



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 21

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

Monday, June 5, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. W.W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker

before we proceed I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege and it relates to an editorial appearing in June 3, edition of the "Evening Telegram" wherein there was an editorial entitled "Cancel Them Now" in connection with the offshore explorations leases.

It was said in the editorial and I quote: "According to Mr. Marshall an in-depth investigation is to be carried out, even a royal commission set up..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out as a matter of privilege that I did not make the statement. Unfortunately when some members on this side make statements criticizing what went on in the past, it is presumed that automatically a Royal Commission would take place. This is not so. There was no need of a royal commission to determine that the granting of these leases were wrong. They are perfectly plain for anyone to see and we are taking the necessary action with respect to it. But I want to set the record straight.

The only people who referred to the royal commission was the editor of "The Daily News" the former Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and the honourable the member for White Bay South, and their interpretations of what I have said were completely and absolutely incorrect.

#### PETITIONS

MR. J. G. REID: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Hopeall and Green's Harbour.

We have in our present asphalt unit crushers with very little stone. The road is well prepared and while the unit is in that area, it is a wonderful time to have that road paved out around Green's Harbour-Hopeall. The roads there have been very bad, but this last year or so they got them in shape and are expecting the pavement in that area. We have school buses running out in those communities

MR. REID: and in certain places have been very dangerous. With a little upgrading now the road can be paved. Very little work is needed, a few culverts, little stone and while the unit is in that area I would certainly like to see and I am sure the general public of Green's Harbour and Hopeall would like to see that road paved.

I have a petition here of 340 people who signed this petition. Mr. Speaker, I humbly support this petition and move that it be received and laid upon the table of the House and submitted to the department to which it relates.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the honourable member on behalf of his constituents in Hopeall and Green's Harbour.

I might say, so forceably presented by the honourable member. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, the paving of that road was on the agenda of the previous administration. It was part of our programme, a bit of unfinished business that we left behind. If we had stayed in office I think we would have paved that road this year, especially with the equipment being so near the communities.

So I hope that the Minister of Finance has the message loud and clear and that the prayer of the petition will be granted in this fiscal year.

On motion petition received.

MOTIONS:

MR. ROSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the presence of the United States Force has contributed materially to the economic and social welfare of citizens of this Province and in particular to the residents of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Community, on the mainland portion of the Province and WHEREAS the status of the United States Air Force in relation to usage of the military installation at Goose Bay has only been determined until the end of June 1973 and WHEREAS it is imperative for the stability of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area that its long-term future be determined and secured as quickly as possible and WHEREAS there is no effective military presence of our nation in this Province, now therefore be it resolved by this honourable House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened that the Government of Canada be urged to secure the economic and social future of residents of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area as quickly as possible by negotiating long-term arrangements suitable to the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland, of not less than twenty years duration, with the United States of America or by providing for the operation of this strategic military operation by Canadian armed forces and that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada forthwith.

QUESTIONS:

MR. A. MURPHY (Minister of Provincial Affairs). I have a couple of answers, Mr. Speaker, to Question No. 27. Order paper, Friday, June 2, 1972, no promotions, review of classifications only and one that was Provincial Affairs, Labrador Affairs. The same question asked by Mr. Woodward, Labrador North. The answer is none, same question.

MR. HICKMAN: I have an answer to a question, but I can not find the number. It was the question asked by the Hon. member for White Bay South.

It is a question along the same lines as the other. The number of persons the salaries of whom were paid out of the vote to his Department of Justice who were granted promotions from one Civil Service classification to another for the fiscal year ending March 31, naming each such person. Number of persons, nine. The names, Elizabeth Clarke, Phyllis Carter, Lorne Tubman, Ruby Walsh, Marie Miles, Ray Grandy, Raymond Greene, David Barret and Gerald Noseworthy. No. (2), what is the number of persons as referred to in (1) above who received such promotions showing the numbers for each classification. Number, 1 Fire Captain, \$379.60; one Police Prosecutor, \$102.00; one Police Lieutenant, \$51.84; one Police Sargent, \$76.34; one District Court Registrar, \$427.50; two Supreme Court and District Court Reporters I, I suppose that is Grade I, \$832.50; one Supreme Court and District Court Reporter, classification II, \$208.00; one Clerk-Stenographer, \$805.00; and the total - Yes, it is the answer to Question 36, Mr. Speaker,

1483

Mr. Hickman.

The answer to No. 3 is \$2,082.78.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to Question No. 34, June 2, part (1): two persons, Malcolm Rogers and Chesley Hapgood. Part (2): one person, a photographic technician, microfilm operator, number two. Part (3): Malcolm Rogers, \$123.00, Chesley Hapgood, \$263.00.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health) With regard to Question No. 23, on the Order Paper for June 2, I would like to mention to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have some 2,700 employees in the Department of Health. I wonder if he would wish us to go through this volume or would you care to rephrase your question more specifically so the data could be more easily obtained. It means going through a list of 2,700 employees. If it is important, we will attempt to do that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with the Department of Health. The minister will find that each month the cabinet have given a list of - appointments are subject to Executive Council ratification. My suggestion is that he talk to Mr. Sellers and merely get copies of the various cabinet papers. If he wishes to consult me outside, find. When I wrote the question, Sir, I was quite familiar with the Department of Health.

MR. ROWE (A.T.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has suggested that he would be aware of the great volume of work in this number of employees. It is a question that he would perhaps ask and would like to have the information more specifically given. I will take your remarks back. With regard to Question No. 39 and No. 40, for the information of the table, regarding medical and surgical specialists and I presume Question NO. 41 is a repeat of Question No. 39 -

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the day, if the honourable member will allow, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister

Mr. Rowe (W.N.):

of Justice and the question is: Whether he has instituted an investigation into some serious allegations made by the morning press to the effect that a man who was suffering from an overdose of sleeping pills, I believe, was incarcerated and held in jail for ten hours while suffering from the overdose? If he has asked for such an investigation, does he have any comment that he would wish to make on the matter at the moment?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for White Bay South for directing a question to me. I am rather anxious to clear up any misapprehension or misunderstanding. I am sure honourable members will appreciate this. It would not be in the best interest if I used any names. On June 1, Thursday, a person who was a patient at a hospital was given in charge to the police by a physician for being apparently disturbed. At 2:45 P.M., on the same afternoon, he was examined by a psychiatrist who refused to certify him presumably on the grounds that there was nothing wrong. Anyway he was refused. As honourable members are aware, under the legislation, in order to have a person committed to the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases there has to be certification by two doctors. Then at 5:35 P.M. on the same day, he was examined by one doctor who certified him. At 6:50 P.M. he was examined by a second doctor who also

1485

certified this person, following which an attempt was made to locate Magistrate O'Neil to issue the necessary order of commitment. Magistrate O'Neil could not be found. There was a message left for him to contact the station upon his return. In the meantime, around about midnight, I guess, or shortly before that, I was contacted by the solicitor for this man, who complained that they were waiting the return of Magistrate O'Neil. I suggested - . reminded the solicitor that in St. John's there are four magistrates, namely, Magistrates O'Neil, Mulcahy, Roberts and Strong, that all four have the necessary jurisdiction to sign the order, Immediately thereafter within a matter I think of minutes, Magistrate Roberts signed the necessary order, the man was duly committed to the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases.

AN.HON.MEMBER: How long had he been in the station?

MR.HICKMAN: He had been there from 2.05 in the afternoon until approximately 11.15 p.m. As I say the police immediately, within thirty minutes after he had been referred to the police by the doctor and the hospital in question. The first psychiatrist was at the jail to do the necessary examination following which he refused to certify the man. Then they had to go looking for two other doctors, the two that are required, one doctor certified and at 6.50 p.m. another - then sought Magistrate O'Neil. But I am at a loss to know why one of the other magistrates was not contacted. I feel quite certain that obviously the man must have been disturbed but the doctors who certified, certainly I am sure would not have left the station if the man had been in any danger, following certification. He was there. In fact, he was taken from the place where he was confined and interviewed in the doctor's office. During that waiting period he was in the doctor's office with his lawyer and his wife. The three of them were together for several hours. So that the story as appeared is really not correct. I am not blaming any one for it. But these are the facts. I can see nothing, no action that police failed to take. It was



not at all reprehensible and the matter was very quickly settled. As soon as his lawyer telephoned me, I reminded him that there were three other magistrates in St. John's. That could have been done in a couple of hours before.

MR.W.ROWE: A question. Is there any truth to the rumour, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of the lawyer he will be made a Queen's Counsel as the result of bringing this civil liberties case to the public notice?

MR.HICKMAN: No, no truth.

1487

BAA

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not been in practice for ten years.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the findings on Thursday past in the Department of Highways, concerning the causeway connecting New World Island with Twillingate Island, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways (acting)? What decision has been made since that day, and when can we expect an answer, please?

HON. E. MAYNARD (ACTING MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS): Mr. Speaker, the Twillingate Causeway is under review by the officials of the department and myself at the present time. I hope within a day or two to be able to make a further statement on the situation, as to what if anything further will be carried on this year.

MR. F. E. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the capital grant to the university does not appear to provide for an adequate increase in space in order to meet the needs of the anticipated student enrollment for next year, can the minister assure the House that qualified students will not be turned away from the university in September and in the January registration?

HON. JOHN A. CARTER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH): Mr. Speaker, I agree that that is a very important question, but it is also a very complex one. The amount allocated for the university is all that can be managed because of the legacy of neglect in the last twenty-three years. I am assured that certainly the most competent students will be admitted and that all students who are properly qualified shall be admitted. I cannot see any need to reduce enrollment from the present level. I do wish - and had to report that we were somewhat shackled in our efforts to provide the necessary funds for all the institutions under our authority.

MR. F. E. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the minister to say that no qualified students will in fact be turned away next year when they make application to the university?

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Thank you! Another question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that during a panel discussion at Memorial University approximately a week before the last provincial election, that the minister told the students that they would not be required to borrow more than four hundred dollars under the Canada Student Loan in order to qualify for provincial assistance, if the P.C.'s. were elected?

MR. CARTER: I will have to take that under notice, Mr. Speaker, because, what I said I will check out very carefully and make a proper answer.

MR. J. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways (acting). I had a report this morning from my constituents in Red Bay. Certain areas of the road have been washed out in several places. The people naturally cannot get over this road. They have to use that road getting back and forth to the hospital, and picking up bait which is a very important thing this time of year at West St. Modeste, and transporting their kids to school. Has the hon. Minister of Highways been notified of the situation and what does he intend instructing his officials to do about getting that road back in shape as soon as possible?

MR. MAYNARD: The Minister's office had not been notified of the situation. I will investigate the matter this afternoon and see what action is to be taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour? Has the minister given any consideration to sending trained staff of his department to offer assistance in bringing together labour and management in Labrador West, before out-and-out confrontation occurs, perhaps culminating in an alarming, costly strike?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, we have had conciliation

officers in Labrador West for some considerable time working with both contract procedures, the Wabush Mines and the Iron Ore Company of Labrador, and the conciliation officer reports to me that negotiations are proceeding fairly smoothly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development or the Premier whichever one prefers to answer this question. The House is aware that Churchill Falls will officially open on June 15 or 16, I think it is, and I would like to ask the minister what measures have the government taken to hold equipment, bunk houses, trailers and other tools and supplies in Labrador for the development of the Lower Churchill, following the official opening at Churchill Falls Hydro-development on June 16? Would it not be in the public interest, Mr. Speaker, for government to purchase all these items and move them to the Lower Churchill for resale later to BRINCO or if government have no hope of developing the Lower Churchill in the foreseeable future would this not be a good opportunity for the Department of Social Services to pick up some low-cost housing for recipients of social assistance by purchasing these trailers as distressed merchandise?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder if the honourable minister has thought over my question I ask on Friday last and if he has an answer concerning who would employ the men for the Labrador Linerboard Mill in Goose Bay.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not have the answer here now.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS (Adjourned debate on the Budget).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I shall thank the minister. He was good enough to adjourn the debate on last Wednesday thus assuring that in

fact we had a debate on the Budget. It was one moment when it seems that we were not to have a debate on the Budget but I thank the minister for leaping to his feet and for leaping into the breach, adjourning the debate. I thank him also for not having anything further to say today. Having listened to two and one half hours of him last week I think that will do me at least and perhaps he will take a jaunt around the province for a little bit. We will have the pleasure I am sure of hearing from him again later in this debate and I for one am looking forward to that.

Now, Sir, the Budget, any budget to say the least is a very important document. The Budget which the minister brought into the House last week and it is a document that comes in a little red book or a wine coloured book, I guess, and that is wine although some may think it should be whine, that Budget, Sir, is the first statement we have had of this administration's philosophy. Thus I think it is particularly important, it is peculiarly important the first time and indeed I think the minister himself said it is the first time really since 1931 or 1932 since we have had a statement of a Conservative Administration's philosophy respecting financial matters.

We have heard a great deal from spokesmen for that party over the years, Sir, but as they were always in opposition their remarks were for the case of opposition. This Budget was the first time we have had any statement, any philosophy, any exposition of what a Conservative Administration, a Progressive Conservative administration would try to do and would try not to do. At the time, and it was a quick reaction.

1491

988

MR. ROBERTS: I said the Budget was exactly what I would have expected from the present Minister of Finance. Upon reflection, Sir, I think it is a valid comment, I think it stands. It is exactly what I would have expected from the minister. The Budget and the more you read it, Mr. Speaker, the more it comes true. I am sure Your Honour takes it home to Lewisporte on the weekends and entertains your constituents with illustrating readings from it.

The more you read it, Sir, the more you realize it is completely and utterly bankrupt of any ideas. There is no statement in it of the future, there is no statement of hope, no statement of any intentions or any worthwhile intentions. I was quite surprised to see "The Evening Telegram's" editorial along those lines. Normally I would have thought that it would be a matter of some months before the evening paper would take up its traditional position of opposition to the establishment. A very noble and honourable position. They must have been chagrined and as surprised as most Newfoundlanders were by the bankruptcy of the minister's approach. I could use bankruptcy in the financial sense, Sir, as well as in the intellectual sense.

The Budget does not have in it any statement of the future, Mr. Speaker, all it says, time and time again, we cannot, we cannot, we will not, we shall not, we must not and so forth. Now I know the minister is busily scribbling it down over there and when he gets up to speak I know what he will say. He will say, we cannot, we cannot because of the twenty-three years of spending by a Liberal Administration that has left the province in financial bankruptcy as well as intellectual bankruptcy and so forth. I can hear him now. He will be quite eloquent. He will be quite sarcastic. He would doubtless provoke my friend from Bell Island as he does so often. But that does not take away, Sir, from the cold, hard fact. It does not for one moment take away the fact that this statement of the administration's

MR. ROBERTS: position is not a statement for the future of Newfoundland, Sir, rather it is a statement of businessman, an accountant perhaps a university professor or two, certainly some of the extremely competent officials in the Department of Finance.

It is not the statement the people of Newfoundland expected. It is not the statement the people of Newfoundland wanted. It is not the statement the people of Newfoundland hoped for from an administration that have been put into office with a very wide support throughout this province and with great expectations.

So there is nothing in it expect an attack on the past, an attack which mainly has overtones and self-justification about it. It is an intellectual game of arrogance. The minister has played it before, he will play it again. It makes him feel happy. Nothing gives him more pleasure than saying, "I told you so." The mere fact that he has told us so and told us again does not make it any more so or any more true. It is filled with some pious platitudes. It is not filled, Sir, with any feeling for this province or any concern for this province or any belief in its future. I, for one, Sir, find no surprise at all in the fact that when the Premier returned and came back in the House, he was in the House before this, but when he made his ministerial statement on Thursday that he set up a planning committee, I think I have the name correct, but certainly that is its purpose, an inner committee of the cabinet, an inner cabinet. It was of no surprise. First of all the Premier found it necessary to set up a planning committee, having heard as we all did the Budget Speech. He doubtless read it before. Secondly, I was not surprised at all that the minister was not on that committee.

I think that is one of the better decisions that the Premier has made, Sir, but I find it ironic that the man who more than any other in Newfoundland has made a political hobby-horse out of talk about priorities and planning, I suppose he was the first person politically to raise this jargon. It is a jargon term. It is a valuable one, but

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a new idea. The minister was the first one, he was then on this side of the House. Maybe he was on that side and then this side and then that side. But anyway he was the first to have raised it.

I find it ironic in the extreme that the Premier did not put the minister on that committee. I think it is significant. I think it bodes ill for the minister. I do not wish him any ill, Sir. I am quite amused by the gentleman's attitude. I am not impressed by his arrogance. I do not pretend to be eloquent, Sir. I do not pretend to be eloquent, I do not have the speech writers. I am far more concerned about trying to say my point and if the minister wants to become sarcastic let him. If he wants to become arrogant I cannot stop him either. But he is arrogant, Sir, we have seen that already in this House. The Premier is not. I must say I am quite surprised to find that and I am pleased. Maybe the Premier has taken the right approach.

Now, Sir, this budget is really two separate budgets. We have on one hand the speech of the minister. As he has said quite properly, it is his speech. It is the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance. He gives it. He brings it into the House. It is his speech on a motion that Your Honour do leave the Chair. It is a statement of the administration's philosophy. It is a statement to which every minister must give allegiance. It is a statement for which every minister of course is responsible. But it is, it is, Sir, the minister's budget speech. That is one train of thought, Sir. That is one statement.

On the other hand we have the estimates which show the detailed expenditures the government propose to carry out this year, which show the money they will be asking the House to vote, Sir, first in a committee and then once the committee passes it, the appropriations bills will be put through the House.

Sir, I submit the two are completely different. You would not know



MR. ROBERTS: that the same man had prepared both documents. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we can conclude that the same man did not prepare both documents. The Budget, the minister's speech, the whining document we have here is tough. It talks tough and then it talks more tough. If you read it and believe it, Sir, you can be filled with foreboding of what is going to happen to this province if the minister continues with this philosophy.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when you come to look at the estimates, the detailed story, you see quite clearly that the minister did not have his own way or he is wearing two hats, one or the other, because they are not the same, Sir. The largest deficits in Newfoundland's history, this is from the man who complains about deficits. Now you will say they were Liberal Government programmes. So they were, Sir. But if

he has the courage he talks so much about, he could end those programmes. I am not suggesting he does. But if he had the courage of his convictions as he expressed them so often the last two or three years, he would have done so, he would cut spending. Indeed, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the minister did cut spending. I think he made an honest effort. Then I think that others prevailed. I think the cabinet or a committee of the cabinet or one or two members of the cabinet prevailed upon him. I say that, Mr. Speaker, from the evidence presented in the Budget and in the Estimates, the public documents, from my own knowledge of the minister. I have known the gentleman for years. I never served in a cabinet with him, Sir, and I never expect to. But, I was a member of the House when the hon. gentleman last brought in a Budget or a Budget with which he was associated. That was the famous chocolate-bar budget in 1968. The hon. gentleman was a member of that cabinet as was the present member for Fortune Bay. He was a member of that cabinet as was the present Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman gave the Budget address. Well that makes it all the juicier, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman can then confirm me when I say that, without revealing any cabinet knowledge, I was not privy to any cabinet knowledge, Sir. Oh, I remember all sorts of references by the minister. I am sorry; the honourable gentleman. He was a minister, Sir, and he probably has hopes of being one again. Many are called but few are chosen, Sir. No he will not be a third-tier minister. He may be a second-tier.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is tough: the estimates are not. The minister has talked like a tiger and acted like a pussy-cat. There is nothing to this, Sir. We hear talk of discipline. We hear talk of it. We all shivered when the minister went down to the Bankers' Institute and like a tabby he purred, but now he meows - but then he purred. He made a speech. Mr. Speaker, I am sure people shivered in their boots. I am sure as well, the cabinet shivered in their boots at the tough line. Sir, I have not got the text. I read the newspaper accounts. I have

heard the accounts on the radio and television. The minister talked tough. What was not going to happen. Sir. He was going to slash here and slash there. "John the Slasher". "Jack the Ripper", they will be calling him. I really believed them, Sir. I know the hon. gentleman. I know that this is the way his mind works. I know that he thinks he is running a business. I know that the hon. gentleman believes that if you can not afford to run the hospitals for twelve months you only run them for ten. If you get sick in the eleventh, that is your fault. You should have had your priorities better. You should have had your planning better. The hon. gentleman's philosophy, it is a tenable philosophy. It is a disasterous philosophy for a Province, Sir, but it is a valid philosophy. He would be a great professor of a business school or a great deputy minister. That is what he said at the Bankers' Institute. There were going to be no hospitals. He did not say that, but that was the implication. There was going to be no, nothing. Did I hear one of those chirps over there, Sir? The hon. member for Burgeo. Well, I will have a few words on him. It is always a pleasure to talk about the honourable gentleman from Burgeo. I guess he is probably the most expensive "MA" we have ever had elected here, two point six millions for a fish plant. Considering, after all the honourable gentleman said publicly it was worth less than one million. We will come back to that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the honourable gentleman will have to answer. He might get the "Daily News" of February 17, 1972, because that is the reference to it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. minister did not bring in the Estimates and Budget that he wanted. I believe he bought in the Budget he wanted. I believed he knuckled under in the Estimates. I believe he gave in. I believe there was a terrific struggle within the cabinet or among or between members of the cabinet. Sir, I cannot prove that. I have no access to cabinet information. But, I can say that every reporter in this House and I can say that every member, I believe has heard this too, will tell of a great struggle which took place on Thursday and Friday

of last week. The Premier arrived home. Well, we will not say where he was. He was on public business. That was what "Information Newfoundland" announced. He was away and he came back. Anyway, he was away and he came back and for that we should give thanks. He came back and naturally enough I suppose he wanted to look at the Budget. If I were premier, I would want to look at it too. The minister had been at it for a while, tireless as he is and with all the ability that he got. I do not doubt either his dedication or his ability or his willingness to work like a Trojan. The story is, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier came back and he had a look at it, he and the minister had a heart to heart talk down on the eighth floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eye ball to eye ball.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it was eye ball to eye ball, if you want to use the Cuban confrontation. They went up against one another and they took the measure of one another. The Premier won, Sir. That is why today the Estimates and the Budget are completely different.

MR. CROSBIE: That is your opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, Mr. Speaker, I expect the hon. gentleman to deny it. What else would he do except to deny it? He did not leave the Cabinet. So he must deny it. He must even defend this Budget, Sir, and defend these Estimates. I have no doubt if we could entice the -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would be good enough to hold his petulant impatience for a bit.

MR. CROSBIE: He is tempermental, you know.

MR. ROBERTS: He has had two and one-half hours, Sir. He doubtless will have many hours more. I do not begrudge him a minute of it. I find him hard to listen to, but I do my best. I have no doubt that if we could entice the Premier into this debate that he too will say the same thing, Sir. I expect him to. I do not disbelieve them. I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that every person connected with the public life, the reporters in the gallery, they cannot speak, they cannot speak in this House. They are not members. They have heard the rumours, Sir, and there have been

too many rumours from too many sources.

MR. CROSBIE: Who spread them?

MR. ROBERTS: Not I, and not any member over here.

MR. CROSBIE: He made it up. Oh! Come on!

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is simply going to have to contain himself, or we will just have to ask Your Honour for a ruling. No, no, no. Let my colleague restrain himself too. I know that my colleague and the hon. gentleman opposite are like oil and water. We have already had the spectacle of the hon. gentleman calling my colleagues slimy and he called my colleague here a contemptible worm and he called me a rogue. That is just a start. I am sure that the hon. gentleman, we will get more out of him. He is pretty good at dishing out, Mr. Speaker, and not so good at taking it. Now let him stay quiet. If he wants to leave the House, by all means do. If he wants to sit there, I am delighted to see him. He has got his nice pink tie on today and I find it very pleasant to gaze upon, very pleasant indeed.

MR. CROSBIE: Try to stick to the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: There we are again, Mr. Speaker. There we are again. I have not said this rumour is true. I am merely saying that I have heard the rumour as has every member of the House, and has every member of the Press Gallery. They have heard the rumour.

MR. CROSBIE: He cooked it up.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman try to be good enough to restrain himself. He is getting flushed again now. The pink, I am sorry, it was not a pink tie, it was a pink shirt. The pink of his shirt is rising. Even the hon. member from St. John's South has to laugh at that. Do not let them see you, Sir. Do not let the hon. gentleman be seen by his hon. colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I think the evidence shows that we have two separate budgets here, two separate philosophies. There is just nothing the same. We have the largest deficit in Newfoundland's history. The largest deficit. I am willing to believe, Mr. Speaker, and I say now that when the minister,

if he is the minister eight or nine or ten months from now when the next year's budget and estimates are brought in, and he may be and he may not be. Mere statements that he will be, from anybody, do not prove that he will be. But I am willing to bet that next year we will see deficits as large or larger. By deficits, Sir, I do not mean deficits on current accounts, I mean the total cash expenditure, the fact that on capital account we have large borrowings, \$100 millions, \$150 millions. The net this year is \$203,000,000 from all sources. That includes some debt redemptions and I may add, includes a lot fewer debt redemptions than last year. Last year the government redeemed \$46.3 million in debt. This year the government estimate they will redeem \$28.4 millions. The

sinking funds are \$1.4 million higher, Sir. So, you have \$8 or \$10 million more on this year's deficit, on expenditure, because there is \$8 or \$10 million less on debt redemptions. You will see that next year, Sir, I am willing to believe you will see supplementary estimates too, Supplementary Supply - items that are just as foreseeable now as anywhere in the past. That does not mean they are foreseeable. I do not believe the Minister of Education will be able to get through the year, if he really means what he said a few minutes ago about no qualified student being denied admission to Memorial. Then, I say now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman will be in looking for supplementary supply next year. We have already seen his handling of the bus thing - a retreat that makes Donaparte's retreat from Moscow look like a beginner's effort. That is just the start - but I should not be hard on the honourable gentleman - incompetence is its own reward, as the honourable gentleman knows. If he wants to be smart, he can say, "yeah, look at the past."

Mr. Speaker, we will see when the Minister brings in his budget next year. Already he has run up the greatest spending total and the greatest deficit in Newfoundland's history, \$138.7 million, Sir, \$33.5 million more than last year. Total borrowings, Sir, are \$200 millions, it was \$200 millions last year.

But, Mr. Speaker, even with these vast expenditures there are cuts. The Minister almost boasts about them. Indeed, I think he does, I think he glories in them. I think he feels that they are a very good thing. I give him credit for being steadfast in his beliefs. The Mothers' Allowance is being cut out, Sir. It does not surprise me when the Minister was on this side of the House, indeed Sir, when the Minister was on that side of the House, as a backbencher, as he was briefly, until he left, even then, Sir, he advocated that this particular programme be ended. He has been consistent. He has carried on through the years.

He has not changed his mind at all. Now that he is the Minister of Finance he has carried out what he said. It is one of the few instances where he has, but he has done this. They are to be cut off the expenditures, Sir. We will not see a saving of \$3.2 million, that is one of the half-truths in the Budget. There are 160,000 school children in Newfoundland approximately, \$20 each per year, \$3.2 millions in a full year. You will not see a full year's expenditure this year, Sir.

We have also seen cuts at the university, despite what the Minister of Education says. We have seen cuts particularly on the capital account side, particularly as well in the student loans. As of September 1. whenever students apply for their loans this year, they will have to borrow \$600 instead of \$400. That is a fifty per cent increase. They will have to borrow that much more before they qualify for any of the provincial government assistance which, from memory, goes hand in hand fifty-fifty with the Canada Student Loan.

But, Sir, I submit that there is a consistency in these. These are the two major cuts in the Budget. There is a consistency in them, Sir. There is a philosophy underlining them. There is a thought. There is a plan. Both of them, Sir, hit poorer people. They do not hit the well-off people at all, I assure the honourable gentleman. He has three children. I am not sure that any of them are at school in Newfoundland. I am not sure, indeed, maybe his eldest child or children are finished their high school education, going to university. He has three children, honourable gentlemen on the other side have children. Some of them doubtlessly got this allowance. They may well even have laughed at it. Just joked at it. Certainly a \$20 bill did not mean anything to them. A \$20 bill meant nothing at all to them. But I can tell them, Mr. Speaker, that there are thousands of people in Newfoundland to whom that \$20 does mean something. If this particular administration does not think so, let them get out around. If honourable members opposite were free to speak what they believed, what they found, they would agree with that.



the money is important, Sir. The mere fact that the Government of Canada are going to bring in a Family Income Security programme - I must say this is one of the more unhappy anachronisms I have ever heard. The mere fact that they are going to bring it in does not excuse it. The other week the honourable Minister of Social Services & Rehabilitation was asked about a statement made in Ottawa by John Munro, the Minister of Health & welfare at Ottawa. The statement, to be fair, was made with reference to the Old Age Security payment which the Government of Canada now increase, are increasing, the Parliament of Canada authorized that a week or two ago.

Mr. Munro at Ottawa had made a statement in which he said that he had hoped that the Provinces would not take advantage of the fact the Federal payments are being increased so as to reduce the provincial payments. That would be relevant to the people on Social Security, Sir. Because a man and his wife on Social Security get more money than does one person, a husband and wife with one of them qualifying for the Old Age Security and the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

So that is what Mr. Munro said. The question, quite properly and quite naturally was put to the Minister of Social Services & Rehabilitation, what did he think of this? Well, Sir, I have not the precise wording of it here, I am subject to correction on it. What he said, we all applauded when he said that they were not going to make, they being the administration, they are not going to penalize the poorer people of the Province. They were not going to take advantage of Ottawa's generosity to increasing Old Security Payments to enable the Province to chisel a few bucks on support for elderly people through the Social Assistance programme. That is what the honourable gentleman said. Good philosophy. I am sure that all of us would agree with it. I know that in the past we were not always able to do that. I think indeed on occasion I can remember difference of opinion. But I think that the Cabinet felt that we had to take a different tack in those days. I am glad the present Cabinet does not, Sir, I think

that is very good. Our elderly need the assistance. But then Jack the Ripper comes in. Sir, he does not cut the - rips the mothers' allowance. What is his excuse? Because Ottawa is going to give them some more money. So, the taxpayers of Canada are going to be asked to put up more money so our government can carry out the wish of the Minister of Finance, the feeling he has had for years, part of his personal vendetta with the previous Premier. I think it is rank hypocrisy. Either the honourable Minister of Social Services & Rehabilitation will leave the cabinet or he will have to explain his statement. They are not consistent, Sir. They are not consistent for one moment.

If the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, felt it unnecessary felt the allowances were not any good, felt they were a bribe or felt they were an insult to the mothers of this Province. I do not doubt that he and all his friends believe that. No doubt at all, Sir, that down on Circular Road or even down in the other end of Hogan's Pond, where the rich people live, as opposed to my end where the mortgages are what cover the houses, I have no doubt, Sir, that they believe that. They really think the people do not need it. They laugh at it, it is only another \$20 bill. What is a \$20 bill to them? But I can tell Your Honour that there are many people in Lewisporte District, in White Bay North or any other district I name, the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development in a previous reincarnation ran a finance company, he gave out loans, I suppose he tried to get them back. He will agree, that \$20 is important to a lot of people.

I was in Buchans on Friday night speaking to a high school graduation. I did not raise politics with anybody. I did not feel it was the place. I can tell the Premier that person after person came up to me and raised the subject. They are not upset about the tobacco tax. It is only another dollar a carton, I suppose if you are hooked on the habit another ten cents a packet does not really matter. I do not think there

is any outcry against that. But I can tell him this Mothers' Allowance struck deep and the university cuts have struck deep. People in this province now feel their child might not get into university. We have had a great dream in Newfoundland now for fifteen or twenty years Sir. We have too many dreams and dream no little dreams .

1505

Mr. Roberts.

Let the honourable gentleman remember that. We have had a policy in this province of any qualified student by the university standards (The university sets those standards) can get into the university. Well I do not know if that is going to be true this year or not. We will await the statement from the Minister of Education. If it makes as much sense as his previous statements on bus - the honourable gentleman misled the House too, (I will come back to that) on the bus policy and then retreated in shame and humiliation, and so he should. There has never been as incompetent a minister and that, Mr. Speaker, covers a lot of ground over twenty-three years, I can tell you .

HON. J.A. CARTER (Minister of Education): Would the honourable gentleman give way for -

MR. ROBERTS: Would I give way for what?

MR. CARTER: Do you want me to make a slight comment?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, of course I would not give way for him to make a slight comment! He can speak all day if he wishes.

MR. CARTER: Very well.

MR. ROBERTS: He can speak outside the House if he wishes or he can speak inside the House. Let him speak in his turn. I would be interested and delighted when the honourable gentleman makes his statement. I always listen with interest to them. They are fictional. He stood in the House, Sir, on May 29 and he said; "no school board is going to get less or substantially less than bus allowances." On that same day a superintendent of a board in Newfoundland wrote to me and said, "last year we were getting \$150,000 and this year, unless the minister changes his formula, we are getting \$75,000," May 29, Monday . The minister has withdrawn from that position. He has been pushed back and so he should have been. He is also now going to set a misleading estimate. We will come to that. But on the university, Sir, not just on current account but on capital account, where are the engineers going to go to school, Sir? Where are all the art students going to go? The university's enrollment has increased every year.

Mr. Roberts

Will it this year, Sir? I do not know. Judging from the statement the hon. Minister of Finance made, it will not. I have not asked the university officially because that is not my role. That is not my part. I know there is concern over there among the administration, among the higher échelons, among the men and women who have the job of shaping the university. They do not have enough on capital account, Sir. We did a great deal last year, Sir, and we did more -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Indeed we did, Sir. Mr. Speaker, let me just comment on that. The honourable minister thinks he can go through the next four years merely reciting what he considers to be the sins of the past, some of which are sins. I am the first to omit it, Sir. I take my full share of the responsibility just as the present member for Fortune Bay was the minister who brought in the "Chocolate Bar Budget." I am sure he takes full responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. It was the gentleman who told me that he read the budget.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): He does not remember which ones he read.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he did not write them, as he himself confessed afterwards. He did not have the courage to do it at the time. But, Mr. Speaker, if the minister or the Premier think the people of Newfoundland will accept that instead or in place of a philosophy of government, an accomplishment of progress, then they are sadly mistaken. I do not think the Premier believes that. The Premier is showing himself all the time, Sir, to be a smarter and smarter politician, infinitely smarter and infinitely a better politician than the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, the university again, the minister's policy there is another case of hitting the people least able to pay. The sons of the doctors and the lawyers and the merchants and the people doing well, Sir,

Mr. Roberts

making \$10,000, \$12,000 and \$15,000 a year, it does not bother them in the least to have to borrow \$600 instead of \$400, Sir. It does not bother them at all. My friend from Labrador North who has a few pence in the bank or out of the bank but has a few pence, (he does not have a son old enough to go to University yet) but if his son were at the university, Sir, it would not bother him to have to borrow \$600 instead of \$400, before we got any aid at all. But there are thousands of Newfoundlanders, Sir, who are not in that position. There are many and even in Labrador West which probably has the highest per capita income in the province. Everybody down there is well paid.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes for the honourable gentleman I would any time.

MR. MURPHY: These loans, when must they be repaid?

MR. ROBERTS: The loans, Sir, are guaranteed by the Government of Canada, not the government of the province but by the Government of Canada, which government pays the interest up to and including a date one year after the student either graduates or leaves school.

MR. MURPHY: In other words, the parents do not have to pay -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! I did not say the parents, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: But inferring that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am neither stating nor inferring it.

MR. MURPHY: You are.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman thinks he can read inferences let him read inferences. I will stand by my word. They are forced to borrow more. Sir, there are many people living - the honourable gentleman is proud of the title, "The Boy from Flower's Hill" (Topsail Pond Subdivision).

MR. MURPHY: Hogan's Heroes .

MR. ROBERTS: I am one of Hogan's heroes sure! Myself and the Minister of Finance walked on the waters jointly at Hogan's Pond, hand-in-hand. It was quite a sight. No! no! that is Ode to a Grecian Urn now, Mr. Speaker. If we stop on the greasy road, who knows who will slip. Mr. Speaker, there are many people in Newfoundland to whom the thought of borrowing money - I suppose to any people, to the minister because he has a horror of borrowing money. His figures are a little larger. He is dealing with the province and not with an individual family, the needs of a family. I stand by it. I think the honourable gentleman will agree with me that this will hurt the students. It will stop them. I will wait and see now. Maybe it is all part of the one plan. On the one hand, the Minister of Education is not going to be able to provide the university with enough capital and on the other hand, they will reduce the enrollment. Well that makes sense, if they want to do that. But either way, Sir, this is the end of the policy of an open university. If I am not correct and I hope I am not, let the minister get up and say it. Let him retreat again. We better get that record, "Bonaparte's Retreat" and a little drum for the minister when he makes his statement. It should not be like that. It is not fair to pick on him, is it? It really is not. If the Lord helps those who cannot help themselves, then he got much help from the Lord and I do not mean Stephen Taylor.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! listen to him.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are shivering in your boots.

MR. ROBERTS: Ha, somebody else came through!

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech is a very clear indication of the government's philosophy. I do not think these words are used in the speech. I do not think they were used by the minister in any of his comments. I think they are probably newspaper words or editorial words but it is "a tighten-the-belt-budget." The only problem is that

Mr. Roberts.

the guy whose belt gets tightened is the poorer man again. There is no belt tightening down on Circular Road nor is there any on the end of Hogan's Pond. I do not even think there is much on Topsail Pond really or any of the other, Lawrence's Pond. I can tell the honourable gentleman that in Buchan's they feel it. I have heard from my own district. In the little places, just ordinary people trying maybe to get a kid off to University or keep their kids in school - let the hon. gentleman from Labrador West laugh and let him smirk. Let him smirk if he wants to! I do not care about the honourable gentleman's heart. I do not know if he has one.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not even care about his head. I am not even sure he has one of those.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR ROBERTS: He has something on top of his shoulders.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite serious. There are many people over this province - I wish the honourable gentlemen opposite could read my mail. I do not hear only from people in my own district. I hear from people who cannot see the Minister of Community and Social Development. Let him go back to Buchans and meet the union. They are waiting to see the honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: The compassion is overwhelming.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman's compassion - no I have no compassion for the honourable gentleman, Sir. He went to Buchans and a date was made with his executive assistant, his high-price Grand Falls executive assistant. I believe he is getting \$12,000 a year, Sir. Twelve thousand is what the estimates say. A date was made with him to come to Buchans, the minister and the Minister of Health, to talk with the hospital committee, a private group perhaps but a group that speaks



was elected to the public meeting, a group that has a right to be heard. We believe in participatory democracy. The minister was in and out of Buchans before anybody knew it. He "snuck" in and he "snuck" out.

AN HON. MEMBER: The "roadrunner."

MR. ROBERTS: "Yeah" the "roadrunner" might be it. Then, he had the gall to say that he had never heard of it, he did not know of the appointment, that his friend in Grand Falls, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Sam Dicks, had not told him of the appointment. That is a first-class executive assistant. I am sure the member for Ferryland tells the Premier of his appointments, I am quite sure of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. ROBERTS: I only know, Mr. Speaker, what five men told me in Buchans on Friday evening. I know what they told me, Sir. I have a letter from them saying the same thing. I have seen the letter of abject apology the minister wrote them. What the minister does not know, is that his own secretary here in Confederation Building called those men on that day and said, naming the hon. minister; "Have you seen the minister? He is supposed to be meeting with you and I have a message for him." He did not know that his secretary here in the building called looking for him.

MR. SENIOR: I got the message.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman will get the message when those men in the union get hold of him. He will get the message, it will come back to him as well, Sir. It will come back to him, A twelve thousand dollar a year executive assistant who cannot even get a message to a Minister of the Crown in his own district.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will not do you a bit of good.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not care if it will do me any good, Sir, I am not concerned about me. I am not even concerned about the minister, but I am concerned about the people in Buchans or anywhere else for that matter. Let them laugh, Sir, I have seen that before, indeed, I may

have been part of it before.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is an excellent golf course...

MR. ROBERTS: We will come to the golf course. I hope they have given the hon. minister, Sir, a membership in it. The Premier also is a golfer, but I can claim no such athletic prowess. The Premier could go out and tee - Is tee-off the - "yeah" you tee-off in golf do you not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, we will come to that later. Well, we will come back to that golf course. I believe it was probably recommended by the officials during our tenure of the ministry. I can tell the hon. gentleman the cabinet turned it down. A new cabinet came in - I am sorry again, the hon.

AN HON. MEMBER: (First part inaudible) cabinet secrecy?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is no cabinet secret, Sir. It was not done. If it were recommended by the officials and not done, obviously it was turned down by the ministry. Mr. Speaker, since that we have seen the belt tightening and we will see more. They have cut capital account, or they are not spending as much this year as last year even though the deficits are larger, but that is because of the Stephenville requirements for the mill, to finish the mill in Stephenville. They have cut Highways from \$41 millions to \$21 million or \$21.3 millions. I find that very interesting. Again, it will hurt poorer parts of the province. It means that there is no Twillingate Causeway unless they do some fancy double work. It means that work is now stopped. What money they spent on a negotiated contract during the election has been spent.

We hear petition after petition being brought in. The hon. gentleman from Trinity South brought one in today from Green's Harbour and Hopeall, I believe for a bit of pavement. They should have it, maybe they will get it. Sir, the Premier has a crack?

MR. MOORES: Would the hon. Leader permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, any time.

MR. MOORES: All right, in cabinet when the contract for the Twillingate Causeway was negotiated at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, if I may quote the Premier's House Leader, we should not use the word "you." The gentleman...

MR. MOORES: I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister made a great point about that the other day.

I said that during the period leading up to the March election the Twillingate Causeway extension was negotiated. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected quite gladly. If I am wrong and maybe I am. I did not ring any of the men who could tell me.

AN HON. MEMBER: What period?

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon me!

AN HON. MEMBER: During what period?

MR. ROBERTS: During the period from January 18th., or after January 18th. when the ministry changed hands. The period leading up to the March election.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: There was another contract formed.

MR. ROBERTS: There were two contracts. Phase (1) was done last summer and I believe it was done on public tender. Am I correct? There was a tender called and Western Construction got the contract. Western Construction carried on on a negotiated contract. About \$600,000 was spent. I have no doubt good money was got and a negotiating contract on those terms or those conditions is not unusual when you have a contractor on site. The fact remains, as I understand it the contract was negotiated. If I am wrong I will gladly admit it, if I am - I will look it up. I cannot ask the deputy minister, I mean, I have no right to that information from officials any more.

We have seen cuts in the proposed expenditure on our highways. We are not going to see much work done this year. I would think the money

in the estimates - when we come to the acting minister, I am sorry that the minister himself is not back. I understand he is on the mend, is he? Good, well that is good. I would imagine this work will merely carry on the work in progress.

The Minister of Fisheries, who down in Bay D'Espoir during March was saying; 'The road will be paved from Milltown right around to St. Alban's and the work will start this year.' Well that may be in here, Sir. I hope it is, for the hon. gentleman's sake. All the other promises that were made during the March election, and I am not even talking as yet, we will here a lot in the years to come about the Northern Peninsula road. During the October election the member for St. John's West, the present Finance Minister made a speech on the radio, on the C.B.C. free-time broadcast, in which he said the Progressive Conservative Administration would reconstruct and pave that road. I fervently hope they will, I fervently hope so. It is the longest road in the province. There are as many people served by it as by the Burin Peninsula road. Now that the Burin Peninsula road is all under contract or about to go under contract, thanks to Don Jamieson, I may add something that has been recognized by the people up there. They have asked, petitioned formally, I understand the joint councils have written to the government, I do not know to whom, but to somebody in the government asking if the highway can be named the Don Jamieson Highway. I think it would be very good, it would be very big of the present administration if they were to do it. It would also be very fair.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The hon. member for Burin thought it was going to be the Hickman Highway.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it will not be the Hickman Highway. No, no it will not, the Hickman Highway runs from Lawn down through Lord's Cove, and Lamaline, the loop, they call it, the loop. We will see if that is done this year. We will see if the municipalities are going to get their work done this year, all the share-cost paving projects that were going

to happen.

I hope hon. gentlemen opposite are listening, because, I am trying to help them. They will be back with their constituents trying to explain this. Trying to explain it, trying to defend it. They will blame it on us, they will say; 'Bye, Stephenville, she's awful tight.' Somebody may look at them and say; 'Well, funny, during the election you knew of Stephenville, you announced it during the election, how come you still made the promises? It is not as if you were a government coming into office, it is not as if you were a new crowd that took over, you had been in office for a couple of months.'

We will find out about the Port aux Basques water system. You know, that is something that needs to be done. It greatly needs to be done, it should be done.

MR. EVANS: It is going to be.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree it is going to be, but the question is when and by whom and on what terms?

MR. EVANS: This year.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope so, this year. Is it going to come out of the \$1 million allocated for water and sewers? Part of it will come from Ottawa under the DREE programme, part of it may even come under the DREE Industrial grant, part of it will have to borne by the promise - borne by the province. It will not be borne by a promise, it may be borne by the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman, it is a good question whether that goes ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: No question.

MR. ROBERTS: We will find out about the - well I hope there is no question. I dearly love it. The one thing I regret ever in government, is that we being the Province of Newfoundland cannot spend everything that people want and need. The needs of this province are incredible.

June 2, 1972, Tape 504, Page 6 -- apb

The honourable, learned and Q.C. member from Placentia East has needs in his constituency. He has brought in a couple of petitions and put them up on the table and supported them very well.

I hope that work is done this year. I am reasonably sure it will not all be done. I hope some gets done. There is not a district in this province that does not have needs except maybe St. John's West and I am not even sure about St. John's Centre. I suppose there are no roads needed in St. John's Centre but there is housing needed, badly needed housing.

MR. MURPHY: The past twenty years.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, the past 120 years.

MR. MURPHY: No, twenty years.

MR. ROBERTS: No, all of it dates from 1949. All evil, Mr. - We have a new theory, Sir, everything was prosperity until 1949 and all evil dates from 1949. That sounds good. There will be a course on that at university, "Newfoundland Folk Lore and Myths."

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman's district has real needs and so does every part of Newfoundland. Carbonear has needs, roads, hospitals, housing. They are not going to get anything out of this Budget except for a hospital and we will come back to that. But, Sir, the philosophy of this administration again has been hypocritical. They made these promises. They went around the province promising everything they could think of - a medical clinic in Terrenceville and all the other things, wonders were going to come to Fortune Bay. Too bad the Minister of Highways is not here, he is ill although he is recovering and that is good, but he went around in a government helicopter promising everything. My friend from Bonavista North is not with us today but down in Wesleyville one morning they look up and like an avenging angel the Tory candidate and the Minister of Highways land from the sky and they step out of the helicopter and there they are and like Moses striking his wand on the Red Sea the minister waved his hand and said, "There will be pavement."

Well, they better look at another miracle, Mr. Speaker. They

better look at the loaves and fishes if they are going to do that work with the \$21. millions they are asking for this year and if we listen to the minister for next year there will be none or less. Old Jack the Ripper is at it again. I believe him. He will do it. I will give him credit for that. If he can get away with it, he will do it. He will do it. We will end up with a balanced Budget, Mr. Speaker. She will be balanced. As a matter of fact we may even have a few millions in the bank. It would be great. It would be just great. Of course, we will not have anything else. You cannot have it both ways, Sir.

During election we heard of promises and all we hear now is their crying "wolf" . During the election, Mr. Speaker, they knew they were taking over Stephenville. The honourable the Premier and the honourable the Minister of Finance and I suppose the honourable gentleman for Port au Port went out on a stage in Stephenville and St. Stephens and said, "We will take it over." They did not tell us about the \$5. million gift. We are still hearing about that. There was no talk then of belt-tightening, Sir. Then it was milk and honey in the Promised Land. . There was not a district in the province where the Tory candidates did not make promises except Humber West. There was no need to make them there.

MR. PECKFORD: And Green Bay.

MR. ROBERTS: There were no promises made in Green Bay. Well, that is good because the honourable gentleman -

MR. WILSON: None made in Port de Grave either.

MR. ROBERTS: Now we are going to hear, Sir, now we are going to hear and I hope the honourable gentleman's constituents - There was one promise made in Port de Grave.

MR. WILSON: There was no promise made in Port de Grave.

MR. ROBERTS: There was one promise made in Port de Grave and it will be



kept. The honourable gentleman should not hurry. He should not -

MR. WILSON: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman should be quiet for a minute as I am trying to help him. There was a promise made and it will be kept. The promise was made of no hospital in Bay Roberts and that promise is being kept. That promise is being - The Minister of Health nods, the Minister of Finance nods, there will be no hospital. That promise was made. There will be no hospital here and that promise will be kept.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it is a good thing. Whether the people of Bay Roberts will consider a hospital in Carbonear or substitute, but that is what they are getting.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I would not attempt to name anything the honourable gentleman says. I know what promise he is going to deliver on.

AN HON. MEMBER: "Yeah."

MR. ROBERTS: "Yeah." Let him say "Yeah." Let him say "Yeah." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another two-sided, another part of this where it is like Janus they have two sides. Every day we get petitions coming in this House. We hear from members on the other side and we even hear from the member for Harbour Grace when he is not digging. We hear from him. He comes in and he presents his petitions and so he should, Sir, so he should. So he should, as that is one of his jobs as a member. We hear of neglect over the years and members on the opposite and members on this side can point to hundreds and thousands of things that are not done in Newfoundland that need to be done. I could start in Raleigh in White Bay North and go through all the communities in White Bay North and work down probably the whole North East Coast and name things that need to be done, many of them.

If that be neglect so it is neglect, as they have not been done.

The fact is there. They need to be done. People want them. Petitions come in and yet the same time the Minister of Finance is up saying, "You spent too much. You have spent too much. Cut her back. Rip her up," which he does.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, yes, we will go on that, yes. The honourable gentleman dug for months and he has found - Where is his evidence? Let him bring it out of the waste.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the teletype machines?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, what about the teletype machines with information about Newfoundland? What about the \$15,000 a year for the reporter who covered impartially the Premier's election campaign? That is a good -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is not bad. I remember the honourable gentleman was here, hearing the eloquence with which he denounced the "Bulletin." Almost the tears would come to your eyes.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$168,000.

MR. ROBERTS: The \$168,000. What is the \$168,000?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Bulletin.

MR. ROBERTS: The Bulletin, alright so that is gone now, that is cut, that is done. I am not even complaining about that, it is done. It is not being spent. What about the \$15,000 now for the chief press officer? What about all the other things, the teletypes? Not bad, not bad. What about flying newsmen in for the weekend and giving them receptions? I am all for that. I think the whole province should get in on that, send a twin otter out to Deer Lake and load it up with the press, the West Coast, bring her in. That is the way, boys! Good stuff that. That is belt tightening. There will be a lot of belt

tightening over that, more belts than belt tightening.

Mr. Speaker, the government cannot have it both ways. If they feel that the people of Newfoundland, the province cannot afford the level of expenditures that we have been having, they feel that and they quarrel with their conclusion, but I will not quarrel with their right to have that belief and have that feeling. But if they feel that, Sir, then let them live up to it, let them act like it. Let us not have a pussy cat approach. Let us have a tiger approach. Cut her, bring her in and cut her. Take the estimates and slash them but do not come in and talk tough and then when the estimates are brought in the talking tough has become a powder puff. That is not what the people of Newfoundland sent this administration into office for. That is not what they are looking for, that is not what they are holding them accountable for in a few years. They want to know what this crowd are going to do for Newfoundland, Sir. They want to know what they are going to do about the commitments and promises.

You know, are we really in the world, Sir, and to read the Budget Speech you would think so? Are we really in the world where if we cannot run the hospitals for twelve months we will shut them down in a month-ten? I do not for a moment believe we are. The former Deputy Minister of Health, Dr. Miller, one of the greatest public servants this province has ever had, always said when estimates came along and the perennial word came down first from Sir Walter Marshall, when he was controller of finance, and laterally from Mr. Dennis Groom and then from the Treasury Board which quite properly took over the function and the present Treasury Board Secretariate, of course, was built by the previous administration and the fine and capable crowd of public servants they are, but the word would come down, the director would come down and cut the expenditures and Dr. Miller would say, "Well,

we will cut them but every time the patients at the General Hospital will still get their meals. " So they will, so they will. That is what happened to the minister. He set out with the best of intentions and ran in - He set out like a tiger but he ran into the real tiger in the Cabinet. Down last Thursday night and last Friday on the eighth floor, Sir, the meetings were held. As a result we now have this new set of the estimates, a set essentially like any government would have brought in except that if we had cut the mothers' allowance, if we had been so foolish as to do that, we would have put it back in education, would have used, something like the pupil-teacher ratio.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine. I mean redirections within programmes are fine. But all this is taken out of the pockets of the mothers of Newfoundland now. A twenty dollar bill ripped out of their pockets and nothing but hard words put in its place.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of budgeting are quite familiar to my colleagues and me, we have been through it. I think I know exactly what the Minister of Health went through this year with his estimates. I have been through it. So has the gentleman from White Bay South, the gentleman from Fogo, the gentleman from Bell Island. They have all been through the budget. Indeed, they have all served on Treasury Boards in the past. They know the sweat and the toil that goes into it. They know that it is really impossible, there is not enough money to do everything that should be done. They know it is a hard process of having to decide what you are going to do and how much you are going to do. I think also I am prepared to admit that there are no magic answers. I have no magic solutions. If I were the premier of the province today, I would not know how to find hundreds of millions of dollars. I know if I were premier the honourable gentleman would not be on my side of the House. I would not have him. I have got taste if nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, we are familiar with this and I do not expect any magic answers from anybody. I do not know how the hospitals are going to be run in five years. When John Monroe brings in this plan whereby he puts a ceiling on of a nine percent or a ten percent annual gross and our costs are going up from eleven percent to fifteen percent. We had years in this province, Sir, when we tightened the belt and if the honourable gentleman thinks back to - he was then an administrator or whatever, he was running, in effect, the Carbonear Hospital, when we said a three percent raise and that was it. The hospitals told us, we cannot do it, our inevitable cost increases are more than three percent, just to stand still they are more than three percent.

MR. ROBERTS: What about all the new services we need? What about all the new services? We said, sorry that is all the province can afford, you will have to live with it. The hospitals did live with it. We are going to see more than that, Sir. I do not know the answers. I do not know the answers at all. Newfoundland must have public services. Newfoundland can only have them by borrowing. I do not think the size of the deficit should be our concern. Indeed the statements in the budget on the debt are misleading. They are truthful as far as they go, it is the minister's technique, but they do not go very far.

Let them point out that if we did not rather have Bay D'Espoir. It is a quarter of a billion. The debt is \$1 billion and some odd, \$1000 million and whatever the figure is. Then roughly \$250 millions of that is for the Bay D'Espoir project and the related projects, the transmission lines. Another \$20 million, \$30 million or \$40 million is for housing. Not a enough of it but the housing down in the centre of St. John's, a part of that is in the debt. A part of it is for hospitals. Not enough. I agree not enough. A part of it is indirect, E.P.A. is in there and the Stephenville Mill is now become a direct obligation. The Come-by-Chance project.

Sure they are indirect obligations of the province, the Come-by-Chance has \$30 millions direct. It is a crown company that has another \$130 millions in it. It is not an obligation to the province, there is no guarantee to the province. You can decide for yourself, Mr. Speaker, whether the province would wish a crown corporation to default.

But, Sir, those are self-liquidating. I think, perhaps we should get a breakdown of the debt. Maybe the minister could bring one in, Sir, a table. He has the officials down there to do it, I have not. A table showing how much has been spent over the years on hospitals and how much on roads and how much on water and sewer services and how much on housing. It might be very interesting. It might be a lot of things.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree not enough has been done. Every time a member opposite says, "boy that is neglect, not done in twenty-three years." We will say, you fellows got a point, boy, it should have been done. Sure the road around the loop should have been paved on the Burin Peninsula. Everybody is for that. So should the people on the Northern Peninsula, should have had pavement. Of course, they should.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I know, we are quite in agreement on this.

The problem is, where does the money come from? And what do you use it for? When Jack the Ripper gets through, Sir, we balance. We will probably balance our own capital account. We can see it now a capital account expenditure of \$18 million or whatever we can raise by appropriations-in-aid.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs problem, the price of beer. There was a letter in the paper this morning, was there not? Whoever Mr. Littlejohn is, he is obviously a beer drinker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I am all for that.

MR. MURPHY: Sure you are.

MR. ROBERTS: If young people in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, if young people in Newfoundland can vote at eighteen to send members to parliament and can vote at nineteen to send members to this House, then I think they have got the majority. I think they have got the majority and the responsibility to decide whether or not they wish to take a drink. If the honourable gentleman disagrees with me, I will gladly —

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, who has the house? Well, the honourable gentleman has the house at Topsail Pond, but who has the floor?

I said it and I believe it and my colleagues believe it and we will see whether the government does or not. But if a young, let me repeat

MR. ROBERTS: it, if a young person in this province at eighteen is able to go and fight for Queen and country and if he is able to vote for a member of parliament and at nineteen in this province if he is able to vote for the provincial election to send all of us here and if he is able to vote for municipal elections, town councils and city councils, Sir, I feel no reason why he cannot be given the right to decide for himself whether he wishes to drink or not. I will tell the honourable gentleman if that young man wants to drink, he does drink. He does drink now. Oh, but -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable gentleman is against the younger people, let him be. I do not think his colleagues will agree with it.

MR. MURPHY: If the honourable member -

MR. ROBERTS: I fully expect them, I fully expect them to bring legislation into this House. I hope they do. I will support it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: You need to lower it to eighteen not to nineteen -

AN HON. MEMBER: Not to nineteen.

MR. ROBERTS: That should be done by an Order-in-Council. We did not do it.

MR. MURPHY: Why?

MR. ROBERTS: Why? That is another story, we did not do it.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I take the responsibility but would the honourable gentleman from Green Bay do it? Would he lower the age of majority in all purposes to the age of nineteen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot but I will have a word with the Premier if it will help. I doubt if it will. Will the honourable gentleman do it?



MR. PECKFORD: I will give it very serious consideration.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, oh, we will have a task force. Let him make up his mind, Sir. All the honourable members opposite will have to. I know the Minister of Justice would like to do it.

MR. HICKMAN: To do what?

MR. ROBERTS: To lower the age of majority to nineteen that can be done by order and then go further and make it eighteen. We will see what the cabinet will do, Sir. We will see what the government do. But if I am wrong the people of Newfoundland know how to make me pay the price, but I will take the stand. I believe in it. If I am wrong, I am wrong, if I am not, so be it. It is not all guts. It is the matter of common sense. The honourable gentleman is the one who talks like a tiger and acts like a pussy.

MR. CROSBIE: Meow!

MR. ROBERTS: The only thing is he is not very good at drinking milk, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Cocktails.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe moose milk, but not milk.

Now I see him out walking on the water at Hogan's Pond, boy, I look down from the house and see him out for a stroll of an evening, it is quite a sight. It is quite a sight.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I agree. No, I agree. I agree. I agree. The Premier would not even dream of doing it. But the Premier is very good at pulling the plug.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does he have a life jacket on?

MR. ROBERTS: No, he does not have a life jacket, he does not know where the rocks are either, he just gets out and strolls.

Mr. Speaker, the budget paints a very bleak picture for the future of this province, if you take just what is in that document. It is bleak in philosophy, this, barren of ideas. I think the budget is a failure. It is a statement of a philosophy for this province. It is

MR. ROBERTS: a statement of hypocrisy. It is not consistent with the estimates. It is not consistent with the actions of this administration. It is exactly what we expected from the present Minister of Finance. Exactly. I was not surprised at all when he brought it over to me a few minutes before he read it, about quarter of three he was good enough to bring it into me and I looked through it carefully. My only surprise was that the cuts were not bigger, the cuts were not greater. But then when I heard the story from - I started from people in the press, about the row on the eighth floor, about the fact that the Premier had

gotten back and had informed the Minister of Finance of certain of the realities of life. That explained it and it made sense. I believe that story to be true, Sir, I say I do not know if it is true, but I believe it to be true.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I do not disbelieve the hon. gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not a word of truth.

MR. ROBERTS: I may add, I fully expected him to say that, he would have to say that.

MR. CROSBIE: You are saying in effect that I am a liar.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no ...

MR. CROSBIE: There is not one word of truth in that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would not dream of calling the hon. gentleman a liar.

AN HON. MEMBER: When you are.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not, Sir. I say it categorically, I do not disbelieve his statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Not an iota.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not disbelieve his statement

MR. CROSBIE: Heart to heart, lung to lung, brain to brain...

MR. ROBERTS: Eye to eye, hand to hand?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I must say that is a little close, even for cabinet colleagues. I always thought the Premier had much better taste than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Teach him how to walk on water.

MR. ROBERTS: Who, the Premier teaching the minister or the minister teaching the Premier? The Premier will teach the minister some lessons before we are through I can tell you.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a look at one or two of the specific points raised by the minister further down in his speech. My colleagues will be touching on these. Of course, when the estimates come

up we will have a chance to say a few well chosen words on each of them, particularly now that we are going into evening sessions and we will not even get the nice long summer evenings to - well, think about it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It is the hon. member's fault.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, speak to your House Leader, Mr. Speaker. He is the fellow, the whip, the hard-hearted fellow. He is a worthy successor to Les Curtis, Sir. Mr. Curtis was House Leader for twenty or twenty-one years, the member for Twillingate.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A heart of stone.

MR. ROBERTS: Boy, he had a heart of stone. His only idea was; 'Well we will tomorrow afternoon.' 'Sir, it is Saturday.' 'Well, what are you doing anyway, come on in.' The present House Leader, Sir, is like all House Leaders, you will see him over there and he fidgets and he says; 'Let us give everything fair greeting today.' It is endemic to House Leaders. The opposition, you know, the hon. gentleman fidgets every time anybody gets up to speak. On his side he can turn them with a look and shrivel them.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: So the hon. gentleman should, so he should. But that is endemic to House Leaders, that is what we are used to. It will go on, we will take our time, Sir. I suppose we will get her through by what? Mid-September with any luck?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I was counting on August 20th.

MR. ROBERTS: You want it August 20th. eh? We get Regetta Day off though. Do we get Regetta Day, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No?

AN HON. MEMBER: Regetta Day is only a holiday for St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: Most of this government are from St. John's, but if we do not get Regetta Day do we get Labour Day or is that a day to labour? How about civic holiday? All right, we get civic holiday.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I heard a quirk from Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, I think we are in labour listening to the hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is very decent of the hon. gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I have no hesitation in recommending that any gentleman opposite who want to take advantage of the hon.gentleman's services should do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is taking your measure...

MR. ROBERTS: When the hon. gentleman looks at an individual and says: 'How are you feeling?' He has mixed motives I can tell you. It is like going to a senator and saying; 'How are you today senator?' The senator clings - hold on now, the flower of Flower's Hill, the tulip from Topsail Pond.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: What was that again?

MR. MURPHY: I was talking to someone the other day and he said; 'How are you? Not well I hope.'

MR. ROBERTS: That could have been the hon. gentleman from Harbour Grace. 'How are you feeling?' 'Well.' 'Sorry to hear that.' Or as my colleague says, 'He takes your measure.' But, he puts us all under in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, one of the points made by the minister was the Development Corporation. He reaffirmed, I think he said it previously on other public occasions that this is going ahead. All of us on this side welcome that, Sir. John Nolan worked very hard to bring this about while he was the Economic Development Minister. I think if the present minister has the grace, which I sometimes think he has, I think he will say so. I am glad he is taking up the work and carrying it on and finishing it. I think it is a good suggestion, it is a good programme, it is a good initiative by the government. We need small industry in

Newfoundland and everybody says we are going to have it, everybody says we need it. Certainly I can name all sorts of sawmill operators in my constituency and other sorts of projects all throughout the province that are looking to this development corporation as the be-all and the end-all.

I hope it is, at time I doubt if it will be. We will see what the Finance Minister does. I am glad he is going ahead and we will have no difficulty at all. We will have great pleasure in fact in voting for the expenditure involved. I believe that it is a couple of million dollars, and that brings in twenty million dollars from Ottawa. It is a good programme. We may want to talk a little to the minister about it, it will be interesting to hear if the directors, you know, what the proportion of directors are and that sort of thing. It would be what? Two and two, two from the province and two from Ottawa and the chairman was to be mutually agreed

AN HON. MEMBER: Three...

MR. W.N. ROWE: Three from here.

MR. ROBERTS: Three from here and two from Ottawa, and one of the five being chairman is that it?

MR. ROWE: The chairman from here.

MR. ROBERTS: The chairman is to be a Newfoundlander. Well, we will want to talk about that a little. We think it is a good programme. We are going to have a little go at my relation in Health. There are one or two misstatements of fact in the Budget. I am sure the Minister of Health will agree that there are. I have looked through the correspondence, I have looked through the public announcements and the Minister of Finance is flatly incorrect, I will not say that he is lying. That would require the intention and I do not think he has that intention, but he is flatly incorrect, flatly wrong when he says that Ottawa ever promised to pay seventy-five percent of the Health Sciences Centre.

June 2, 1972, Tape 507, Page 5 -- apb

The Ottawa Government, the Federal Government agreed to pay up to \$30 million, actually it is twenty-nine, point something, something, something, up to \$30 million provided that did not exceed seventy-five percent of the cost. Well, Sir, obviously it will exceed seventy-five percent, the estimated cost was \$40 millions, there was a report which I think we got in late November, I filed a copy in my own files from the Scribner people, the estimated cost had gone to \$45.3 - that is the document that we now have here. It may well go higher, Sir. I see in the newspapers calls for tenders, I do not know whether they are coming in on estimate, below estimate, above estimate or what.

AN HON. MEMBER: On page (24) you will see...

MR. ROBERTS: I am looking at page (24), it is the strawman thing. The minister says; "One of the main arguments of the proponents of the assemblage of the Health Sciences Complex at Memorial was that, seventy-five percent, but he does not quote any authority for this. I have looked through the statements I made, I looked through the statements Mr. Munro made, I have looked through the correspondence between the Government of this Province and the Government of Canada and I

find no commitment by anybody and no statement by anybody that Ottawa would pay 75 per cent. Then, Mr. Speaker, the minister constructed his whole argument on a fallacious ground. I know what he did, Sir. He sat down and he said how can I nail Roberts? And that should not be very hard for them. That should not be any hard at all. I can find all sorts of things he can nail me on. When the investigating minister turns to it, I can give them lots of fertile subjects. It would be fun. But all he can find is this quite picayune attack on me founded on a fallacy, as he now admits.

Now, Sir, in addition the minister goes on and he castigates the Government of Canada for their refusal to lift that \$37,000,000 ceiling. I think he is right. That ceiling has been in effect certainly from the time the hon. member from Burin was Health Minister. It was in effect at that time. I do not know if it was in effect when the hon. gentleman, the present Finance Minister was Health Minister or not. But I am not sure if castigating the Government of Canada Budget Speech is going to do very much to raise that ceiling. It is up to the Finance Minister in Ottawa to allow the Health Department in Ottawa to spend more than \$37,000,000 a year out of the Health resources fund.

The thing that disturbs me though, Sir, is the Government, the minister in his speech attacks the whole idea of the complex and indeed he says that they would cancel it if they could. He says they cannot and it is with regret and petulance that he says so. But he does not propose any alternatives. He does not face the facts that are relevant to the situation. We can debate it at any length we want. We had a go at it last year on Estimates. We can have a go this year.

Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, the facts that the minister does not point out, include such things as the fact that the present General Hospital is not adequate and can no longer carry on for even a short period as a general hospital, unless there is spent on it between twelve and fifteen million. The report is down in the Department of Health and indeed I



believe it was commissioned by the present Finance Minister when he was Minister of Health.

The Board of the hospital certainly feel that way. I may add the officials in Health, that is the advice I received at the time. I do not know if they changed their views at all. The fact remains, Sir, unless the Government of the Province are prepared to expend an estimated twelve to fifteen millions, and we see estimates go higher, an estimated forty millions is now become forty-five. Unless the Government of this Province are prepared to spend twelve to fifteen millions on that hospital, it must cease within a very short period of years to be used as an active treatment, acute care. The minister and I agree on the point, I take it?

DR. A.T. ROWE: It is one decision or the other -

MR. ROBERTS: Right! We took the decision. I think it is the right decision. That is all I am saying. But the Minister of Finance was consistently opposing that over the years. When he was on this side he opposed it. I can find for the Health Minister the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Speaker, was the Premier of the cabinet that went ahead with this programme. When it comes to knuckles being rubbed the present Finance Minister should know about that.

AN HON. MEMBER: It took him a weekend to recover.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and for that I give thanks. I would rather he was there than here. The only political nightmare I have is that at some point when the hon. gentleman leaves the present ship is that he would reapply for admission on this one. Sir, I think we will just have to put up the raft guards, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Move over here by me.

MR. ROBERTS: Do not ask him over here. We got enough trouble without-leave him over there. The last thing we will ever want. He will either lead a party or he will wreck it. He has done it to two. He is now working on his third.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: Right! Right! If I had not trusted Bill Saunders too. That was a mistake I made. I wonder what wee William is getting out of it. I do not know. Maybe nothing. He is not getting his House pay. The minister told us that.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, is he still on the Power Commission? I do not know. Is he still on the Power Commission? Your the Minister, the hon. gentleman is the Minister of Economic Development. He is responsible. Is he still on the Power Commission?

AN HON. MEMBER: He said that three times.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentlemen perhaps check for us and let us know when his estimates come up? I do not know. Maybe Mr. Saunders would tell you. I am prepared to believe he was. I only know what he told me on day one and what he did on day two.

MR. CROSBIE: What he did on day one and what he told you on day one

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, the resignation was on Monday and I saw him on Tuesday.

MR. CROSBIE: - you are old buddies.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess will answer for what they did or did not do. I think they have answered. I think they have. I really think they have.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: That is what the Minister of Justice is hoping will happen in Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are very few independents in Newfoundland politics. But that is what he is hoping for, the Premier will slip a coin and the loser will have to take the job.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the Medical School, I am glad the Medical School and the new hospital - glad the Health Minister agrees with my statement. The Minister of Finance in his Budget neglected to point out these very relevant facts and that is all that I am saying. What I am saying is that the minister set out to do a hatchet job and he selected the facts that pleased him and the facts that suited his case and the rest he did not even mention. The Minister of Finance is as aware as am I or as the present Minister of Health is about the fact that either the General needs a lot of money spent on it or a new hospital is built.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance knew that yet in his Budget he - all I am saying, I am not talking about Health, I am talking about the Budget. I am talking about the Budget when it comments on this particular project. All that I am saying is that the Minister of Finance is trying to present a distorted picture. He deliberately selects the things which are favourable to his case and makes no effort to present a fair case. That is all I am saying. I do not need to say any more. The merit of my arguments have been proven by the Minister of Health himself - by his own colleague. That is all that I am saying. I am in complete agreement. If I never achieve anything more in public life, if I go out of public life tomorrow or if I drop dead tonight.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman can hope if he wants. But if I never do anything more, if I have forty years of life left ahead of me and I am in retirement or I am practicing law, whatever happens to me, the previous leaders of the P.C. party might have all sorts of places, I will be proud of that Health Scientist Complex and the small part I had in it. I will be very proud. I think any health minister who can become involved in it should be. I am sure the present minister will be proud he had a hand in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Right! That centre, that project is an essential step forward. All I am saying is that the present Finance Minister who knows better, he was once Health Minister. I have driven his blood pressure up, or is this farmicare.? Do we have a farmicare programme now? Mentally or physically?

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance owes the people of this province an explanation for his tactics in this case. He has only selected - now there is another example in here. He talks at some length about the costs of the new general hospital and the costs of the present general being operated as a convalescent unit. His figures I have no doubt are correct or no doubt they are the estimates given by the advisers and so on. That is fine. But he tries to make it appear that these are new costs.

Now that is not so . It is not so. The present General Hospital is costing six million or seven million dollars a year. I do not know what the figures are but the minister hopefully will have the information available. We will be asking. It is of the order of six million or seven million dollars to operate the present General Hospital. A teaching hospital is going to be more expensive, and it will be a teaching facility. The minister neglected to point that out. Anybody reading the budget speech would somehow get the impression that it would go to fourteen million or fifteen million dollars a year extra cost. Not so. Oh, the minister can shake his head. He did it deliberately and knowingly. No it is not a devious plot, it is a perfectly obvious plot. It is a perfectly obvious plot. Figures are very funny. When the honourable gentleman was on this side, everything he said was almighty wisdom. Now all of a sudden, anything that is said from this side is silly, you know. I wonder. The only thing that has changed is that he has moved over. Talking of silliness, the honourable gentleman from Green Bay is fast becoming the House expert on that. That is not the way to get in the cabinet.

June 5, 1972

Tape 508

NB - 6

AN HON. MEMBER: Fourth-tier.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he is not fourth, unless it is tear, that sort of tier  
maybe.

1539

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other item in the Health Estimates that I want to touch upon briefly. The budget came in on May 31. That morning or the morning after the "Daily News" there was a report of the Newfoundland Medical Association, one of their committees, a request for the special probe to be sought on mental health care. The report goes on. Apparently this request had already been made to the Minister of Health, so the item says.

Mr. Speaker, there are three former Ministers of Health in this House now: the present Justice Minister; the present Finance Minister and myself. Of course, there is the present Health Minister. I think all of us would agree with the one item which must have priority in the health service of this province now is the whole field of psychiatric care. If somebody wants to make a smart crack, let him go ahead. That is the sort of a line that leads to smart cracks. I think anybody who knows anything about health services in this province will advocate strongly and as forcibly as they can the expenditure of additional monies on our mental health services. That must include the addition of the Mental Hospital. I can say before any one else says it but for twenty-three years, twenty-two years or twenty-one whatever it was, it was done. The last extension I believe was finished ( I do not know if it was started by Commission of Government. It may have been) by the Liberal Administration in the early years of Confederation, 1949, 1950 and 1951. I am not speaking now in any partisan sense. I think if the government should reconsider this - they brought in a deficit of \$138,693,500 on capital account. I do not know what would be needed on the Mental Hospital this year. Perhaps \$1 million or maybe \$2 million will be needed. The estimate I had was \$2 million to complete the whole thing, just the beds. All the other facilities, the expensive things, the X-rays, the labs, the dietary, the laundry facilities are all adequate. The present plant, as I understand it, is adequate for the additional beds. All you got to do is build bed space. You are talking of maybe \$ 15.00 or \$20.00

Mr. Roberts

a square foot, Sir. For \$1 million or \$2 million, those additional beds could be put into operation. I would ask the Premier - I am not speaking politically or partisan. I am not making political speeches on this subject. I would ask the Premier to reconsider this. I think the minister and indeed I heard him on the television the other night - he was speaking at the Public Health Association. He made some remarks. He indicated that he personally thought this should go ahead. I think it should. I do not know whether a couple of millions can be shaved off the other General Hospital project in the province, the acute care hospitals. Maybe it can and maybe it cannot. But an extra \$2 million or whatever it would cost - I do not know if one would need \$2 million this year, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what could be spent. I do not know how far the architects are. I do not know if they are ready to call tenders or not. If one project in this province should go ahead, Sir, if there is one project that the people of this province need this year - let the smirk of that gentleman, if that is the word, from St. John's North - it is not a matter for smirking. Let him smirk if he wishes. I am being perfectly serious Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: What is the point of order Mr. Speaker?

MR. CARTER: The amount of abuse we have to put up with in this honourable House is probably fair enough. I can put up with the hon. Leader of the Opposition being abusive but one cannot put up with him being tedious.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, what is the point of order?

I said that the honourable gentleman was smirking and he was.

MR. CARTER: Listening!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not care if he was listening or not, that is his problem but he was smirking. That is all I said. I am being perfectly serious about a problem that has nothing to do with politics.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Indeed I would have gone further. I think it should be a priority, not a next order.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I know. That is fine. I heard the minister on one occasion. I had not heard the other. My own sources of information on the Corner Brook meeting are in San Francisco. They are in Montreal on their way to San Francisco. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier to have another look at this one with the cabinet. It is not a lot of money. I know \$2 million is a lot of dollar bills to have piled on a table. It is not a lot of money when you look at the overall expenditures of this province. We are spending nearly \$600 million this year. Yes, it is nearly \$600 million this year. Being spent is \$589 million which is provided for in these estimates. If the government's credit is as good as they tell us it is, then I think they could find an extra \$1 million or \$2 million. Let it be the next order of priority. Let the next order of priority go ahead right away. If they cannot find additional money on the current account side, Sir, then that I can regret. I think if I had stayed in the department I would have made some changes to free some funds for current account. I can understand the sorts of pressures that do exist. I think if the minister had been there a year or two he, perhaps, might feel the way I do that there are some things within the Health Department that could be changed and should be changed. That is another story. I am talking about capital account, Sir. I am talking about what I believe to be the greatest single need still in health in this province today and that is at least for adequate, at least potentially adequate physical facilities for the treatment of psychiatric illness. We do not have them now. The stories I have heard of the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases - they have a magnificent staff, Sir. They have their hearts taken out of them. The guts are taken out. They are heartbroken over this. They do not blame the minister. They realize that he was out-voted or out-weighted or whatever the phrase is. They are doing a magnificent job, Sir, with the facilities which are inadequate



Mr. Roberts

by any description. Parts of that building are over one hundred years old. Parts of it are - I do not know if any of the honourable rotarians have ever been involved, some of the rotary groups. Do the Husky Boys Group have anything to do with it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Caribous.

MR. ROBERTS: Caribous. Any people who have seen anything at all of the hospital can only marvel at how so much has been done with so little, nothing to do with politics. Whatever goes ahead or whether we go ahead with this or that or something else, I do think that that is something that should be done and I ask the government to have a look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I could not agree more, Sir. It has been evident for a long time and I think I can claim that I was the first Health Minister ever to do anything about it. I got it to the stage where the government in principle had agreed and where the plans are been drawn up. Then I left office, Mr. Speaker, with the administration and the new administration came in and now the first chance they get, the project is on the carpet, axed, gone, dead. I suspect that the truth of it is - Dr. Miller used to say and publicly that there are no votes at the Mental Hospital. I suspect that that is too true. I suspect that that is why it was cut.

AN HON. MEMBER: A very terrible statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Well Dr. Miller used to say it, Sir. He believed it. I believe it. I have been part of the government. I have been part of the cabinet. I know the way cabinet sometimes think. All I can say is if there is one thing the government should do this year, they should do that. They should do the extension to the Mental Hospital. They should go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance on page twenty-three of his diatribe talks about the fact that in the next few years we are going to have

Mr. Roberts

to spend a lot of money on capital health facilities. The figure he gives is \$88 million. Again he is being inaccurate because he is lumping in all of St. Clare's, a table from 1972 to 1976, when St. Clare's expenditures began in 1970-1971 and were very heavy in those years. He complains that this puts a burden on the province. Well it does, Sir. We need the facilities but they are going to be expensive. They are going to be expensive to run. I do not quarrel with that. What I do quarrel with is his statement that the programme should have commenced in 1967 and carried out over a longer period of time. That statement I find very interesting, Sir. I find it very interesting. When I look at who was Minister of Health from September, 1967 to May, 1968 and who was

MR. ROBERTS:  
and then when I find out who was Minister of Health from May of 1968 until June of 1969. It is true that architects were appointed for Carbonear and for Twillingate although the Twillingate hospital as it was designed was a different one than the one we now have. The plans for Carbonear were about one-third done when I became Health Minister, a year and a bit after the honourable gentleman left office. But, Sir, there was no plan prepared by either of those two gentlemen, there was no effort made at planning. I have been through the files. He talks now about the need for plans but, Sir, when he was there there was no planning. There was no effort at planning.

MR. CROSBIE: Bunk.

MR. ROBERTS: He can say "bunk" if he wants and he can say "tripe" but calling something "bunk" and calling something "tripe" does not make it so. The honourable gentleman is now so pure and holy well let him answer for what he did or did not do and the Minister of Justice who was Health Minister for a little over a year put no plans afoot either. There was a meaningless statement about plan "D" at Western Memorial and the honourable minister's brother who was and for all I know still is chief of staff at Western Memorial can wax eloquently and bitterly on that and so can I. When I became minister in June of 1969, Sir, there were no plans for the development of the capital facilities in this province, none at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like hell there were not.

MR. ROBERTS: There were not. There were some architectural plans started for Carbonear and there has been \$20,000 or \$30,000 worth of work done on Twillingate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why were the Carbonear plans stopped anyway?

MR. ROBERTS: Because I went to Cabinet and I said, "Freeze everything until we can find out what we are doing, until we can get an overall

plan." I took the responsibility for that. I met with the board in Carbonear. I made no secret of the fact and I think the honourable gentleman was there as medical director involved at the hospital. I took the responsibility for it. I was a part of the government but I was the minister. We deferred it, deferred all capital expenditures in the health field until we developed a plan. The plan was developed and authorized by the Cabinet in the fall of 1970. It is a long paper. Oh, it is fifteen or twenty pages, I guess. A long, it is a good paper if the honourable gentleman wants to read it. It is a little out-of-date now as that was two years ago but it was a good paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: A white paper.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was not a white paper. White papers are like four year plans.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Would the honourable gentleman not use "you." He keeps being sanctimonious with us. I was going to bring in a white paper but I never did. That is true and I would think in a couple of years we will hear a lot about four year plans too. I decided better not to have a white paper instead to go ahead on a series of developments and that is what happened. But that paper, the cabinet paper that was prepared by a group of people of whom I was one is still a good statement. It is a couple of years out-of-date and it may need to be updated.

When the Minister of Finance comes in with his half-truths and his insinuations and his inferences, let him answer to the fact there was no overall planning done when he was Minister of Health or for a year thereafter. He was out of it. He was out of the government. While the present Minister of Justice was the Minister of Health there was no planning done. There was no attempt to develop an overall plan when I went into that department in June of 1969. The

plans were prepared in - The government -

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am modest about the things I must be modest about. I am very modest about the things I should be modest about but I had failures in the Department of Health, of course I did and so will any minister in any department. No minister will achieve everything he sets out to do, I submit no Premier will achieve everything he sets out to do.

MR. HICKMAN: No planning, nothing.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the honourable gentleman says no planning and I think he may even believe it but there was certainly no planning in his time. I see the honourable member for St. John's East shaking his head. The honourable gentleman is not even on the planning committee. He has no role in this. He is not even on the sub-committee. He is not on any committee. All he does is he goes to cabinet, I assume. I mean that is what he is being paid \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year for.

MR. CROSBIE: There is only one plan -

MR. ROBERTS: Just listen to them over. You know, the arrogance of Jack the Ripper, you know you would not believe it.

Mr. Speaker, let me touch briefly on a subject that is bound to get the Minister of Finance into it again. There is no way he can sit through the next three or four minutes without a comment. He better take one of his tranquilizer pills because I want to touch on his references to the Social Services and Rehabilitation Department.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, do that.

MR. ROBERTS: You see I won my bet, Mr. Speaker. He just cannot control himself as a matter of fact nobody else can control him as the Premier will agree.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman's lips may move but

his mind is what worries me. I would like to know whether that moves or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the social services and rehabilitation thing. There were some very serious accusations made here against my friend from Bell Island not of anything personal but what amount to accusations of maladministration. My colleague has already said publicly that if anybody on this other side feel for a moment there is anything wrong or improper let them carry out the investigations and fine. Let him answer for what he has done or not done and I think he feels he has nothing to answer for that is in any way improper or wrong. Let me repeat that. If there is anything that is wrong, any of these nasty insinuations let them investigate and we will see. I do not think the honourable gentleman need worry about the reactions of his constituents by being the lone survivor south of Bonavista or south of Bonavista North. He has shown that he has their support and confidence.

But, Mr. Speaker, let the administration also, my colleague will deal with this at length, let them also bring out the facts as to why this expenditure increased. The houses that have been purchased under the Atlantic Development Board Programme from people who had left Bell Island and were fixed up with this vote. Again we see the half-truths. This administration, Sir, is becoming a master of the half-truth. The statement as it stands is correct. There is nothing incorrect about it but it is only half the story, it is half-true. It leaves insinuations. It leaves inferences. It is a dirty, despicable trick. It is done deliberately, Sir. It is done with the intention of leaving a wrong impression. These are serious charges to make, Sir, but it is done. Maybe it is the trick of the advocate. Maybe it is the trick of a lawyer in court making a case who is paid to represent a client and that is his job to represent the client but,

Sir, the Minister of Finance of this province is not an advocate. The Minister of Finance of this province is supposed to give the full story and we hear so much from the minister about how in the past, according to him, not everything was said fully and frankly but, Sir, there is instance after instance in this Budget, in this Speech where we get half-truths and distortions and this statement on Bell Island is one of them.

There were more than ninety houses fixed up under this vote, a one-shot deal, the houses being acquired under an Atlantic Development Board grant and they had to be fixed up and then they were turned over to people on Bell Island who needed them. I do not claim to be familiar with Bell Island, Sir. I do not know much about it but what I do know of it there are many people who need houses there. Perhaps the need is greater than almost anywhere else in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Some of the houses were certainly torn down, Sir. Some of them should have been torn down and those that should have been were. But, Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Finance when he brings in next years budget, which according to the Premier will be a Tory budget or at least according to the "Evening Telegram's" account of the Premier, will be a Tory budget, let him tell the full story. I have not read the paper but I am only reading the headlines, "Budget not trully Tory next year, says Moores." I do not know if it is accurate or not but the " Telegram" says so.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame to touch on the Education Minister's policies if he has any. I have over the years, and if it is true of my own party it is true of the present government, have seen some ministers who are less competent than others but I do not think I have ever seen one who in so few months has exposed himself as being as incompetent as the present Minister of Education.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not saying anything about him personally. I am not making any personal allusions, I am speaking of his official conduct, as a minister of the Crown, as a minister of a very large and a very important department.

The spectacle of his retreat over the bus regulations, the change in bus policy, is well worthy of being remembered by every person in this province. The minister marched into this House unheralded and made a great statement that we were going to have a new revolution in buses and that he had worked out a new policy, a new idea. The government had authorized it and with pride he announced it and he went on the television and announced it and said, everything was going to be right. Every board was going to get \$100 a student. Six million on bus transportation, 60,000 students, \$100 a student, round figures but I think the arithmetic is good.

Well then, Sir, the roof fell in on it because then he had to look at the facts. The moment he looked at the facts, Sir, he got the superintendents in from all over the province, My friend the member from St. Barbe North who knows a lot more about education than the honourable gentleman ever will began pointing out some of the fallacies. Then, Mr. Speaker, the minister began to retreat. He retreated in stages. He stood in the House on May 29 and said; every board will get substantially the same. And as I have said, I know of one board who wrote me on May 29 and as of that day the superintendent of that board said, we were going to get \$150,000 and we are now going to get \$75,000. That is substantially the same, it is only \$75,000, it is only half. So much for the Minister of Education.

Now to get an idea of what he was talking about, so then we put a question on the Order Paper, Sir. My colleague from St. Barbe North asks and the minister finally has the information dragged out of him, what the boards are getting. Sir, we find that all the cuts have been restored now. It is no longer \$100 per pupil or anything close to it. I do not know what they have done to the formula. The result is the same as the old formula would have been with one exception, the



MR. ROBERTS: minister is misleading us on his estimates.

His estimates require a request \$5.91 million, Sir, for the purpose of transportation of school children. It said 612-02-06. His own figures show \$6,051,705.06. I have whipped it up quickly but the honourable gentleman can just run it through his computer and check and see if that is correct. \$6.05 million. It leaves a couple of hundred thousand dollars. I was surprised the Finance Minister let anything that large slip through his figures.

Then we hear that it is a five percent plus or minus figure. Five percent of \$6 million, Sir, is roughly \$300,000. That means that the expenditure could go from \$5.75 million to \$6.35 million. If I know anything about expenditures they will be on the high side. So we can see a potential here of a \$400,000 or \$500,000 misstatement. Well the minister can nod wisely. Time he has got a little wisdom. I have never seen a minister new to office make as big a fool of himself as quickly.

Then he cuts the mothers' allowance. Maybe he is proud of that. He does not need the twenty bucks, he sells enough savory I am sure to feed and clothe his children well. I admire him for it. He does not need the twenty bucks. There are a lot of people in St. John's North who do, I submit, Sir. Not only does he take it away from the mothers he takes it away from education. No wonder the NTA are disappointed in the fact he will not reduce the pupil/teacher ratio.

The honourable the member for Labrador West was teaching and he is a teacher who would I think agree that the reduction of the pupil/teacher ratio is one of the things that is needed very much in this province.

We made some steps towards it when we were the government, Sir, but we did not finish it. It is one of 140,000 things we did not get done that we wanted to do. There are many others. But, Sir, we certainly see where the priorities of the honourable the gentleman from St. John's North lie, the present Minister of Education.

MR. ROBERTS: The University, he has given us a wishy-washy statement today about no student will be turned away. It is not what he said. Actually what he said, if I remember, was no qualified student will be turned away. I hope when he drags himself into the House next, his next statement he can tell us whether or not any student who is qualified will be turned away. In other words whether the rule that has been in effect now for twenty years will be maintained. If it is fine and if it is not, fine.

My information is that on the provision requested in these estimates it cannot be done. It cannot be done that there will be students who under previous or present policies will get into Memorial in the fall who will not be admitted there next year. Just to say that the enrollment is the same does not meet it, Sir, as the tables on aids distribution, the aids distribution model in the estimate and in the budget speech shows a bulge in our population is in the group from whom the potential university students are drawn. There must be an increase in the enrollment if that policy is to be maintained.

So let the minister answer that. As he ended, a policy of twenty years application. Is Memorial University no longer to be a people's university where any person in Newfoundland, any child who can pass his Grade XI with - what is it sixty percent they need? What is it sixty percent to get into Memorial? What is the matriculation Sixty percent in matric. to get into Memorial?

MR. F. ROWE: Sixty percent.

MR. ROBERTS: Sixty percent. Where any child who can get sixty percent in a matriculation, who wants to go into the university can get there. Are they going to end that now? Is that the first sign of the new Tory philosophy or is it not?

On the information I have on the figures in the estimates, on the statements in the budget it is the end of it. I hope I am wrong, Sir. I hope I am wrong. All the things this administration should or should

MR. ROBERTS: not do, they should not cut that.

The minister may wish to make a statement in due course, if so, fine, if not we will have him at his estimates on it. Perhaps he could prepare himself. It has been one of the great public policies of this province. Sir, that people were to get a higher education if they could. When the Liberal administration built the Vocational Schools with substantial help from Ottawa, seventy-five percent of the cost, the administration of the Progressive Conservative headed by Mr. Diefenbaker, they were scorned, they were laughed at. Ha, Ha, Ha, they would never be used! Now of course the story is the other way. In Port aux Basques I am sure the school is overcrowded and in Stephenville Crossing I am sure it is overcrowded. In Gander it has been extended substantially and I bet there are still more kids trying to get in there than there is space. I can go through every one of the twelve or thirteen in the province and the five or six new ones.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, that is a flat lie.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, time and time again said publicly in this House and outside that the Diefenbaker Administration provided seventy-five percent of the capital cost, time and time again. Indeed, he said it at the official opening. Perhaps the reports of the day will concur. I say it too with no hesitation, with no doubt, with no trepidation, It is true. I give them credit. I would like to see the Government of Canada back in this field. Perhaps the Minister of Education can tell us about that, Are we going to see the end of the open door policy at Memorial or are we not? And if we are then let them defend it, if we are not let them provide the money. There is not enough money in these estimates for it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The provision here requested for Memorial University will not allow them to continue with the open-door policy. It will not. The engineers, they have 300 and no place to put them next year. They will have to put more garages up. We did not spent enough money, we spent every cent we could get our hands on over there and we would spent more. Are the Vocational Schools going to be open next year? What about St. Anthony? Why has it been delayed a year? I do not know. But it is. What about Springdale is it going ahead? Is the Springdale school going to be open in the fall? The new vocational school?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is fine because St. Anthony I am told is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree it is not as far advanced, that is why it is not being opened. What I want to know, why is it not as far advanced? What about Placentia? What about Bonavista? There was a fifth? Baie Verte? When is Baie Verte going to open?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Baie Verte and Springdale you know are very close to one another, are they not?

MR. PECKFORD: As far as the construction phase of the Voacational School, it might be hundreds of miles apart.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then let us hear the minister speak about that in his estimates because it is something that is needed. I would like to know why. I am not saying it is the fault of the present administration. They have only been there since January and they will have to answer for what happened from 18th. of January on. If there were weather conditions, I will not blame them for that. I will be generous about that. The Minister of Justice would not be, if he were in this position, but I will.

Finally, Sir, much to the relief to the people on the other side. I regret that I am no orator, I do not have the hon. gentleman's facility for oratory.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is this you are talking about now?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I am talking about the Finance Minister's great oratory.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not take the course did you?

MR. ROBERTS: All I know is five ministers were asleep during the Budget Speech. There were five of the hon. gentlemen, maybe they heard it before. But they were actually asleep during the Budget Speech. I do not have the facility for oratory and I am sorry if I bored the hon. Minister of Education, but deeply grateful that he is at least permitting me to carry on. I think he should get full marks for that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Burgeo. I find it very hard to talk about this within the parliamentary rules. During the election campaign I wore myself out. It does not look like that, does it? I have been resting since then, asking about the Burgeo situation. What were they going to pay? We got evasions. It did not make any difference to the election. It probably helped in Burgeo town or in Burin-Burgeo LaPoile Constituency. It probably helped. It probably got some support for the P.C. candidate there. But, I do not think it made any difference to the election. The Premier refused to answer. He had some cooked up excuse. The Finance Minister refused to answer. He was too busy on his tale of deprecation and vitriol. But, Sir, it was not until the Finance Minister's speech that we began to find out why they would not answer. I thought the five million dollars they have given Mr. Doyle and Javelin shareholders was an outrage. Well, Sir, Mr. Lake and the Lake family are now 2.6 million dollars richer for letting the Government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: I am talking about Burgeo. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman is back. For letting the Government have a twenty year old plant. We were told by the officials it is worth \$600,000 net. That is the plant and the

three trawlers one of which is 16 years old and the other of which is 10 years old and the other one of which is 7 years old. We were told by the officials that it is \$600,000 plus the loan of about \$400,000 which was outstanding. Say \$1,000,000 in all. It was good value for the Burgeo plant. Poor Mr. Lake acting within his rights would not agree to that. Then we said find, we will take it. We will let the Supreme Court settle it by an arbitration process. Of course it was then at that stage we left office

MR. EVANS: Why did not you expropriate the trawlers?

MR. ROBERTS: We could not expropriate the trawlers.

MR. EVANS: You were going to pay six or seven hundred for the plant too.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, we would have paid for the plant exactly what the arbitration board came to the conclusion it was worth. No more and no less. We would have paid \$600,000 and forgiven the loan a total roughly \$1,000,000 for the plant and three trawlers.

MR. EVANS: Lake said six.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not care what Lake said, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that Mr. Lake asked for \$5,000,000.

MR. EVANS: It would have been paid.

MR. ROBERTS: I can say he asked for \$5,000,000. He also asked for a waterfront site at St. Albans in Bay D'Espoir preferably serviced and as near as possible to the Government wharf. I do not know if he got that. When the Minister of Fisheries has to try and defend his estimates, we will ask him. He also asked for a gift of a piece of surface land at St. Albans which was previously used as a trailer court by construction engineers and their families. This surface land is now vacant and has been for a couple of years and also he went on and on. He was not willing to sell the La Monde or the St. Jude Roman Catholic Chapel. But for \$5,000,000 plus plus the Government would have had the modern ground fish processing plant, three trawlers, a new meal and oil plant, a large barn

I do

I do not know if that is where they kept the lamas, rentable office space where the present bank is, a modern beauty parlour, a modern barbour shop, a modern laundry mat, a modern supermarket - looks like K.C. Irving doesn't it - a fuel oil, stove oil, bunker "C" and gasoline storage tanks, a new office and bank building owned by Coastal Reality Limited, six houses including my own home for eighteen years which I estimate would cost today somewhere around seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars to replace.

AN HON. MEMBER: We got a gift then.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the person who got the gift, I do not know if the hon. gentleman got a gift, but I can tell him that Spencer Lake got a gift. He got a gift of at least \$2,000,000, Sir. We have not heard yet. We will have to hear about the sales contract. That plant, Sir, produces, from memory, 38 per cent of the fish sold by the Lake Enterprises. Have they got a contract? They have that fish as part of their product mix in the market. Have they got a contract for that? Are they selling it now? If so, on what terms? Are they selling it on a commission or what? Have they got a management contract? If so, on what terms? People in Newfoundland have no information whatsoever about it. What about the three old trawlers one of which I am told is just about unserviceable. The other, two say they are fishing, is being kind about it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Burgeo plant is going to become a bit of a cause-célèbre in Newfoundland. A union down there fought a bitter strike. A brutal strike went on for four or five months. The other day the Minister of Finance said in the House that a strike is a normal part of collective bargaining. I agree with him. Collective bargaining involves the concept of a strike or a lockout. It is a normal and proper part of collective bargaining. If you believe in a collective bargaining system, you are going to have that system, you have to be prepared to have strikes. Conversely you have to be prepared to have lockouts. So we had a strike at Burgeo. It was bitter, it was brutal and it got nasty and it got bloody.

We kept hearing from Spencer Lake. He was on the phone. He needed fifty police, one hundred police, there were going to be riots in Burgeo. I heard, I do not know if it is true, Mrs. Lake rode a horse at one of the strikers. The whole community was polarized right down the middle-bitter, bitter. I hope the bitterness goes quickly.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is gone.

MR. ROBERTS: It is gone. That is the best news I heard in a long time. It is a good thing. So there was no resolution to it, Sir. The Government reluctantly because we believed as a Government in the collective bargaining process, said we will buy the plant. We could not come to an agreement on price. I read large parts of Mr. Lake's letter with his offer in it. We rejected it out of hand. The advice we had from our officials was certainly that we should reject it, and we did. A letter dated January 17th addressed to Mr. Rupert Prince from Mr. Spencer Lake. The new Administration came in and we decided that we would expropriate it. We could not expropriate the trawlers and we could not expropriate anything that was not a fixture in the legal sense. But we said we will expropriate it. We figured we had some weapons. Mr. Lake had the fish or he would lose a large part of his market. He had the "Caribou Reafer." He had to use her fully. To use her fully, he had to have fish from Burgeo. Had they made a deal on the "Reafer," I do not know? We have heard nothing. The present Administration came into office and they decided for their own reasons, and I ascribed no motives to them. The people of Newfoundland, the people of Burgeo when they know the story will deduce whatever motives they wish.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, they could have got back to work for a lot less than 2.6 million dollars. Javelin could have been taken over for a lot less than \$5,000,000 on top of the other millions given out. Why did not we do it? We did not do it, Mr. Speaker, because we did not win the election. It is very simple. We did not win the election in case any hon. gentlemen

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman has switched his whole ground, Mr. Speaker.



All of a sudden is, we did not do it. Why didn't we do it? Well we did not do it, Mr. Speaker, because we would not pay Spencer Lake 2.6 millions. We certainly did not pay John Doyle and Shell their \$5,000,000 either.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: And - Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentlemen speak in his turn. Yes, I have no doubt he will, and again in five minutes we will nod off to sleep. I may not be the greatest speaker in the world. I may be the world's worst, but I have company. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal to be modest about, especially when I compare myself to the honourable and arrogant gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the administration in Burgeo, the administration with respect to Burgeo, Sir, made a decision. I ascribe no motive to them, but they still have not told the people of Newfoundland why they paid \$2.6 million. They have

Mr. Roberts

not told the people of Newfoundland what they are going to do with that plant or what arrangement other than this they have made with Spencer Lake. I hope the Minister of Fisheries notes it down because he did it. He was special assistant and \$19,000 a year at the time but now he is the minister and he will answer here in the House. He may have a perfectly good case. All I say is that we were advised by the officials that \$600,000 plus wiping off the debt i.e., \$1 million would take care of it, would be fair and honest payment for the plant, the trawlers and everything up there you wanted. This crowd waltzed in in the middle of an election campaign and made a settlement, \$2.6 million. Why even the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile cannot maintain that. He looks at page one of the "Daily News," February 17, 1972. He is quoted as saying that the capital assets of Burgeo Fish Industries, the plant, the trawlers and so forth were not worth \$6 million as Mr. Lake contended. I agree with him. They were not worth that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: I do not have the statement in front of me. I have a note of it - worth \$6 millions. It was worth "less than \$1 million." Maybe when the honourable gentleman speaks in the Budget Debate, he will tell us where the extra \$1.6 million came from. You tell us.

MR. EVANS: It was going towards more to get the people back to work.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman says it was worth less than \$1 million. They could have gone back to work, Mr. Speaker, without the \$1.6 million in the pocket of Spencer Lake.

MR. EVANS: Why did he not?

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, expropriate the plant! Mr. Speaker, they are going to have to bring in more trawlers anyway. The plant now is only going because other plants on the south coast cannot handle the supply they have, on a temporary basis.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The tough tabby - the "Pussv Cat Minister of Finance."

Mr. Roberts.

That is what the hon. member for Burin/Burgeo said. He said that it was less than \$1 million. Now it becomes \$2.6 million.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: There is \$1.6 million for Spencer Lake. We will add that on to the \$5 million for John Doyle and that is \$6.6 million. God! they are not doing so badly.

MR. EVANS : (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: They are not doing so badly, Mr. Speaker. Let the honourable gentleman take his seat.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman take his seat.

MR. MURPHY: Is it your idea to bring Mr. Jamieson -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman take his seat and hold his mouth.

MR. MURPHY: Let the record stand that Mr. Jamieson is quoted as being -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker is calling order. Keep quiet!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I was saying they put \$1.6 million in the pocket of Spencer Lake and they put \$5 million in the pocket of John Doyle and the other shareholders and that is \$6.6 million so far. It is not cheap, Mr. Speaker. It is \$6.6 million. The mothers' allowance for two years, the Mental Hospital, Memorial University, any number of things - Mr. Speaker, no wonder they would not tell us. No wonder they went through the election campaign dodging and twisting and hiding, no wonder! Now they have had to tell us. They have had to tell us part of it. They will have to tell us more, Mr. Speaker. The Fisheries Minister will I hope have all the information. If not, we will be after him. Let him have the information, Sir. Let him bring it out. Is Spencer Lake now selling it to his firm on a commission basis. If so then Mr. Spencer has all the benefits and none of the headaches. The Government

Mr. Roberts

of Newfoundland have the headaches. The Government of Newfoundland have a twenty year old plant which they paid an exorbitant price for political purposes. Now, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say to try to sum this up is to wonder whether it is all part of a four year plan. As my colleague for St. Barbe North said, "have we got a four year plan underway over on the other side now, year one and year two?" We will talk tough. Originally we thought that the minister's speech would be backed up by action. But it is not of course. He ran up against some other forces and backed off.

Are we going to see nothing spent in year one and year two and then in year three and year four they will find the magic cornucopia. There will be money spent every where. Mr. Speaker, I am not worried. I am not the least bit worried but obviously the minister has the plan or he would not have said it that way. Are they making the people of Newfoundland suffer for partisan purposes? Are they? Is that the plan next year? Are we going to have a tougher budget?

tougher, on expenditures, tougher on talk. This year it is only tough on the talk. Are we going to? Then in year three and year four we will see, as my friend said, "the well-springs will open." Is that their plan? Is that the great Tory integrity we have heard so much about?

Sir, I say this Budget lacks any integrality. It is not an integral whole when you take the estimates and you take the Budget Speech and put them together, one is not the other. One is the talk of the tiger and the other is the meow of a pussy cat. Nor is there any basic honesty in it. In section after section the minister has told half the story deliberately trying to distort it. He spent months now down there trying to do it. I do not think he did a very good job but he tried. Half statements, half the story time and time again. It is becoming the hallmark of that minister.

MR. CROSBIE: Lies, lies, lies.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he can say, lies, lies, lies. Sir, he has been saying that sort of thing for years trying to bully people but I -

MR. CROSBIE: What are you doing now if you are not bullying?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, how do I bully the honourable gentleman? The honourable gentleman is over there waving his hand like he thinks it will fall off.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman better watch out -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I had been in this House and distinguished myself by calling an honourable member slimy and calling an honourable member contemptible, calling an honourable member a rogue -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is it?

MR. ROBERTS: It is only Jack the Ripper over here or pussy cat. Mr. Speaker, this Budget has been a complete failure. It reveals the administration for what it is. It is preoccupied with partisan vindictiveness. It has no hope for the future of this province, no

plan for the future. Just negative attack, attack, destroy, half-truths and also it has a callous disregard for the needs of the people. When he cut, he cut where the little people felt it. Let that stand. Yes, and little people have cigarettes to and I can tell the honourable gentleman that ten cents to some fisherman is a hell of a lot more than ten cents to a wealthy lawyer in Stephenville and they have a right to smoke. I do not smoke as I said earlier before the honourable gentleman deigned to honour us with his presence -

MR. CROSBIE: He does not smoke, he quit.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, probably a lot of people quit last Thursday, had to. But I said, Mr. Speaker, that I welcomed the -

MR. HICKMAN: Is it approved by the Medical Association?

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, it is approved by the Medical Association. Everything is approved by the Medical Association except the honourable gentleman and he needs the Psychiatric Association. Mr. Speaker, I said before the honourable gentleman came in that I had no objection to the tobacco tax on either financial grounds or health grounds but I can tell him it is a regressive tax. It hits rich and poor alike. Who was it said, "The rich and poor alike are prohibited from sleeping under the bridges of Paris?" Well rich and poor alike in Newfoundland have to pay an extra ten cents and if that last forgotten fisherman is still out on the Bill of Cape St. George, Mr. Speaker, he has to pay an extra dime just as the lawyers in Stephenville have to but I can tell you ten cents on the Bill of Cape St. George is a devil of a lot more than ten cents on Main Street in Stephenville.

This Budget is a complete failure, Sir. It is belt-tightening for the poorer people -

AN HON. MEMBER: And dash it out for the rich.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is a callous disregard for the needs of the people

of this province. It is an elitest budget. It really is. It is Circular Road run rampant. It has no regard for the needs of our people, Sir. We will oppose it. We will do so as strongly as we can.

Thank you.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I think this is probably a time for honouring some of the great men of the past

1565

and to open my talk on the Budget Speech, I would like to honour one great man who was born in 1849 and died in 1936, a very talented physician and physiologist who did a lot of research. His name was Ivan Petrovich Pavlov. He started off his work with dogs. He found that he could exhibit a conditioned reflex whereby by the ringing of a bell he could cause a dog to salivate. He felt that there was some connection between these two. Later on further researchers found that they could get the same response from swine and from snakes, from serpents, from vipers, in fact all the lower forms of animals we regard as loathsome and disgusting exhibited this particular facet of behaviour.

Last year as additional proof of this type of behaviour certain of the humanoids in the previous administration also exhibited this behaviour and used to jump, on the order of their master. The honourable Leader of the Opposition really should keep very, very quiet. He has a lot to keep quiet about. I think he is about to be replaced. I should say he is only a temporary leader. I do not see how any party in its right mind could fall behind such a person with any hope of anything but a long long and continued future in Opposition. In fact he is perfect for us, perfect. I am very glad that he does not speak highly of me for I can think of no greater compliment than to be attacked by the present Leader of the Opposition. As for some of the other members I think there is a genuine excuse. The honourable member from Bell Island I do not think he is responsible. I do not think he knows any better. The learning that he has he obviously learned it from a devoted and detailed study of lavatory walls, all over this province and probably some neighbouring provinces. It is disgusting and I do not need to mention any further.

The honourable member for White Bay South of course is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's lackey. I guess he finds it is a psychological necessity. I personally feel he would be a much better



leader but I guess he would rather be a blushing bridesmaid than a bride. However, that is his own choice. I was very very interested in this last couple of hours, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the honourable Leader of the Opposition defending his record. Now, it is rather like a dog walking on its hind legs. It is not done well. But you marvel that it is done at all. His association is very close association with the honourable the former Premier. It goes back to about 1962. How he can say he was not in the Cabinet I would say he was above the Cabinet. He was in the former Premier's pocket. He was a side kick, a shadow of his echo, his lackey. How any one can say that, how he can stand up here and say that he had no responsibility for some of the decisions taken in the last ten years is more than I can possibly imagine. He must have known what was going on. How else could he have been so close to the honourable the Premier.

We all remember the imperious snap of the fingers with which the former Premier summoned his chief lackey to new depths of

1567

subservience. However, he seems to be in very good spirits today. I imagine Empire Drugs must have a new vitamin. This was certainly an exhibition of virtuosity and since education happens to be my portfolio and I am able to perhaps recommend, although not able to implement certain honorary degrees, to the hon. member for Bell Island, I would recommend the Bachelor of Coarseness; to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would recommend the Master of Arrogance and to all of them, a Ph.D in irresponsibility. In any event they have all shown no understanding whatsoever of the financial difficulties of this province. (I believe I have the floor Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker insisted upon his rights rather strongly). There is enough comment about the other side. I would like to very briefly comment on this budget. I, for one, believe that there should be a great deal more education. I am very, very sorry that our educational budget is as low as it is. It is only, current and capital together, \$128 million. I am very sorry that it is not more. Of course, our predecessors spent with wild abandon and it is impossible for us to make it any larger.

We all wish it could be larger. There are a great many programmes and plans that we would like to implement. There is one aspect of it that I would like to mention here and now and that is that more and more study seems to indicate that the important years of a child's life are between the years of four and nine. Whatever happens then, happens or it does not happen at all. Unless a person gets a good grounding, a good start, it is very hard to repair the damage later on. Primary schools, elementary schools certainly should have a great deal more attention paid to them. There should be a lot more money invested in that part of the school system. The secondary school is also important. Our schools leave a lot to be desired in that a great deal more could be done. The vocational schools, I am happy to report there seems to be a fair bit of progress on them, not enough. The programmes are not varied enough. We are entering a very, very complex

Mr. Carter

technological age. The challenge is unrelenting. The new methods of storing, processing and transmitting information are going to require a great deal of paraphernalia if nothing else in order to teach the new techniques. I think education is the answer to many of our problems and probably the most important aspect of education in the next few years is in the realm of philosophy. I think that only with education are we going to be protected against the kind of demagoguery that we saw in the last twenty-three years. I think that by a process of good education, we are able to discern between the genuine and the spurious. I think that by a process of good education, we would be able to understand financial matters so that we would be able to see that this budget that was presented in this honourable House was probably the best budget that ever could be presented under such circumstances. It is a great tragedy, Mr. Speaker that we will not get the credit for the fact that the civil servants can cash their cheques with confidence. I would predict (of course, there is no way of proving it. I will admit this at the outset) that if the former administration were still in power, there would be considerable difficulty in cashing the pay cheques of the civil servants.

1569

Of course they did not abandon the ship until they saw that their cause was hopeless and once they did they were quick enough getting out and they got out with very bad grace indeed. But I am happy to say that I think that Newfoundland is now in rational hands and that the kind of taxation that is imposed is done with the double idea not only of raising money but of affecting or encouraging initiative where possible and that this government will work towards encouraging initiative in all aspects of its endeavours. I am happy to say that as a Conservative I subscribe to the notion of stewardship and trusteeship and I am very, very happy to be associated with a very good crew. I am proud to be associated with them and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in happily endorsing this Budget.

Thank you, very much.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is now quarter to six. Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I call Order (1).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

Heading VII - Justice: 701(01):

MR. ROWE (W.N.): We are back again, Mr. Chairman, on salaries in the minister's office. Again we only have a few minutes at the end of the day to make a few remarks on the general aspects of the Department of Justice. I started at ten to six on our last day here in the House and made a few remarks. I mentioned the executive assistant who is being paid a salary of \$12,000 and I without knowing I suppose I agree with the honourable Minister of Justice who says the gentleman whose name eludes me at the moment is very well qualified and that he deserves a salary of \$12,000. I have no doubt he does, Mr. Chairman. It is just that in my estimation a salary of \$12,000 is a lot of money to be paying a political appointment and he is a political appointment. I do not use the term in a derogatory sense. He is not part of the established civil service. He is a man who was appointed by the minister. He is

dismissed by the minister, I suppose by the government on the advice of the minister and when the government falls or if the government resigns he will go out of that position. He has no security of tenure. \$12,000 is a lot of money to pay such a gentleman when you come to think that \$10,000, well less than \$10,000, \$6,600 is what a member of this House gets for being elected to the House and representing the people in this House and in the field and to see another man whose job is not to be responsible to the people of the province, not to be responsible to any people who might have elected him but to be responsible to a minister and as appointed by a minister we have to vouch for the qualifications of the gentleman. We have to believe that when the minister says he has qualifications he has the qualifications. He is not subject to any competition for the job. He does not go through the Civil Service Commission to see if he has qualifications to do a particular job and if he is the best man who has applied for such job.

When you compare -

1571

his salary is \$12,000, to some of the other salaries paid both in the civil service and outside of the civil service for example, in this House you start to wonder whether inflation with regard to executive assistants is not perhaps getting just a little out of hand. Maybe the Minister would like to comment on that, Sir, when he speaks on this particular subhead of expenditure. Last time as well, Sir, I mentioned the Supreme Court. I mentioned that when I had the privilege to be acting minister of Justice I wrote Mr. Turner, then the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, with a request that a fifth Supreme Court Judge be appointed. I did that on my own volition, but with the support of the Law Society of Newfoundland, that a fifth Supreme Court Judge be appointed and that he be asked to sit and hold court in Corner Brook and to reside in Corner Brook.

At the same time, Sir, I asked the Minister of Justice to agree to have his officials prepare the necessary legislation in conjunction with our officials in this Government, the Provincial Government, to get an Appeal Court set up in this Province. Rather than carry on with the archaic and wrong system that we have now, whereby three members of the present Supreme Court act as a Court of Appeal and decide upon judgements made by one of their brother judges of the same court, we get rid of that system and that a separate Appeal Court be set up whereby judgements from the Supreme Court and from other courts could go to appeal division or a separate appeal court in this Province. I thought and I still think this would improve the system of justice that we had in this Province. Not because there is anything wrong with present judges on either bench of the Province but that as a matter of principle there should be a separate Appeal Court with separate judges hearing appeals from the Supreme Court. Then of course justice is not only done but also appears to be done, which is one of the basic tenants of any legal system.

Also, Sir, I included in my letter to Mr. Turner a request that

three other district court judges be appointed in this Province. One, I am glad to see has been appointed, perhaps because there is no need of any legislation or the setting up of a particular judicial district in the case of Mr. Nathaniel Noel's appointment.

There are two other judicial districts in the Province Burin-Burgeo I believe is one. Bonavista-Twillingate is another, These are still without district court judges. I believe that there will need to be some Federal and well as Provincial Legislation in order to change that situation.

The reason Sir, that I gave for wanting these two judges, extra judges to be appointed, was primarily as a convenience and as a matter of efficiency and to effect savings of money in respect of people who do have the misfortune to seek remedies in our Courts of Law. Why somebody from Burin-Burgeo or Bonavista-Twillingate or any other judicial district where there may not be a district court judge would have to come to St. John's or go to Grand Falls or go to Corner Brook in order to get a hearing in a district court when the case falls within the jurisdiction of that court. If any one has to do that Sir, it is not right in principle, again. Again they should have access and efficient access to the courts of this Province. Also of course it would have the effect of getting lawyers who are trained in our law schools away from the practice of merely setting up the practice in places like St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls. I see there are one or two others have gone to Stephenville and Marystown. We hope to get lawyers spread around the Province so that people when they are seeking legal advice, when they have usually the misfortune to have to seek legal advice in certain cases that they can seek this legal advice with a minimum of inconvenience and a minimum of expense.

I am aware of some of the problems involved. The Federal Government pays the salaries of District Court Judges and Supreme Court Judges but do not pay, under the BNA Act do not pay for the administration of these courts and do not

pay for the capital construction of these courts. I was glad to hear the other day that the Minister of Justice had made certain requests I believe to the present Minister of Justice, in Ottawa to get some help to set up and to administer extra courts in the province. I would like to hear the minister make a few comments on the whole question of Supreme Court Judges, Appeal Court Judges and District Court Judges in this province.

Also, Sir, I took a measure when I was Acting Minister of Justice which I think was well conceived, namely, to ask Mr. Geoffrey Steele an eminent lawyer in St. John's, to form a royal commission of enquiry of one, to investigate, to look into the whole question of magistrates in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Again, and I hasten to add, not because there is anything wrong with the job being done by present magistrates, but to see whether there were ways in which the magisterial service could be improved for the benefit of the people of the province. I believe I had the full support of the present magistrates when I set up that royal commission.

At the time I did that, I remembered that there was a lot of criticism, or some criticism from the Law Society to the effect that royal commissions should be set up to investigate the whole realm of the administration of justice in this province, and that it should not be done in a piecemeal fashion. I am afraid, Sir, that I have to disagree on that stand. I think that there is a need to investigate and to bring in recommendations concerning certain aspects of the administration of justice in the province, in order to get improvements made in things - magisterial service, perhaps the penitentiary, for example and other aspects, police work and other aspects of the administration of justice. and get improvements made as soon as possible. I am very leery of royal commissions which are set up and given overwhelming terms of reference as we have seen in the case of the Labour Royal Commission and other similar royal commissions. It takes years upon years to get any kind of a set of recommendations from such a royal



commission and then, the royal commission covers such a variety of areas and ordinarily brings in some controversial recommendations, that the whole report of such a royal commission has a tendency to be shelved and to gather dust from now till doomsday.

I thought that perhaps the thing to do would be to get royal commissions set up and task forces or commissions of enquiry set up into various aspects of the administration of justice, bring in recommendations on that particular aspect and quickly be able to be in a position to effect some of the recommendations, if not all.

I do not know what position the present Minister of Justice took at that time, but I notice that there is only four thousand dollars I believe in his estimates for inquests and public enquiries. I see from that, that he certainly does not intend, unless he expects to do it under - okay, under the Department of Finance I believe royal commissions come

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is magisterial enquiries. Under the Department of Finance I believe there is a very small amount for enquiries as well. That does not mean anything. Royal commissions \$75,000, perhaps he intends to get a royal commission set up under that particular head or perhaps not, I do not know. Again, I would be happy to hear what he has to say on it.

Then, Sir, in the question of Legal Aid, I believe the estimate for this year is \$25,000, the same as it was last year. I remember a meeting of the Law Society held recently behind closed doors I believe, and so I will not say too much about it. I am not sure whether any public utterance was made at the time, either by the minister or the Law Society.

June 2, 1972, Tape 520, Page 1 -- apb

MR. W.N. ROWE: Again, Mr. Chairman, I guess I will just say that I will conclude my remarks the next time we call this subhead. It is getting close to six o'clock.

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

On motion report received and adopted, committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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