



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 16

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD(PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I learned a few moments ago, to my deep regret, of the death of Mr. James C. Thompson, who for many years was the special financial adviser to the Government. Mr. Thompson was, I think, when he first became attached to the Government of this Province or before we were a Province, the senior partner in the great accounting firm of Peet, Marwick, Mitchell and Company of Montreal. When the first delegation were appointed to go to Ottawa to ascertain whether and what fair and equitable terms of union of Newfoundland and Canada might exist, he was appointed by the Commission of Government of the day to be the financial adviser to the Newfoundland delegation. He accompanied us to Ottawa and spent three months with us there and then, when the second delegation went to Ottawa for another three months, again he went with us as financial adviser. When Confederation came the new Government appointed him to be special adviser to the Government, on central accounting, accounting controls and it was Mr. Thompson who instituted the present system of accounting in the Government of this Province. He was nearly eighty years of age and he was a remarkably able man, he was a remarkably affable man, a friendly man and he was one of the most valuable public servants that ever served the Government of Newfoundland. I learned with deep regret of his death at the age of something between seventy-eight and eighty years of age.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep gratitude and with considerable regret that I inform this House today of the impending retirement of a devoted and faithful public servant of Newfoundland. Dr. Leonard, Albert Miller has informed me of his intention to resign, as Deputy Minister of Health, on June 30th of this year. On that date his service with the Government of Newfoundland will have spanned a period exceeding thirty-nine years. He is the only person ever to have held the position of Deputy Minister of Health with the Government of Newfoundland, having assumed that position

MR. SMALLWOOD:

soon after Newfoundland became a Province of Canada. Dr. Miller's record of Government service dates beyond Confederation, however. It goes back to 1932 when, at the age of twenty-five, he became a medical officer, on a part-time basis, with what was then known as the Department of Health and Public Welfare.

A native of St. John's, Dr. Miller was born the son of the late Charles and Yetta Miller. He grew up in St. John's and attended the former Methodist College. He received his initial university training at Dalhousie University, graduating in 1926 with a bachelor of arts degree and in 1930 with the degrees of Doctor of Medicine and Master of Surgery. He served his internship at the Victoria General Hospital in Halifax. It was in 1930 that he returned to St. John's to begin a private practice of medicine. In 1933 he furthered his training by pursuing post-graduate studies in pediatrics, in Vienna.

At the onset of the darker days of the depression and with the inception of Government by commission, Dr. Miller decided to enter the public service on a full time basis, in 1934. He was to serve the Government as medical officer in St. John's until 1944, except for one year which he spent studying at Harvard University, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, on a Rockefeller scholarship. He received the degree of Master of Public Health from that university in 1939. From 1944 until Confederation Dr. Miller served as Director of Medical Services with the Department of Health and Public Welfare. Since his appointment, on September 10th, 1949, as Deputy Minister of Health, the senior civil servant in what is now the second largest department of the Government of Newfoundland, on the basis of annual gross expenditures, Dr. Miller has managed Government health services during the tenure of seven individual Ministers of Health.

Beyond his service to the public, in this capacity with the Government, Dr. Miller is held in very high esteem by members of his profession, by residents of this Province and by the Canadian public. He is a past president of the Newfoundland Medical Association, a past president of the St. John's Clinical Society and a past president of the Canadian Public

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Health Association. In 1968 he was awarded an honorary Doctorate of Laws Degree from his alma mater, Dalhousie University. Dr. Miller was a member of the Canadian delegation to the World Health Organization in 1950 and again in 1964. He is the recipient of the centennial medal; a past master of Masonic Lodge, Tasker; a past president of the St. John's Kinsmens Club.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you will have gathered from what I have said, it would be a difficult task for any man now to assume the responsibilities of being Deputy Minister of Health. Indeed it would be an even greater task to prosecute those responsibilities in the most able manner which Dr. Miller has displayed these many years. However, I am confident that the man appointed to this task has every qualification and he is most able to carry out these duties according to the precedent which Dr. Miller has established. I am pleased to inform the House of the appointment to this position of Dr. Donald Cant. Dr. Cant, who is now the assistant Deputy Minister of Health, is, I think, a most worthy choice for this position.

Dr. Donald Cant, age 54, has been appointed Deputy Minister of the Department of Health, effective July 1st next. He has been assistant Deputy Minister since September 1968, a native of New Castle in England. Dr. Cant received his early education in New Castle. He studied at the University of Durham in England from which he received the degree of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery in 1939. Dr. Cant came to Newfoundland the following year to serve as medical officer aboard the hospital ship, "Lady Anderson", which served ports along our Southwest Coast. In 1941 he became medical officer in charge of the cottage hospital at Stephenville Crossing. In 1942 Dr. Cant joined the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps, serving in Europe as a medical officer until 1946. He returned to Newfoundland and served as medical officer at the cottage hospital in Harbour Breton until 1948. He again took up the position at the cottage hospital at Stephenville Crossing, remaining in that post for one year before leaving in 1949, for Hamilton, Ontario, where he studied chest surgery until 1950. In that year he came back to Newfoundland to open a private surgical practice in Corner Brook, which he maintained until his

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Government appointment in 1968. During that period he served also as surgeon at the West Coast Sanatorium.

Dr. Cant is certified in surgery by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada and in addition he is a fellow of the American College of chest physicians, a fellow of the American College of surgeons and a fellow of the International College of surgeons. He was married in 1938 to the former Leila Ovenden of Brighton, Sussex, England, who is a nurse, served in various rural areas in Newfoundland. They have two sons, John and James and three daughters, Jennifer, Elizabeth and Daphne. The son John is a medical doctor and a former medical officer at the Botwood Cottage Hospital. A very distinguished medical family, whom the Government are most proud and pleased to appoint to be the new Deputy Minister.

The hon. member for St. Mary's, who is the former Minister of Health and sits on this side of the House, served in the Department of Health for a great many years with Dr. Miller, and I am sure that he has heard my announcement today with profound interest indeed.

DR. JAMES MCGRATH: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I would like to say a word or two about Dr. Miller with whom I was associated with in the Department of Health for close on forty years. At first he was serving in St. John's and I in St. Mary's, afterwards I went to Harbour Grace with the Avalon Health Clinic for five years, and then came into St. John's directly under Dr. Miller's authority, as Director of Medical Services. I do not think anyone was in a better position to realize than I was what a terrific job he made of that. I do not think it is a derogation of anyone else in the Civil Service to say that, in my experience and in my opinion, there never was a better civil servant in the service of Newfoundland than Dr. Miller.

Hon. Member: Here! Here!

DR. MCGRATH: He had the respect of all the medical profession, the confidence of all the medical profession and he was sort of Pater Familiaris and Father Confessor to all of the younger doctors coming to Newfoundland and especially those coming into the government service. His devotion to his work, of course, was phenomenal. His capacity for work was also phenomenal.

DR. MCGRATH:

and his sane and balanced attitude towards all things affecting that work and his enthusiasm for all things that were for the benefit of the Newfoundland people had to be seen to be realized. He had one tremendous faculty that very few people have, and that was the faculty of reproofing people who went out of line without upsetting them. I have actually seen a good many young men who were headed the wrong way, who would be interviewed by Dr. Miller and be lacerated by him and come out of it angry with themselves and appreciative of what they had really been doing, appreciative of his manner of pointing it out to them, dealing with them in the plainest of terms but, at the same time, would help them. I know of many cases where, I am sure, it was Dr. Miller's approach in handling a problem of that kind, due to a personality problem, that saved a number of men, whom I doubt very much would have had the successful careers afterwards, that they have had, if it had not been for his wisdom and his guidance and the fact that he was able to make people accept more or less unwelcome reprimands.

It is very, very difficult task, as anyone in authority must know, but he had it to perfection. Of course, my own personal association with him, over a period of forty years, we have been very close friends in all that time and I can truthfully say that in all that period we never had and personal nor official friction of any kind. And they were difficult times. For instance, I had been a subordinate for, I suppose, nearly twenty years, and then became Minister of Health, and I do not suppose it is pleasant, in a sense, to have a subordinate leap-frog in over one but his only comment was to remind me of an incident that occurred to him when he was in early practice in St John's and had an office down in the Imperial Optical Building, and there was a gentleman there, named Cotter, who ran a sort of general agency and among other things used to make keys and that sort of thing, and it was Cotter & Son. The father was an elderly man and the son did most of the work. He had a row with the father on one occasion, when the old man came down in the morning and found that the sign had been changed from Cotter & Son to Son and Cotter, and then he quoted this when congratulating me on being made Minister of Health. That

April 14th, 1971

Tape 246A

JM-6

was the only comment he ever made, and it never spoiled our relationship.

I also am very happy to say that the man who is succeeding him is someone that I have known and worked with also for many years, and I cannot imagine a better choice for the position. I am most happy that that has been the choice.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to add a few words, since I was for ten months, Minister of Health and naturally, Dr. Millier was my deputy minister at that time. Of course, the hon. member for St. Mary's has had a much longer association and experience with him. But, as a younger man who only had ten months experience in the health field of Newfoundland, I would certainly like to add my best wishes to Dr. Miller, who was a tower of strength, as the member for St. Mary's has said. He has a very, very enviable record in the public service of Newfoundland. Dr. Miller epitomizes some of the very, very fine public servants that the people of Newfoundland have been blessed with, permanent civil servants. I do not suppose there is anyone else in the Civil Service who can better his record, either in length or quality. He did a wonderful job for this Province in the field of health both before the war, during the war and after the war, even in the days of medicare, I guess from the time he started the cottage hospital system, from the time of the institution of medicare and all the great hospital buildings and the health system which has been built up around the Province, Dr. Miller was in the Department of Health or deputy minister during that whole period. I found him to be a very understanding and very patient with a new minister. As all the hon. ministers opposite, I am sure, will be first to agree; when you become minister of a department, you have a lot to learn and whether or not you get in much trouble, very often depends on your deputy minister.

Dr. Miller certainly deserves the congratulations of this House on his fine service for the Province of Newfoundland, and best wishes, I trust, for a long retirement. I hope that there will be more heard from him; that he will not cease his interest in the public affairs of this Province or even the health affairs of the Province. I can just say that I enjoyed very much my association with him for ten months. I am glad to have this chance to congratulate him on his retirement on June 30th.

The new Deputy Minister, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. He came to the Department of Health, just after I left there. I am sure that he is an

Mr. Crosbie.

excellent choice, and I wish him well and hope that he will have a long and successful career in the Department of Health.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to join other hon. members who have spoken in paying a tribute to Dr. Lennard Miller. As hon. members are aware, I served in the portfolio of Minister of Health for fourteen months and, as the hon. member for St. John's West has said; Dr. Miller is a man of great understanding to any person occupying the Portfolio of Health. I recall my first day in Health. It was a pleasant surprise for many reasons. Dr. Miller indicated to me the function of a deputy minister, as he thought. He said, "I believe it is my responsibility and my duty, if I am of the opinion that a minister is about to embark upon a course of folly or if the course is not in the best interest of the Province, to try and dissuade from so doing. But if I fail and despite my advice and everything else he persists and it becomes Government policy, then it is my sacred responsibility to defend that policy. That he could do. And that he did. He was really the buffer between the Government and those, the professionals involved in the health service of this Province. Quite often I have seen him take criticism that really did not belong to him at all. It should not have been aimed at him, but this was his responsibility. He did it well. He was a great negotiator. During my term there, we negotiated, with the Newfoundland Medical Association, the medicare programme. This meant many, many tedious hours of vital negotiations insofar as the health services of this Province were concerned. He could do it with diplomacy and tact and, whilst those with whom we were negotiating did not necessarily receive some of the benefits they would have wished, yet, Dr. Miller always put the interest of his Province first, but he was always mindful of his responsibility to his profession.

The other thing that amazed me about him is that whenever complaints would come in from various parts of the Province, concerning health services or a particular cottage hospital, he could visualize the little room they

Mr. Hickman,

were talking about. He knew the cottage hospital system inside out, both from a functional point of view and from the point of view of the structure that constituted that cottage hospital or the clinic anywhere in the Province. He has been a fantastic man, a great Newfoundlander and a man who has devoted his whole lifetime to serving his Province.

It was my great privilege to sort of hunt out Dr. Cant, to seek him out (for want of a better word) and to invite him into the Department of Health. Because at that time, he was a very busy practitioner in Corner Brook. My recollection is that he was Chief of Staff at the Western Memorial Hospital, at the time. He, too, has a great knowledge of the Province. In lighter vein, Dr. Cant can entertain one for hours describing his years serving along the South Coast, on the "Lady Anderson," that is when the boat rushed from one place to another, always as a result of the "pink telegrams." I vaguely remember the pink telegrams but if you wanted to get the hospital boat to come on time, you had to send a pink telegram, whether it was for a wharf or whether you were dying of some serious ailment. The choice of Dr. Cant as Deputy Minister is an excellent one. I congratulate him on his appointment. I do hope that Dr. Miller, who has been for many years in the public service, will enjoy a long and fruitful retirement.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works) Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to also to express my appreciation of Dr. Miller, as I was the first Minister of Health, under Confederation and held that portfolio for, approximately, three years.

Dr. Miller came in at that time as the first Deputy Minister of Health in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I may also say, Sir, that my Assistant Deputy Minister, my colleague from St. Mary's, who came a long way since, I must admit, too. Dr. Miller engineered the co-ordination of the Department of Health, legal aspects, with the new, Dominion of Canada, medical legislation. It took us quite a few years,

Mr. Chalker.

I believe, to get it done. I think the first year that the House was open right through until, I believe, in September or October, just more or less getting our different legislation affixed, to coincide with that of Canada.

I have know Dr. Miller pretty well all my life, although the Premier did not mention the fact that he is married to a very beautiful girl from Brigus, Miss Chafe, whose sister is married to one former Lord Bishop of Newfoundland, His Lordship Bishop Meaden, and of a good family. They have two children, a boy and a girl. In his retirement Dr. Miller certainly deserves a long one.

I may say also, Sir, before sitting down that he was considered at the time that I was there as the best Deputy Minister of Health in the entire service of Canada.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, now that all of the previous Ministers of Health have spoken, unless there are some would-be ministers who wish to say a word, perhaps I could say a word, with the leave of the House. The Premier, of course, has made a statement on behalf of the Government. There is nothing more I can add to it.

I feel I should say, on behalf of Dr. Miller who cannot be here to speak to us, a word of thanks. Dr. Miller is today in Ottawa, as is Dr. Cant. It will not surprise Your Honour or the members of the House to learn that they are there (shall we say) helping the Government of Canada to dispose of some unwanted money. We hope, substantial sums. The information I have (I have spoken with Dr. Miller) is that things look very good from our point of view and, hopefully, very bad from Ottawa's point of view. Dr. Miller and Dr. Cant are today in Ottawa at some very important meetings. I think that is probably as well, because any of us who know Dr. Miller and has had the pleasure of working with him, realize that he is a very modest man. I think he would be somewhat embarrassed by the tributes

Mr. Roberts.

that have been paid him today. I think the tributes were, in every sense of the word, deserved and, of course, you know I would want to be associated with them.

I will have more to say on another occasion, because there are a number of ceremonies that are being planned by my officials and by former colleagues and associates of Dr. Miller; ceremonies to mark his retirement, after what has to be an unique career. There will never again be a man who will have had the impact upon the development of our medical services, an all important area of public services. There will never be a man again with the role and the scope and the range and the contribution that Dr. Miller has made. In very many ways today, he can take credit for much of what we have been able to accomplish. So, I will have my say then. But I do want to associate myself and, in behalf of my Deputy Minister, to thank the hon. member for St. Mary's, who was for so many years a colleague and then so many years a minister and has been for many years a close friend of Dr. Miller. My colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who was Dr. Miller's first minister, following Confederation, and a good friend to him ever since and the separated former brethren, the member for St. John's West, and the member for Burin, each of whom served as Minister of Health, they both had the benefit of Dr. Miller's advice.

Dr. Cant, I think I can only say, will carry on the tradition established by Dr. Miller. I believe the people of Newfoundland will be well served by Dr. Cant, as they have been by Dr. Miller. As long as I am Minister of Health, I will be proud to be associated with them and whoever follows me in the portfolio, that somebody is bound to; there has been a high mortality rate. I think I am now next but one in seniority of all the Ministers of Health in Canada. There is even a higher mortality rate in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. But whoever follows me in the portfolio, I think, should be proud and honoured to have the chance to work with men, not only men

Mr. Roberts.

like Dr. Cant and Dr. Miller but the men they have recruited to work with them in the Public Health services of this Province.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to support the statements that have been made in respect of my friend and former colleague, Dr. Miller, although perhaps before I make the announcement I have to make, I should say a word of tribute to him, if for no other reason than that he and I were appointed, respectively, Deputy Ministers of Health and of Public Welfare, at the same time, and occupied adjoining offices in the old building down by the Newfoundland Hotel. I was very happy to work in close collaboration with him for a period of nearly three years.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce the appointment of Mr. Bruce K. Hookey to the position of principal of the District Vocational School at Gander. He succeeds Mr. K. Griffiths, the former principal, who has been appointed supervisor of curriculum for our expanding vocational service here in Newfoundland. I should say, Mr. Speaker, also that the school at Gander is rapidly becoming one of the major vocational schools for the Province'. There are two or three of these schools, which, for obvious reasons, are becoming larger and more important centres of vocational and technical education every day. The obvious ones that come to mind are, of course, the one at Corner Brook, Grand Falls and also the one at Gander, which actually, I think, is getting priority in our expansion programme for vocational education.

Mr. Hookey is forty-one years of age. He was born here in St. John's and was educated at Bishop Field College and at the original vocational training institute in the City. That institute is no longer in existence. It is the one that did the pioneering work in vocational education in Newfoundland. He was awarded a Department of Transport

Mr. Rowe (F. W).

Certificate in radio. He worked as an instructor of telecommunications and electricity for three years. He was a field supervisor of apprenticeship training with the Department of Labour for seven years. Since then,

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Since 1963 he has been departmental head at the District Vocational School at Gander and at the District Vocational School at Carbonear respectively. Mr. Hookey received his teacher training at the Vocational Training Institute and at the New Brunswick Institute of Technology at Moncton where he took courses in administration, supervision and evaluation. Mr. Hookey will be taking up his new position, as Principal of the District Vocational School at Gander on May 3, this year.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. W. R. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the voters of Brighton Island. I think, Sir, before stating the prayer of this petition that I give a slight bit of explanation. As you so well know, Sir, Brighton is an Island and actually there are six island in Green Bay District, which are populated, namely; Little Bay Island, Long Island, Sunny Cove Island, Pilley's Island, Triton Island and Brighton Island.

Now Pilley's Island, of course, just lies of the mainland of the settlement of Robert's Arm. There has been a causeway joining Pilley's Island to the mainland and the road across Pilley's Island. Then another causeway from Pilley's Island to Triton Island and a road down across Triton Island joining up the settlements of Jim's Cove, Card's Harbour and the settlement of Triton itself.

Now last year, Mr. Speaker, the Government had road work going on on the Island of Triton and the work was being done by a contractor and that work was to extend the road from the settlement of Triton down over the remaining part of Triton Island to the narrow channel separating Triton Island from Brighton Island. Of course, as all the members of the House know and the public are aware of, the contractor doing this work went bankrupt or they went out of existence, and the work has now been taken over by a new contractor.

It seems, Sir, that the people of Triton have fears that, since

MR. SMALLWOOD:(W.R.) the contract, I think, only was for the building of the road to the channel separating the two Islands, the people are under the impression have fears that when this road work is completed that a causeway will not be built and the road around the Island itself, of Brighton.

The prayer, Sir, of this petition is for the construction of a causeway across the narrow channel separating the two Islands of Brighton and Triton, and also, for the construction of a road around the settlement of Brighton itself. The Island is a very small settlement and essentially the settlement takes up just about the whole of the Island, it is only a small Island.

I strongly support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and asked that it be received by this House and referred to the department to which it relates.

On Motion petition received.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to present a petition signed by a great number of the citizens of a number of communities in St. Barbe's South. The petition has been send to me, Sir, by a sponsoring body, the Local Improvement District of the community of Cow Head, through the agency of their secretary, Mr. Henry N. Payne, J.P. Mr. Payne is here in the chamber today, sitting in the Speaker's Gallery.

The petition, Sir, is signed by 761 residents of the communities of Cow Head, Bellblows Point, Parson's Pond, Three Mile Rock, St. Paul's and Sally's Cove. Taken together these communities comprise the Nursing District of Cow Head. Well, I have not checked against the voters list, I am willing to bet that is near enough to every citizen in those communities in that area of the Province.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that a district nurse be appointed to the nursing practice at Cow Head. The need for this came about because of the decision of the lady who had been there for seventeen years to retire. That lady, Mrs. Jane Hutchings, I think is in that small

MR. ROBERTS: group of people who became a legend in her own time. She served nobly, she served magnificently, but, after seventeen years, her health gave out and she was forced to retire. And she has done that.

I think, any of us who know the area at all, my friend and colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, I think, would be aware of the services Mrs. Hutchings gave and my hon. friend from St. Barbe South, who I am sure will join in supporting this petition in a moment or so, I think will also testify to the magnificent service Mrs. Hutchings gave. And my friend and colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation tells me that he is well acquainted with the lady.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to recruit a nurse, as of today we have not succeed, but I can report to the House in supporting the petition that, as a result of a recent campaign put on by my officials, at my direction, we have a number of applications from nurses outside the Province, who are interested in taking these positions. It seems that we are not able to attract our own Newfoundland girls, there are very few. There is a young lady, Miss Gillard in Woody Point, who comes from Englee, in my own constituency. We are not able to get a nurse in Englee, but we are good enough to put one in St. Barbe South from Englee. But very few Newfoundland girls, Sir, seem to want to take up this work. We are trying to find some ways to change that.

One of the inquiries - and I realize that, as I say this, I may have to backtrack a little later, because this person has not be recruited, we have to recruit him and her, it is a husband and wife team, if we succeed well and good, but if we do not, we will have to keep trying. But one of the applications we have had is from a husband and wife team. each of whom is a registered nurse. And what we have in mind, if we succeed in recruiting these people is to appoint them, so that they will serve both Cow Head and Daniel's Harbour, also in St. Barbe South and also where we have a shortage of nursing services.

MR. ROBERTS: The thought would be, Sir, if we are successful in recruiting them, and I stress that "if", we will try, but I cannot guarantee it, we will ask this husband and wife team to live at Cow Head, in the facilities there; one of them will be responsible for Cow Head Nursing District, which runs inclusively from the communities of Green Point to Parson's Pond. The other one would assume responsibility for the Daniel's Harbour Nursing District, which includes the area from Portland Creek to Bellburns.

The thought would be that one member of the team would live at Daniel's Harbour area and hold clinic two or three times a week, and the other communities would be similarly served.

Mr. Speaker, I can also say that provided that our little indenture of medical students do not renege, as some of them did last year, provided they all honour their commitments to the Government this year, we will be stationing an extra doctor at the Bonne Bay Cottage Hospital. That will make a third doctor at the hospital. The thought is, Sir, that doctor will not be stationed permanently at the hospital. but that he will hold clinics throughout the area served by the hospital.

This is part of our policy of trying to improve the direct medical services available to our people.

Mr. Speaker, I present the petition gladly, on behalf of the citizens of Newfoundland. I think, they are entitled to this service and insofar as it is within our power, the only limitation on our power in this sense is the ability to recruit - insofar as it is within our power we will grant the prayer of this petition. I have very much pleasure in moving that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates, which will not be entirely surprised to receive it.

Thank you, very much.

MR. G. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise and support this petition, mainly, because, as the Minister knows, I have been speaking to him about it, and

MR. MYRDEN: the good people of Cow Head have asked me to support it, when it came through. This petition, Sir, as we all know in both Cow Head and right up along the coast, is asking for a nurse to replace one of the finest woman that have ever left St. John's, fortunately she came to Cow Head many years ago, married, she was the former Jane Clouston, and she has operated I guess under almost impossible conditions, health-wise, because she has had that dreadful disease known as multiple sclerosis, and she has had a terrible time in getting around. She and I have never, I cannot say never, but not always looked eye to eye, as far as the political part of the Island was concerned, She was a very

T

very outspoken person. She is a very, very outspoken person but a very fine person, she has worked very very hard for the whole coast .

I would like to say also on behalf of the Local Improvement Committee at Cow Head, headed by Mr. Payne, who is now in the Chamber here, both he and his committee have worked hard to try to improve not only health facilities there, but, they have for many years advocated a Vocational School. Now, this, of course, is not in this petition but I would like to mention that a Vocational School in Cow Head will also be a welcome thing Sir, because it is almost in the centre of the coast and it is a very beautiful area and I am sure that at some future date they will think about it. I would like to add my thanks to the Minister, or for the Minister's announcement that there may be a possibility of a man and wife team. Again, health services are very, very important down there and we appreciate everything can be done for us.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak briefly on this, but knowing Mrs. Hutchings, in fact, I knew her when she was Miss Clouston before she went to the St. Barbe Coast, and she went there long before there was a highway, and conditions were much more difficult when she went to the coast than they are now. Although, even now, they are difficult enough. It is quite a coincidence that the day Dr. Miller's retirement has been announced, and we were speaking about his great contribution in Public Health in this Province, and now Mrs. Hutchings has been mentioned in the House. A Newfoundland girl who did yeoman service for the people of the Northern Peninsula, as a nurse, on that coast.

knowing her and her up at Cow Head and having been up there quite a bit, a year or two years ago, I would certainly want to say today that she deserves the thanks of this House and the people of that area. I hope that the Minister will be able to find an additional doctor for Bonne Bay

Hospital and additional nursing services for that coast. It is a long distance from Bonne Bay to St. Anthony. There is no doctor between Bonne Bay and St. Anthony. It is a tremendously long stretch of coast. Certainly they need more medical services over there. I know the Government is doing everything they can to accomplish that and I hope that the Minister is successful and know he will make every effort. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is, Mrs. Hutchings is one of the few Newfoundland girls who has, as a nurse, done yeoman service in the more remote parts of the Province and she deserves every thanks. I hope that she will have a worthy successor.

Moved and seconded that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. J. MAHONEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from some 116 residents of Chamberlains, in my district. All of these people, 116, are residents of Chamberlains and live on Chamberlains Road at that place. Mr. Speaker, Chamberlains Road extends from the Topsail Highway towards the shoreline of Conception Bay, and that particular road is heavily populated, it is a short section of road, and, year round, particularly in summer, when there is a lot of tourist traffic in that area, the usual problem on gravel roads is created, particularly as I said in summertime with the amount of traffic; and that is the dust problem.

The prayer of the petition is, that, because of the unpaved condition of the road, and the volume of traffic using it, that serious dust condition exists particularly during the dry season, and the petitioners ask something that is very reasonable, because the length of the road, as I have already said, is not very great; that this road, be paved during this construction season - if I might call it that - during the paving season of this year, and that preferential consideration be given to it in that regards.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking for myself and my colleague from Hr. Main, we both fully support the prayer of the petitioners, and urge the Department of Highway to pave this road, this heavily populated road, which, to repeat it for the third time, is not of any great length.

MR.SMALLWOOD: What road is this?

MR.MAHONEY: Chamberlains Road, at Chamberlains Mr. Speaker. It runs down by the side of the building there, which was formerly owned by the Stead Lumber Company. It runs down to the shoreline of Conception Bay.

MR.SMALLWOOD: At right angles to the highway, or parallel?

MR.MAHONEY: Right angles to the highway.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I know the one, I know the one.

MR.MAHONEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be received and laid upon the Table of the House and referred to the Department to which it relates, and in saying that I would ask the support of the whole House for the prayer of these petitioners, which is the most reasonable one.

MR.A.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this petition, being very familiar with that particular road. I lived there for fifteen years, in the summertime, and give ample proof for the amount of traffic that uses that particular road. I would certainly like, I know when I was living there during summertime the dust menace was really terrible, summertime you could not open a window or open a door, and it is badly needed. It is a short stretch of road. Incidentally Mr. Speaker, this road leads to two sections of beach there, while I was there I was asking the Government, on many occasions, to clean up, it was being used as a dump down there. Parallel to that road, about a hundred yards or one hundred and fifty yards, there is another road and I would suggest to the Minister of Highways Sir, considering this petition, that they

might level out both these roads that connect in there, and I think they would make an excellent job if they paved both these small roads and perhaps had a one-way in. I think it would avert a lot of tie-ups in traffic there, but I lend my wholehearted support to the petition because as I say, having lived there summertime for a great number of years, I realized what a nuisance it is, the people having to keep their windows closed. Even a screen door is not effective, that cannot keep out dust. As I said, I support wholeheartedly the petition as presented today by the Junior Member for Hr. Main.

Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. DR. G.A. FRECKER (Prov. Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to table some regulations namely, the Newfoundland Consumers Protection Regulations, 1970 and the Newfoundland Protection Regulations 1971, an amendment to the first one.

HON. E. JONES (Min. of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table copies of Regulations, the Social Security Assessment Amendment Regulations 1971, date March 30, 1971.

HON. W. CALLAHAN (Min. of Mines, Agri, & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table regulations made under the Natural Products Marketing Newfoundland Act, 1966-67.

HON. E. DAWE (Min. of Mun. & Housing): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of the Annual Report of the Newfoundland & Labrador Housing, for the year ending March 31, 1970, and the financial statement ending Dec. 31, 1969.

For the information of members, additional copies are available at the Clerk's Office.

HON. L.R. CURTIS (Min. of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the final projects of the Family Law Study; these represents projects 8 to 14. I might say that there are copies in the registry and any members of the

House who would like to have copies can get them at the Clerk's Office. Dr. Gushue and his team have done a thorough job. They have gone into the subject very exhaustibly. As a result of some of the recommendations, legislation will be introduced in the present session and undoubtedly further legislation will develop from time to time. I am sure Dr. Gushue and his assistant deserve our thanks and congratulations, for this exhaustive report.

HON. E. WINSOR(Min. of Lab. Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce the regulation, The Fishing Ships Bounty Regulation 1970. I would also wish to table the Annual Report of the Fishery Loan Board of Newfoundland & Labrador.

HON. E. ROBERTS(Min. of Health): Mr. Speaker, three or four documents that I am required to table, by legislation there are I believe copies available in the Clerk's Office for distribution to the members of the House and the press. One of these is the Annual Report of the Department of Health for the calendar year 1969 and another is the Annual Report on Births, Marriages and Deaths in the Province of Newfoundland also for the calendar year 1969. There is an amendment to the Food and Drug Regulations which brings in the District of Fortune Bay, and I hope I have it correct this time. Also, Mr. Speaker, I table the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Physicians and Fees Amendment Regulations 1971. These might become the Amendment(One) Regulations 1971 because I believe there will be subsequent changes as a result of the ministerial statement which I made some time ago. In any event here they are. Also, Mr. Speaker, may I table the Annual Report, the first Annual Report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, this is for the calendar year ended March 31, 1970. It took the Commission a considerable while to get this to me, I only got it a day or so ago and it is with real pleasure I table it. I commend it to hon. members I think

they will find some most interesting and enlightening data in it. I would only point out one or two things. I do not know what significance it has, Mr. Speaker, but 51.1 per cent of the people of Newfoundland are males and 48.9 per cent are females, which may explain why my mother has not been able to get rid of me yet. If it does not come to a hundred we will go back to the drawing board, Mr. Speaker, but 51.1 per cent who are male used 44.6 per cent of the services, 48.9 per cent who are females used 55.4 per cent of the services. I do not know what that proves but it is an interesting statistic. Members may also wish to note, I am sure they will read the tables with great interest, Mr. Speaker. When the year ended March 31, 1970, excluding salaried positions, over 1,080,000 separate medical bills were paid by the department to the medicare commission. In other words there were over one million separate occasions when Newfoundlanders went and saw their doctors for medical reasons and he sent the bill to medicare and the bill was paid.

There is some interesting data on doctors incomes, which I think will be of interest to hon. members and hopefully to the press and to the House. I am sorry, the hon. gentleman has a question? The Leader of the Opposition - and do not forget it - has a question:

MR. MURPHY: (inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have seen Mr. Speaker, very few of my legal brethren have applied for short-term assistance, to my knowledge - Very few doctors showed up for short-term assistance, very few doctors have shown up either.

MR. NEARY: After the next election.

MR. MURPHY: The present liberal -

MR. ROBERTS: Aw, aw, the Leader of the Opposition, and do not forget it, has spoken again. Mr. Speaker, we might not be the only ones who might be looking for jobs - the hon. gentleman had better look to his job.

MR.MURPHY: (inaudible)

MR.SMALLWOOD: After the mass meeting in Spaniards Bay last night.

MR.ROBERTS: Is that the one who wish they were -

MR.SMALLWOOD: They had all of eighteen last night - at the mass meeting -

MR.ROBERTS: Sure, and all of the eighteen, five were our people there to find out who was there.

MR.ROBERTS: Aw! Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and do not forget it is always -

MR.SPEAKER: Order please.

MR.ROBERTS: Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may point out the figure in the report are also given for the number of physicians in practise in the Province. It may interest hon. members to notice that there are now four hundred and forty odd physicians practising in Newfoundland and Labrador, that is the highest total we have ever had. In any event I commend it for the hon. gentleman and perhaps after he is finished haranguing the eighteen people at the meeting in Spaniards Bay he would want to read the report. As soon as I get the report for next year out, I will table it and he can have volume 2.

MR.NEARY: Did the Hon. Minister say four hundred and forty odd physicians?

MR.ROBERTS: Some of them are odd.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR.SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the question No 162, on the Order Paper of March 26, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer is a little too long to give orally so I will pass it along. Question No 299, on the Order Paper of March 29, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. Question 299. I have a feeling that this has already been answered. It was given to me today to deliver in the House -

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The answer to the first part is no, and the answer to the second part is that I am informed that he expects to make his final report within a month. The answer to the third part is yes, after the Cabinet shall have considered it. The answer to the fourth part is \$17,983.66. Question no. (195) on the Order Paper of March 29th. in the name of the hon. the member for Gander.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was answered on April 2nd.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was answered? Well, I do not see why I should answer it a second time. Question no. (195), on the Order Paper of March 29th.

MR. MARSHALL: Is the hon. the Premier repeating that answer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it was answered some days ago so I am not going to answer it again.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is just repeating the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. (326) on the Order Paper of March 31st. The answer is that the cost to date is \$32,078.04. The unpaid accounts are \$56,800. for a total of \$88,878.04. Question no. (356) on the Order Paper of April 1st. in the Name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. I am told it was answered on April 1st. or whenever it was, but I am also able to say that it was answered in June of last year.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the cost? The cost part has not been answered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The cost part has not been answered? Well I have that here, the cost to the Government is \$21,560.53

HON. E.M.ROBERTS(MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, as of yesterday there were sixty-eight question on the Order Paper, in my name. I have answers here to fifty-four of them. If the hon. gentlemen opposite wish me to read them, if not, perhaps I could two or three and another day we would come back and have some more. Mr. Speaker, most of the questions do not require tabled answers and if they want me to go down through them, there are some that I think should be tabled. Of course I will table those, but you know, most of them are questions that are so appallingly worded that a simple yes or no answer would take care of it.

1142

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in that case I shall answer the questions as the hon. gentleman asks. First is question no. (51) which appears on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 25th. The answer is, that it is a matter of policy, and matters of policy are not dealt with in answers to questions. The second question is question no. (52) on the Order Paper of March 25th. in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition did not hear, he wants to know the number again, he was deafened by all the applause last night.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, (51) was the first one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ever since the meeting last night he cannot hear well.

MR. MURPHY: Bravo, bravo.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I could say at least there is hope on this side, and no longer even hope over there. Question (52) the hon. gentleman asked what expenditures were made in 1970 to improve conditions in ward "3C" in the hospital for mental and nervous diseases. The answer Sir, is \$11,890.00. Improvements to the said ward (a) Installation of heating facilities. (b) painting of rooms and so forth including replacement of floor tiles. (c) Purchase and installation of six special beds. As the hon. gentleman realizes, that of course is the so-called maximum security ward and that should have been done many years ago.

Question (53), appearing on the Order Paper for Thursday March 25th., in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East. I have the answer. As at February 28th. It was \$3,405,580.53. The second part of that question, the answer is yes. About the third part I can say this, that the representation Mr. Speaker, in the form of correspondence, discussions with officials of the department, and I might add with me. I went to New York last April, and attended a meeting of the board of the International Grenfell Association. No additional funds were provided in the calendar year 1970 as a result of those representations, but agreement was reached regarding a number of items including the opening of approximately twenty additional pediatric beds in the Charles S. Curtis Memorial Hospital early in 1971. As hon. gentlemen realize, that is the new hospital at St. Anthony.

1143

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am speaking through his leader and you do not forget it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is this "don't you forget it?"

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman has asked us not to forget that he is the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not St. John's West.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Mr. Speaker, to carry on

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) more closely together.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I would have said Mr. Speaker, it is other portions of their anatomy which are touching.

MR. MURPHY: Ha! ha!

MR. ROBERTS: In December 1970, Sir, the I.G.A. submitted their 1971 budget. Of course that has been discussed with them, we have approved it with some amendments subject to the funds being authorized by the House. I have been assured by the Association that the budget is satisfactory, and will enable them to operate their services without curtailment. Question (54) Mr. Speaker, again in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East, again on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 25th. The answer is, in February 1965, when it was announced publicly. That is six years ago Sir. Since February 1965, there have been correspondence, meetings and discussions between the Newfoundland Pharmaceutical Association, Memorial University, the College of Trades and Technology and the Department of Health, with the result, I am told, that the training of pharmacists will commence at the college in September 1971. Question no. (55) Mr. Speaker, again in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's East, again on the Order Paper of March 25th. The answer, Sir, is during that eleven year period ending December 31, 1970, 274 patients were confined. Of the 274 Sir, 238 improved to the extent that the medical authorities ordered them discharged. Some of these patients who were confined as a result of the criminal process, were returned to the jurisdiction of either the courts or the penitentiary, as was appropriate in each case. Those patients, not subject to any criminal sanction, were discharged in the same way as would any other patient. Question (56) Mr. Speaker, I will call it quits

at this unless hon. gentlemen wish me to continue, but I do not want to use up their time.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: If Mr. Speaker, the press have any further questions, I am always delighted to hear from them, as the press know full well. Answer to question (56), the hon. gentleman, the member for St. John's East, asked me, it appears on the Order Paper of March 25th. It is almost impossible to answer that question Sir, because I do not know, and my officials cannot tell me what the hon. gentleman means by escapes. We do, however, have figures, the technical term, as the hon. gentleman from Burin, I think, would prefer, is elopements. I do not know why they call it elopements, but they call it elopements. I always thought elopement was running off to get married, but it is not. My mother is the one who should be concerned about that. She has been praying for a number of years, Mr. Speaker, and, in her behalf, I can only hope her prayers are granted.

MR. MURPHY: Your day may come, there may be a female escape.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, Mr. Speaker, you know, all I can do is suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. In any event, let me give the House, Sir, the data representing elopements of harmless patients, i.e., notorious. These figures.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, the hon. gentleman is not in these, he is in others. These figures generally represent harmless patients. In 1961, thirty; 1962 forty-one; 1963 forty; 1964 one; 1965 fourteen; 1966 nineteen; 1967 twenty-one; 1968 thirty-four; 1969 thirty-one and 1970 the figure was twenty-four. Mr. Speaker, it is an important point, and perhaps I should stress it. Many of the patients receiving treatment at the hospital, as Your Honour realizes, are receiving treatment on open ward privileges. It is a matter the psychiatrists determine if the patient needs that sort of treatment or if he needs another one. That means a patient can literally, you know, he is free, he is not locked up. He is not a prisoner and many of the people listed in the numbers I have given are people of that category. Sometimes these patients wander off and almost inevitably they are found very quickly and brought back to the hospital.

The figures were particularly low in 1960 and 1964.

MR. NEARY: Did any wander off last night, and get over in the Spaniard's Bay area?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh they would not get as far as Spaniard's Bay. In '60 and '64, there was an acute shortage of medical personnel. As a result, the open ward privileges were severely restricted. I can say as well, that the number of serious elopements, or elopements in the serious category, of people who can seriously harm themselves or others I am told, on an average, is one or two per year. I do not think there have been instances, at least none to my knowledge, where a person in that category who has managed to elope has not been found very quickly and brought back to the hospital.

Finally, since I tabled the Medicare Report, let me answer the hon. gentleman's question about the Medicare Commission. It is question no. (89) March 25th. the hon. member for St. John's East. The answer is, the Chairman Mr. Peter J. Gardiner, C.A.; the Vice-Chairman was Dr. J. Arch McNamara; the members of the commission were Mr. James J. Halley Q.C.; Dr. Hugh Thomey of Botwood; and Mr. Roy Cheeseman. There were two ex officio members, my Deputy Minister Dr. Miller and Mr. Roy Moores, the Executive Director of Medicare. The only two members with offices were the Chairman Mr. Gardiner and the Vice-Chairman Dr. McNamara.

Mr. Roberts.

The hon. gentleman then asked: What, state remuneration, if any, paid to each individual member in 1970? The answer is that the chairman is paid \$150 a month plus \$75 for each meeting. In the calendar year, 1970, the total remuneration paid Mr. Gardener was \$2,625. Individual members are each paid \$50 a month, plus \$50 for each meeting they attend. During 1970, Dr. McNarama was paid \$1,150. Mr. Halley was paid \$1,050. Dr. Thomey was paid \$1,050. Mr. Cheeseman was paid \$1,150. Dr. Miller and Mr. Moores, of course, are full-time public servants and thus receive no remuneration. It goes without saying that members, out of town, Mr. Speaker are paid their expenses properly incurred in coming in.

I should add, too, so that the House will be quite aware, the terms of two of the members, Dr. Thomey and Mr. Cheeseman, expired on December 31st and subsequently Dr. Leslie Wells of Carbonear and Mrs. Gillett (I forget her christian name) from Grand Falls, Mrs. A. M. Gillett, I believe, from Grand Falls were appointed in their stead

Now unless the hon. gentleman really wants, I will knock it off for the day. Okay? Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker on today's Order Paper, Question no. 454 asked for by the hon. member for St. John's West, I am afraid, Sir, I cannot find anybody who knows anything about such a study. I am informed that when the hon. member was Minister of Health, that an approach was made to the Department of Health, but he made his departure before any study materialized.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the minister not remember telling the House last year that such a study was underway, in response to a question tabled last year? I can get the minister the number and so on.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member, if he would be a little more specific and reword his questions..

MR. CROSBIE: It is based right on the question asked last year.

MR. NEARY: Let me know what it is he is after, and I would be glad to try and get him the information. I do not know whether he is looking for information from the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation or when

Mr. Neary.

I was responsible for transportation. I would be glad to endeavour to try to get him the information, if he would just let me know what it is, the hon. member is looking for.

I have the answer to Question no. 425, asked by the hon. and learned member for Burin, on the Order Paper of Thursday, April 13th. The answer to part (1) is, yes. The answer to part (2) is, February 11, 1971 and February 25, 1971, by Deputy Minister of Public Works, Fire Commissioner, Assistant Administrator for Cottage Hospitals Division, Department of Health and Assistant Director of Institutions, Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. The answer to part (3) is March 2, 1971. The answer to part (4), Mr. Speaker, I am not going to table these reports. Such action might seriously limit the possibility of the sale of the property in question for some other purpose. It is the policy, Mr. Speaker, of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation to provide help for citizens and not to place obstacles in their way or in the way of the conduct of their business.

I also have the answer, Mr. Speaker, to Question no. 432, on the Order Paper of Thursday, April 13th., asked by the hon. member for Fortune Bay. The hon. member has his pencil sharpened, Mr. Speaker. The answer to part (1) is ten - part (1)(a), ten, (b) nine. The answer to part (2) of the question: thirteen pay \$62 per month, one pays \$46 per month, one pays \$31 per month and four pay \$17 per month. The answer to part (3) is two. The places, Mr. Speaker are Grole, one, in 1969; Rencontre West, one, in 1969.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, three or four questions, orally, Sir, and I will table some others which are quite lengthy in detail. The answer to Question no. 172, standing in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of March 26th. The first part: Has the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited submitted to the Government the account of the expenditures of that corporation, its assignees, lessees or transferees, required by June 1, 1970. to be made, pursuant to paragraph (a)

Mr. Callahan

of subsection (ii) of Subsection 3(b) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, as amended by Act No. 53 of 1965, on exploration and investigation during the period from April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1970 and, if so, did the Corporation or others having rights under the Corporation spend a sum of not less than \$1 million during the said period for purposes of exploration and investigation? The answer to the first part, Mr. Speaker, is yes. The answer to the second part, therefore, does not arise. The third part: If the account required has been received what was the amount spent by Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited or others having rights under it during the said period? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is \$1,641,237.

Question no. 232 also in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West on the Order Paper of March 29th. Has Hooker Chemicals (Nanaimo) Limited or any company associated therewith indicated to the Government their intentions with reference to the development of deposits of sodium and potassium salts or elemental sulphur in the area granted it by the Crown for mining exploration and, if such intentions have been indicated to the Government, what are those intentions and when will development commence with reference to the deposits found? I can say two things on that, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, there is no grant. There is a concession agreement which is a matter of legislation approved by this House. Secondly, in respect to intention: I think I must answer no, not definitely. The matter is still under discussion.

The Question no. 344, standing in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, on the Order Paper of April 1, 1971. What licences, claims and concessions have been given by Government for offshore oil exploration rights? (2) State the location of such licences, claims and concessions. The answer, Mr. Speaker, British Newfoundland Exploration, Limited. That is in answer to the first part. British Newfoundland Exploration Limited, and the applicable portion of the second part: Off Shoal Point, off the Port au Port Peninsula. Pan American Petroleum Corporation, which is now known as Amico. Amico that is southeast of the Avalon Peninsula. Alberta Export Refining Company Limited, east of the Avalon

Mr. Callahan.

Peninsula. Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Incorporated, that is south of the Burin Peninsula, and in the Strait of Belle Isle. Canadian Homestead Oils, south of the Avalon Peninsula. Mobile Oil Canada, Limited, south of the Burin Peninsula.

I would also like to table, Mr. Speaker, the partial answer to Question 192, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander, on the Order Paper of March 26th. I think this question, originally, having to do with aircraft, was put to my colleague, the Minister of Supply and Services, and the relevant portions of that question or certain portions of that question were referred to me. Also question no. 194, in the name of the hon. member for Gander, on the Order Paper of March 29th., dealing also in six parts with aircraft. Question no. 446, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander, on the Order Paper of April 13th., dealing with caribou licences and Question no. 440, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander, on the Order Paper of April 13th., dealing with the issue of moose licences. I table these.

MR. DAWE : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question no. 313, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre on the Order Paper of March 30th. In answer to Question no. 398, asked by the hon. member for Burin, on the Order Paper of April 2nd., 1971. Question was asked: (1) Has the Government agreed to making the necessary grant or loan to Grand Bank Town Council to permit the installation of a gravity fed water system at Grand Bank? The answer to the question is no, Mr. Speaker. An engineering study has disclosed that a gravity fed water system is not feasible. However, installation of a storage tank and other improvements to a pump house is just about being completed.

On motion of the hon. the member for St. John's East, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Revenue And Audit Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the member for St John's East, a Bill,
"An Act to Provide for Compensation to Employees Affected By The
Declaration Of The State Of Emergency By The St. John's Municipal
Council," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. member for St. John's East, a Bill,
"An Act Further To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act," read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. member for St. John's East, a Bill,
"An Act Further To Amend The Civil Service Commission Act," read a first
time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the hon. the member for St. John's East to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Enquiries Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the hon. member for St. John's East to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Equitable Purchases By Government," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the hon. member for St. John's East to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act." read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the hon. the member for Burin to move:

Whereas it is in the interest of good Government that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine the Report of the Auditor General;

Be It Resolved that Mr. Speaker do appoint a Select Committee of this House to consider the Report of the Auditor General and to report to this House and that the said Select Committee have permission to sit during the sitting hours of this House.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Rising to speak in support of this Resolution, as hon. members will recall this type of motion, or motions somewhat similar to it, have come before this House on numerous occasions, I can speak only with certainty of the past five settings of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to hon. members and to this House that with each passing year the need for the acceptance of this Resolution becomes more apparent and indeed more critical. On some occasions this House had debated the desirability of appointing a Standing Committee on the Public Accounts and, without fail, Government have defeated the Motion. And we still continue to be one of two Canadian provinces that are without a Standing Committee on the Public Accounts. These are the provinces of British Columbia and the Province of Newfoundland.

We do not share the wisdom nor the protection of the other Canadian provinces. We do not share the wisdom nor the protection of the Mother of Parliament. We do not share the wisdom nor the protection of the Parliament of

MR. HICKMAN: New Zealand Australia and probably many other Parliaments in the Commonwealth. Because all of these Parliaments and the members who compose these Parliaments jealously cling to the right that, if the power of the purse is at all restricted or removed from Parliament, then Parliament loses its prime function and, indeed, some constitutional scholars will question the right or the need for Parliament when once that disappears.

Mr. Speaker, this year again, we have received a very comprehensive report from the Auditor General. I do not propose to take the time of hon. members to deal with every item in the Auditor General's Report. This year the report is not quite as critical as one finds in some other years. And, quite often we hear an answer, which is not an answer really, it is an attempted answer, that every Auditor General's Report is critical. That the Auditor General, as the servant of the House, must go around with a tooth fine comb and a microscope and he must look for mistakes. Mr. Speaker, that is not the answer, that is not an answer that is acceptable to the British Parliament. It is not an answer that is acceptable to most Canadian Parliaments, the Parliament of Canada nor eight of the provinces. The simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that, if the Auditor General is going to function, and if his report is going to mean anything, then, obviously, within the confines of a Select Committee, he should be, and I suspect he would welcome the opportunity to be questioned on various items and various comments that he makes in his report. Indeed, it is very much in the interest of this Province that the report of the Auditor General be subjected to the scrutiny of hon. members on both sides of this House. Because it is my understanding, it is more than an understanding, I know it is a fact that eventually the Auditor General's Report, together with the accounts of the Province, are bound and they find themselves into the hands of the financial institution with whom this Province must do business, along with other forms of Government, both Federal and Provincial and Municipal. No one is going to tell me that, that the eyebrows of a lending institution or those involved in it are not raised, when they see that, and they know

MR. HICKMAN: if they do that Newfoundland and British Columbia are the only two provinces in Canada who will not subject their Auditor General and his report to the scrutiny of the members of the House.

In this Report, Mr. Speaker, that was tabled recently, there are certain items that must be explained and cannot be explained during the Budget Debate nor can it be explained during the questioning of hon. ministers during a consideration of the estimates in committee.

Let me refer this House to paragraph 91, as contained on Page 72 of the Auditor General's Report. This deals with the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. It says; "Government and Newfoundland Liquor Commission interrelationship. During the audit of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission it was noted that consultant's fees in the amount of \$27,055 were paid during 68-69, and \$44,820 in 1969-70, for a total of \$71,875 to March 31, 1970. My auditors could not find any record of the engagement of these services by the Commission. Our enquires disclosed that the services had been engaged by Government and that a Cabinet Directive ordered that payment of the consultant's fees be charged against the appropriations for Head XII. There was no appropriation available in Head XII, so the invoices were submitted to the Commission for payment."

I have obtained legal opinion that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission is almost completely autonomous in the administration of the Alcoholic Liquors Act. That may be correct from a strictly legal point of view, but I will question that beyond that scope. The inclusion of most of the subjects of expenditure shown under Head XII, in the Estimates, and in the Public Accounts represents, in my opinion, a misapplication of the appropriation process and an encroachment upon the responsibilities and prerogatives granted, by statute, exclusively, to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission."

The he goes on; "the transaction described illustrates a potential weakness in the measures taken for the security of revenues due to be conveyed to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In this instance it appears that the Government may incur expenses and arrange payment for them out of

MR. HICKMAN: income of the Commission, without reference to the House of Assembly. It should be reaffirmed as an inviolable principle that 'the executive should have no income which is not granted to it, or otherwise sanctioned by Parliament' and 'the executive should make no expenditures except those approved by Parliament, in ways approved by Parliament.'"

Now Mr. Speaker, you may argue - \$71,875, in relation to the total budget of this Province. But, if we will not accept the position or if we will not tolerate the position that any elected government in this Province can spend monies that are not voted by this House and can spend monies that are not approved or authorized by legislation, then where do you draw the line? Why draw it at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission? Why not let any committee? Why not place Government in a position where whenever it finds itself short of cash it can go to a Commission and demand that these monies be paid or alternatively make commitments on behalf of the Commission?

Because, if that principle is allowed to operate or allowed to continue, then no Commission would be safe. And I remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that we have Commissions functioning and appointed, under Legislative Authority in this Province, that deal almost exclusively with trust funds. For instance, the Workmen's Compensation Board does not deal with monies that are raised from the taxpayers of this Province. They do not handle monies that are principally voted to that Commission by this Legislature or by Government. On the contrary they deal with trust monies that are collected from companies, arising out of the earnings of people in certain industries in this Province. Now would we dare to suggest that, that the funds of that Commission or the commitment on behalf of the Workmen's Compensation Board could be made by Government, without Legislative Authority? Because the principle is precisely the same, Mr. Speaker. The principle is precisely the same, when we take a look at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, and what has been stated by the

MR. HICKMAN: Auditor General as an illegal expenditure of money by the Government of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again the Auditor General in his Report says that, (he makes a very good suggestion which would be of very great help to hon. members, on Page 74.) When he refers to the explanatory statement contained in the Public Accounts. He said, "I would suggest, however, that they would be, members of the House, informed to an even greater degree if the Departmental statements of Expenditures and Appropriations-in-aid included the detail of the Legislature's appropriations. It would be

MR. HICKMAN:

most informative, in my opinion, to show the actual expenditures compared with the estimates, so that the members of the House could more readily appreciate the performance for the year in relation to what they have approved.

Now we have heard, Mr. Speaker, time and time again members express the opinion and sometimes criticism and certainly there is public criticism of delays in the House, carrying out its functions and performing its business. One very simple way of eliminating some of these delays of putting hon. members in a position where they do not have to question every single item contained in the estimates is if the recommendation of the Auditor General on page 74 was implemented. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the sort of recommendations that, in my opinion, require some elaboration. They require the House to have the opportunity to ask the Auditor General why he makes these statements, why he makes these recommendations, why he believes that these recommendations should be implemented in the interest of the proper functioning of his master, the House of Assembly, or his masters. We do not suggest, at least I do not suggest, that the Auditor General should ever be faced with the situation that he found himself in two years ago, when he had to appear before this House, because there you cannot dispassionately and sensibly question the Auditor General on his report. But with a select committee, that can meet when this House is in session or can meet at other times and if they so desire can meet in private, there you can get the rationale behind the recommendations that the Auditor General's report contains, and the recommendations made by the Auditor General.

Again, on page 76, the Auditor General refers to the absolute necessity that his department remain independent, and he feels that the independence which ought to attach to his office is being compromised. Now this House cannot afford, under any circumstances, to allow their servant to find himself in a position where his independency is compromised in any way. He must be totally and absolutely independent of Government. He must be placed in a position where he has to look to Government for absolutely nothing. He must be in a position where we, as members of this hon. House, know that he

MR. HICKMAN:

squarely and fairly comment on any of the accounts of this Province, without fear of recrimination, without fear of any withholding of the services that his office must have and the facilities in order to do their work. He has asked for that year after year. It is obvious, from reading his report and the reports in the past, that his requests have not been answered or, alternatively, if they have been considered, they have not been considered worthy of implementation.

Maybe there is some good reason. Maybe there is some good reason why the independence of the Auditor General, that he seeks, should not be granted or should not be confirmed in the eyes of the public. I cannot think of it but again I would like to hear his views elaborated on before a select committee of this House. There is, again in the Auditor General's report, the usual request for additional staff and the rather startling unusual statement that since his appointment three years ago he has not as yet been asked to appear before Treasury Board to discuss the estimates of this department.

Now here is an Auditor General who, if we are going to maintain, at least in the eyes of the public, the solvency of this Province, must operate with an efficient staff, he must be in a position to hire all the staff that he requires, and he makes his requests to the House, obviously he makes them to Treasury Board, and nobody has ever asked him to come up and put to Treasury Board his reasons why they should be implemented. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of hon. members to page 72, paragraph 90 of the Auditor General's report? This deals with overpaid financing charges not recovered in 1968 and 1969, and which was referred to in his report and this is the sum of \$157,696, owed to the Crown Corporation Vocational School, Western Building Corporation, Limited. This, according to the Auditor General, arose out of the overpayment to the contractor, who is the project manager, on account of financing charges, during construction of buildings in Corner Brook and Grand Falls. The contractor, according to the Auditor General, has not refunded the money.

"The overpayment was first brought to the attention of the corporation

MR. HICKMAN:

by my predecessor, the Auditor General says; 'in 1965, but no settlement has yet been received or collected. Public monies annually required, to provide lease payments for the buildings involved, yet the corporation and hence the Crown is being deprived of the amount of \$157,696. plus interest.' Now this House is entitled to know why. This House is entitled to know who is this contractor. Obviously the Auditor General, if you read his reports of 1967 and 1968 onward, has come to the conclusion, and I know that the Auditor General arrives at these conclusions based on the advice he receives from the Department of Justice, that this is a sum of money owing to this Province by a contractor. The obligations on the Minister of Justice, under the Revenue and Audit Act, the obligations on the Minister of Justice are quite clear, to take the necessary steps to recover from the contractor this amount of overpayment; but it has not been done.

Maybe there is a logical reason. Maybe there is, I do not know. Hon. members of this House have no idea but, as it stands right now, it is a blot on the credit of this Province, it does not satisfy our people that the affairs of this Province are being properly managed and, most assuredly, it does not satisfy the people of Newfoundland that this House has the control of the purse strings that we are supposed to have as the elected representatives of the people of this Province. An hours work, a half an hours hearing of a select committee would yield the explanation concerning Item 90, the overpayment and the nonrecovery from an unknown contractor of \$157,000. Maybe the Auditor General could tell us that the contractor disputes this liability, but I suspect he would not because if he did, this would be contained in the report. Maybe he would tell us that it is a waste of time to go after the contractor, that the contractor is no longer in existence or maybe he would give us some other reason which might not be so pleasant or so palatable, but whatever it is we, as members of this House, are entitled to know the reason and, if the House comes to the conclusion that action must be taken, then the House, as the controller of the purse, can direct Government to take the action.

Mr. Speaker, again we find on page 71 an overpayment to the Newfoundland

MR. HICKMAN:

and Labrador Housing Corporation of \$57,900., a withdrawal from another fund, which again, according to the Auditor General, should not have been withdrawn, and without any legislative authority. All of these payments, contrary to the law, Mr. Speaker, indicate to me that the time not only has long since past and, if you forget the past, that the time right now calls for the appointment of a select committee to have the Auditor General's report examined, and criticize and accepted or otherwise, in the greatest detail.

On page 67 we find an understatement of the cost of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission to the tune of \$3,667,150. Then, Mr. Speaker, on page 62 we find a rather startling finding, in connection with the Department of Highways, in paragraph 67 and 68. Paragraph 67 refers primarily to the changing and accounting that for some reason the payment of monies on account of the hire purchase of machinery is now shown as summer maintenance. Paragraph 68 is the one that, I think, should arouse the concern of hon. members of this House and I read it, "Additional interest charges on refinancing of balances owed under road building contracts. In April 1970 certain road building contracts, which the Province had entered into in previous years at interest rates of six per-cent and seven and one-half per-cent and with unpaid balances amounting to \$2,351,719., at 15th April, were, upon the request of the contractor, refinanced for a five year period at an interest rate of ten and one-half per-cent. In September, the Province having remitted monthly installments, consisting of \$156,781. principal and \$80,461. interest, liquidated the remaining balance of the liability, with a payment of two million two hundred and some odd thousand, consisting of principal and interest. Interest payments by the Province, through refinancing in the manner for a five month period, amounted to \$44,000. more than would have pertained had the original payment schedule been followed to the date of liquidation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the relevancy and the seriousness of that finding is this, that it was the contractor, here is a contractor who finds himself in the position where some years ago he entered into a binding contract with

MR. HICKMAN:

the Government to finance the construction of highways in this Province. He agrees to it, at a time when the interest rates were six or seven per-cent, which by today's rates are rather attractive to any borrower. He now finds, a few years later, that he does not like this, that he wants the interest rates increased by four and one-half per-cent, to ten and one-half per-cent. He comes and makes a request to Government, and Government agrees. Now there has to be some reason for this. Obviously the Government has no right nor any responsibility to concern itself about the earnings of a contractor, it has a binding contract, the work has been done and the contractor is going to get paid.

Now why would a Government accede to this request from any contractor? There has to be an answer. The proper place to give the answer because sometimes you will hear a request, we do not like to discuss the business of private individuals before the House, this reasoning certainly would not apply to this particular item but, if it does, a select committee is the place where you can get the answers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, and this was referred to in a previous debate, the increase in the subsidy to ERCO, I would like to know from the Auditor General as to whether he believes that these increases and the payment of the subsidy, over and above what this House approved, meet the requirements of the ERCO legislation, whether they were made within the provisions of the agreement that forms part of the legislation that this House passed or whether for some other reason we know nothing about.

Paragraph 62 under the heading, Department of Fisheries opens up a rather nasty can of worms. It refers to an amount on account of fishing gear bounty which included payments totalling \$28,450. to one individual, based upon documents submitted to the Department of Fisheries which later proved to be fraudulent. Now this is where the hon. Minister of Fisheries comes in. If we have a select committee and we are faced with a report such as this, and these bounties were all very small, it is not an isolated incident of one item that might escape the attention of scrupulous accountants, but it was a pattern that developed and apparently was not caught by the

MR. HICKMAN:

Department of Fisheries, and I am not suggesting the Minister personally, but he knows as well as I do that, as Minister, he is responsible to this House for any of the negligence or acts of negligence or misdemeanors within his department.

Now this House is entitled to know where the breakdown occurs. How could this have gone on for over an extended period of time, within the Department of Fisheries, without the offender or offenders having been caught and without the necessary safeguards implemented to see that it would not happen again? The proper place for the Minister of Fisheries to give this information, so as not to embarrass the innocent people working in his department, is not in this House. The proper place is before a select committee, so that the select committee can report back to the House and say, "We have received a satisfactory explanation from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. We are satisfied that with the new accounting system, with the new safeguards and the new checks and balances that have now been introduced into the Department of Fisheries that this will not happen again."

MR. HICKMAN: Because, whether the hon. minister knows it or not, I gather from what we have heard around the country since, that this is pretty common knowledge. People were aware of the fact that the system within the Department of Fisheries left a great deal to be desired and there was a bit of a soft touch. If people were aware of this, then surely this House is entitled now to know, and to be satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that it cannot happen again, and to know why it happened. I do not believe that the place where that should be given is before the House of Assembly.

I think that the hon. Minister of Fisheries would be more than anxious to give this information to a Select Committee of the House. I think that hon. members would be reassured if they could be told by a Select Committee, at the end of their deliberation, that this will not happen again, and that we now have the necessary changes implemented to take care of it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on page (57) we find under the heading of health 1969-70, \$250,000. 1970 - 71, \$240,000. for a total of \$530 thousand dollars paid by the Department of Health to a construction company, said to be owing for services rendered, on instructions of the Government of Newfoundland in connection with several planned hospital construction projects which had either been cancelled or postponed. Now there is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that I would suspect would touch touch the heart of Your Honour. I am sure that this must strike some apprehension into Your Honour's heart when he reads that these payments are being made in connection with several planned hospital construction projects, which have either been cancelled or postponed. This House is entitled to know that projects have been cancelled or postponed. Is it Twillingate? Is it Carbonear? Is it Bay Roberts? Is it the regional hospital at Salt Pond, Burin? Is it the Western Memorial Hospital extension? Is it the hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases? Whatever they are, it would appear that the officials in the Department of Health came to the conclusion that there had been a binding contract entered into with the planners and construction companies, and that they, the Government, were now in breach of contract and that they would have to pay the penalty.

Surely if this House votes \$500 thousand, and plans to prepare,

scrap it, we are entitled to know what plans have been scrapped, what postponements have been implemented. The hon. member for Bonavista South is valiantly, for years, asking this House for improvements to the Bonavista Cottage Hospital, and they are badly needed. He is entitled to know, is his hospital included in that postponement? Were contractors paid, or architects paid for plans?

MR. BARBOUR: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: Right, have they been postponed? Maybe he is not in that category. Maybe his has not been postponed. But, \$500 thousand worth of plans have been postponed or cancelled. Who are they? This House is entitled to know.

Mr. Speaker, it is only a small item. I am not sure if it is small because, I cannot tell if there is a comma left out here. Under head (55), the expenditure under this is in connection with the Melville project. Under this subhead, it comprises of payments of (I hope it is \$5,850. and \$5,200.) for legal service in the matter of the Melville project. The Auditor General says, "I am informing the Department of Justice that in my opinion these are irregular charges under subhead" so and so, and "(2), the related payment vouchers were incorrectly certified and approved as a proper charge." (3C), there was no legislative authority. It is noted that the Deputy Minister of Justice agreed with my opinion, as set out, but subsequently with approval of the treasury board countervailing savings of \$11 thousand were transferred."

Now Mr. Speaker, what is the point in having a Deputy Minister of Justice? What is the point in having an Auditor General? What is the point in this House passing laws governing the payment of expenditures? What is the point in this House considering a Budget Speech or becoming involved in a debate on the Budget Speech? What is the point in our sitting here day after day, and the Government going through the motions of asking the House to approve estimates, if, when they are approved, items come up that are not covered. There is no legislative authority for the payment thereof, and the Auditor General goes to the Deputy Minister of Justice and he says "No, they cannot be paid," and Treasury Board pays it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, my recollection is, and it is a pretty clear recollection, that these legal fees were to be paid out of the Melville project. That they were

not to be a charge upon the consolidated revenue fund of this Province. But they have been paid, they have been paid contrary to the advice of the Deputy Minister of Justice. Presumably, his Minister must have agreed with that opinion or there would have been a countervailing or a counter-opinion to it. It is not a big amount, \$10 thousand. This Province will not collapse over the payment of \$10 thousand, but it can collapse over the illegal payment of funds by Government, of the payment of funds by Government that have not been authorized by this House, of the payment of funds by Government where there is no legislative authority for the payment thereof, or indeed, in some instances where there is an absolute prohibition against it.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General, in his report on page (43), talks about his inability to reconcile, or to complete the bank statements of this Province, and to completely reconcile the Province's bank accounts. He draws to our attention, as he has drawn it to the attention of this House before, that under the present system of accounting he cannot, and he will not verify the reconciliation of the bank accounts for the Province of Newfoundland. Questions have been on the Order Paper this year, they were on the Order Paper last year about borrowings and overdrafts at the Governments' bank, the Bank of Montreal. You get answers that may or may not disclose anything. We do know this, that whatever the answers are, they are not verified by the Auditor General. He refuses to, he cannot. I want to see the Auditor General tell a Select Committee as to why. I want to hear from the Auditor General as to how they can reconcile the bank accounts in other Provinces. What are their procedures there? When we find out, then this House can direct the servant of this House to implement the necessary procedures.

Mr. Speaker, we can go on and we can take practically every page of the Auditor General's report and you can find things that are worthy of questioning or worthy of querrying. We can find an item such as the one on page (34) again, where he talks about the inability of the Province to collect sales tax that are owing by people who now reside outside of Newfoundland. Other Provinces can do it, why cannot we? That is not the fundamental principle, because, that is the sort of information that can be gathered together and obtained

by a Select Committee. It cannot be obtained in this House. It is not an answer. I have heard all sorts of answers, some of them I suspect have been made in jest, obviously, they could not have been made in any sense of seriousness. I would hope we are made to expect anyone in this House to accept, for instance, one time I heard the statement made in this House that, if we had been doing business for 100 years, we could have been doing business for 100 years without a Standing or Select Committee. That should be good enough. Well it is a simple statement, it is a statement that verges on the half-wittedness. I seriously doubt if anybody would make it today, in the year 1971, when we realize the extent of the budget of this Province. I am sure they would not.

I am sure of the fact that we supposedly, when it suits our purpose, when it suits Government's purpose, worship at the Shrine of Westminster, and the procedures that are followed in the House of Commons in Great Britain and in other places, I am sure that we should be far more cognizant of the fact that they, in their wisdom, have seen fit to appoint these committees.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough, indeed, it is not an answer at all to say that the Department of Finance has a large number of bookkeepers, and department heads, and accountants, and they get paid to keep the ledgers of the Province, and we can rest, secure, in the knowledge that the hon. the Minister of Finance has a great staff. Sure he has a good staff, but, you know, anyway, that would be a silly answer, a stupid answer, it is an answer that would not be acceptable to any other House of Assembly. That is not what the job of the bookkeepers and the department heads and the accountants is in the Department of Finance. Every business worth its salt has bookkeepers, of any size, department heads, and accountants, but they still have their auditors completely free and independent, who come in and critically analyze the books and accounts of their clients. Then they come back and the auditors are subjected to the severe and close scrutiny by the principals.

It is not an answer at all. I am only reciting the answers that I have heard, and you Your Honour dealt with them so effectively last year, that I do not think they will be ever given again. I have heard it, that, you know, we make a half million entries. The officials in the Department of Finance, they make a half million entries or more a year in the accounting departments, and the Auditor

General out of this half million, he has found a few items to criticize. Silly statement, silly for me even to make it now. It is embarrassing to make it, but it has been said. It completely ignores the whole purpose, the whole concept behind the Auditor General and his department not being a department of Government. Does it make any difference whether he finds one item to criticize? Indeed, it would be delightful if we ever reach that Utopian situation, in this Province or any other Province.

It certainly is not an answer to say that hon. members of this House have an opportunity to question, and in fact, they do question the various ministers when they are trying to put their estimates through the House. They are not questioned any more severely or with any more scrutiny in this House than they are in the House of Commons in Ottawa, but there is a Standing Committee in the House of Commons in Ottawa to examine the report of the Auditor General.

It is not an answer to say that when next year's budget is brought down hon. members can debate the budget to their heart's desire. That they can question hon. ministers to their heart's desire. The budget debate, the questioning of the estimates, is not relative or germane to the issue or to this Resolution. It is not enough to say that the opposition waits in anticipation, that oppositions traditionally wait in anticipation of the Auditor General's report. These are silly, half-witted answers that cannot stand the light of day, cannot stand scrutiny by any responsible legislatures who operate under the British system of Government.

Mr. Speaker, last year we were treated with all sorts of learned dissertations and quotations from various authorities on Parliamentary Procedure and Parliamentary Government. I do not propose to go back over them all again, but simply to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that any text book on Parliamentary Government, as we know it, you will find that without fail the author accepts the fact, and in England, in fact, it goes back to as far as the Reform Act of 1832, that the elected Parliamentarians in their anxiety to maintain absolute control over the spending of the monies that are collected by way of taxes or otherwise, insist on the setting up of a Standing Committee on public accounts. Indeed, in many Parliaments, they go further, in their anxiety

to, because, not only must justice be done, but it must appear to be done, in their anxiety to convince the public that this absolute control is maintained, they will appoint someone from the ranks of the opposition as chairman of the Standing Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have to accept the Auditor General as something more than an accountant, something more than a man who goes and questions and scrutinizes the activities and the work of the officials and the accountants. He is not employed to nor appointed to question or not to question, to check up on the work of the accountants in the Department of Finance. The Auditor General's job, is to report to this House on what the Government has done with the money that this House voted the Government last year. Every so often we get up and we hear some hon. minister answering a question. It is my plan, or it is the Government's plan to implement such and such a programme. It is the plan or the hope of the Government that in Cow Head this year there will be a team of nurses, if the House votes the money. The emphasis is always on that, if the House will vote us the money.

Mr. Hickman.

The Auditor General is paid by this House to report back to us as to whether the money that we voted, to pay the salary of the team of nurses in Cow Head, was in fact spent in the manner that this House directed that it had to be spent. He is not simply checking on the comptroller of Finance. He is not simply checking on the chartered accountants in the Department of Government. He is reporting on the stewardship of the Government to see that it is spent the money, within the law, that it stayed within the law. We read his report and we see that Government have not stayed within the law. A Budget Speech and estimates cannot be regarded as any substitute for what the Auditor General has to do.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that you, Sir, last year, in participating in a similar debate, summed up very, very adequately the position of the Auditor General and the responsibilities of the Auditor General. I refer this hon. House to the Volume 1, No. 16 of Hansard, March 4th., 1970, page 953. This is what you had to say, Sir: (I commend you for it) "There is no more important business that ever comes before this House than the business of finance. The power of the purse, and if this House loses control over the power of the purse, then this House has, in effect, passed control over to the Executive arm of Government. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that a resolution such as this would not have been necessary. I would thought that in the ordinary course of things that the balance of power would have been preserved, and I do feel that this balance of power must be preserved and that this question which is before the House now will be a continuous question, until this business of the balance of power is resolved. I am not sure," (said the hon. the member for St. John's North) "that the resolution actually goes far enough, but I do feel that the time has come for this House of Assembly to set up some form of committee to examine the public accounts of the Province and the Report of the Auditor General.

Now just how this is going to be done, I do not know, but the time has come. The time has come for the Premier and the Cabinet to put before

Mr. Hickman.

this House, a means whereby the balance of power in this Province can be maintained." I think the hon. members will recall that very lucid and fair statement of the hon. the member for St. John's North. I think hon. members will recall the chagrin and the look of horror on the faces of hon. members opposite. I think hon. members will recall when someone said, "Not now Nat. We are going to bring in a better resolution."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that statement of the hon. the member for St. John's North, last year, more than a year ago, on March 4th., 1970, is just as valid today, if not more so than it was a year before. Last night we heard the hon. the member for St. John's West disclose some pretty frightening figures as to the excessive borrowings of this Government during the past year. Borrowings far in excess of that estimates or indicated to the House, when we were called upon to vote, Supply last year. We also have had tabled in this House, a list of the Lieutenant Governor's Warrants.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we may be inclined to treat Lieutenant Governor's Warrants a bit too lightly. We may be inclined and have been inclined in the past to say, "well, Lieutenant Governor's Warrants, that is the sort of thing you find in almost any free country." Obviously, you do. But, Mr. Speaker, may I direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that there has been a gradual increase in these Lieutenant Governor's Warrants. Then suddenly in 1970 a rather serious escalation from 1969 - 1969, 1970, \$21,000,046. In this past year, \$43,347,218.

Now a Lieutenant Governor's Warrant, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we realize this or not, but certainly it does not hurt to be reminded of it. A Lieutenant Governor's Warrant is not a matter that Government are entitled to as of right. No government have the right to go to the

Mr. Hickman.

Lieutenant Governor and say, "here is a warrant, Your Honour, sign it." Because the basic principle is that the Government can only spend the money that this House votes it. But under the Revenue and Audit Act, in anticipation of certain unforeseen exigencies which may arise— I can think of them. I can think, for instance, this past year. The hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, he brings in his budget. His budget is based on the projected, say with long-term or short-term assistance; the projected requirements based on the then unemployment situation in the Province. It is very carefully worked out in anticipation of what the requirements will be. Well then, suddenly, the hon. the minister of his official find, as he found this year, that Newfoundland is in a state of serious unemployment, which he could not have anticipated, when his estimates came before the House.

MR. NEARY: It is not what we found.

MR. HICKMAN: Whether you found it or not, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker!

So, what happened? It has to be an open-ended vote. It has to be.

It is the same with health services. It is the same with homes for senior citizens. The same with bus transportation. These are open-ended votes. The hon. minister or an hon. Minister of the Crown can fall within the provision of the Revenue and Audit Act without too much difficulty.

But even then, Parliament has said to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation; you are not entitled to walk down to the Lieutenant Governor and say, "here is my warrant for short-term assistance for \$1,198,000" and say, "sign it." No! No! The hon. the minister or the Minister of Finance has to advise the Lieutenant Governor that (what is the wording) in his opinion the necessity is urgent and he must give reasons for his opinion.

He must say that grave damage to persons or to property or to the interests of the

Mr. Hickman

Crown or the public will occur or excessive additional expenditure will result from delaying the expenditure until the necessary legislative provision has been made by the Lieutenant Governor.

Now this is very easy, and very understandable, when you look at some of the Lieutenant Governor's Warrants. No difficulty at all for the hon. minister from Bell Island to put in his, and justify and advise the Lieutenant Governor that it is in the interest of the people and that grave damage would result, to persons without it. No trouble at all. No trouble at all.

But, Mr. Speaker, every Lieutenant Governor's Warrant demands of the minister the same information. Now let us take a look at some of the others.

MR. NEARY: Are you satisfied with that one?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes! No question about it. The same applies to Health. The same applies, to some extent, but not to the same extent, to the Department of Education. There projections can be a bit more realistic.

MR. NEARY: Do you think we can fight the upper class?

MR. HICKMAN: Of course! I have no doubt at all that in these particular items that the Minister can conscientiously and truthfully advise the Lieutenant Governor that grave damage will be caused to persons. But who is the minister?

MR. NEARY: Now you can go back to sleep again.

MR. HICKMAN: Good. We will call you after the election.

MR. CROSBIE: We will call you, after you wake up.

We did not know you were awake.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry....

MR. HICKMAN: Now let us take a look at some of the other Lieutenant Governor's Warrants. Expo buildings: \$1,711,418. Again Expc buildings, \$271,000. This brings a total of approximately \$2 million. Now remember,

Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Speaker, that \$2 million for Expo buildings is over and above the \$1.5 million paid out of the 1969-1970 Estimates. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that little if any work has been carried on these Expo buildings during the past fiscal year. I can tell you that with absolute certainty, that the amount of work that has been done on the Expo buildings in Grand Bank is infinitesimal. It is not enough for the contractor to warrant a progress payment. I have no doubt that the same may be true of the other two buildings.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is getting difficult to hear the tremendous conversation that is going on over there, lead by the hon. the Premier. We cannot hear the speaker.

MR. MURPHY: The Common Room...

MR. SPEAKER: I have spoken, when there has been a similar point of order taken before. I wish that hon. members, if they must confer, if they would do it quietly so that whoever is speaking can be heard throughout the Chamber and without interruptions.

MR. CROSBIE: There!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, is your ruling going to be followed or not?

Mr. Speaker, what this House is entitled to know and what a select committee would know is; who is the minister? What minister in writing advised the Lieutenant Governor that grave damage to persons or property or to the interest of the Crown or to the public, will occur, if you do not give us another \$2 million right now in Lieutenant Governor's Warrants for the Expo buildings? No minister can say that. Unless a minister says that, the Lieutenant Governor cannot issue the warrant. A select committee would be entitled to say to the minister; "let us see your written reasons." Is he going to say? The reason cannot be that there was \$2 million

Mr. Hickman.

worth of work done during the last fiscal year. That is not the reason, because it has not been done. If it is that the contractor needs the money before he does the work, that is not going to cause grave damage to persons or property or to the Crown.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. Is the hon. the Premier an ordinary member of this House or not? Is he going to observe the rule...

MR. SMALLWOOD : Shut up!

MR. CROSBIE: Is he going to observe the rule that no one is supposed to be talking while a member is speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already told hon. members that the rules of the House are that if anybody is carrying on a conversation with anybody else, he must do it in such a manner as not to be audible and disturb the person who is speaking, and otherwise the decorum of the House. I hope that all hon. members will regard that rule.

MR. MURPHY: If not, let us get them punished - the punishment to fit the crime.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member continue?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this House is entitled to know - poor fellow! Poor, poor fellow! This House is entitled to know, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister tell the Lieutenant Governor that grave damage would be caused to this Province, if \$2 million was not paid and, obviously, in advance, for the Expo building? This House is entitled and a select committee is entitled to insist that the minister come and explain this and satisfy them. Maybe he can. Maybe he can say that I have got such a warm spot in my heart for Lundrigans, Limited that I think that it is in the best interest of the Crown and in the public interest that they get their money now. But if he does, he is

Mr. Hickman.

putting the loose interpretation on what is possible, on the Revenue and Audit Act.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we see another item and, presumably, the minister again went to the Lieutenant Governor looking for his warrant and said that, unless you give me this money, in my opinion, because the necessity is urgent.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. ROWE (F.W.). I call Your Honour's attention to the fact that there is a very animated conversation taking place there right by the side of the hon. gentleman now speaking. This interferes, I think, to some degree with the audibility here. I wonder, if we could have them called to order please?

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. members raise their voices and liven them up a bit?

MR. HICKMAN: No! No! I would rather put you asleep. That is not very difficult.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see another item. This is a pretty sizeable item. It is an item of - there was a Lieutenant Governor's Warrant issued for \$27 million to Provincial Building. No Minister of the Crown could possibly go to the Lieutenant Governor and say that it is urgent or necessary or grave damage will be caused, if you do not give me \$27 million. Not only can he not say it, but even if he did, the Lieutenant Governor could not give him the warrant or should not. The reasons for it are: whatever monies are paid to Provincial Building, whatever monies are paid to Mr. Shaheen, are set forth in the Shaheen Bill, Bill eighty something or whatever. We heard it often enough last year. But there is \$27 million paid out on a Lieutenant Governor's Warrant. Where it has gone, it is my understanding that the total

Mr. Hickman.

cost of the Come-by-Chance proposal or project would be drawn down on a pari passu basis. That \$120 million was to be raised..

MR. CROSBIE: \$130 million.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, \$130 million was to be raised in the open market and \$30 million by Government, which is about one-fifth. So that if \$27 million was urgently required and was in the interest of the Crown, etc., then

MR. HICKMAN: We have to assume that the \$27 million constitutes one-fifth of the monies that have been drawn down and paid on the Come-by-Chance proposal. But anyone with half a brain going out to Come-by-Chance, if he can get down the closed road, the public road that is closed, if he can get down that road, he will see that there has not been twenty-seven cents worth of work done, not \$27 million. The work that was done before was paid out of the Interim Finance.

So, Mr. Speaker, does the Revenue and Audit Act mean anything? Does the responsibility that is imposed on the minister mean anything? Is he going to stand in this House and say, "I advised the Lieutenant Governor that \$27 million was urgently needed for John Shaheen, that it was in the public interest that he get it now. That it was in the public interest that we ignore the Law that was passed by the House of Assembly last year. That we forget the undertaking that the draw-down would rank *pari passu*. And that we would get a Lieutenant Governor's warrant for \$27 million."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what the hon. the member for St. John's North meant, when he talked, about last year, about the power of the purse. That is what he meant, when he said; "if we allow the power to shift to the executive," I think he used, his words, "that is how a dictatorship comes about."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. HICKMAN: Sure.

MR. CROSBIE: Well underway here.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there has been a breach of - let us call it the "Shaheen Act," the one that was adopted by the House last July, with respect to the \$27 million which represents the Province's advance.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that what the hon. gentleman said? Could he elaborate, because I remember the *pari passu* clause. I do not have the Act in front of me, but it says that nothing can be put in by the Province until all the

MR. ROBERTS: money is committed. I have not got the wording, but is the hon. gentleman alleging, there was a breach in - now whether or not it should have had been a special warrant, the hon. gentleman can make all the political speeches he wants, is he alleging there is a breach in the Application of the Law?

MR. HICKMAN: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I assume and I suspect that every other hon. member in this House assumes, that whatever draw-downs there were going to be for Mr. Shaheen, that the draw-downs would rank pari passu, that it was the fundamental principle. This was one that the hon. the Minister of Health stood on. We are not going to put our \$30 million in first. But, we have got \$27 million of it. What has happened the \$27 million? If the \$27 million has not been spent, Mr. Speaker, then how could a minister go and say, "I want a Lieutenant Governor's warrant, that is a matter of urgency, that the Province is in grave danger, there will be great damage to person and to property."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might wish to consider that the money is held by Provincial Building Company, Limited, which is a Company, shares of which are held by this Crown.

MR. HICKMAN: I know where the money is. Is it a Crown Corporation?

MR. ROBERTS: Provincial Building? Yes. The Directors are the hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Justice, myself, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, and the Minister of Community and Social Development.

MR. CROSBIE: How much is being paid to Procon?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: There has been a substantial payment to Procon.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is \$13 million or something. It is in the agreement that we tabled, the exact, and, I think, the draw-down schedules are in the agreements." They are not pari passu, but -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: There are conversations going on. The hon. member has the floor.

MR HICKMAN: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, is there anything could point up more clearly the absolute necessity for a select committee? Anything? By a simple little exchange between the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. the member for St John's West, we have now elicited a bit of information, that PROCON has received \$13 million of the Government's money. We do not know how much money has come out of the \$130 million, you know. But is the hon. Minister of Health going to say that any minister of the crown could give a written opinion to the Lieutenant Governor, and comply with the Revenue and Audit Act, and say we need a Lieutenant Governor's Warrant for \$27 million, or \$2 million for Expo buildings?

MR ROBERTS: Of course,subject to approval, Cabinet approval, the Lieutenant Governor signs the warrant.

MR HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we voted \$100. or \$1. I have forgotten which.

MR. ROBERTS: \$100.

MR. HICKMAN: One hundred dollars for Expo Buildings. We had already paid \$1.5 million 69-70. I cannot speak, I do not know what has happened in Grand Falls, and I do not know what has happened in Gander, except what, I believe, I read in the press there is very little activity on Expo Buildings this summer in Grand Falls or in Gander.

MR. ROBERTS: We will spur the hon. gentleman into another speech here.

MR. HARBOTT: What summer?

MR. HICKMAN: The summer that has just passed. But, I can say with absolute certainty, that there was no work on the Grand Bank Pavilion in the summer of 1970. As of Friday, before last, there were about three pieces of steel pointing majestically at the sky. Now is this House to accept the fact that the contractors are entitled to progress payments for this? Why could they not wait until the House opens and we vote it. If Government has entered into a binding contract for the construction of Expo Buildings, obviously, these contracts have to be honoured when the House votes the

MR. HICKMAN: money. But, the House has not voted the money. But, somebody, some minister went to the Lieutenant Government and said, "the security of the Province is in grave danger, grave damage will be caused unless Mr. Lumsden gets \$2 million." Now this is \$2 million plus \$1.5 million for that free gift. You know these gratuitous Czechoslovaks, who were so overwhelmed by the work that was in Gander the day that tragic crash that they were going to make this a free gift.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It had nothing to do whatsoever with it.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government pretended it did.

MR. HICKMAN: It certainly did. They certainly did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Ho! Ho! That is not so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ho! Ho! It is so.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot understand why they would want -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no, these are not my words, I cannot understand why the Czechoslovaks want to honour us this way. It is only our Newfoundlanders who do this all the time. But, for some reason they want to. These are not my words, you know. These are not my words. Two and one-half million dollars, and we have it, and the end is not in sight.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what the hon. the member for Bell Island thinks.

The Royal Trust Company agreement, on highways. Another special warrant, \$1,822,000. What is that for? Is it to renegotiate a contract that the Auditor General refers to in his accounts? Where the Province for no good reason says to a contractor; "we will up the interest rate four percent."

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: But, if this is an - I beg, did the hon. minister say, "a much cheaper interest rate?" He better read the Auditor General's Report.

MR. HICKMAN: It was six percent and seven and a quarter and it went to ten and a-half percent.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Three and a-half million Expo Buildings to date.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no, I am not talking about \$3.5 million. I am talking about the Auditor General's Report.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Let us just go back to that for a moment, and I will have a look at what the Auditor General said.

MR. ROBERTS: Go ahead, you have got until six o'clock.

MR. HICKMAN: Highways - 62. In April 1970 certain road building contracts which the Province has entered into in previous years at an interest rate of six percent and seven and one-eighth percent and with unpaid balances amounting to \$2,351,719 at 15 April, whereupon the request of the contractor, refinanced for a five year period at an interest rate of ten and a-half percent.

MR. ROBERTS: And we paid them off.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: That was the \$1,822,000 warrant.

MR. HICKMAN: Why do you accede, why does Government accede to the request of a contractor?

MR. ROBERTS: That is only what the Auditor General says.

MR. HICKMAN: It cost the Province \$44,702.

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now, would the hon. gentleman like what the Auditor General says? Would he like to put a question on the Order Paper and we will get him the rest of the information?

MR. HICKMAN: The question should go to the Auditor General, by a Select Committee.

MR. ROBERTS: God alone knows what he said.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, of course, it is. That is what a Select Committee is all about.

MR. ROBERTS: Nonsense.

MR. ROBERTS: Why not put a question on the Order Paper?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, I want to put it to the Auditor General, so should every other member of this House.

MR. ROBERTS: The Auditor General has got a telephone, ring him up.

MR. HICKMAN: That is silly.

MR. ROBERTS: Write him a letter, if you wish.

MR. HICKMAN: Now we are getting back to some of the foolish statements we used to hear before.

MR. ROBERTS: Ask the Auditor General, ask him. Telephone the Auditor General. He is quite capable of answering them.

MR. MURPHY: That is a good idea, telephone him.

MR. EARLE: Call a telephone and have a committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure there will be eighteen people from Spaniard's Bay with you.

MR. MURPHY: Ah! hooray for the Minister!

MR. HICKMAN: The Minister, obviously went to the Lieutenant-Governor and said that grave damage would be caused to the Province unless he would give him \$1,822,000 to execute never, never agreements with the Royal Trust, covering the cost of the building.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, to pay off.

MR. HICKMAN: A never, never agreement

MR. HICKMAN: Well, is that what it is, to pay off?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To pay off.

MR. HICKMAN: That is why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good! A glimmer!

MR. HICKMAN: MR. Speaker, is this proof positive as to why every parliament, except British Columbia and Newfoundland, has a standing committee on public accounts? Is it not proof positive, MR. Speaker, that one minute you have tears streaming down the cheeks of hon. members on the other side: "We will provide a clinic, if this House votes us the money." But then, Mr. Speaker, when this House says we want to know how

you spent that money, you have to drag it out of them. We are supposed to ask either questions or we are supposed to do it during estimate time. You know, it was a concept that somebody introduced a hundred years ago, and the gentleman says, if it was good enough one hundred years ago, it is good enough now.

MR ROBERTS: That is why we have committee on supply, and that is why we have the estimates, with detail, on and on and on. That is the whole point of it.

MR HICKMAN: Well, anyway, Mr. Speaker, the authorities on parliamentary government they seem to disagree with the hon. minister. The hon. member for St John's North, does not agree with the Minister of Health. The parliaments in the United Kingdom and Australia -

MR ROBERTS: In the United Kingdom every bill that comes in has closure on it and has a guillotine. Now what other examples do you want?

MR SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR HICKMAN: And the hon. member is not going to be diverted by talk about closure. Mr. Speaker, the issue that is before this House is a very simple one: Does this House control the purse or does it not? If it controls the purse, it is entitled to have all the details that it requests, not the details that the government deems appropriate, not the government that decides on the total amount of money that is to be spent. The government comes in and says; "we would like to spend "x" million dollars this year on education. We heartily recommend this to the House, we hope the House will vote us the necessary funds in order to do it, but having voted the funds, having said to the hon. the Minister of Education, you can have your \$130 million, we are entitled to say, anytime we so desire, the hon. Minister of Education told us exactly how you spent every cent, every nickel, and you cannot get that by putting questions on the Order Paper. We are entitled to say to the independent auditor; "you appear before a select committee of this House and you tell us why you have questioned the expenditures which you felt should not have been made, but they were made anyway. You tell us.

Maybe the explanation we get will be able to satisfy us. We are entitled to say to the Auditor General; "What recommendations have you made to ensure that there will be no further abuse of programmes, financial assistance, from the Departments of Fisheries?" If he can satisfy us, he satisfies the Province too, he satisfies the lending institutes. But when I hear people standing - one time it used to be the height of treachery to question the financial position of the Province. You were being most unpatriotic to even suggest that the Province or the Government were spending more money than they should. That patriotism kind of wore thin. If you look at it, Mr. Speaker, from a point of view of patriotism,

MR. HICKMAN:

the most unpatriotic thing that any hon. member could do would be to allow a continuance of a system that is peculiar to two Provinces which can only indicate to people who must be assured of the financial status of this Province that we leave something to be desired. If we have nothing to hide, if Government is satisfied that it can convince the people of Newfoundland and the lending institutions of Europe and North America that every cent that is voted is properly spent, if Government can convince, and I do not have the report in front of me but there is a report of the Economic Council of APEX that was recently circulated and it showed that the cost of services in Newfoundland, in the last four years, has escalated out of all proportion compared to the other three Atlantic Provinces. If we can be satisfied and if we can satisfy our people that these escalations were absolutely necessary, that the services could not have been provided and improved on at much less cost with more money to be spent in other social services, if we are satisfied that there is no problem there, then obviously no member of this House could vote against a resolution calling for the appointment of a select committee.

A select committee, Mr. Speaker, gives stability to the Province's financial position. It gives all the stability that people expect of elected representatives. Mr. Speaker, to me you know we have had, some people will say all you want to do is talk about money, money, money, money, money, you know, but this House has to get its information on public expenditures from New York. It has to wait or hon. members do, the House does not get it anyway but hon. members have to wait until they can get a copy of a prospectus issued out of New York. What does it say for this Province, when we have to express gratitude to the laws of the United States of America? The laws of the United States of America do more to force the Government of this Province to disclose financial information than our own laws do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman yield a moment? If he would now conclude his speech and if no other speeches were to come from the other side of the House and the motion were put, we will vote for it. Now is it

MR. SMALLWOOD:

a debate that is wanted or is the motion wanted to be carried? If he will do that now so that we can go home and eat.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will vote for the motion as the hon. gentleman is now moving it.

MR. HICKMAN: Right and will the hon. the Premier give an indication as to whether the select committee will report and be appointed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, it will be appointed right away.

MR. HICKMAN: With representatives from both parties?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, of course, certainly. Well, now the Speaker will, of course, name them and the Speaker will undoubtedly, in my opinion, I cannot speak for Mr. Speaker, but in my opinion he will appoint representatives from both sides of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour that the resolution carry say "Aye", contrary, "Nay". I declare the resolution carried.

MR. CURTIS: I would move, Mr. Speaker, that when the House rise that it rise on tomorrow, Thursday at 11 of the clock and the House do now adjourn.

On motion, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 11 o'clock, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.