Goulds, Bay Bulls and on down the southern shore.

House feels this way Sir, in reference to the speech just made by my friend and colleague the Minister of Supply. He and I have been chums for a long time and he does not know what I am going to say now, but what I am going to say is what I mean, and what every member of this House means, it was a magnificent speech Sir, it had a certain amount of fight in it and so it should have, it had good proposals, some very good proposals that I hope we will hear a little more of. I am especially interested in the fishing references Sir, as of course the hon. gentleman catches fish only when they are tied on, and I know that because there have been times when I helped tie them on for him.

While I am in a congratulatory mood Mr. Speaker, may I say what a number of other members have said earlier in this session, and congratulate the editor and the staff of our Hansard, our verbatim record. By my count Sir, this is the eighteenth sitting of this session, I think it is eighteen I am subject to correction, but as I make it it is eighteen, and we have just had placed on our desks by our pages the eleventh edition, the verbatim full edition. It is a splendid achievement. We produce words at a great speed in here Sir, eighteen sessions at three hours each is fifty-four hours of debate, of questions and answers, fifty-four hours of the House sessions Sir. If we speak at 100 words per minute for sixty minutes per hour that is more words than I would care to count. But Sir, it is quite a tribute that they have been able to produce the Hansard this quickly and keep it as closely up to date. I am glad to hear the hon. member say that Sir, because I will little later make some reference to some remarks he has made, and of course Hansard will be a relevant document to which I will draw his attention.

MR. NEARY: You will not hear - hear, hear then

MR. E.M.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is traditional in the debate on the address in reply to touch on many things, not least of them being to touch upon the status, the condition, the activities of the districts which each of us represents, so perhaps Sir, I may be permitted to say a few words about the district of White Bay North.

It has been a hard year Sir, for our people in White Bay North. The people there make their living or do not make their living by the fishery, work in the woods, and perhaps the 300 or 400 jobs in the hospital and the I.G.A. but it is the fishery Sir by which White Bay North like so many other parts of Newfoundland lives or dies. This past year Sir, the fishery was as bad as it has ever been. In harbour after harbour, man after man spent the summer fishing, well up into the fall, well up in December when the ice comes and Sir

1041

people.

George Humby is doing a first rate job Mr. Speaker, and he had the courage, he put his own assets to the rest, we backed him, we backed him with the timber limits, we backed him with a guarantee at the bank, and he is producing. It is really the best news that I have had from White Bay North all year and already Sir, within a period of two or three weeks you can see the difference in Rodderickton, and Englee, and Conche, and in Main Brook, and in Bide Arm, where people now have the chance to get that job that they want.

At Main Brook Sir, Bowaters live up to their noble tradition of never knowing when they are going to come or when they are going to go. My colleague the member for White Bay South has been eloquent on this in the past. Bowaters continue to cut almost at whim or at fancy with no apparent pattern. They may have a pattern Sir, but the people do not know about it. Of course the answer to that is the Government's policy to buy out these paper companies, buy out their timber holdings, guarantee the mills their wood supply, buy them out and run them for the benefit of the people of this Province. Maybe I can mention my perennial terror, fear on this subject, and that is the "Mooney Block" one and one half millions cords of wood owned by Price (Nfld.) that are rotting, just rotting, they have not cut 10,000 cords of wood on it in thirty years Sir. Rotting, rotting while the people rot too. Rotting when it should be harvested and used because wood Sir is a vegetable as Your Honour knows. Wood grows and dies, and if it is not harvested then it is wasted.

But Sir, we still need, even when we get our woods industry in our hands, as we will God willing, we still need further developments and of course that is the basic purpose of this administration, and that is why I take pride in being part of it. We are not perfect Mr. Speaker, even if we ever thought we were the hon. gentleman opposite quite properly and rather effectively reminds us of that. Lord Randolph Churchill said I believe, I believe he was the author of this "that it was the duty of the Opposition to oppose." I agree with that, I think it is a first rate thing and Lord Randolph Mr. Speaker, gave Primer Ministers, the Premiers of his day in England, particularly William Ewart Gladstone the great liberal, the grand old man, gave them an Opposition like he had never seen before. Eventually Lord Randolph came to office Mr. Speaker, he came to office finally in the election of 1836 which was the second election in a ten month period, and

Mr. Speaker, let me mention briefly some of the improvements in public services that have been made in White Bay North this year, we still have a long way to go, but we have made some progress. This year finally the road to Conche was built. Finally it took a little doing, and it took a few dollars, but thanks to my present Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Highways we got it done. We got it done. I think, Conche is the largest community on this Island, Sir, not on an Island within this Island, but the largest community on the mainland, that did not have a road link. There maybe the odd place up in Fortune Bay, around that part of the southwest coast, but I am not to sure, Burgeo for one. Conche now has its road, Sir, and the 600 or 700 people have finally been given the advantages that their fellow citizens had for so long.

Sometimes, Sir, when I hear of petitions and demands for pavement and blacktop and rebuilding, and new roads elsewhere, I can support them, yes. But, I can also remember the people of Conche, or the people of Croque, and northeast Crouse, Grandois, St. Julien's, and I can remember above all the people of Great Brehat and St. Carol's, they too, deserve roads Sir. My hon. friend from Trinity North knows Great Brehat well. I have heard tales of some of his meeting in Great Brehat. But in deference, Sir, to the Rules of the House I will not go into them in too much detail now.

Mr. Speaker, also we got the lights put in Raleigh and Ship Cove, this year if the House gives us a few bucks, a few dollars, some lights to some other communities. The C.N.T. finally, they move like glaciers, they finally produced a few more telephones. So now I have the pleasure of my constituents phoning me daily. A very useful service, especially if the House sitting afternoons and evenings, I can keep in quite close touch. We got a long way to go. We got a long way to go yet. I am glad to hear my hon. friend support the road from Brehat, I trust when the estimates are brought in he will speak in their support. I have been speaking in their support, perhaps all of us together, the whole House will get this road for those people. We need lights in Conche, St. Anthony Bight, Quirpon and Straitsview. Funny names perhaps, too many people up here in the south, Sir, to the people who live in these communities and who still use Delco's at ten cent an hour, when they work, Government lights are pretty important. These will have to be diesel units for the time being, but they are still pretty important.

We do need pavement especially in St. Anthony, and I have got hopes, bounded on firm faith. We need -

1045

A great figure Sir. The hospital at Stephenville, in the District of Port au Port, is named after Sir Thomas Roddickon. So is Roddickon the Town of Roddickon. We hope to get a -

HON. G. A. FRECKER: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS): The gates to McGill University in Montreal are named the Roddickon Gates.

MR. E. M. ROBERTS: Indeed, my friend the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the gates to McGill University in Montreal are named the Roddickon Gates, after Sir Thomas Roddickon, and given by Lady Roddickon.

There are 5,000 people in that area, Sir. They are a 150 miles by road from a doctor, twenty minutes by air, when the weather is good enough. We got good air ambulance service, that is not good enough. So, I hope we can get a doctor in Roddickon, and again I have a little more than faith to go on, when I say that.

While I am at it Sir, may I mention just one small point about Roddickon. There was a report on the radio that somebody said, there has been eight deaths from flu in Roddickon, or in the area. that is not true. My medical advisers tell me, as far as they know, it is a day or so old now, that there have been only eight deaths in the whole of Newfoundland that can anyway be attributed to flu. Nobody is saying, that they were caused by flu, Sir, but in which influenza was a factor. Eight in the whole Province. Some where elderly people Mr. Speaker, we had a case where a young lady, a young woman, a young girl, in her twenties died of pneumonia which we think was brought on by the flu. The serious thing with flu is, elderly people. As my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, I suspect knows full well there is no cure for the flu, one just has to go to bed and suffer it. I presume he had the flu in his absence from the House this week.

MR. ANTHONY MURPHY: Wrong as usual.

MR. ROBERTS: Wrong as usual. The hon. gentleman was out of town spreading the - I know what he was doing, he was spreading the firey cross, and they will get forty-five at the next meeting in Lewisporte, and not forty-four. And six in Burin.

MR. MURPHY: And the people of White Bay North, we are so proud of them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker what the people of White Bay North think of their member he will find out in due course. I would not ask the hon. gentleman to run against me, if he wishes he could. But I do not believe in that sort of thing, but I do hope this party will put up a candidate. Last time they had to canvas, last time they

Not terribly exciting, except it does mean the plant can continue operating, and the few hundred people who find work there will continue to get their jobs, and the 150 fisherren, who sell fish at that plant they can continue to do that. We do need further improvements at Englee, but I am twisting the arm of my colleague the Minister of Fisheries, and his officials, and I have hope. Of course, we need draggers, both at Englee and St. Anthony. That is a different problem on the northeast coast.

As far as education goes, as the House may have heard Sir, as members have heard, tomorrow the Premier and I go to St. Lunaire or St. Leonard's as it is often called, just north of St. Anthony, we are going to take part in the opening of the magnificent new eleven or twelve room school, all grade school it serves the Pentecostal children of that entire area, in place of the school that was completely destroyed by fire about a year and a-half ago. It represents a tremendous achievement by those people, Sir. The insurance on the school, and the capital grants to the Pentecostal Assemblies, the porportional grants have helped those people, Sir, in that area, have made it an altogether magnificent contribution. I will never understand how do they do so much, with so little. But, I will be proud to be there tomorrow, and no doubt the Premier will also be equally proud. And we will be among friends, Mr. Speaker. We will be among friends.

In Harbour Keep and in Foddiction, we have had new schools open this year as well. We still need more classrooms, particularly in St. Anthony. But we have made a lot of progress this year. White Bay North was the first area, I believe, to a fully integrated school system, the amalgamated system centered about the collegiate, the Harry Curtis Collegiate at St. Anthony. It is now in operation two or three years. The results have been dramatic. The improvement in grades, the improvement in the education offered children - no matter how you measure it, has been superb. Again, Sir, a tremendous achievement by the people of the area, our local leadership. And we still need, particularly in St. Anthony, a vocational school. The Minister of Education, who is not with us tonight, I think he would agree, and again, we hope that before very much longer we will be in a position to provide these facilities, there are none north of Corner Brook now, and as the hon. member for St. Barbe South knows its a long ways from Corner Brook to St. Anthony. It is a good road, but it is a long road. We do need that school.

1049

in his remarks the other day may have - as always eloquently and with force and with knowledge and with enthusiasm and with truth, as always may have painted a picture, a very good picture, perhaps one that I am not able to live up to, but, Sir, for your benefit, I will try. I will try. That is all I can do, but I will try.

What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is, of course - in fact I would like to say a few words about the hon. member for Humber East who I am glad to see is here in his seat tonight. A few words which would touch upon some of the things that the hon. gentleman has said in this House at our current session.

Now, Sir, right at the outset, may I say that it is not my intention to debate with the hon. member at this time, and by debate, I mean differing with his opinions or with his views. There is plenty of time and plenty of opportunity for that. We have got a long session ahead of us. Governments open Houses, but, Oppositions, whether they be regular, irregular, travelling, or not, Oppositions close them.

We will be here for awhile yet, Sir, and there will be plenty of time for debate between the hon. gentleman and me.

My intention today, is a little different. You see, Sir, I have listened with very real interest to a number of the speeches made particularly in this debate by the hon. gentleman, particularly the one I believe was made on Monday 23, February, on which he spoke on the - in this debate on the address in reply, for the hon. gentleman's benefit, the Hansard^{OF} which I have a copy if he wants his No. 3 and his remarks with which I am sure he is intimately familiar, are set forth at considerable detail. The hon. gentleman -

MR. WELLS: I have not had a chance to look.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman might want to look, but if not, I will again try to help him, Mr. Speaker, and I will try to refresh his memory for him. But, if he wants the reference, it is the - it is Volume 1, No. 3 and I do have an extra copy if his is temporarily unavailable.

Well, Sir, I found the hon. gentleman's speeches eloquent and articulate and that may sound unusual coming from somebody who opposes the hon. gentleman politically. We belong to different parties. We differ on politics.

MR. WELLS: Same Party.

1051

the people here, but until they occupy their seats in the Chamber, of course, Your Honor's ruling is the correct one.

In reply to the hon. member from Gander, I can only say that Polonius could easily live in Gander for the hon. member would know.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened, the feeling that there was something wrong, grew larger or longer, rather. Finally, it became quite apparent to me what was wrong with the hon. gentleman's speech. The conclusion just leaped out at me, Sir. Just leaped right off the table - leaped across the way and there it stood, plain and unadorned. It was a hard conclusion to reach, Mr. Speaker. It was very hard to decide just what was wrong with the hon. member's speech.

It is a hard conclusion to reach, Sir, because what was wrong about the hon. gentleman's speech was so very wrong and so needlessly wrong that I found it very hard to credit - very hard to credit, that this type of error could be made by a member of the House of Assembly of this Province.

But, Sir, I must give him credit for that because the errors were made. Just what was the error, Sir? What was so very wrong that I found it very hard to accept? What was so very wrong that I found it terribly hard to grasp the reality of the situation?

Mr. Speaker, the answer as is so often the case, in matters like this, is simple. As I listen to the hon. gentleman's speeches and then as I reread them in the Hansard, it became quite obvious what was wrong. The hon. gentleman simply did not know what he was talking about. I am not speaking of his opinion, Sir, although I find them wrong in most cases, but, that is not what I am after, now.

I am speaking not of his views. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was earlier told by my colleague that he has a mouth like a fifty cent fish, let him not prove it again. I listen, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentleman.

MR. WELLS: I do not know what a fifty cent fish is.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman does not know what a fifty cent fish is. A fifty cent fish is one a boy, a little boy can just stagger along with. It has got a mouth about as big as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. gentleman, and let him listen to me. If he wants to leave the House, that is his privilege but let him

based firmly on the record. It is based upon the hon. gentleman's words as we heard them in this House, Sir. As our reporters took them down, they were then reported in our Verbatim Report - our Hansard, here.

On the basis of the what the hon. gentleman said, Sir, I submit that the hon. member was not only wrong in his facts, but that he was careless in the extreme and Sir, the gravity of the charge is with the second. Anybody can be wrong if they be careless, Sir. If they be careless, is another story.

Now, I have spoken of evidence, Mr. Speaker, and with a charge like that, I should support - I should bring forward some evidence, so let me do so. Let me look at an example.

In the hon. gentleman's speech in the address in reply, he took some time to scoff at the DREE program. He is a pretty good scoffer, so he scoffed at that, too. His views about the DREE program, I think, are quite wrong, but, Sir, that is a matter of opinion. That is the matter that will be resolved within due course.

What I am concerned about, right now, are the facts that ^{were} ^{led} the hon. gentleman - led by the hon. gentleman in support of his opinion. All right, what did he say? He said in speaking of the program, that we could not afford to pay for it. Now, that may be a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot afford to pay for something. It might be a matter of opinion. So, maybe that is not wrong. Maybe it is. Maybe it is wrong, but we do not want the hon. gentleman to know that or he might believe, in fact, we cannot afford to pay for it.

But, just what did he say? On what facts did he base his argument? Let me quote, Sir, and if I go wrong, I hope the hon. gentleman will correct me because I do not intend to do him any injustice just as he would not do me any. If I go wrong - I am wrong, and if the report is wrong, if Hansard is wrong, if his words are incorrectly put down, Sir, then let him say so. I can only read what I have in the copy that has been given Your Honor and has been given to every member of this House, Sir, and I assume, to the press as well.

The relevant ^{one} again, Sir, is the afternoon I believe. No, the evening of Monday, February 23, Volume 1, No. 3.

1056

quotations Sir, the pages are not numbered, has the hon. gentleman the place? It is about twelve or thirteen lines down.

MR. MURPHY: They are numbered

MR. ROBERTS: Are they? Well some are numbered Mr. Speaker, 123, the way the page is cropped obscures the number, but the next page is 124 therefore, I assume it is 123.

So he said Sir, "look at the estimates that we approved last year and you will not find a single, solitary cent there for it." To repeat it in my own words and not his Sir, he said that we should look at the estimates that were approved by the House last year, and he said that when we did look we would find there no money for DREE.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is no money in the estimates for the DREE program, no money in the estimates for the year ended - the year 1969 - 70 which will end in three or four weeks from now, the end of this month has nothing to do with the DREE program. He is quite correct that there is no money in the estimates for the current year. How could there be Mr. Speaker? The DREE program does not begin until April 1st. coming, and that was announced in this House on opening day in behalf of the Government by its leader, by the Premier.

The DREE program does not begin until April 1st. Sir, and the money to pay for Newfoundland's share, for there will be a Newfoundland's share could not be included in the 1969 - 70 estimates. It could only be included in the 1970 - 71 estimates which in due course will be brought before the House Sir by the Government in our request for supply.

MR. WELLS: What is our share going to be?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will find out what our share is going to be when the estimates are brought before the House

MR. WELLS: Where will we get the money for it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will find out where we get the money. Our share will be included in those estimates Sir, and if this House approves them it will be spent this coming year by the Government beginning on April 1st. because, Mr. Speaker our year begins on April 1st. and the estimates for 1969 - 70 by law could not have money in them for a program that is to begin on April 1st. In other words Sir, the hon. gentleman's statement which he alleged is fact is wrong. He asked where are we going to get the money, and he said that there was nothing in the estimates approved last year. What has that to do with the DREE program Mr. Speaker?

1058

in the 1919 - 1920 estimates as to say there is nothing in the 1969-70 estimates. Mr. Speaker, why has the hon. gentleman gone wrong? Is it because of a tyrannical Government or are we clutching facts over here? Has he gone wrong because we would not reveal those facts? Has he gone wrong because we are withholding information? I find that hard to understand, Sir. The Premier on the opening day of the Throne Speech debate Wednesday 18th, of this month, of February the first day of the session said that the programme would begin on April 1. Does the hon. member then really need to question or does he need further information to know that the 1969-70 estimates have got nothing to do with the 1970-71 programme?

MR. WELLS: Well aware of it.

MR. ROBERTS: He was well aware of it then why did he say what he said. He was for nearly two years -

MR. WELLS: Would the minister like to know, I will tell him.

MR. ROBERTS: He was for nearly two years,

MR. WELLS: I will tell him if he would like to know.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I can quote the famous leader that the hon. gentleman is faithfully following for this week. Let me make my speech he has made his and made more, and more, and more, and more.

MR. WELLS: If the minister will propose a question I will answer it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will answer a question of the hon. gentleman if he wants to ask one.

MR. WELLS: Then do not quote a question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman sit and listen, let him listen to the facts.

MR. WELLS: Then do not quote a question.

MR. ROBERTS: Because he is very careless with the facts, and I have only begun Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has got to learn Mr. Speaker, that when he says a fact is a fact let him make sure a fact is a fact.

MR. WELLS: I learned a long time ago.

MR. ROBERTS: He was nearly two years, ^{Sir} two years a ^{minister} ~~member~~ of the Crown and each of those years came before this House with his colleagues, and asked for Supply. That is the duty of the Government, Sir. And he has been for four years, this is his fourth session a member of the House and each of those years the Government have come forth and will come forth shortly again to ask for supply. Does the hon. gentleman really not know, money for a programme, it is going to be drawn from the estimates for the year in which the programme is to start.

that is good, that shows Mansard is accurate it shows his other statements have been accurately reported, it is too bad they are not accurately based. Mr. Speaker I have only got two remarks about that statement. The hon. gentleman quite modestly disclaimed that until he spoke nothing had been done.

First, if that were true and it is not but if it were true Mr. Speaker, how in conscience and how can he answer his constituents for having remained for two years as part of an administration that thus shamefully neglected his constituents.

MR.WELLS: That is right.

MR.ROBERTS: Surely if this administration treated my constituents that way I would not be part of it not for two minutes.

MR.WELLS: I am no longer, the hon. observes correctly.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman sit quiet, he is no longer a member of the administration. We know that and we are glad of it. He went on Sir, or let me say one thing about the neglect of Corner Brook, during the hon. gentleman's - before he leaped up and started spouting - what about the \$3 million that has been put into the School of Nursing out there? The best School of Nursing in this Province, a first-rate building, and the hon. gentleman was present at the opening.

MR.WELLS: That is right.

MR.ROBERTS: A first-rate School of Nursing, a significant improvement.

MR.WELLS: It is good, it is good.

MR.ROBERTS: It will help to clear up one of the major problems.

MR.WELLS: Hospital beds are much more beneficial.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. If he wants to talk about hospital beds I will, very shortly, let him just bide quietly and wait, Sir. And then on estimates we can talk some more about hospital beds, we will talk about the ways to use hospitals, he is surrounded by experts on health let him talk to them, because they know that hospital beds are not the only answer. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman sailed on regardless of the facts. His next statement and I quote again: "was that it - by which he means the Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook - it is supposed to be a Regional Hospital to serve the entire western half of Newfoundland." Mr. Speaker, that was the hon. gentleman's statement, that Western Memorial Hospital was supposed to be a Regional Hospital to serve the entire western half of Newfoundland.

MR.WELLS: That is as I understand it.

MR.ROBERTS: He has no denial, so, as the hon. gentleman, - the statement is correctly reported but the hon. gentleman now qualifies it, he says: "As he understands it."

1062

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Western Memorial Hospital, the area it serves that will be spelled out among other things in the white paper which this Government will bring in in due course. But it never has been spelled out Sir, in any detail. Never has been spelled out specifically. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the House Sir, that Western Memorial Hospital is a Regional Hospital and it will be one, but I can assure him also that it will not be the Regional Hospital for the entire western half of Newfoundland which is what he said.

There is another Regional Hospital in Western Newfoundland Sir, the Doctor Curtis Regional Hospital at St. Anthony, which serves a large part of western Newfoundland, serves part of the area represented by hon. friend for St. Barbe South, the District of St. Barbe North, the District of White Bay North, the District of Labrador South, and part of the District of Labrador North. That is a Regional Hospital Mr. Speaker, and that is part of western Newfoundland. This hospital is going to continue

MR.WELLS: And is referral from Western Memorial

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can give me the referrals

MR.WELLS: This year.

MR.ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, if the work cannot, I will not say there never has been there are always exceptions. But if the work generally speaking, cannot be done at St. Anthony by the I.G.A. facilities and staff and specialists, Sir, that patient is moved to Montreal or to St. John's not to Corner Brook. Western Memorial Mr. Speaker is a hospital which serves people who are within the hospital district He was wrong in this too, because Western Memorial is only going to serve the hospital district of Bonne Bay, Channel, Port aux Basques, Stephenville, possibly Burgeo as well as Corner Brook itself. Together with the hospital, the Central Newfoundland Hospital at Grand Falls,

MR.WELLS: Baie Verte.

MR.ROBERTS: Together with the hospital at Grand Falls it will serve Baie Verte and Springdale, together, the patients are sent to either hospital Sir. But even taking all these areas together using the 1961 census figures that are the latest we have, the area served by Western Memorial Hospital is a regional service, as a region, is less than one-fifth, less than 20 per cent of the people in Newfoundland, those are facts, Sir.

So much for the hon. gentleman's statement of fact, he made it as a statement of fact and he was wrong. And he went on Mr. Speaker, fearless, unafraid, ignorant of the facts he went on. He said in his next sentence that the hospital does not

MR.WELLS: Pediatricians?

MR.ROBERTS: Pediatricians are specialists. There are radiologist, pathologist,

MR.WELLS: A radiologist.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman know how many are needed, he does not know if he is asleep. Pathologist, I will have the full list for him tomorrow Sir, and gladly.

MR.SMALLWOOD: But there were none.

MR.ROBERTS: There were none when the hon. gentleman spoke, Monday week past.

MR.CROSBIE: What about a pathologist report on the hon. minister?

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will trade that for a psychiatrist report on the hon. member, any time, any time.

MR.CROSBIE: You supply your share and I will supply mine.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to pay for the third part examination of the hon. gentleman by a psychiatrist, at standard rates.

MR.CROSBIE: We both go, we both go?

MR.ROBERTS: And if the hon. gentleman wants to have a pathologist. I know his hatred is pathologist Sir, perhaps if he wants a pathologist report on me he can have it. In any event I do not want to engage in the pleasantries and jollities of debates with the hon. jovial, pleasant, altogether just like a great big friendly bear., the hon. member for St. John's West. The hon. gentleman is lucky, really. So, well his record at the leadership convention is perfect.

MR.CROSBIE: Oh we all know who got licked, we all know.

MR.ROBERTS: We know, Mr. Speaker, but let the hon. gentleman bide his time. He can lead his own party Mr. Speaker, he has now formed his own party let him lead it. That is the only way he will be leader. Now, Sir, let me be quite clear I am not saying there are specialists enough in Corner Brook, or anywhere else in Newfoundland for that matter because there are not. But I am saying Sir, that it is carelessly, needlessly, stupidly wrong to say that there are no specialists in Corner Brook.

MR.WELLS: I did not say it -

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker the hon. gentleman said it, it is here in the record.

MR.WELLS: Does not have specialists available to it, there are some there, surgeons too, a surgeon who lives next door to me.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Western Memorial Hospital is operating this day as a referral hospital.

MR.WELLS: If that is the devastating argument of the minister God Help Us.

1066

MR. ROBERTS: Now Mr. Speaker,

MR. WELLS: Nonsense, permit the question, permit the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course not Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Permit the question, then we will see.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can ask his question in due course.

MR. WELLS: Count the number of times Roberts' name appears on interruptions on the next three pages, it is twenty-one. That is right count them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker the hon. gentleman allowed me,

MR. WELLS: 131, 132, 133 and 134, count them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman allowed me and it is funny he should mention that Sir, because the next statement to which I wish to look was the one with which we had our little question and answer period on the night in question. Funny he should mention that Sir. Mr. Speaker, when the time is right the hon. gentleman will ask his question - let him contain himself -

MR. WELLS: Fear of the truth, again.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker no fear of the truth

1068

MR. WELLS: Four hundred and fifty is the number, is it?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will have the precise figures for the gentleman.

MR. WELLS: Not a waiting list. I had to go to St. John's with my little boy.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, the hon. gentleman tells us, he had
bring
to/his son to St. John's, I do not doubt him for a minute.

MR. WELLS: That is right. That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: What I have said, Sir, is that of the cases, 450 were T. and A.
And I have also said, Sir, it is correct that they are not counted by hospital
as a
authorities, /standard by which to measure these things -

MR. WELLS: They are counted by the parents of the children.

MR. ROBERTS: as part of the waiting list. Indeed, Sir, as the hon. gentleman
may know, he is a parent, and I am not.

MR. WELLS: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: If I am, my mother wants to know about it. Tonsils and adenoids, Sir,
are surgical procedure, which are scheduled often, which are scheduled so as to
allow a child to have the operation carried out during the summer holidays, not during
the school session. I am not sure where that should be prevented under a cruelty
to children law, but in fact they are often scheduled that way, Sir. It is rarely
in an emergency procedure. When it is it is treated like any other emergency
surgical problem, and treated immediately. In other words, Sir, the hon. gentleman
slap stick me in the back, when it was incorrect -

MR. WELLS: What?

MR. ROBERTS: The waiting list is less than 600 on the day, he said it, and now it
is in excess of 1000.

MR. WELLS: Less than a 1000.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, the waiting list, by the standard used all across
North America was less than 600.

MR. WELLS: The minister interrupted and asked whether it included T. and A. and I said,
yes, it does.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I did not disagree with him, but he said, it was immaterial.

MR. WELLS: This is the devastating attack..... cigarette.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants a cigarette, I can give him

people waiting to get into it; for every bed at St. Clare's there were 2.6.

I guess at Western Memorial from what the hon. gentleman has said, there would have been a lot more. Interesting. Because on a day that I did not select, the St. John's Hospital Advisory Council did this study some time ago, it is one of a number they have done, very interesting, very useful. The waiting list at Western Memorial on that same basis on that same day, was 533. There were 204 beds, Sir, that gives a ratio of 2.6 to 1. The same as St. Clare's Sir, St. Clare's is 2.6 to 1 Sir. Western Memorial was 2.6 to 1, the Grace is 2.2 to 1.

MR. WELLS: Stop the nonsense.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be..... The hon. gentleman says, stop the nonsense.

MR. WELLS: You will be a long time convincing me that hospital services in Corner Brook are anywhere near per capita what they are in St. John's. Cut out the nonsense.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have no hope of convincing the hon. gentleman -

MR. WELLS: Right -

MR. ROBERTS: There are somethings beyond the realm of mortals to do.

MR. WELLS: Permit the question, that is all I ask. Have the courtesy to permit the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows he can lead a house..... he can let me have the courtesy of finishing what I have to say, I have heard him out Sir on speech after speech, in this House.

MR. WELLS: Have the courtesy to permit the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will get the courtesy he deserves. He will get it in full measure.

The figures that I have just given, Sir, are not flights of fancy, they are hard, cold facts.

MR. WELLS: Did he hear Dr. Farrell's statement two days ago?

MR. ROBERTS: Dr. Farrell? Dr. Farrell said, there were not enough glasses, he gave no evidence.

MR. WELLS: And the hospital was bankrupt.

MR. WELLS: Dr. Farrell said the hospital was bankrupt, and there was no evidence. I have heard nothing from the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member cannot refrain himself, in the rebutal in the normal course of the debate laid down by the Rules of the House, we will have to deal with them another way. I asked already, that we will have no interruption, normal

MR. WELLS: Will the hon. member now permit a question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in due course. It should be on the Order Paper.

MR. WELLS: In respect to what he is saying now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in this debate? I will answer it in due course. Every question which stands in my name has been answered, Sir. The hon. gentleman could have had this information. He does not have to bother to ask for it. He did not. All he did was make statements of facts, statements which he did not check. Statements which he did not check but statements which he could have checked, statements which were wrong.

Perhaps I should add, Sir, for the benefit of the House that at the present time, generally speaking, approximately twenty or thirty elective surgical cases a week are being admitted to that hospital. It has been a little lower in the past two or three weeks because of the difficulties with the flu and an excessive and unusual number of emergencies, but twenty to thirty cases a week are being admitted and dealt with. The Chairman of the Board has told me, and I believe he said publicly, that this is tremendous with the number of surgeons available. We all wish there were more surgeons, Sir, and we hope there will be and we expect there will be. If there were then there could be more cases handled. The difficulty is not financial but it is one of personnel. And even with that, Mr. Speaker, the waiting list for people seeking elective surgery are still long, even with the twenty or thirty cases being dealt with.

Let me go on Sir, the hon. gentleman did not stop there. So far he has been wrong on four separate points.

MR. WELLS: The minister has his opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have my opinions too, but I also know what facts are. And the facts that I have given are facts.

MR. WELLS: Not likely.

MR. ROBERTS: He went on, he wandered, he meandered, and eventually came to rest upon the medical school. Again, he made a number of assertions, you will find them on page 137 of the Hansard, Sir. For the hon. gentleman's benefit I will read them, if I am wrong, I am sure he will have no hesitation in correcting it. He said, "and I quote, Sir, "The Medical School," now I cannot declaim, hat the hon. gentleman declaimed, but I will try to read it, "The medical school, where are we going to get the \$50 million or \$60 million to build that? Where are we going to get the \$10 millions or the \$15 millions that it will take to operate, and to get about fifteen doctors a year for this Province, at a price somewhere between \$500,000

1074

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was he wrong in his figures?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he was a little wrong, Mr. Speaker. He went astray.

MR. WELLS: Not likely.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us just look at the figures, because I have taken the trouble to check them. His first statement was that the Medical School was going to cost \$50 million to \$60 million to build. That is what he said and he made it as a statement of fact. Even if he had made it a statement of fantasy, it would have been inaccurate. I will include the hospital. The facts are, Sir, he did not mention the hospital. He said a Medical School, but I will include -- He did not say the hospital, Sir. I will include the hospital.

The total cost of the Medical School, itself, is estimated by the world renowned firm of Llewelyn Davies and Weeks, Forester, Walker who have done our functional plan, estimated at a little over \$12 million - \$12.66 million. I do not know how they get that precise. He said \$50 to \$60 million.

MR. WELLS: Of 400 bed hospital?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will just be patient, we will get to the 400-bed hospital.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are now talking about the cost.

MR ROBERTS: We are talking about the Medical School itself, Sir. Seventy-five per cent of that is recoverable from the Health Resources Fund, to the Government of Canada, subject to agreement by that Government.

If the University Hospital were to be built on campus it would add to that cost another \$21 million. So that \$12 million and \$21 million is \$33 million, Sir. He said it was \$50 million to \$60 million. The Medical School and the hospital, together, \$33 million. These are the estimates from the consultant firm, Sir. It is a report about that aspect, and the usual sum up.

Now, if I want to add other buildings, Mr. Speaker, some of them for the Medical School and some otherwise, we would add an additional \$11 million. That would bring the total cost to a little under \$50 million, but that would include a Medical School, a Life Scientists' Building, serving the whole university, and a 400-bed hospital.

Mr. Speaker, he did not mention the hospital. He did not mention the Life Scientists' Building.

1076

costs, Sir, the gross costs.

Because of the Federal Government and the hospital insurance we share, the actual cost is considerably less, Sir. It is \$2.7 million for the General Hospital, \$1.3 million for the Janeway, \$1.2 million for the Western Memorial. Those are facts, Sir, not speculation.

It is a long way, a long way, from \$8 million - \$10 million gross to his \$10 million to \$15 million. It is a long way from a net cost, a net cost, Sir, of \$3 million to \$4 million. Let him figure it out.

MR WELLS: Right again! I am right again.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman's definition is right, it is most unusual.

MR WELLS: We have got to pay back the money we borrow -

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman wants to talk about capital costs we will. But there is still even more:

I have not finished yet, Sir. I am only talking about the whole complex - a 400-bed hospital. A 400-bed hospital, Sir, compared to the approximately 200 Western - twice as large as Western Memorial is now. Not as large as it will be.

That \$4 million to \$6 million, Sir, only \$3 million of that is for the Medical School. The remaining costs are related to hospital services and so forth. So, again his facts are wrong, but he did not stop. He went on and he said, we get fifteen doctors a year and either they were going to be a half million each, or they were going to be a million each. There were fifteen a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is why it will cost so much.

MR. ROBERTS: Correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$15 million to run it. Get fifteen doctors. Ten to fifteen to run it and fifteen doctors. So, that is half a million - \$5 million a year turn out --- Is not that right? Is not that correct?

MR. ROBERTS: That is what the hon. gentleman said. That is what the hon. gentleman said. It is fairly simple division. He is capable of that.

MR. WELLS: Probably get fifty, right?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk of the facts. I do not know where he got his estimates.

1078

MR. ROBERTS: The facts I have, come from the Dean --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is out of order. In fact he is very unparliamentary when he tells an hon. member sitting opposite he is not telling the truth. I do not think he means to do that and he should correct himself.

MR. WELLS: My apologies, Mr. Speaker, to Your Honour, I was going on the new principle established in this session of the House where the statement, "That is a lie" was accepted as being okay, so I was basing it on that, Your Honour. Otherwise, I would not have said it.

MR. SPEAKER: Regardless of what the hon. member is basing it on, I say now, that when another member, regardless of which side of the House in which he sits, if he says another person is not telling the truth, I think the hon. member is the first one to admit that that is not parliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I gather I have about run out of time unless the House will give me a few more minutes to compensate. May I have a few more minutes of the House? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The only way the hon. member can carry on over the time limited, by the rules, is to have the unanimous consent of the House. If the unanimous consent of the House is offered, he may continue. Do I hear any dissent?

MR. WELLS: I am not satisfied, Mr. Speaker. If it were something sensible, I would listen to it, but I am not satisfied.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the Question? It is moved and seconded that this debate be adjourned, those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay",
Carried:

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,
March 6, 1970, at 3:00 P.M.

1081