



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 3**

**5th Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1971**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. F.W. ROWE: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this House we approved an amendment to the Schools Act, whereby the Federation of School Board Associations of Newfoundland and Labrador were given the right to be represented on the General Advisory Committee.

I am pleased to announce that, on the recommendations of the Federation of School Board Associations, the Government have appointed Mr. George C. Rowe, C.A., of Corner Brook to be the official representative of the association, and Mr. J. G. Fitzpatrick of St. John's to be the alternate to Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Rowe is President of the Integrated School Board Associations of Newfoundland and Labrador, and Mr. Fitzpatrick is the Executive Secretary of the Federation, which was created last year by a joint decision of the Integrated and the Roman Catholic Associations of School Boards in this Province.

The General Advisory Council is that body created by this Legislature with the right to advise the Minister of Education and the Government on all matters of education policy. It consists of representatives of the Government, of all the churches, of the universities, of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and now of the Federation of School Board Associations of Newfoundland and Labrador.

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. C. M. LANE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of the fishermen of Little Catalina. The prayer of the petition is that during the high tides and storms of January 16th. most of the fishing premises of that town were destroyed or damaged and the replacement is beyond the capability and means of the fishermen of that area.

While I know what I am to speak about is not a matter for the Provincial

MR. LANE: Government, but a joint operation, yet the prayer of the petition is that, in due of present day conditions and circumstances, the quality of fish and the holding of fish, the Government is requested to build a community stage in the town of Little Catalina.

There are quite a number of fishermen there, good fishermen, and it is impossible for them to replace the property which they have lost and which had over the years deteriorated too.

I know that the scheme that was inaugurated some years ago, between the Federal and Provincial Governments, community stage building has not been the success we had hoped it would be. But, still, I think, that something should be done for this very important fishing area, a summer fishing area mainly.

I would ask that the hon. Minister of Fisheries give some consideration to this proposition. I am sure he will. I would now ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss indeed if I did not rise to support this petition because Little Catalina is only a stone's throw, about seven minutes to be exact from Bonavista to Little Catalina, and because there are a large number of fishermen who depend solely on catching fish to support their families. I would indeed, as I said earlier, be very remiss if I did not rise to support this petition knowing the good people of Little Catalina like I do and I certainly support it.

On motion, petition received.

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by three hundred and thirty-one voters from Dildo in the district of Trinity South. The authenticity of this petition, I may add, has been assured by such men as the principal of the Goodland Elementary School, Harry Reid, Mr. Herbert J.A. Coffin, Rector of the Anglican Parish of New Harbour, Mr. Percy, the district school supervisor and Captain M. Senior of the Salvation Army.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that there is a line of cribbing along the beach which protects fishing property and the road going through the settlement of Dildo, which is 1300 feet long, and this wooden cribbing gets broken every year; through recurring expense, because of the high winds and ice along the beach. The petition is; they are asking that the wood cribbing be replaced by a concrete retaining wall and in this way they will eliminate any further expense for many, many, many years to come.

I strongly support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the Department to which it relates, and in this case the Department of Highways.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting this petition. I have a copy of a letter from that area referring to this particular dangerous piece of road where, as the hon. member has said, there is some cribbing along. I have seen pictures of the area where with high seas the water completely covers the road. I think there is some indication that the Highroads Department are talking of upgrading this particular section of road but, according to the people I was speaking with, unless

MR. MURPHY:

you get a concrete retaining wall, some 1300 feet long, there the Government is just wasting its money.

So I sincerely support the petition as presented by the hon. member for the district of Trinity South.

On motion, petition received.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Child Welfare Amendment Regulations, 1970. I would also like to table copies of the Regulations, amendment number two, of the Welfare Institutions Licensing Act. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to table the 1970 annual report of the Workman's Compensation Board.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure today in tabling the report for the Royal Commission on forestry. This is the second Royal Commission on forestry in this Province in fifteen years. It was headed by the former Deputy Minister of Forestry for Canada, Dr. L.Z. Rosseau. His colleagues

MR. CALLAHAN: On the commission were Dr. Richard McArdle, the former head of the United States Forest Service, and Mr. Hugh Hodgkins, recently retired vice-president of the Crown Zellerback Corporation. The secretary was Mr. T.A. Blanchard, who is now the Government's chief negotiator with public service employee groups.

The report contains various and far reaching recommendations, ranging from the fundamental question of effective public control of all the forest of this Province, to the establishment of a commercial forest corporation to be joint venture agency of the Government and private interests for the commercial management and utilization of forest lands and the redefinition of the role and the reorganization of the Newfoundland Forest Service as the chief public agency for recommending and enforcing forest policy, for planning, for research and for protection.

The Government Mr. Speaker, have already adopted some of the major recommendations of the Royal Commission, are studying still other recommendations and generally speaking consider that we have been provided with sound up-to-date advice by three of North America's foremost experts in the field of forest development, conservation and use. In tabling the report today, Mr. Speaker, I might say that a limited number of copies are available in the clerk's office, and that they are in photostatic form. The permanent issue of the report is in the hands of the printer, and will be made available to the House and to the public in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: Further presentation of reports:

Before we take up the next order, Notice of Motion, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we have in the galleries today, some twenty-five students, grade IX students from Booth Memorial, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Melvin Drover. I know that, as usual, this House is very happy to see them and will accord them a hearty welcome.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the appointment of the following; Dr. Rowe, Mr. Chalker, Dr. Frecker, Mr. Collins, Mr. Myrden, to constitute a committee under standing order no. 88, to prepare

a list of members to compose standing committees of the House, there named.

MR. SPEAKER: Further notice of motion:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, the motion of which I gave notice yesterday.

MR. CURTIS: No. 11

MR. SPEAKER: No. 11?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It is agreed that this committee be now named. The committee, under notice of motion of yesterday, if it is agreed, will be as follows; the hon. capt. Winsor, who is the member for Labrador North, Mr. Strickland who is the hon. member for Trinity South. Mr. Mahoney, the hon. member for Harbour Main, Mr. Canning, the hon. member for Placentia West. The hon. Mr. Roberts, Minister of Health. Mr. Collins, the hon. member for Gander, and Mr. Myrden the hon. member for St. Barbe South.

The motion is that these members whom I have just named be this committee, in accordance with the motion no. 11 on the Order Paper.

Those in favour "aye," Contrary "nay," Carried.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of yesterday, March 25th., I believe, there is a question asked by the hon. member for Burin, Question no. 80. What has been the pupil-teacher ratio for each of the past ten years in both elementary and high schools in Newfoundland? I have that information tabulated here. It is a considerable amount of statistical information. It would be of interest, perhaps, if I were to give the House orally just the first and the last year for the pupil-teacher ratio for 1960-1961, which is the first year. That year there were (can my hon. friend hear me now?) - I thought the House would like to have this part of the answer drawn to their attention.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to answer the question verbally, we would like to have the whole question answered. If the minister is not, then he should just table the answer to the question. Is the minister tabling his answer or not?

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, may I draw the attention of members to page 147 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, regarding the answering and asking of questions. On page 153, citation 181: "Questions must be answered briefly and distinctly and be limited to the necessary explanations, though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question." I think that answers the hon. members point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that citation does not answer my point of order at all. That citation says that if the questions are being answered verbally. That is the implication of the citation there. If a question is being answered by the tabling of the answer, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is an entirely different matter. The hon. minister is not answering his questions verbally. He said that it is voluminous, and he intends to table the document. Therefore, I submit to Your Honour that that is all the hon. minister says with respect to that question. If he is answering the question



Mr. Crosbie.

verbally, then the citation applies. So, I would submit to Your Honour that it does not clear the air at all, that citation.

MR. SPEAKER: If the argument presented by the hon. member for St. John's West is to apply, it means that a person just says, I table it and he passes it to the clerk and it is tabled. I think it is reasonable to expect that any hon. minister or any other member who is answering a question, may be allowed enough latitude to clarify it. It says that the answers should be brief and distinct. I do not think it is reasonable to expect that he cannot give an oral explanation of any part of the question for elucidation. I do not think that that would be fair to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is not attempting to give any explanation or clarification. He is just attempting to give part of the information that he is going to table. What the ratio was in 1961 as to what the ratio is in 1971? He is not attempting to clarify his answer at all.

MR. SPEAKER: I quite admit that it is not necessary, if a person is going to table a question to answer it. Other times, other members will insist what is the clarification. He is probably avoiding or anticipating an oral question or supplementary question in explanation of what he has already - Will the hon. member table his question or whatever explanation he can give, but make it brief?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I

March 26 1971. Tape 34 page 1.

I shall give the answer to this question orally. I would like to thank the hon. member for St. John's West, this is two days now, I think it is going to become a habit. This is two days now that he has taken it on himself to advise me and I presume he will be doing it for other members, as to how we should answer the questions. With due respect to Your Honour, I could inform the hon. member that I intend to do what I have been doing for this last twenty years and that is to answer questions in my own way without any help from the hon. gentleman.

1960-61 the ratio was 1 teacher to 29.86 pupils. Perhaps if my hon. friend would permit me I could change that 29.86 to call it 30. 1961-62 the ratio was 1 to 29.70; 1962-63 the ratio was 1 to 28.75; 1963-64 the ratio was 1 to 27.87; 1964-65 the ratio was 1 to 26.93; 1965-66 the ratio was 1 to 26.43; 1966-67 the ratio was 1 to 26.28; 1967-68 the ratio was 1 to 25.92; 1968-69 the ratio was 1 to 25.26; 1969-70 the ratio was 1 to 25.22; 1970-71 the ratio was 1 to 24.96. In other words the ratio is one teacher to fewer than twenty-five pupils on an average in the classrooms of Newfoundland on this day, twenty-sixth of March, 1971. Ten years ago it was 1 to 30 approximately. In case Mr. Speaker, any hon. member did not get a chance to copy down all these figures I will be glad to table them with, I might say, additional information as well. I am sure the House would be very happy to know that the trend has been so favourable to our boys and girls during the past ten years in Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. I wonder would the hon. the minister be prepared to table comparative figures for the cities of St. John's and Corner Brook as well, over the same period of time.

MR. ROWE: I would be glad Mr. Speaker, perhaps Mr. Speaker if I may make a suggestion to my hon. friend that he might put that on the Order Paper, so that I would know exactly what he wants, and I would be very happy to give him that information or for that matter any other relevant information on it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as a further supplementary, would the minister indicate

to the House, he has already admitted that this is an average figure for Newfoundland and we have just heard some remarks about St. John's and Corner Brook, how does this figure compare with the average school, bearing in mind lack of space etc. - the average school across the Province, places like Lewisporte and Glovertown and Botwood.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if you would put that on the Order Paper too, All I can say is that this is an average figure and we know that there are places in Newfoundland where there are classrooms where that average is not so favourable and there are others where it is even more favourable. In order to get 1 to 25, then there must be some that are 1 to more than 25 and others that are less than 1 to 25. If my hon. friend wants any specific figures, all he has to do is to put it on the Order Paper. No secret, We publish this every year, in the supplement to the annual report of the Department of Education. We publish it, There is a mass of figures there, it would take the average person two weeks to read even, not alone to digest, I would be very happy to get any information -

MR. ROWE: had any information of that kind. It is no secret. And I might say nothing that anybody need to be ashamed of.

HON. S.A. NEARY: (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND REHABILITATION): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to three questions on today's Order Paper. Question No. 187 asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. The answer to (1) is "yes." (2) "yes." (3) Mrs. Julia Howell, Sergeant Gerald Noseworthy, Constable Wayne Coffin, and Mr. James O'Leary.

I also have the answer, Mr. Speaker, to Question No. 185 on today's Order Paper asked by the same hon. gentleman. It is Question No. 185 and the answer is "no."

The answer to Question No. 175 on today's Order Paper -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Question No. 185, have any complaints been received by the minister in connection with employees of Atlific Newfoundland, Limited who operate the Holiday Inns Hotel? Specifically the one at St. John's?

MR. NEARY: I have already answered the question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no."

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister answered the question about Holiday Inns (Atlific Limited) there is no such company. On a technicality, should therefore be answered on that bases. Has there been any complaints from the operators of the Holiday Inn, the employees of the Holiday Inn at St. John's here?

MR. NEARY: The answer is "no," Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Fine.

MR. NEARY: The answer to Question No. 175 on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the hon. gentleman to another authority of Government in answer to part (1) and in answer to part (2).

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister saying that the minister does not know what the cost of these renovations

MR. CROSBIE: are or whether they are finished or not? And that this must be asked of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not what the costs are.

MR. CROSBIE: How clever the hon. the Premier is. How clever. If he were only as clever as giving two answers to questions in this House, and giving information it would be well appreciated. Does the minister not know whether these renovations are finished yet and what they cost?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. and learned friend should know by now that all the matters are undertaken by the Department of Public Works.

MR. CROSBIE: And whose budget do they show up in?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to Question No. 187: Would the minister be good enough to table the names or the answer to that question? Or would he be good enough to make them available to me?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have the names if the hon. gentleman would like to have a copy.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Public Works, in connection with Question No. 175. Have the renovations commenced by the Government at Exon House in St. John's, to prepare that building for use as a home and training centre for severely handicapped children, now being completed and, if so, on what date were they completed?

HON. J. CHALKER: (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS): No actually they are just about completed, Mr. Speaker, and as a matter of fact the question is on the Order Paper of yesterday, I believe, which is being prepared, and I will have the answer possibly on Monday.

HON. E. DAWE, (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question No. 3, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre, on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 25th. The list of municipalities in Newfoundland and Labrador, indicating to each the amount of the monthly water rates charged by them. Answer to Question No. 64 asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre - The Provincial Appeal Board, Mr. Leo Stead. The remuneration received is in accordance with those paid by other Government Boards, that is \$50.00 per meeting. The members receive \$35.00 per meeting. The other members of the Board

MR. DAWE: are Mr. Arch Frost, Mr. Walter Dalton, Mr. Richard S. Murphy, and Mr. Graham Martin.

Mr. Dalton and Mr. Martin who are civilian servants do not receive any remuneration in respect of their services rendered to the Appeal Board. And I would like to point out as well that we do hold meeting in the West, an area of the Province, and that no remuneration is received by the members of the board during their travelling time or any meeting are held after or to discuss any appeals that are received. They actually receive remuneration only for the day on which they are sitting to receive appeals.

MR. A. MURPHY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, did the hon. minister intimate that they travel at their own expense?

MR. DAWE: I said, they did not receive any remuneration for the time in travelling. Their travelling expenses are paid, but they do not receive any remuneration in the time going to Corner Brook or the time coming back. They do receive remuneration actually for the days they are sitting. The travelling expenses are paid.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, would the minister indicate approximately how many meetings would be held during the year?

MR. DAWE: Well this is a new Appeal Board which has just been recently set up and I understand they have had about three meetings in Corner Brook area and they do not have any meetings there until at least they had eight appeals to be heard, and that they meet from time to time or the time warrants within the City of St. John's and, while I am not quite familiar just exactly how many meeting have been held, I could get that information for you.

HON. E. WINSOR: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): \_\_\_\_\_ Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer asked by the hon. the member for Gander, appearing on today's Order Paper. Question No. 190. I would also like to answer the Question No. 191 asked by the same hon. gentleman and the answer to part (1) is "thirty-three," and part (2) The last of August 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: Thirty-three. Yes, that is right, but other officials of the department have travelled to Labrador, when it is necessary.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: On orders of the day I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Leader of the House, and the member of the Internal Economy Committee. On March 12th., Mr. Speaker, well before the House opened, I tabled 108 questions here, and despite the fact that two weeks and a day have passed since they were tabled, so far on the first two days of this session there are about twenty on the Order Paper. I know there are several hundreds of other questions have been tabled. Can anything be done to expedite the appearance of these on the Order Paper or to speed up the printers? What is the position?

HON. L. R. CURTIS: (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it any questions asked before the House is opened should not be on the Order Paper at all. I mean the Notice of Questions are suppose to be filed during the session of the House. There were a lot of questions filed before the House opened. I do not think they are properly asked.

MR. A. MURPHY: We co-operate with the business of the House like we always do, giving them a chance to get the questions out.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, the House has now been opened since Monday, March 22nd., these questions have been available since then. What is there to prevent them from being on the Order Paper? What is the problem?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to do with the Order Paper, I do not know who prepares it.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the Internal Economy Committee.

MR. CURTIS: No, it does not.

MR. CROSBIE: Does not the Internal Economy Committee have to do with the affairs of this House of Assembly and how its business is proceeded with? I cannot ask a question to the Speaker, I can ask -

MR. CURTIS: I think it is the clerk. The Internal Economy, we have nothing to do with this in Internal Economy I think it is the clerk's office. Whoever prepares this we do not see it.

MR. CROSBIE: You take no responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Speaker does not want to be drawn into any debate and he will not be drawn into any debate but for the purpose of clarification, the questions are cleared through the office of the clerk. The Speaker sees all the questions before they go to the printer and everything that can be done and everything that should have been done has been done to expedite the printing of the questions on the Order Paper. The clerk cannot answer for himself here in the House but, just to clear this matter up for the benefit of all members of the House, there has been nothing left undone to speed up the printing of all the questions that have been received to date and I do not know how many they have numbered so far but I think it must be somewhere in the vicinity of 400. A great portion of them are on the Order Paper and, of course, the printer himself has something to say about how many he can conveniently put on an Order Paper or what his facilities are for printing these.

I just give that explanation, without being drawn into the debate. I think it is necessary.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on that, it is a pity we cannot get the same gentleman who prepared the 700 questions for the Premier in three days that he mentioned today on his program.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the acting Minister of Labour: Would he inform the House as to when we might expect to



MR. HICKEY:

have the report of the Royal Commission on Labour tabled?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Justice. Could he inform the House whether the report into the affairs of the Town Council of Bay Roberts has been received yet and also inform the House whether or not their report together with the evidence correlated at the hearings will be published?

MR. CURTIS: That report, Mr. Speaker, will be made to the Department of Provincial Affairs and not to Justice.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point, Mr. Speaker, the report is made under the Public Inquiries Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice. If the Minister of Justice is not going to answer the question I would like to direct one to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The question I would like to ask him is; has the report into the taxation system of the city of St. John's been filed yet and, if not, when does the Minister expect it to be filed?

MR. DAWE: The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is no, and we expect it momentarily.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, can that hon. Minister tell the House whether the Adams report, on the Commission of Inquiry into the affairs or otherwise of the town of Bay Roberts, has that been received yet?

MR. DAWE: The Adams report has not been received by my department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Has it been received by anyone in the Government to the Minister's knowledge?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the report has not been received.

MR. CROSBIE: Is it expected momentarily?

MR. MARSHALL: I might ask the hon. the Premier, since he is giving the information. Could he tell us when the report is expected?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MARSHALL: Will he tell us when the report is expected, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that last question?

MR. MARSHALL: Will he tell us when the report is expected?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not know.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! At the last sitting we read the Resolution and we will now deal with the schedule in the Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we start with the schedule. Is the procedure that we are going through the schedule item by item and then Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The procedure we follow is to read the Resolution, go through the schedule item by item and the clauses of the Bill item by item and then pass the Resolution.

Schedule: Head of expenditure (1) Consolidated Fund Services \$45,000.

MR. CROSBIE: This item is on the Consolidated Fund Services for which last year, according to the estimates that were given to the House last year on current account, there will be an expenditure of \$35,387,300., on capital account \$11,525,900. The Consolidated Fund Services, Mr. Chairman, deals with the debt repayment, the interest and principal repayment, the money that Government has borrowed in previous years. Now that we are on Interim Supply and the Government is asking for the House to vote this money without having any particulars of the expenditure for next year, I believe that this House is due an explanation from the Minister of Finance on what the borrowing of the Government has been this year and how that will affect payment under Consolidated Fund Services in the year 1971-72.

Mr. Chairman, in the budget speech last year it was reported to this House that borrowing for the year just ending, that will end in a few days time, would amount to altogether \$56,243,000. General borrowings on the bond market were to be \$29,415,000; \$15, million was to come from the Canada Pension Plan, \$11,266,000. from DREE loans, \$561,000. from CMHC loans so that the total borrowing of the Province for the financial year that ends next week, we were told by the Minister of Finance last year, would be \$56. million of which only \$29.5 million would be required to be borrowed by way

MR. CROSBIE:

of debentures on the open money markets of the world.

In case the hon. Minister of Finance has forgotten, he states that on page twenty-six. The Budget Speech was delivered by the hon. the Premier last year, Mr. Chairman, so it had unusual authority, and on page twenty-six it was said; "The remainder of \$29.5 million dollars will be obtained by the sale of debentures on the financial market." Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the actual position? How much are we going to need under Consolidated Fund Services this year? We understand, Mr. Chairman, from newspaper articles and from prospectus file, this is where we get our information on the financial affairs of this Province, Mr. Chairman, not in this House, not from this Government, no. We have to get it from newspapers or we get it when the Government is forced by law to give us the information when they are out to borrow money. So our information to date comes from the prospectus for an issue of \$25. million dollars worth of bonds in the United States, March 15th of this year, and it is now in the process of selling these bonds in the general market down in the United States.

According to the information in this prospectus, Mr. Chairman, the Government did not borrow simply \$56,243,000. last year. Instead it borrowed approximately \$125.1 million dollars, which to me is twice the amount

MR. CROSBIE: As twice the amount that the Government estimated last year in the Budget Speech, it was going to borrow. Twice the amount. Rather than \$29,415,000. in debentures as the hon. the Premier said in his Budget Speech rather than that. - now the hon. the Premier is not an accurate forecaster in any event, but for him to be wrong by so much. In actual fact, the Government borrowed this year on the bond market in debentures, \$97.5 million. \$97.5 million Mr. Chairman, not \$29.5 million, and unless there is something wrong with my arithmetic, twenty-nine from ninety-seven, could be seventy - five million.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Sixty-eight.

MR. CROSBIE: What?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sixty-eight.

MR. CROSBIE: Sixty-eight, I am glad that I have a mathematician here. Sixty-eight million dollars out. In other words Mr. Chairman, we borrowed three times as much on the bond market this present year, as the minister of Finance, as the hon. the Premier told this House just a few short months ago in April I think, March or April of '70, that we were going to borrow.

Now Mr. Chairman, when the Government now comes to this House of Assembly and asks us to vote blindly, without any details, without telling us what the Government spent last year, when it asks us to vote them another \$100 million. I remember Mr. Howe said once in the Federal Parliament, "what is a million?" Well this is a Government that says what is \$100 million? It wants \$100 million from this House without any explanation of it - any details.

When that Government, Mr. Chairman, does that, we expect some explanation of why the Government in 1970 - 71, borrowed \$125 million, when they told this House eight months ago that they were going to borrow \$56 million. What was all this money needed for? What was it all used on? Where are the warrants? - The Lieutenant Governor's warrants are not placed on the table of the House for us to see what it was spent on. There were two issues in the last twelve months Mr. Chairman, of \$15 million each on the Canadian market. That is a total of \$30 million. There is a loan on the U.K. market for \$22.5 million. There was a loan in Euro dollar bonds, February 4, 1971, \$20 million. There is a

present loan in New York March 15, 1971 for \$25 million. \$97.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, on page 26 of the Budget Speech last year, we were told that the figures were given for the deficit on capital accounts. The complete deficit for last year, the year we are in now that ends next week, the complete deficit would have been according to those figures would be somewhere in the vicinity of fifty or sixty million dollars, if those figures were right. When we look at the prospectus Mr. Chairman, the prospectus of Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes (that is a name by the way, not a condition) and A.E.Aimes & Co. . . , when we look at their prospectus using figures supplied them by the Government of Newfoundland, the Deputy Minister of Finance.

Page 23, budget estimates 1971 for the Government of Newfoundland. Deficit - deficit, \$103, 206, 000. That is what this prospectus says. This prospectus goes to every person who might be interested in buying those bonds in the United States. It has to comply with the requirements of the securities and exchange condition. They are very rigid down there, so the prospectus has to give certain facts. It has to give the truth. Here is where the people of Newfoundland find that their Government this year did not have a deficit of just \$50 million or \$60 million, the ordinary old deficit of this Government. No, it had a deficit in one year that totalled more than all the money that the Province of Newfoundland owed in '49, before we went into Confederation. The Island of Newfoundland then had a total owed of \$100 million, and everyone thought it was a staggering burden. This Government has a deficit in the financial year 1970-71 alone, if this prospectus is to be believed, of \$103,206,000.

It has revenues on capital account up to \$48 million, I will just use the round figures. It has expenditures and capital accounts of \$151 million. There is something peculiar there. As I look at the estimates, the estimates that this House passed last year, that the Government told us were accurate last year, I look at the official estimates, that is the Red Book for approval by the legislature, the Blue Book will not differ much. The total capital expenditure given in the estimates \$95 million. \$95 million. I look at the Hornblower, Weeks - Hemphill, Noyes and A.E.Aimes Co. prospectus and it is given

as \$151 million. According to that, the Government spent \$50 million more in capital accounts last year than were in the estimates, producing a deficit in capital accounts of \$103 million.

There is an anticipated surplus shown on the current account which if my guess is correct will turn into a deficit when the audit is done of \$97,000. giving an overall deficit of \$103 million - \$103,120,000 or \$103,130,000

What is the explanation of all this, Mr. Chairman? Would you not expect that when these alarming figures appear apparent that the Government would give this House some information about all this before it asks us to vote \$100 million this year? What is the Government doing? Why was the Budget Speech forecast so far out? Why is it, that instead of borrowing \$29.5 million in debentures the Government borrowed \$97.5 million? Why is it that instead of a total borrowing of (I do not know what it added up to, fifty or sixty million) the total borrowing has been at least \$125 million? Why is it that our deficit this year, according to the forecast now of the Department of Finance, because the information here is given to these people by the Department of Finance, why is it that our deficit in this one year alone is \$103 million? Does not anybody get worried or alarmed by that? Is the Government not at all worried or concerned about it?

Look, here is the for the years since '56. 1966, deficit in capital accounts \$27 million. (This is round figures) 1967, \$76 million. 1968, \$102 million. Now those two years were the result of extravaganza during the earlier election campaigns. By the way, this is the tight money period. She was tight during those year, the Government would have us believe. You could not borrow money during those years it was so tight, the money was.

Mr. Crosbie.

\$27 million in 1966; \$76 million in 1967; \$102 million in 1968, the deficit; \$63 million in 1969; subject to audit in 1970, \$56 million; budget estimate for 1971, a bumper year. No wonder the Premier went to the seal fishery. He has a bumper deficit - \$103,206,000 - no wonder, no wonder the Government asked the House to vote them now \$100 million in Interim Supply, without so much as a by your leave or blink your eye. What is \$100 million, when you can have a \$100 million deficit now in a year?

The Budget Speech (I will get the date of it. I have the date of it here) last year's Budget Speech - they have copies of this in the Department of Finance. So anybody who wants to see what our financial condition is and writes in for this Budget Speech will get a lovely book. There are some wonderful photographs in it. He will not get much information on our financial prospects. He will not get much information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I would like to call the attention of the visitors to the fact that in the House of Assembly visitors are not supposed to make their presence known by laughter or by applause or in anyway. Carry on please.

MR. CROSBIE: You will not get too much information on our financial condition, but you will get a lot of fine pictures. On page seventeen a picture of the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, signing the DREE agreement. What has that got to do with the budget, I wonder? On page fourteen a picture of the Newfoundland courts - three Newfoundland courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just like to say something. Could we stick a little more closely to the item under discussion now. This is not really the Budget Speech. The same degree of latitude as would be allowed in discussing the budget is not really permitted at this time. While the hon member has been relevant for a good deal of his speech, some of it is getting a little bit on the border line.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I will observe your caution. I was just looking at the new Minister of Finance.. Mr. Chairman, this is really a serious subject, you know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the whiskers they are laughing at.

MR. CROSBIE: That is good. I want that noted gentlemen of the press. Note the whiskers, gentlemen of the press. Do not note the \$56 million or the \$103 million deficit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member have anything further to say on the topic before the committee.

MR. CROSBIE: I am just getting started. I have not said a thing yet. That is a \$103 million deficit. It is right on this item, consolidated fund services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Ah! now we have done it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the next time there is a laugh from the gallery, I am going to ask to have the galleries cleared. Everyone out! Visitors are allowed in the galleries to listen and not to talk, laugh or wave or make themselves heard or seen. "Seen but not heard."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am on a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: The Chairman of this Committee..

MR. SMALLWOOD: One point of order at a time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: It is for the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Chairman ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Will the hon. member for St. John's West please be seated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say again, Mr. Chairman, the next time there is any laughing from the gallery, I will cry, "strangers" which means that Your Honour will have no choice but to clear the galleries. The bullying will come from the floor, not from the galleries.



MR. CROSBIE: It will come from us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I will not allow it.

MR. CROSBIE: It will not come from us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will not allow it. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to get away with bullying.

MR. CROSBIE: Bully Boy! Bully Boy!

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bully Boy will not do any bullying here. Mr. Chairman, here is the point of order. The Budget has not yet been brought down.

MR. CROSBIE: Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The estimates have not yet been brought down. They will be brought down. They must be, by law. When they are brought down, complete and thorough-going explanations of the finances of the Province are given, because they must be. That is the law. Questions, innumerable may be asked, and they must be answered. We are not yet ready with the budget. We are not yet ready with the estimates. The year ends in a day or two, a few days from now. We ask this House, first this committee, then the House, to grant us Interim Supply, something on account, an advance. That is all. We are not required to give the estimates today. We are not required to give the budget today. We are not doing it. We are not required to do it. A debate on the budget cannot take place today, because the budget is not before the committee, nor are the estimates before the committee. There is merely a request for Interim Supply. Now this could be put in one lump sum. We could come to the House, the committee, and we could ask for \$99,780,000 and that and no more, just that amount, an interim amount, an advance on account. We could do that. Instead of which, we have divided it into twenty separate headings, twenty separate items. Under the heading of Consolidated Fund Services, \$45,000, I submit to Your Honour that it is entirely out of order for a general debate on the public debt to take place now, on the accounts of the year just about to end, even the full accounts of the year just about to begin. The item before Your Honour is \$45,000.

the rule of relevancy requires that that be debated. The debate on things in general took place before the House went into Committee. But that debate ended. Now it is starting all over again, I say improperly and unconstitutionally. I ask Your Honour so to rule.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on a point of order. It is the most important one that Your Honour will have to decide in his career in this House because what it amounts to is this: That the Hon. the Premier is submitting to you, as Chairman of this Committee, that a Government can ask for \$100 million in interim supply, from the House of Assembly or a Parliament, and give no explanation as to what that money is to be used for.

Now Mr. Speaker, I refer first to Beauchesne page 198, "it is one of the old standing principles of our constitution that the House of Commons should control the finances of the country. That is the right privilege and duties of the House. It has been achieved by means of struggle lasting through centuries, beginning from the fourteenth century down to the seventeenth century, when it was fully confirmed and since then it has never been disputed, except in twentieth century Newfoundland. That is on page 198. Same page, the bottom of the page discusses going into Supply or Ways and Means, "...when such motion is proposed it shall be permissible to discuss any public matter within the powers of the Federal Parliament or to ask for the redress of any grievance." Page 201. "The whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way when the committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the estimates of that department," which reads as follows: "General Administration." Here Mr. Chairman we are discussing a vote for a whole department, not just a heading, a vote for a whole department, when that amount is before this Committee we can discuss I submit, any item of expenditure in the Estimates of that Department of the Government. Page 202: "Supplementary Estimates." Now Supplementary Estimates are estimates the money. The Government spent more money this year than was authorized; they had to come in and get approval. Interim Supply, the Government asked for money for next year before

it gives the House any estimates at all to look at," Supplementary Estimates, when treated as customary and as a matter of course, instead of being restricted to occasion of unforeseen contingencies, do more to destroy effectual parliamentary control than any other indirect methods that could be devised." I could go on and on Mr. Chairman, we are now in Committee of Supply when the people of the Province through their elected representatives, this House, have a chance to see what their money is to be spent on and to discuss every department of Government. Mr. Chairman, the Government could have had a budget speech by now. We are not responsible for the fact that the Government was not ready with their budget speech nor their estimates when they should have been. This is what we are discussing Mr. Chairman, the estimates for next year. It is the custom -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, I think I have heard enough to let the Committee know what -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I have heard enough to make up my mind - the point to which the hon. member referred, discussion of grievances and so on, it is quite correct that on an application for money members have that right, but that has to be done in the House not in Committee and it has to be done on the occasion of the Resolution. Ordinarily, Supplementary Supply goes through - an Interim Supply goes through with very little debate because hon. members know that the occasion for a full debate on the financial affairs of the government is on the occasion of the Budget Speech which must, as a matter of fact, come before the House at least once in every year. The usual routine is that hon. members reserve their criticism of government policy to the budget debate. Otherwise they would only simply be repeating themselves in the same session. In the present case, as I see it, the first heading here, Consolidated Fund Services, is a heading which is rather wider than the other, which are more definitive. What the Chairman had intended to do was to allow members to address themselves

to Consolidated Funds Services in slightly wider manner than would be on the other item.

Hon. members should be strictly relevant to the item there, and I think the hon. member for St. John's West could continue and bear in mind that he must be relevant to the item, and at the moment we are discussing Consolidated Fund Services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, when all these resolutions were brought in, we had the chance to debate either on the Resolution or on the Bill itself. We get one opportunity to debate fully these gifts and I will not use the word gifts - they are gifts in a sense - to discuss the thing thoroughly we can do it either on the Resolution stage or on the Bill stage and we elected to debate it. I think we should be given full opportunity to debate it on -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was introduced here yesterday and that debate concluded.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if I can continue, I do not think the Premier has the floor. Yesterday we debated the principle as to whether there should be Interim Supply at all and we reserved our remarks for today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we still on my ruling or are we on - I have given the hon. member for St. John's West an indication that he should proceed under Item 1 Consolidated Fund Services.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what I propose to do Mr. Chairman. Now Consolidated Fund Services is the amount the Government has to pay out in interest and principal repayments on the money that is borrowed. It has borrowed \$103 million as far as we know, may be more, no, \$125 million, this year. It may be more. It has borrowed \$97.5 million in debentures, does that mean Mr. Chairman if we take an average interest rate of eight to nine per cent during this past year that the people of Newfoundland have an additional burden placed on them in the year coming up of \$9 million in interest payments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order Mr. Chairman. We are debating \$45,000 which is not the interest or the principal or the sinking fund on \$100 million or ten

March 26 1971 Tape 34 page 4.

hundred million. It is an amount of \$45,000 now, strict relevancy requires that we debate the \$45,000. The amount of interest to be paid and the amount of the sinking fund to be paid on the public debt must be debated when the estimates are brought before the House and the estimates will not be for \$45,000 but almost as many million. That will surely be the time to debate the public debt and the servicing of the public debt. This is merely an amount of \$45,000. Merely \$45,000. Under that heading \$45,000 and clearly this is not the interest on the public debt clearly this is not the sinking fund clearly that will be debated when the figures are brought down here in the estimates and the budget. That is the time to debate it. You cannot debate what is not here. What is here is \$45,000 not \$45 million. Not the interest on the public debt, not the servicing of the public debt, not the sinking fund, not the retirement of the debt merely \$45,000. But the full debate must take place on the public debt on the interest on the public debt on the retirement of the public debt on the sinking fund of the public debt, all that must be debated when the estimates are brought down and the budget is brought down. These are not yet brought down, how then can they be debated?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are debating an item under Consolidated Fund Services. We will be debating, shortly, legislative services, Finance and so on. The hon. the Premier says that all we can debate is the \$45,000 or that when we come to Finance, all we can debate is \$2,682,000. To state it, is to see how ridiculous and juvenile the argument is. This is a block vote for a department of Government. When we come to Finance, we can discuss under that block vote, in my submission Mr. Chairman, anything that the Department of Finance does. It will use that money in the next two or three months...

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not true. That is not true.

MR. CROSBIE: It will use that money during the next two or three months of this year for all of its various activities. It will use it to pay the salaries of its employees. It will use it to pay the cost of bond issues, lawyers for bond issues, all kinds of purposes. It will use it to pay teachers, to pay the salaries of the Civil Servants to operate the Government. We have the right, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to debate every aspect of the Government service under those departmental headings...

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can have the budget debate now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can now have the budget debate?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, we can. We can.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can have the budget debate now today.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, will you keep the hon. the Premier in order or do I just shout him? Now, continuing with my answer to this so-called point of order: The budget, the Government says, is not brought down. That is not the fault of the members of this House. That is a fault of the Government. The Government have not presented us with the estimates of expenditure for next year, as is done in the Canadian Parliament before Interim Supply is asked for. That is not the fault of the members of this House. We cannot be expected, Mr. Chairman, to vote this..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member now, who is presenting his point of order, is really continuing his speech. I think the ruling of the Chair has been quite clear on this. That is that the general policy of the Government is not, at the moment, a subject for debate. The subject for debate, at the moment, is whether or not this House will vote to the Government or to the Queen, I suppose, will vote the sum \$45,000 under the heading Consolidated Fund Services. All debate must be limited to Consolidated Fund Services and not to general policies of the Government. As I have explained, that is dealt with at another time. At the present time, we are dealing with Item (1) Consolidated Fund Services, \$45,000 and members should confine their debate to that.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, possibly one way to solve this matter is to call back the Speaker. As I recall it yesterday, before debate took place on this Resolution, members of the House were told that they need not have a full-scale debate on the Resolution; that plenty of latitude would be given when the schedule would be debated." Now we are told the opposite. So, I would suggest that if this is going to continue, then this is nothing short of closure. Let us bring back the Speaker and have him give a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member for St. John's West please continue under Heading (1).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking of Heading (1) Consolidated Fund Services. The amount is \$45,000. The total amount voted last year in current account was \$11,525,000. This, Mr. Chairman, is a vote for the year 1971-1972 for which we have been given no explanation, not one word of explanation as to what the \$45,000 - oh! the hon. minister is quite clever, but when the hon. the Chairman called the item, the hon. the minister waited for it to be passed without offering a word of explanation. The hon. gentleman got up to prevent a vote on that item immediately. So far, Mr. Chairman, no information.

Mr. Crosbie.

Now this deals with borrowing. I have addressed myself, Mr. Chairman, to the question of borrowing, because under the Consolidated Fund Services, we expend monies to be paid for interest. Last year that came to a total of about \$52 million, Mr. Chairman. It was \$37 million with respect to interest and \$13 million with respect to sinking fund payments or \$50 million.

MR. CALLAHAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Another point of order.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the same situation the committee got into a year ago. Your Honour's ruling had been the same as the ruling a year ago. We are not debating the budget. We are not debating borrowing. We are supposed to be debating the amount that is shown, and the explanation is readily available. I submit to you, Your Honour, that in keeping with your ruling of a year ago, your ruling of a few minutes ago, that we should not continue on this course, if I am given the opportunity to do so, the explanation, which I assured the House yesterday could be given - as Mr Speaker indicated then there should not be wide-ranging debate but that there would be opportunity to get information. That information is, in fact, available.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, is the information available from the hon. minister on just what the Government borrowed this year? Why the Government have a deficit of \$103 million, when \$50 million or \$60 million...? Because, Mr. Chairman, the Government want this House to vote \$100 million for next year, without a word of explanation of the financial mess they got us into in the present year.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not the question.

MR. CROSBIE: And they want to harass with points of order to prevent this information from coming out.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not the question.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think the hon. minister offers an explanation for the heading. I do not know whether the hon. member for St. John's West would like to give him a chance to...?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): What right has this hon. gentleman got to say that he is asked and this committee are asked and the House is asked to vote \$100 million, (I take it by the \$100 million, he means \$99,780,000) without a word of explanation. These are his words, "without a word of explanation." How does the hon. gentleman know that? We are on Heading (1). Under Heading(VI), this committee are asked to vote for the largest, single amount there, \$27 million, approximately. It is on education. I am speaking on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I want this point of privilege ruled on by Your Honour. I do not want any interruptions from the hon. Leader of the Opposition or anyone else on this point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I really do not think there is a point of privilege there. Would the hon. the member continue with his explanation?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Chairman, I submit, in all respect, Your Honour has not heard the point I wish to make. The hon. member for St. John's West has accused this side of the House, the Government, specifically, of not offering a word of explanation. These were his words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please!

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Under Item (VI), I have not had a chance to utter a word of explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Well utter again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It is not out of order for an hon. member to say that he has not got sufficient information or the information is not being offered. Please carry on.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the amount \$45,000, under Item (1), the amount has nothing whatever to do with items that have been referred to. It refers, the item in the schedule refers to debt management expenses. It is broken down

Mr. Callahan

as to legal fees, bank charges, commissions on Treasury Bills and Crown corporations for a total of \$45,000. This, of course and this is the point, Mr. Chairman, it is quite aside from statutory payments already covered by legislation and from amounts that will be included in the voted estimates.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we have great elucidation with that explanation. The vote is \$45,000 for debt management expenses. Mr. Chairman, I am directing myself to the managing of the debt and the expenses of it. These expenses are many and tragic. This is debt management expenses. In other words, this is money..

MR. CALLAHAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Another point of order. Do not let any information out if you can help it.

MR. CALLAHAN: These expenses, Mr. Chairman, these items as the hon. gentleman said are related. Yes, but related to the extent of \$45,000 as shown in the schedule and with no reference to anything else, particularly the items I have mentioned: Statutory payments, and amounts in the voted estimates. I ask Your Honour so to rule.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this is an item being voted for debt management. Now whether it is \$1.00 or \$45,000 or \$45 million, when the Government asks the House of Assembly to approve a vote for debt management, members of the House can discuss debt management. They can ask what the costs are going to be for the whole year, etc. There are a number of questions and that is what I am going to come to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the minister is asking for \$45,000 for debt management for the first several months of this year. I, therefore, ask the Minister of Finance to answer a few questions for me on what it costs him in debt management last year, the year that's going to end Wednesday. The Government borrowed

MR. CROSBIE: ■ record of \$125 million. What were the total expenses of a minister in his department for the Financial Year that ends next Wednesday on Debt Management? Obviously, Mr. Chairman, with bond issues of \$15 million, \$15 million, \$22.5 million, \$20 million in Euro dollars bonds, \$25 million on the American market, Canada Pension Plan \$15.9 million, Regional Economic Expansion and the rest of it, there have to be considerable expenses in Debt Management. Underwriters had to be paid, the cost of prospectus had to be paid. There are prospectus here in others. Lawyers had to be paid. We notice there are lawyers here giving opinions in this prospective.

When a Province borrows \$97.5 million from a bond market, there is considerable expenses in debt management. So, we would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what did it cost the Government this year for Debt Management a year of a record sum, a sum in excess of what this whole country owed in 1949? What did it cost in Debt Management in expenses this year? What does the Government prophesy it is going to cost the Government next year for Debt Management expenses? How many bond issues does the minister figure we are going to have next year? How much does the minister figure we are going to have to borrow next year? Is it \$200 million? Or just \$150 million? If so, what will the Debt Management expenses be? These are questions that arise under the Debt Management.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Another point of order, ah!

MR. SMALLWOOD: If this is continued will it be permitted again in this present session when the budget is brought down?

MR. CROSBIE: No, not if you can help it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we have a debate now on the Public Debt, if we have a debate now in this present session, on the Public Debt, the interest on the Debt, the sinking fund on the debt, and all the items of the Public Service, if we have a debate now, is it permissible to have a debate later in this same session, in the one session? May the same thing be debated twice in

MR. SMALLWOOD: the same session? Is not this merely a request of the Government pending the bringing down of the estimates and the budget when there will be a thorough-going debate that may last two or three weeks? Pending that, until that does come, and all the information will be brought before the House, and the House knows it. It is provided in Law that the budget must be brought down, that the estimates must be brought down for a whole year, that is necessary. That is unavoidable, that has got to be done. And, when it is done, the debate is far-ranging and may go on for several weeks.

Now, we know that to be so, and has it not been ruled a thousand times by Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman, in this House and other houses, has it not been ruled a thousand times that when the House knows that a matter is to come before the House later in the same session, when it knows that, it may not debate the matter until then.

Now there is a slight difference only here, we are asking for \$100 million on account, I hope that your Honour will agree. I hope that your Honour will see that there cannot be a debate twice on the same matter. My view is that the debate can last a day, or a week, or a month. But it is one debate, it starts and it ends. And in between the start and the end there may be any period of time, but that is one debate. When that debate takes place there cannot be another debate in the same session. Now there is no rule in the British Parliamentary System more clear than that. You cannot debate the same thing twice.

Now are we going to debate the Public Debts, now in this present debate? If so, will Your Honour rule it out of order, when the budget is brought down? I do not want Your Honour to rule it out of order, I want it to be debated with the most ample thoroughness, when the budget is brought down, and the estimates. But, this is not the budget, this is not the estimates, this is merely a request by the Government for enough money to keep going with, to pay the public expenses until the House has an opportunity to

MR. SMALLWOOD: consider the estimates, consider the budget and vote the money for the year. It is just something on account. Now something on account I hope does not allow a full-dressed debate, and this is what we are having.

We are having a full-dressed debate, no different from what the ordinary debate is on estimates and on the budget. This is a combined Budget Speech Debate and Estimates Debate. It is a combination of the two and I hold, Mr. Chairman, that it is entirely out of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I think it has got to be brought forcefully to the attention of the House that this is not a usual Supply Bill. The House has been asked to vote approximately one-quarter of the known or anticipated expenditure of last year. The remarks of the hon. the Premier, I would submit, have no validity whatsoever on its point of order. What really he wants us to do is, they have got the authority now to borrow in secret Cabinet session, now they want to spend it in complete secret Cabinet session and cut out the traditional rights of the Legislature of this Province to pass on \$100 million.

A \$100 million, yes, it does not surprise me that, the Premier of this Province can get up in this House and in effect ask us to give him \$100 million for the next two or three months, so that he and his Government can play around with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have to correct a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman, the amount that we are asking for in Interim Supply now is almost precisely the same proportion as we asked for a year ago. Almost exactly the same proportion. Almost exactly the same proportion.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on this point of order. This is quite a serious point. The hon. the Premier has put forward the position to Your Honour the Chairman, one never put forward before by a parliamentarian that I ever heard of, that if a Government brings in an Interim Supply Bill or the Government brings in a supplementary Supply Bill that the members of the

MR. CROSBIE: House are suppose to sit mum. They are not to speak on those Bills when the Government asks for Supplementary Supply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not mention Supplementary Supply. I was not talking about Supplementary Supply. I did not mention it.

MR. CROSBIE: Let us see, twenty-two years ago -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking of Interim Supply.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: On this point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it necessary for the Chair to hear any more on this point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: The rule, Mr. Chairman, is that we cannot speak on this because the estimates are to come up, if there is not an election in between is that what - what is the ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If hon. members would listen to what the Chair has said, and bide by the ruling of the Chair, we would make much more progress.

Now the Chair has ruled that the item under discussion - Item One Consolidated Funds Services \$45,000. And one would think that. that would mean that debate would revolve around whether or not the \$45,000 is justified and whether or not it should be granted. Now let us proceed.

MR. CROSBIE: I was addressing myself right to that question, Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted by any one of these points of order. Debt Management \$45,000 we have been asked to vote for next year, without any explanation of what debts are going to be incurred next year. We know, as the minister says, it is to pay for legal fees, and it is to pay for bank charges, and it is to pay investment counselors and so on. If this money is required, Mr. Chairman, for the Government to have during the next month or two months, because it has not got a budget ready and it has not got its estimates ready, and has nothing but contempt for the House, if that is what it is required for to carry the Government -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one moment now, the hon. gentleman knows those last remarks are completely out of order, and they are not at all related.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order. Mr. Chairman, is any hon. member of this House allowed to stand up while Your Honour is speaking. Is that lawful?

MR. CROSBIE: We know it is not to be blamed on him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, we are not told what this \$45,000 is for. For what bond issue - the Government needs money to operate the Government services for the next two months, it tells the House. It wants the House to vote \$100 million. It now asks for \$45,000 under Consolidated Funds Services. And we ask, and I ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the necessity for that expenditure during the next two months? Is there to be a bond issue in the next two months, in addition to the \$99.7 million that they just borrowed? In addition to the bond issue, we just had of \$25 million on March 15th. Is there to be another bond issue? Are the Government planning another one in April or May, so that, they have to have \$45,000 to pay out to lawyers? Are the Government planning - How much are the Government planning to borrow next year? How much is the minister going to need for Debt Management altogether next year?

MR. CALLAHAN: You will find out in two or three weeks.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, now we are told.

MR. MURPHY: Promises, promises.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the Government wants the money now, but the minister says we will find out in two or three weeks. We do not want to find out in two or three weeks, Mr. Chairman. We want to find out when we vote the money.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman will know.

MR. CROSBIE: We have no assurance whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, there are going to be any estimates come in this House. When this \$100 million is voted the Government can call an election, there is no reason why it cannot,

MR. CROSBIE: without bringing down any budget or any estimate. So we demand our rights, as members of this hon. House, to know why the Government requires this \$100 million? What it is going to be spent on? Why did the minister ask for \$45,000? Why does he not just ask for \$20,000? Does he need the \$45,000 at all? Why did the minister borrow last year? He asked the House now for money, so we will look at his past record, Mr. Chairman, or the Minister of Finance's past record. The Minister of Finance told this House, six or eight short months ago, that, he was going to have to borrow \$29.5 million, and he ended up borrowing, April 23rd., May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December, January, February, March, I think, that is eleven months ago.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Eleven months ago, told this House he was going to borrow \$29.5 million. He has borrowed \$97.5 million in debentures. Now we want the minister to explain to us why he requests \$45,000 for Debt Management? What did the Debt Manager of this Government borrow this year? Why did he have to borrow this \$97.5 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is beginning, I think, to repeat himself?

MR. CROSBIE: Do you think so, Mr. Chairman?

Well these are some of the questions, Mr. Chairman, that we want to have answered before we vote the sum of \$45,000 or any amount. And one other



MR. CROSBIE: One other question Mr. Chairman. This Government between April 1st. of last year and March 31st. of 1973, has to repay \$104 million in monies that it borrowed the previous year and had no sinking funds for.

AN HON. MEMBER: What has that got to do with it?

MR. CROSBIE: I will just guess what that has to do with it. Between April 1st. '71, April 1st. next week, and two years from that date, the Government is going to have to repay \$100 million that it has no sinking fund for.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! order please!

MR. CROSBIE: What it has to do with it is this, Mr. Chairman. It is debt management. This is going to involve the Government Mr. Chairman in a considerable amount of debt management expenses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is \$45,000. as I read it.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, \$45,000. for the first two months. How is this, how is this.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): That is all we are asking for today \$45,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Plus another nineteen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all, plus nothing. \$45,000. is this item that is now before the Chair.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, when an item of expenditure comes before the House, the members of the House have the right to ask the Government to account for how they spent the money they were voted last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is done, that is done in the Budget Speech.

MR. CROSBIE: We are asking the Government to account to see whether or not they should be voted the money this year. The Government is now asking for \$45,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! you know, it is all very well to - but the particular item here now is Consolidated Fund services \$45,000. Shall the item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: No Mr. Chairman, no. We have had no answers yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is going to be carried.

MR. CROSBIE: There has been no vote, and no one else has spoken yet.

MR. MURPHY: No one has spoken on that yet.

MR. CROSBIE: I have asked the minister certain questions, and naturally we are expecting an answer to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

MR. MURPHY: Carry Mr. Chairman, carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Look at it.

MR. MURPHY: It depends on what kind of a vote it is.

MR. CROSBIE: Do away with the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it not a majority vote. Does the majority carry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Abolish the House.

MR. MURPHY: We had two against one yesterday and our vote did not carry. There is only one who said "aye," and two said "nay."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! order please! The vote is not taken until the usual "ayes" and "nays" are heard.

MR. MURPHY: It is not Mr. Chairman, you are the boss. I just have a few words on this, Mr. Chairman, I did not get a chance to speak on the original debate, but.....

HON. E.M.ROBERTS: (Minister of Health): The hon. gentleman did not try very hard.

MR. MURPHY: Did not try?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is fair, that is fair.

MR. T.HICKEY: To a point of order Mr. Chairman, point of order. I have already made this point of order before, and apparently it has fallen on deaf ears. Hon. gentlemen on this side, were told by the speaker yesterday.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! the hon. gentleman will please try to let us continue with the debate.

MR. HICKEY: Oh well, a good try anyway.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not, it is chairman

MR. HICKEY: Famous last words.

MR. MURPHY: This item for \$45,000. the hon. deputy Minister of Finance says is for interest and debt management, towards that payment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Debt management and expenses.

MR. MURPHY: Debt management and expenses yes. The debt management interest and debt management for last year was \$32 million. This \$45 thousand is just a small part of the huge vote that we are asked to pass here today. It was agreed that we would take it item by item. We have not a complete breakdown, it just says that it is some part of debt management or something like this, but I quite frankly feel that it is just an amount thrown in to make up a total amount of \$99 million 7.....

The hon. minister has not given us yet the answer to the question that has been asked.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have given it once, I will give it again.

MR. MURPHY: If that is what the hon. minister is going to give again, what he gave just now, it is not too much information as far as we are concerned.

MR. CALLAHAN: If the hon. gentleman wishes, if he permits I will give it again.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I am quite concerned with this, and this is only a part of the total vote. When I hear a statement made by the hon. Premier that this is just slightly or somewhat over last year's Interim Supply which was \$61 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh boy! oh boy!

MR. MURPHY: Would you like a recording of the remarks the hon. the Premier made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said by the same proportion, I did not say the same amount

MR. MURPHY: You said that in the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said it was almost exactly the same proportion, do you know what proportion means?

MR. HICKEY: Point of Order. I was just asked to sit down, I could not make a point of order. Now, your Honour is allowing two. What do we have here? The rules are for both sides or they are for no one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please go on.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, in a few short weeks, we are told, the estimates will come down and the budget will come down. I contend that it should have been down long ago, where we could discuss this thing fully. This has been a practice of this Government the past number of years. They say that it has gone through another year Mr. Speaker. That has nothing whatever to do with it. We feel that in an amount like this, and we are just discussing one heading now, \$45,000., and we will get into others, I feel that on a matter of principle the Government should have the courtesy to bring forward to this House, who after all has the exclusive right to grant permission for Interim Supply or any other supply.

We do not at this moment know how many millions over and above this Government has spent since the last budget was brought down in this House. We have not the faintest idea. It is just absolute contempt, not for our money, not on this side, it is not our money Mr. Chairman, it is the people's money. When they ask us for \$45,000. we want to be damn well sure that this \$45,000, although a small part, as I said, of the \$99 million, is not just something that is thrown into a bucket, and every department is balanced out on various amounts of money. As far as I am concerned, this Interim Supply I am against granting. This is a terrific amount of money, and I think my hon. co-leader, the Conservatives just next to me there, as mentioned by the hon. the Premier, has stated very fully a lot of things.

We talk about loans. Do we want to get into loans, cheap money, everything else? We are paying 8.9 percent for our last loan of \$25 million, and the prime rate at a bank is 5.5 percent. This is all a part of this consolidated fund services. They talk about tight money or loose money, no wonder we can borrow all the money we are borrowing. I will just say Mr. Chairman, that I will vote against this item here as I will against every other as it comes up, until this Government is reasonable and courteous enough to treat this House with the respect that it deserves.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this vote relates to the debt management of the

debt of this Province. I would submit that this is an issue. One of the reasons why we are making any expenditure, whatever expenditure we are making on debt management, is directly relative to the amount of the debt which this Province has incurred. The mode of incurring debt in this Province is to my mind completely and absolutely contrary to the basic principles of British Parliamentary democracy and to the principles, as a matter of fact, of any other democratic form.

In 1966, we saw an Act go through this legislature, an Act to amend the Revenue and Audit Act, wherein unlimited borrowing power was given to the Cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think the Chair has said often enough, that what we are talking about here.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down while the Speaker is speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we are talking about here now is consolidated funds services, \$45,000., and it really boils down to whether that amount should be allotted or any other amount. I do not see what this has to do with the Revenue and Audit Act.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I relate then to the debt of this Province and not to the Revenue and Audit Act. The fact that we have the amount of the debt that we have, is because of the carelessness of this particular Government.

MR. CALLAHAN: Point of Order Mr. Chairman, may I refer to Your Honour's ruling on this very point one year ago. These are Your Honour's words on page three, of tape 100 on March 10th. "This is a committee of the House, appointed to do a particular job, and the committee is to examine this particular Bill and the motion before the committee." The it goes on and says, "members must understand that the remarks must be limited to that point and to that point only. The House is the place for members to speak generally, and everybody knows the occasions which they are." Mr. Chairman, we are back into it again, and I ask Your Honour to confirm the ruling made one year ago, made again here this afternoon at least a half dozen times, but still being ignored by the other side.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with your address.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The amount of this money, \$45 thousand I am surprised at the attitude of the Government. They say, " just vote for it and do not inquire into it." After pressing today, we were told that it is for debt management. The debt of this Province over the past year has accelerated some \$68 million from that which

MR. MARSHALL:

was originally envisaged and it has accelerated, Mr. Chairman, as a result of steps taken within the Cabinet itself. This money was borrowed without the Legislature of this Province being informed on the reasons for which it was borrowed and, surely to heavens, since forty-five thousands of dollars will obviously relate to the \$68. million dollar additional, as well as the rest of the debt, we are entitled to know why the other debt was incurred, what it was used for etc. I think this is one of the basic problems that has occurred here and one of the reasons why we take the stand we do. We are being asked to vote for something that was done ahead, has to go in the future without knowing what went on in the past.

It is a ridiculous situation, Mr. Chairman. The debt of this Province now has accelerated to \$1. billion dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has not.

MR. MARSHALL: It has been said it is gone to \$1. billion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has not.

MR. MARSHALL: It is over \$2,000. for every child in the Province ....

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: Over \$2,000. for every child that is born at the Grace Hospital and St. Clares and all around the place everywhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not so.

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps the hon. the Premier would like to give a certificate of debt for the newborns so that it will be drawn to their attention that they owe over \$2,000. and it will probably be \$10,000. by the time they reach twenty-one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please concede this.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the situation with respect to this, we are being asked in this Interim Supply Bill to vote \$45,000. and I do not think with respect to this Consolidated Fund Services or any other item that we ought to be asked to vote upon it without there being a breakdown.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is a breakdown, I have given a breakdown.

MR. MARSHALL: You have given, a general breakdown has been given, Mr. Chairman.

We had been told after -

MR. CALLAHAN: A breakdown for \$45,000. has been given.

MR. MARSHALL: The breakdown has been told to be debt management and what else?

MR. CALLAHAN: Would the hon. gentleman like me to repeat it?

MR. MARSHALL: I would very much like the Minister to repeat it, yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, legal fees \$28,500., bank charges \$4,500., commissions on treasury bills \$1,500., Crown Corporations \$10,500., total \$45,000. which does not have any relation or is not obviously inclusive of statutory payments already covered by Legislation nor those included in the voted estimates which will in due course be brought to the House.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister, and I would hope that he would table similar details with respect to the other heads of expenditure prior to them being debated, so that this side can have an opportunity to examine them.

MR. CALLAHAN: If that side will give me time I will be glad to rise and do it.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, would the hon. Minister care then to adjourn the debate, to give us the information so that we can debate?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, no, no need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please proceed with this particular debate?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to vote a sum of \$45,000. for Consolidated Fund Services. We are being asked to do this and it relates to the debt of this Province, I say again. The hon. the Premier and this Government cannot come before this House, it is against all principles of Parliamentary Government. Now I do not care whether you get into the technicalities of Interim Supply, Supplementary Supply or estimates. As far as the people of this Province are concerned \$100. million dollars is being asked by this House and we are asked, as has been said before, to sign a blank cheque. Well that is just a little bit too much. I think, Mr. Chairman, the proper reason for Interim Supply is to give the Government enough money to operate between now and when the estimates are requested.

Okay well, we are being asked -



MR. SMALLWOOD: Not when the estimates are requested, when the estimates are passed.

MR. MARSHALL: When the estimates are passed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: So I take it then, Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who knows how long that would take?

MR. MARSHALL: So I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the intention is that this relates to approximately one-quarter of a year and the Government does not then expect the estimates to be passed until March, April, May, June, the end of June or July.

MR. CALLAHAN: That depends on the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

MR. MARSHALL: It may well be that, if we do not get the information that has been requested. I cannot conceive, Mr. Chairman, how this House, how the Government of this Province can have so deteriorated, as far as I can see, absolutely deteriorated, to come and ask \$100 million dollars of this Legislature without giving complete and absolute details and complete and absolute details, giving enough information to the other side so that they can take it, compare with last year's estimates, with the estimates the year before and so on. In my mind it is a piece of unbridled, unlitigated arrogance.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman will have that chance.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman will have that chance, Mr. Chairman, after the fact.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the proper time.

MR. MARSHALL: After the fact.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the proper time.

MR. MARSHALL: We have been elected for the purpose of serving the interest of our constituents and the interest of our constituents do not include giving a blank cheque for people to travel to Romania, Tokyo, Japan, Liechtenstein and all over the world everywhere. We want to know why this money is being asked for? The \$45,000. in debt management, I would like the Minister to address himself to the question to what borrowings do these relate, what are

MR. MARSHALL:

the interest rates applicable, to give us a complete tabling of all of the debts? We must know the debt of this Province. We must know the complete detail. We must have all of the information that is available to the Government. One of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why we have the problems which we have in the Western world today is because this Government has been here for so long that it thinks it does not have to give the information to the people but it will find out when it has the courage to call the general election.

Mr. Chairman, on that point, we have a total debt now, a staggering debt as I say of \$1. billion dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not so.

MR. MARSHALL: It is so. We have a staggering debt of \$1. billion dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not so. It is not true. That is not a lie, because I do not know whether that is a lie because I do not know whether the hon. gentleman believes it.

MR. MARSHALL: Is the hon. the Premier speaking on a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If he believes it, it is not a lie but it is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: I believe and I know that the debt of this Province amounts to \$1. billion dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not true. You are hundreds of millions out, hundreds of millions.

MR. MARSHALL: Which way? Upwards or downwards.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Upwards. You are hundreds of millions too much.

MR. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: It is an absolute fact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here goes whiskers.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. the member for Burin when he was speaking the other day mentioned -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Last year it was hair but this year it is whiskers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please!

MR. MURPHY: No-one is going to laugh at that joke.

MR. MARSHALL: To correct the hon. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Now look, can we hear this hon. member in peace and quiet?

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Chairman, on the situation of the debt and I get back to the debt and I give the Premier the benefit of the doubt, for the sake of being able to express myself only, but we will say the debt whatever it is, whatever it is represented to be, has to be determined and the Province of New Brunswick recently had a Commission to determine the debt and this was after a change of Government. It is something that the next Government will do as well, but they will also have a Commission to find out why that debt was incurred. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Government might consider having a Royal Commission appointed, of independent people, to determine exactly what the debt is.

I say it is \$1. billion dollars, the people on this side say it is \$1. billion dollars, the Premier says it is less than \$1. billion dollars, the hon. the acting Minister of Finance says nothing as usual but in any event, Mr. Chairman, I think that this Government could show its sincerity in view of the suspicions that have been cast upon it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On \$45,000.?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, this \$45,000., Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a Budget Speech debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: I am only just starting, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a Budget Speech debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it is a Budget Speech debate. What do you expect?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, where is the Budget Speech?

MR. MARSHALL: When you come to this House and ask for \$100. million dollars.

MR. CALLAHAN: \$45,000.

MR. MARSHALL: Right at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, we are asking for \$45,000, but \$45,000. is much more important to this side of the House than it is to the other side of the House. But in any event the question at issue,

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, is whether this should be voted and I say it should not be voted because it relates to debt management and because this Legislature exists purely and simply for the purpose, not purely and simply but mainly for keeping the general public informed and because the general public is not informed, knows nothing of the debt, does not know the true facts with respect to the debt of this Province, we should not do it, we should not vote on it and that is one of the reasons why we should not vote this \$45,000. for Consolidated Fund Services.

It is a shocking situation, it is dangerous, I am new to this House, I will be here a long time, a lot longer than a lot of the other members on the other side but I must say I have never seen anything to match what I considered to be the unbridled arrogance, contempt and carelessness with respect to the money of the people of this Province and it is a very sorry -

MR. CALLAHAN: You are learning.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I am learning and so have the people of Newfoundland learned.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we have not received any answer to the questions as to what this \$45,000. relates to, what bond issues? The Minister says that it relates to the payment of legal fees, bank charges in connection with borrowings. We know that in last years estimates we voted a very substantial sum for Consolidated Fund,

Mr. Crosbie.;

\$46 odd million. Why is not the money to pay this \$45,000 in the estimates of last year? The minister is asking for amounts to be paid to legal counsels, banks and others in connection with debt management. Why is there not sufficient monies in his vote for the year that ends next Wednesday to pay this? If it is money that has to be related only to next year to what debt management does it relate?

What are the details of it?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance also another question. This does not refer to the servicing of the debt. This is a statement that he made. Now I would like to ask, for my own elucidation, is there an extra amount. Obviously, there must be an extra amount necessary to service the debt and what is that amount? What is that amount for this particular period?

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the \$45,000. Would the minister advise us if this is for the next month or two of borrowing or is it a past or what? Is it for the next month or two for future borrowings?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, as I have said already, in preliminary general remarks yesterday, it is a proportion of the estimates amount that will be required for the year.

MR. CROSBIE: What proportion?

MR. CALLAHAN: A proportion, Mr. Chairman, a reasonable proportion.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister has come into this House and tells the House that this \$45,000 ( and this is just illustrative of everything else that is to follow the \$100 million) is a proportion of what the minister estimates will be required for debt management for this year. Surely, the House has a right to know what proportion this is of the vote necessary. Is it one per cent? Is it ten per cent! Is it twenty per cent? Is it enough for one month? What

Mr. Crosbie.

is the explanation for it? The minister asks us to vote it without having the detailed estimates before the House for the coming year? Now what proportion is it? Is it ten per cent? Is it twenty per cent? Is it one per cent? Is it five per cent? Why cannot the minister tell even that? The hon. the minister is determined not to answer the question. This is the way the hon. minister approaches this House to vote \$100 million, starting with the first item: \$45,000. He will not tell the House what percentage is this of the vote necessary next year?

MR. CALLAHAN: A reasonable proportion.

MR. CROSBIE: How can the House judge whether this is a reasonable request or not, if it is not told what percentage it is?

MR. CALLAHAN: We are asking to accept it. That is what we are asking for.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the hon. gentleman opposite asked last year for a deficit of \$50 million and ended up with a deficit of \$103 million. Is that reasonable? Was the excess of \$53 million reasonable? They told the House last year, Mr. Chairman, that they were going to borrow \$29.5 million in debentures. They borrowed \$97.5 million in debentures. Was that reasonable? Is that what the minister bases reasonableness on?

Now they ask the House for this \$45,000, and we want to know what proportion of the year's expenses is it estimates to be? We want to know that for each one of those votes. Why is that \$26 million being asked for Education and Youth? What percentage of the vote is that? Is the minister going to refuse to answer that? Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the minister is.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is just one more point arising from the minister's...

MR. CALLAHAN: Just one more?

MR. MARSHALL: Well one more - there are a lot of points which flow

Mr. Marshall

from what the hon. the minister says. But I asked the question to which I did not get the answer. I made the observation that this Consolidated Fund Services does not include the amount necessary for service of the debt. I would like to point out or ask a question, that last year the total amount to service the debt, as estimated, was \$46 million. It is probably much more than that. But it was \$46 million in Consolidated Fund Services. So, if we are talking about twenty-five per cent extra in Interim Supply, you should increase that \$100 million by the tune of, perhaps, \$20 million that the Government are actually going to be required to spend during this mysterious period that we so arrogantly have been refused the information of what it covers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, after the hon. gentleman has been in the House for a few years, he may learn that you do not in Interim Supply and you do not with the regular estimates, ask the House to vote the money to pay the interest on the debt. The House is never asked to vote that. The House does not vote it. It is statutory. What is asked here today is what the House has to vote, not what it has not got to vote.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. the Premier for the information, and that is that, it is known to everybody. It is known to everybody who knows anything about Government financing. But the fact that the hon. the Premier cannot deny is that an extra \$10 million or \$15 million will have to be obtained by the Government of the Province to pay on its debt. So, in other words this is not - \$100 million ..

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is not to pay on the debt.

MR. MARSHALL: You are authorized to spend \$100 million, but there will be another \$15 million or \$20 million spent.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      This is not to pay on the debt. But this \$45,000 is not to be paid on the debt.

MR. MARSHALL:      I am not talking about..

MR. SMALLWOOD:      This is what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

MR. CROSBIE:      On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. the Premier nor no member of this House is permitted to speak from his seat. Is the hon. the Premier to be given the privilege of shouting and interrupting from his seat without rising, or he is to be brought to order? I submit that the Premier should be brought to order.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Go and shave. Go and shave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:      Shall the item carry?

MR. CROSBIE:      No, Mr. Chairman, not yet.

MR. CALLAHAN:      It has been carried three times already.

MR. CROSBIE:      It has not been carried at all yet.

MR. CALLAHAN:      The hon. gentleman was out of the House.

MR. CROSBIE:      Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Now, if personal abuse is to be permitted in this House, I will give as good as I get. I will not forget the business at hand either. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that personal remarks, supine, silly remarks about people's hair, whether it is dyed or bald or what it is, are out of order in this House. If they are to be permitted by the hon. the Premier, with his twenty-two years experience, then the rest of us will have to join in to .

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Well shave it off. We will not be able to talk about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:      Those in favour, "aye."

MR. CROSBIE:      "Nay!"      We want the recorded vote please, Mr. Chairman. Recorded vote.      Well, on division, we want it noted on division.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      He wants his name to go down in history that he voted against it.

MR. CROSBIE:      Certainly.



MR. SMALLWOOD: He wants it put up on a big monument.

MR. CROSBIE: We, younger people are not going to abuse you old men.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee always rules the number in favour and the number against, without allocating any names, which is rather pointless.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I gathered the impression that the hon. gentleman was opposed to it. I formed that impression.

MR. CROSBIE: Can we have the vote recorded as to how many are for this, Mr. Chairman and how many are against it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will those in favour of the motion please rise?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are we going to have this everytime?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No we will not. We will not do any such thing. No we will not. We will put it to a vote and see. The majority will dictate, yes, not the minority. The majority will decide. That is known.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will those against please rise? The motion is carried fifteen to six.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if I am in order, I am going to make a motion, If I cannot make a motion, I will give notice of motion that no Standing Vote will be taken in this committee on Interim Supply, no standing votes.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that that motion is out of order and will require an amendment to the Standing Rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motions are to be made in the House.

MR. MARSHALL: (2) ,legislative, \$270,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that was the general idea, I thought. I have been asked on at least two occasions, I think, from the other side as to why I had not, in fact, done that. So I propose to do it, if hon. members wish it that way. In the present case, which is no. (2) legislative, the total amount \$270,000

Mr. Callahan

represented by: Salaries, \$21,000; allowances, Being sessional allowances expenses for members, \$240,000; miscellaneous items \$ 3,000, I think, in each month, a total of \$9,000 for a total of \$270,000. I might say, Mr. Chairman that, of course, members were paid the first installment of their allowances before the House.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would repeat that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Salaries, \$21,000; allowances, expenses etc., for members \$240,000; other miscellaneous items \$9,000. I believe that comes to \$270,000.

MR. CROBBIE: Mr. Chairman, this item is under the heading, Legislative, as the minister has just described. This is an opportunity to discuss how the business of this House is carried on.

MR. CROSBIE; Mr. Chairman, there is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: On Interim Supply.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, must I be interrupted by <sup>a</sup> member who does not even rise in his seat?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, are there rules for the Premier only and rules for the rest of us or will the Premier be kept in order, Mr. Chairman? Senility is fast advancing on the other side of the House. Now Mr. Chairman, this is a Legislative vote for salaries and allowances for members and for expenses in connection with this Legislative Assembly. There are three members in this House, Mr. Chairman, who the Government is not providing accommodation for whatsoever. The same situation pertains in this House this year as last and that is that three members of the House, <sup>the</sup> member for St. Barbe South, myself and the member for Bonavista North are not provided by this vote with any office accommodation for ourselves, with any place to hang our hats or coats, with any place to keep our records, with any place to do research, we are in the corridors of this, the ninth floor here. We hang our coats in the Clerks Office, we do not have one place to keep a file, one place to keep a copy of the Statutes, one place to keep any research material, and ~~there~~ is a men's room on the floor the hon...minister reminds me, thank you. Yes, and we have had to use that occasionally to have a meeting in. This is very amusing. The Premier cannot stand the truth. Cannot stand the truth. The Premier likes his own looks, everywhere we look the Premier's picture, look at the Budget Speech. Look at the Premier and on the back is the Premier in twenty years. First page and last page. ~~Twelve years~~

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twelve years not twenty-

MR. CROSBIE: Twelve years in activity on the other side of the House. Mr. Chairman, here there are three members of this House treated by the Government with absolute contempt representing three districts in this country, given no space

no opportunity, no place to do research, no facilities. Now I am not going to make any great point or even talk about it very long. But I think that the people of this Province should realize how the government treats the members they elect to the House of Assembly if the members happen to disagree with the Government. It is unheard of Mr. Chairman, in parliamentary history, for any members of an elected House of Representatives, <sup>to</sup> be treated so shabbily by a Government who wants to discriminate against them because they disagree with the Government and what the Government should be doing. Now I just say that in passing.

Mr. Chairman, this is a Legislature where the Leader of the Government does not meet with the Leader of the other Party or Groups to arrange government business. It is a House where when they do meet any agreement reached is broken. There was an agreement made in this House yesterday.

MR. NOEL I do not really see that this has to do with the finance -

MR. CROSBIE: This has to do with the conditions under which the members of this House meet and how its business is done. The Address in Reply Mr. Chairman, was supposed to be called yesterday so the member for Bonavista North could make his speech, he having to go out of town Sunday. Instead of that that agreement was breached and we went on with Interim Supply. That is the way the business of this House is conducted. Answers to questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOEL: We are in committee now you know, and in committee you are not, we are not permitted to discuss what went on in the House, we have certain restrictions on us in Committee. The item here is Item 2 Legislative.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, when the estimates come before the House for the full year for the Legislature or any other branch of Government the House is permitted to discuss on the first item all of the affairs that are carried out under that vote. I am discussing now what is carried out under the Legislative vote. Answers to questions, how the Government answers questions.

MR. NOEL: Order please. The hon. member is not permitted to refer to what goes on in the House in Committee, the time to do that is in the House not in Committee.

MR.CROSBIE: Television and Radio coverage of the Committee, Mr. Speaker.

Television and Radio coverage, the Hon. the Premier when addressing the House on Monday thought it would be an excellent idea if we had television coverage of this House. I suggested that I thought the same way that this should be arranged. Yet we discover from the radio, of course, that it is "all or nothing," says the Premier, to this proposal. Not that the House of Assembly is going to consider it. No, no the Hon, the Premier himself decides "all or nothing." Not a conference with the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else in the House to discuss it. No, a unilateral decision of one member of the House, the Premier, not made by the House of Assembly as it is done in other jurisdictions Premier Smallwood says, "the Government will consider it only if it be indiscriminate, universal, full-time, unedited, and unselected television knowing full well that the people of this Province could not stomach seeing the Hon. the Premier on the airways six or eight hours a day, that it has to be universal, full-time, unedited, and unselective, which would not be acceptable to the television stations; rather than an edited version of perhaps an hour a day or several hours a week. That is the way the business of this House is conducted. The decisions are not made by the members of the House, as they are in other Provinces, as to whether their proceedings should be covered by radio or T.V., the decision is made by one man, the Master, who does not hesitate to make them, the same man who refuses to appear on Television on a programme - with the Leader of the Opposition or the member who is now speaking.

MR.NOEL: Order please! I think the hon. member has been in the House long enough to know that this is completely irrelevant to this particular item we are talking here now, on <sup>an</sup> item which deals with the actual financial affairs of the running of the House of Assembly and not these other items at all.

MR.CROSBIE: All right Mr. Chairman, we are told before the House even meets Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature will have long sessions. It is going to meet morning, afternoon and night. Not set by the members of the House. We are discussing this Legislature Mr. Chairman.

MR.NOEL: Order please! Perhaps the hon. member did not understand me. As I understand it, the Legislative deals with the salaries and the actual financial costs of running the House of Assembly. That is what it deals with. But the hon. member now is talking about is an entirely different -

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, when the Government asked the House of Assembly to vote it money or when the Cabinet asks, or the Government of Canada asks the Parliament of Canada to vote it money under a heading of Legislative or under the heading of the Department of Finance, you do not just discuss the money that is going to be spent you discuss the activities of those departments or functions of Government. I am discussing the activities of the Legislature. The Legislature cannot operate - and any time when they ask for money -

MR.SMALLWOOD: No. no.

MR.CROSBIE: Yes, yes this is the right of the people and their representatives in the House. This is a House, Mr. Chairman, that, that one person threatens continually, that the members will have long sessions if they do not vote the money.

MR.NOEL: Order please!

MR.CROSBIE: We will have long sessions if we do not vote this money, that is relevant to this debate Mr. Chairman. Morning, afternoon and night if we do not vote the hundred million. That is what we have been told.

MR.NOEL: Order please! The question before the Committee now is whether the Legislative \$270,000 will pass. Shall the Item carry?

MR.CROSBIE: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not finished speaking on this Item. I am not going to vote in favour of this Item, because I have been threatened with morning, afternoon and night sessions if I do not vote for it. The Government wants to force this House of Assembly to give it this \$270,000 plus another \$99 million, if we do not give the Government the money they want when they ask for it, without asking questions or debating. I am certainly not going to vote for that. I am not going to vote money for a Legislature where the forty-two members are not treated equally. Where the members on the Government side have

a large Common Room where one member who is a Minister Without Portfolio has an office on the floor above us, never used. While three members of the House are down here with no where to meet their constituents, with no where to do any work, why should I be expected to vote \$270,000 or even a dollar for a House of Assembly that permits its fellow members to be treated like that. A Common Room, a large Common Room for the Government members, a small inadequate Common Room for the Conservative Members, and for the three members sitting here as Liberal Reform Members with no space, we are told we can have a cubby hole down by the Legislative Library, where every one can overhear you if we wanted it, eight floors down from this floor. Why should we be expected to vote money for the operation of the Legislature in that manner? J.S.L.

Last year there was a salary increase of \$1500 per member voted, for every member of the House, Well it is time, Mr. Chairman, that some money was voted to provide office facilities in here for all the members of the House, so they will have somewhere to do their work. Every day, when I come in I have to carry in all the files and everything, have to be carried in, no where else to put them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Move over now. Why wait for spring, do it now.

MR. MURPHY: Be on the other side then hey! chief?

MR. CROSBIE: By golly, we get some real gems. We get some real gems of advice from the Minister of Welfare.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Hansard, Hansard, Mr. Chairman, some of this money is being voted for Hansard. We want to know why there has been the summary disappearance of the Editor of Hansard. I saw him here earlier this afternoon. The Editor of Hansard, and I think, he is called Chief Librarian, he seems to serve this House quite well during the past year?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Imagine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not Librarian.

MR. CROSBIE: Thanks for all your help. It is wonderful, it is wonderful

MR. SMALLWOOD: This Government do know how to speak English.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: This Government knows how to say it would not be enchanted, if all the power of Newfoundland went to BRINCO and they use it outside of the Province,

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: for the uranium plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, we do know how.

MR. CROSBIE: Would not be enchanted. The theme of the Government should be "Some Enchanted Evening," as the power leaves this Province to created jobs outside of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The Editor of Hansard, his resignation was announced yesterday, Mr. Chairman. We ask why? The Government does not wish to tell us why? Is it ill health? Was he fired? Was he dismissed? Is it a political reason? Is he going to run in St. Mary's Bay? Are we going to lose this distinguished Editor of Hansard? Surely the Government owes us an explanation of what has



MR. CROSBIE: happen to the Editor of Hansard? It is the public business too. Does the hon. minister not think that the public deserves to know what he is up too in his cubby hole down on the third floor, the first floor? That is the public's business. The public pays the salaries. The public has the right to know. Or has the minister realized that? His answers to questions indicate that he does not realize it. He has never yet answered a question tabled in this House by me, fully and completely. Never. So he better find out something about that too.

What is happening to Hansard? Is Hansard, Mr. Chairman, this year going to be printed? Are we going to have a printed version of it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Here it is. You just got it.

MR. CROSBIE: Printed. Bound. Volume of Hansard. Are we going to have that? Are the Government going to consider a pay system to allow extra perhaps for out-of-town members, who live outside of St. John's? That was a question raised here last year, when the \$1500 increase for the Premier and all the rest of us went through? What is going to be done about that? Is there going to be anything going to be done about the Standing Orders? What is this miscellaneous money going to be spent on? What is the miscellaneous?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The miscelleaneous. The what? The miscellaneous.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier does not like miscellaneous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or wiskers like that.

MR. CROSBIE: And he does not like obfuscation? I wonder did he get his dictionary and look that up the other day? It means trying to confuse people, like the hon. the Premier has been trying to do for so many years.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: He does not need a dictionary when he has the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources around. He will run and get the dictionary for him everytime he wants a word looked up.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Where is the gaff I wonder? It is a wonder we have not seen the Party Whip with a gaff there now that the Premier has learned what it

MR. CROSBIE: is? He has not mentioned it for four years. Now in Election Year the gaff becomes important. The guff becomes important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Could we have a little more closeness to the subject?

MR. CROSBIE: Yet, so, Mr. Chairman, in concluding my brief remarks under this heading, I would like the minister to indicate whether the Government are going to see fit to treat all the members of this House equally this session and to provide us with some -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some will be treated more equally, even more equally than others.

MR. CROSBIE: So before we vote on this item, I would like to hear from the minister on that.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I look at the breakdown given by the minister under his Subhead No. 2 - Head of Expenditure. I see salary \$21,000 and allowances \$240,000. Now I ask the minister first, whether this is a new breakdown different from that appearing in the estimates? Because the only thing appearing in the estimates that I can see here is allowance.

The minister apparently is not going to answer the question, but you would think that we would get a breakdown on this, Mr. Chairman, a proper breakdown \$240,000. We are asked to vote \$261,000. The total amount provided for last year for the legislature in salaries was \$350,000. All ready all of the members of this House are being paid a substantial proportion of their allowances for the year. And one asked whether this is really a serious request calculated and figured out by the Department of Finance before this particular schedule was put in or was the figure picked out of the air, as so many figures have been from time to time?

AN. HON. MEMBER: Such as the \$1 billion?

MR. MARSHALL: The \$1 billion will probably make us go up in the air before we are much older, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as we go on in this legislature grant, this head of expenditure, one of the things that has occurred to me is the fact that, this Legislature should make more adequate and proper grant for the

MR. MARSHALL: Opposition as such. I am talking about the expenses of running the Opposition Office itself. For the purposes of proper research, for the purposes of employment of people to put together various programs and do the research for members. It is something that - it is an institution that is available in every Province of Canada and it is certainly one that should be available here, and it has been ignored. And certainly it should be in the interest of the Government this year with their impending cross - across the House here to provide something for the Legislature because they will find out just how hard it is to do the research without the legions and the legions of civil servants behind them.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: This is an item that ought to be provided there, ought to be provided for the past twenty years, and still it is not here again.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see again, and here we come again, we have been given a breakdown of some \$261,000. That appears to me to be nothing but a rouse. This \$261,000, if the proportion is correct, for the total of the Interim Supply, we are talking about two months or three months, and \$261,000 is immeasurably more than what was provided in the last year estimate for salaries and allowances. And I wonder just how accurate the forecast it? It is another instance, Mr. Chairman, of us being asked to vote in a vacuum, of being able to vote monies and write a blank cheque and it is a situation that this House should never allow itself to be in.

I repeat again, one of the big problems in the present day society is the fact that the facts of Government are not revealed to the people. This is the proper place for it to be revealed, in this Legislature, to show the people where the money is going. There is an awful/lot of unrest in this Province today, purely and simply because this Government has not communicated with the people, has not told them what the situation is.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not feel that we should be asked to vote, as I say, without having the full complete and absolute details. It is an abrogation, as far as I am concerned, of the basic principles of Government. It is an indictment on the Government of today, and another instance of unbridled arrogance and contempt for the rights of the people in this Province.

MR. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there is just one question I would like to ask, the hon. member standing, or sitting or crouching; and that is with reference to the Interim Supply of members' salaries. Now that to me in itself is a rather extraordinary request at this time. When I came into this House first, at the first<sup>of the</sup> session, you received a portion of your sessional pay, and on the final day, you received the balance. This has changed, I think, we received a proportion of our sessional pay in January and now we are going to receive approximately the rest of it in the next week or so when this Supply Bill is passed.

MR. MURPHY: Which rather strikes me as being insignificant because of the rumours that there may not be a budget brought down, and I am wondering now, why the members will receive their salaries before the actual budget is passed. As I said, another year.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is no, so the hon. gentleman need not wonder any more.

MR. MURPHY: The answer is no to what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are not.

MR. MURPHY: We will not receive our salaries in the next couple of weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the budget.

MR. MURPHY: Before the budget.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. MURPHY: Well why then, all the haste in seeking Interim Supply for.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: For a projection of three months or four months hence? I think the Premier's answer is rather stupid to me, silly, stupid. Why we should seek this money now in Interim Supply, when he definitely states there will be a budget, and these salaries will be in it, why look for it in Interim Supply now?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Part of it has to come out of this year. Interim Supply is now, not next year.

MR. MURPHY: Ah, what is the hon. minister.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: You mean one part - the hon. minister means one portion is charged to 1970 and one to 1971, am I correct in this? Has the hon. minister got it straight now, the point that we are trying to make?

MR. ROWE: You are going to get the rest of the money in the next week or two.

MR. MURPHY: Then why are we looking for it today, why do we not wait until the budget.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because it is one of the headings of the estimates.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, so if there is a heading there we must put something in it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, right, right, and if we did not we would get -- - you know.

MR. MURPHY: This is tremendous you know. Wonderful, wonderful,

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the kind of a crowd that we have over there.

MR. MURPHY: That is what it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: And that is the kind of a crowd over there that will be over here next time, if they carry on like this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Keep saying that and of course it may happen.

MR. ROWE: That is nothing new, we have heard that for the past twenty years.

MR. MURPHY: I know, but the hon. members are getting much older and the people are getting just a little bit suspicious of them.

MR. ROWE: We are not losing any sleep either.

MR. MURPHY: Oh hoho, the hon. minister is not. He is not losing any sleep not at all, he is solid, solid. Outspoken on his department.

MR. STRICKLAND: Wonderful, wonderful.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on this, I just cannot see why this amount should be in this at the present moment. I do not know if the other members.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Move to reduce it, move to reduce it.

MR. MURPHY: I am moving to reduce it all, not part of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are not allowed to do that.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not allowed.

MR. MURPHY: Not allowed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MURPHY: Cannot we reduce it to one dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not allowed, it will not be accepted.

MR. MURPHY: Cannot reduce it to one dollar?

MR. SMALLWOOD: NO, try it, try striking out that item, go ahead.

MR. MURPHY: Cannot we reduce it to one dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Try it, yes, now that is another matter, I said reduce it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I said that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now go ahead, move to reduce it, and if the hon. member will, I will vote for his motion.

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no, but for legislative \$270,000. move to reduce it to one dollar and I will vote for it.

MR. MURPHY: I am voting against the whole thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no, you cannot - yes, but we are not. That is calling it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, well if I can make a motion now Mr. Chairman, I move that this vote be reduced to \$20,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will vote against that.

MR. MURPHY: Ha, ha, ha, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this item be reduced to \$250,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before voting on it.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: To \$20,000.

MR. MURPHY: To \$20,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Reduce it to \$20,000. yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To be reduced to \$20,000. Those in favour.....

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before voting on the amendment, I would like to say a word on it. The hon. the minister and the hon. the Premier. have just explained that this money is not to be paid out until after the budget and the estimates are brought before the House and approved.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that, I did not say that.

MR. CROSBIE: Therefore it is obvious that we do not need the money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

MR. CROSBIE: Well that is what we heard the hon. gentleman say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the hon. member did not hear me say that.

MR. CROSBIE: What did the hon. Premier say?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I meant sessional pay, to the members of the House.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right, then why is sessional.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not to be paid before the budget.

MR. CROSBIE: Then why is sessional pay to the members included in this \$200,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is why I said, reduce it to one dollar and I would vote for it.

MR. CROSBIE: The motion is to reduce it to \$20,000., .....

MR. SMALLWOOD: But I say one dollar.

MR. CROSBIE: As sufficient to carry on the activities of the House without paying any salaries to members. Members can wait until the budget and estimates come down, if there is going to be a budget and estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course they can. If there is.

MR. CROSBIE: If the Government is not going to plea to the people before the financial facts become known.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If there is not they will get no pay will they?

MR. CROSBIE: The Government does not want to explain where the \$103 million deficit came from this year or why it borrowed \$97.5 million instead of \$29.5 million. Nor, does it want to explain where the \$270 thousand is going to be spent. It is certainly not going to be spent on providing for facilities for members of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this on the motion now, to reduce?

MR. CROSBIE: On the amendment. For all these reasons Mr. Chairman I intend to support the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item (2) be reduced to \$20,000. Those in favour please say "aye," contrary minded "nay," The motion is lost.

MR. CROSBIE: Have the vote recorded Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will those in favour of the motion please stand. Will those opposed please stand. The motion is lost, nineteen to four.

On motion, item two carried.

Shall item (3) Executive Council carry?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman if I may, if we are going to have a vote and a count let us do it properly. There were only eighteen people standing on the other side, I do not know where they got nineteen.



MR. CHAIRMAN: We just counted nineteen

MR. MURPHY: I asked for a recount on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order Mr. Chairman, a member cannot be counted who is not standing. The hon. the Premier did not stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! the clerk counted nineteen.

Shall item (3) carry.

MR. CROSBIE: Item (3) is the Executive Council, also known as the Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, before passing this item which is for \$190 thousand, we know that is a measly amount compared to what the Government usually asks for. It is only a small part of the \$99 million - \$100 million. The Executive Council is the Cabinet, it is the members of the Government, it is the seventeen or eighteen over there who are in the Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, before this is carried, we want an explanation as to what this is for.

There was a series of questions tabled in this House last year requesting information on what it cost the Province for the trips the various Cabinet Ministers took last year. They were not answered. There was a question tabled the last session, "what was the cost of the trip when the hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of Social and Community Development, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Justice - five or six of them went over to London, and Paris, and Amsterdam last March of 1970, this House was adjourned, they spent quite a time over there. There was a question tabled asking what was the cost of that trip. That was not answered. Question after question asking for the cost of where ministers are going and what the cost of those trips are, and what they are spending are not answered. Why is that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it is under Executive Council.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, whccl them around anyway you can to try to get out of giving the information. The Premier's office is under this vote, Executive Council office is under this vote, the electoral office is under this vote, the

Lieutenant Governor's establishment is under this vote.

The Premier went last March to England. He went last

MR. CROSBIE:

summer to the Far East, Hong Kong, Japan, I happen to know he was in Hong Kong as I was in the store there where they said he was frequently in there buying different things at this particular store. They said, "You are from Canada and that they knew Mr. Smallwood, the Prime Minister of Canada, well." So the hon. the Premier really gets around the world. So when questions are asked, we question the Government to get information on what all these trips are costing, what public business was underway when each trip took place and the rest of it, why are they not answered?

Now this vote I am very happy -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister's travel is not in this vote at all.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier's office is in this vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are completely irrelevant.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not the Premier's travel.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier's office, Mr. Chairman, is in this vote. The Premier is in the Premier's office if not there is something wrong and anything relating to the hon. Premier can be discussed under this item.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is not in it. I am in it but the hon. gentleman is not in it although he tried hard.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, that is a misfortune for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He tried him. It is a misfortune for him.

MR. CROSBIE: It is a misfortune for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAHAN: Apparently he does not know what is in there.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier is supposed to be in his office. The hon. Minister is supposed to be in this House but his mind is so vacant I think he is somewhere else.

MR. CALLAHAN: Why do the hon. member not go Hee Haw?

MR. CROSBIE: Now the Premier's office, the electoral office, this is a vote of \$190,000. I know which end of the hon. Minister would be on Hee Haw, the back end, the donkey's end. \$190,000., Mr. Chairman, part of that is for the electoral office, can we have some information from the Minister on what part of this money is to be spent for electoral purposes? Does the Minister propose to do anything about redistributing the seats of the Province so that

MR. CROSBIE:

they are more equal in terms of the number of voters? Is there to be an election this year with one district, St. John's North, having sixteen or seventeen thousand voters while other districts have only two thousand or twenty-five hundred, you could put seven St. Barbe Norths in St. John's North? Does the Minister propose -

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister is lost and he goes back there again. Does the Government propose to change the electoral boundaries so that they will be more nearly equal in population? The Minister should tell us, is any of the money to be used for that? Is there to be any amendments to the Election Act this year to provide greater notice of the date of the election? Twenty-one days notice of an election is not very much notice, particularly with the Leader of the Government so confident that he is going to be re-elected one would think he would give months of notice but at least give what is given in other Provinces, five weeks, give the Opposition party some kind of a chance. The hon. the Premier, who so often screams about the British connection and British justice and the rest of it, he would not get to first base in England when it came to justice, gives three weeks notice of an election.

The electoral office, are the lists of voters now completed? When are they expected from the printer? How many voters do they now show, total number of voters? This is the kind of information that we would expect to get under this vote, Mr. Chairman. \$190,000. is that all to go to the Premier's office? Will there be several trips around the world on it or is it going to be shared with the electoral office, the Lieutenant-Governor, the executive council office? Surely when the Government asked this House to vote \$190,000. we deserve a little explanation of what it is to be used on. The Minister of Finance is lying there sleeping, he is probably running over in his -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Would the hon. gentleman please continue with the debate?

MR. CROSBIE: You know getting authority for \$100. million dollars puts them

MR. CROSBIE:

to sleep, Mr. Chairman, and they hope that the people of the Province are asleep. \$100. million would not even fill the deficit the Minister had last year, \$103. million dollar deficit. Was he asleep all year when that deficit built up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! If the hon. member does not continue under heading (3), you know.

MR. CROSBIE: Executive council, that is just what I am on, Mr. Chairman, electoral office.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member cannot continue until he gets his ...

MR. CROSBIE: If we cannot have this information, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot have this information we can hardly be expected to vote approval for the expenditure of \$190,000. Now I will wait to see whether the Minister is going to give us an explanation.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on that. The last two headings that we spoke on the Minister very kindly gave us a breakdown, is the hon. the Minister going to give us a breakdown on this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, only after whiskers has had a speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: He do not want answers, he only wants to make a speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the hon. the Premier very kindly with his long, long knowledge of Parliamentary procedures, reminded me today of a couple of points. Now perhaps I may draw to his attention a rule, Order (11) number (c) - "When a member is speaking no member shall pass between him and the Chair," no that is not the one but there is one here. Well, I am new at it, I shall persevere on this, just one second now. Anyway there is a rule here to the effect that, the hon. the Premier knows it, to the effect that you are not to be interrupted except on a point of order and I would appreciate if the hon. the Premier would extend to me that courtesy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here we are again and we are not even going to be given a breakdown of the executive council, the \$190,000. which is a considerable amount of money to be asked to vote in blank. We are not told

MR. MARSHALL:

how much of this for instance is for the electoral office? How much is for the electoral office, will the hon. the Minister tell me now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why should the Minister when the hon. gentleman has just assumed he is not going to get the answer anyhow?

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member is not going to accept it, he is not going to accept it.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not see any point really in debating this and this is something that the Government would love us to take this attitude that we should not debate it. I have never seen in my life anything to match the unmitigated, unbridled ...

MR. CALLAHAN: What was that? What was that again? Say that louder?

MR. MARSHALL: Get a dictionary and the hon. Minister will find the meaning of it, arrogance, complete and absolute arrogance to come before, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether this is really in accordance with the rules and regulations of the House. I mean, surely to heavens the Government cannot say ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Actually the hon. gentleman is not in accordance with the rules and regulations of the House, so would he please continue under item (3) - Executive council?

MR. CROSBIE: Before the item is carried, the Minister just intimated a minute ago, Mr. Chairman, he was going to provide some explanations. Now we have to get up, if the hon. members opposite are going to yell "carried," to show it is not carried, we want the Minister to have his chance, he just said he was going to give an explanation.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, could we get an explanation of the figures before we vote on this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the customary way of doing this is for the Minister, if he is permitted to do it, to get up and give the explanations. If he does not get up usually someone on the Opposition side asks, "Is the Minister not going to give an explanation?" and after he has given the explanation and not before or before, if he does not give it, if he will not give it, after he has given it then the comment goes on, it is usually quite

MR. SMALLWOOD:

brief because not much is required because of the fact that he has given the explanation. But there is one bewhiskered hon. gentleman here who is not interested, he just wants to make speeches and the minute every item is called he is there like a racer going in a short sprint ready to be on his feet to make a speech. He is practising, it is become for him a debating club, he is just practising.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if this is a point of order or just the usual point of disorder from the hon. the Premier. "You should never face a robber's horse," the hon. bewhiskered gentleman now speaking. What has been happening, Mr. Chairman, is that you call an item, members on the other side immediately try to carry it by saying carried, the Minister makes no attempt whatsoever to get up and give an explanation and he has had on this particular item about six chances to give an explanation so far and has not done so. Now we are quite willing to have them explained and we will wait again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the speeches all over again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Item 3 carry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Before this carries, Mr. Chairman, the total is \$190,000. and by the way, Mr. Chairman, the complete details of these amounts will be in the estimates. As I have already said a number of times and as Your Honour has explained already in the Committee before the consideration of the Bill started it is not usual, it is not the practice to have a long debate nor is it the practice to have the complete estimates at this time, they are yet to come.

So the explanation, Mr. Chairman, is of the \$190,000. it is made up of salaries in the executive council office \$90,000., other sub-heads including the electoral office and the compilation of the voters list \$100,000., a total of \$190,000. and the detail will be, Mr. Chairman, spelled out in the estimates when they come to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says it is not the usual practice to give any information on Interim Supply.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I did not say any information.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not the usual practice to attempt to get Interim Supply without any estimates before the House, without the Auditor General's report before the House, without the public accounts before the House, without knowing what the supplementary supply was for last year. This whole procedure here today is irregular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We have been through all that before.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister brought it up again and it needs to be made clear again. I move, Mr. Chairman, that this vote be reduced to an amount of \$37,000. Now my reason for doing that, Mr. Chairman, is this that last year under executive council the total vote was \$367,000. but all the Government needs is sufficient money for five or six weeks operation. There is no reason why the Budget and the estimates should not be before this House and passed within six weeks from the end of March and therefore ten per-cent of last years total vote is more than enough for this department or any other. I therefore move that it be reduced to \$37,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Item 3, Executive Council be reduced to \$37,000. Those in favour of the motion please say "Aye"

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the motion. Would the Minister tell us what period this money is to cover, how long?



Mr. Hickey.

I have heard someone say, three weeks, four weeks. Would he tell us what period he is asking this money to cover? How many months or how many weeks?

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Trying to get the date of the election, I take it.

MR. HICKEY:      Mr. Chairman, I am not asking anything about the election at the moment. What I am trying to find out is this: "Why we are asked to approve \$100 million?" It would appear to me to be enough for about four months. Why we are being asked to approve \$100 million?

MR. CALLAHAN:      We are not. We are being asked to approve..

MR. HICKEY:      Oh! we are being asked to approve \$99, 780.

MR. CALLAHAN:      No, \$190,000 - \$100 million.

MR. HICKEY:      Mr. Chairman, the total in this Bill is almost \$100 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get that technical, surely.

MR. CHAIRMAN:      The motion before the House now is that the amount in Item (3) be reduced to \$37,000. That is the motion now.

MR. HICKEY:      Mr. Chairman, that is the motion I am speaking to. I would like to know what period of time \$190,000 is to cover.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Would the hon. member let me answer?

MR. HICKEY:      I would be delighted.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Mr. Chairman, in sheer self-defense, in sheer defense against the most arrant, lurid type of low-class politics, in defense against that, let me say here now that we are going to have a general election; that the general election will be held in Newfoundland..

MR. HICKEY:      Ah, Mr. Chairman, to a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      I am answering the question now.

MR. HICKEY:      To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD:      Let me answer it.      Let me answer the question.

MR. HICKEY: I have the right to stand to a point of order. The point of order is this: I asked nothing about the election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HICKEY: I do not give two damms when it is. I want to know how long this \$190,000...

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are not going to be allowed to run in St. John's East (Extern).

MR. HICKEY: Oh! that is another matter. I have something to say about that, and so have the people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me answer the question.

MR. HICKEY: Forget the election...

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HICKEY: Will you please forget the election?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, let me answer the question, in my way, but I will answer it. I will answer it.

MR. HICKEY: You cannot teach an old dog new tricks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will answer the question. I will put certain hon. gentleman out of their pain with the answer. There will be an election, a general election this year. Before that election is held, the Budget Speech will be brought down. So will the estimates be brought down. The debate on them will take place. After and only after they have all been adopted by the House and given the Royal Assent, only then, will there be an election, not before. I do not say that there will be one immediately then, but it will not be before then. So all this propoganda is sheer love's labour lost.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to delay the House further. I am sure the Premier meant well. He was not answering my question,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, yes I did.

MR. HICKEY: I could not give two hoots when the election is. It is going to be this year. We all know that. I do not care if it is next week, next month or six months from now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because you will not be in it. They are out to knife you. The hon.

Mr. Smallwood

gentleman knows that.

MR. HICKEY: Are the knives out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The knives are out to the hon. gentleman, yes. The knives are out. They are not ours. His friends' knives are out.

MR. HICKEY: I have managed to do a bit of stick handling in the last four years. I think I will survive for the next few months. I would suggest..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not, do not. The hon. gentleman should not turn his back.

MR. HICKEY: No, I appreciate the Premier's concern.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Keep out of dark corners. Keep out in the light. Do not let them get you.

MR. HICKEY: I appreciate the Premier's concern. I will certainly take his advice.

MR. MURPHY: He will survive.

MR. HICKEY: I will not turn my back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: I certainly will not do that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we can get back to the subject that we were debating; namely, how long this \$190,000 - I have not got the answer yet. Truly and sincerely, this is what I wanted to know. I am not asking about the election. I could not give a darn, when the election is. Would the minister be good enough, after being softened up by three or four speakers? Would he be good enough to tell me what period of time this is to cover? In other words, when will the budget or approximately when will the budget be brought down. Because when it is, the Government have all the money they wish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After it is passed.

MR. HICKEY: After it is passed. Well, okay, when does the minister...?

MR. CALLAHAN: May I try to answer the hon. gentleman? Going back to the hon.

Mr. Callahan.

the member for St. John's West just previous to him, it was suggested that once the budget and the estimates are brought down, it might be six weeks. Let us say they are brought four weeks from now, three weeks from now. That could be nine or ten weeks. That is getting up to three months. Now does that suggest an answer to the hon. gentleman?

MR. HICKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, that does it fine. We can assume that the total we are being asked - of course, even with the \$190,000, but then one has to consider the \$100 million.

MR. CALLAHAN: No; no, no, we do not consider that until we get to the end.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I know. But this \$190,000 is to cover, approximately, three months.

MR. CALLAHAN: It may.

MR. HICKEY: Therefore, it could be...

MR. CALLAHAN: It will all be included in the estimates, when they come in.

MR. HICKEY: One could also say then that the total of \$100 million is also to cover three months. If we multiply that by four, we are talking about \$400 million .

MR. CALLAHAN: Now we are getting it. That is the new mathematics or is it the old?

MR. HICKEY: Is that the budget? Is that what the budget is going to be this year? Is that what it is going to be, \$400 million?

Mr. Chairman, if you only need Supply for two months, and it is \$60 million, then ask for \$60 million. Why ask for \$100 million? As far as I can determine, this is what the argument is about.

MR. MURPHY: That is pocket money for the travellers.

MR. HICKEY: Pocket money?

MR. HIEKEY Well there must be a great bottom in the till. That is all I say. Anyway thank you very much for the information. I should thank the Premier for his information on the election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Carried.

MR. CALLAHAN: Shall what, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will those in favour of the amendment please say, "aye." Contrary "nay." The amendment is lost.

Will those in favour of the amendment please rise? Will those opposed to the amendment please rise? The amendment is defeated 18 to 5.

Those in favour of Item (3) Executive Council \$190,000 please rise. Those opposed please rise. The Item is carried 21 to 5.

Shall Item (4) Finance carry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the total of this item is \$750,000 made up as follows: Minister's office, \$5,400, including salaries, travel and office expenses; general administration, \$532,200; pensions and gratuities \$24,000; transfers from other departments, printing, office equipment, etc., \$27,000; Auditor General, salaries, travelling, office etc., \$87,000; Civil Service Commission, salaries, travelling and office, \$15,900; Government Loan Boards, salaries, travelling and office, \$9,000; miscellaneous, general contingencies, Royal Commission on Labour Legislation, the total of that is \$49,500, for a total of \$750,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this item is the Department of Finance. One of the items covered in this vote is the Auditor General, the Auditor General's Department. Before voting these monies, certainly there are several points which need to be discussed in connection with the Auditor General. Other provinces, Mr. Chairman, are taking steps to strengthen the office of the Auditor General. The province of Ontario, i.e., is currently taking steps to strengthen the position of the Auditor General. The province of New Brunswick is doing exactly the same. They are taking steps to strengthen his power. What have our Government got to propose about that. The Auditor

MR. CROSBIE: The Auditor General of Newfoundland makes a report to this House, Mr. Chairman, it is supposed to be tabled within fifteen days after the session starts. It is not tabled here yet, the session started March 22nd. We are now discussing Interim Supply, but still the Report of the Auditor General is not before us showing what the position of the Government was a year ago, after an audit.

I ask the minister to tell the House, Mr. Chairman, is the Auditor General's Report ready for the year that ended March 31st. 1970, and when will it be tabled in this House? Why are the Government waiting the statutory fifteen days? They are asking us to vote \$100 million, but keeping from us, as far as I can see now unless it is not ready, but keeping from us the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Public Accounts of Newfoundland under the Revenue and Audit Act have to be tabled here within fifteen days after the House opened.

MR. CALLAHAN: They will be.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but they can be tabled earlier than that. Why are they not tabled now, when we are discussing \$100 million expenditure? The minister says they will be tabled within the required time. My question is why are they not tabled now, so we can have them to use when we are asked to vote \$100 million? That is the purpose of those reports. Not just to be tabled in the House. But to show the members how the Government has spent its money in the past, so they can decide whether or not to vote the money to the Government now or for in the future. Has the minister got the Auditor General's Report? Has it been delivered to him? Are there copies available?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it has not been delivered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it has not been delivered to the Minister of Finance. So, if there is any delay then, we take it, it is in the Auditor General's Department. That he has not produced his report.

Now there was a motion to appoint a Select Committee last year, or

MR. CROSBIE: a committee on the Public Accounts. The Government did not go forward with that motion last year. It was on the Order Paper all year. In fact when the House ended last July it was still on the Order Paper, a Government motion. Does the Government propose this year to establish a committee of the members of this House to receive the Auditor General's Report and go into it with them, and the Public Accounts with them? Is that the intention of the Government this year? It apparently was last year.

Is the hon. member noting the questions? There are several other questions, I do not want him to be confused when he answers them. Has the minister got note of the question? Does the minister propose to have a committee on the Public Accounts this year, such as they have in all other Legislative Assemblies of Canada? The minister will answer that I trust.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether during the year, this present Financial Year if the Government had to pay any money out in guarantees, in connection with loans of the Government guarantees?

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: They are not tabled yet.

MR. CALLAHAN: They will be.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is now asking for \$750,000 for the Department of Finance. We would like to know how many defaults the Government had - loans last year that they guarantee? We would like to know, for example, why the Halfway House at Carbonear was purchased for \$930,000, when the Government was already on a mortgage in default, where it could have had taken over the whole premises for \$350,000. This is the kind of information that we would like to have. Why that was done? What is the situation with other hotels, the Hotel Windsor? The Government guaranteed a mortgage loan for the Hotel Windsor?

MR. CALLAHAN: Sir, is this relevant to the Department of Finance?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, this is relevant to the finance.

MR. CALLAHAN: Is this relevant to the Auditor General's Report?

MR. CROSBIE: Sea Mining Corporation, there was a default in Sea Mining Corporation, the minister reported to the House last year. Was there any further money paid out under those guarantees? Is there any of this \$750,000 being provided to pay under guarantees where loans are in default? Are there any defaults in connection with loans made by Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation? And corporations like that?

We should have now the details of last year's borrowing. The Department of Finance, the Minister of Finance now asks the House for \$750,000. Before he has voted that he should show how he carried out his duties last year, the year that is just ending. Why did he borrow \$103 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The committee has to rise and the Speaker has to be back in the Chair by 6:00 o'clock.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker returns to the Chair.

On motion that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday, at 3:00 P.M.