



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 4**

**5th Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1971**

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

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Leader of the House, the hon. the attorney General, has refused the refusal - has received a refusal from the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the request of the Government that they expedite the passing of Interim Supply, as it has been presented to the House, before the expiration of the present financial year, I wish to inform the House that we will meet tonight and tomorrow morning and tomorrow night, and until say midnight on Wednesday, starting tomorrow morning at ten o'clock until midnight on Wednesday to make sure that the Government are granted the money that the Government needs to carry on the public service.

MR. A.J.MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): Sir, I would just like to say in response to that very irresponsible statement of the Premier's, that we in conference, I in conference, and I think the hon. member for St. John's West refused to pass this \$100 million without extensive debate. I proposed to the Leader of the House that we would be prepared to grant one month's supply, for the month of April, so that civil servants and anybody receiving cheques would not be denied that. We considered that the month of April was long enough, and do not let it go out to people in this Province that we are trying to keep anybody from getting any amounts due them in the month of April. We figure that \$100 million is too much. We are prepared to grant one month's supply, whenever the Government is ready to accede to us. If they want to debate it, we are quite prepared to carry on.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that also. The statement that the Premier made is as entirely incorrect as the Leader of the Opposition has said. We are prepared to agree to an amount of ten percent voted on current account last year. That is more than one month's supply. Ten percent of the amount voted in current account last year, which would give the Government more than enough money to carry on beyond the month of April this year. In any event, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of voting \$100 million in this House without having some explanation and some debate on it. We are quite prepared to agree that the Government gets supply by Tuesday evening on the basis of ten percent of the amount voted last year. We will not be threatened

or bullied into morning, afternoon and night sessions. That does not deter us, we are not going to be threatened into voting \$100 million without some discussion in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into the presentation of petitions, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that we have in the galleries, visiting with us today, some eighteen girls from grade VIII, St. Pius X. They have with them, as visitors, a number of students from Notre Dame Academy in Labrador City. These students from St. Pius X, are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Keating.

We also have in the gallery, the second group of Grade IX students from Booth Memorial. I know there are about twenty-five of these students from Booth Memorial. I know that you will all accord them a very hearty welcome.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Presenting Petitions:

MR. J.A.MCGRATH Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here from the people of Point Lance in the District of St. Mary's, saying that improvements could be made on the road from Branch Highroad to that settlement of Point Lance. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that Point Lance is easily the most isolated settlement in St. Mary's Bay and is now one of the more isolated settlements in my riding. Improvement of roads have increasing importance everywhere in Newfoundland, we know, in recent years, both for commercial and other purposes. The use of school buses to convey children from small settlements to larger ones has again increased the importance of roads and the importance of having them in good condition. I realize that there are many other places almost as isolated, who require improvements too, but I think that any of these, there is no part of the country that need very special consideration more than these smaller isolated places, that are doing their best to keep in touch with education and to get them to the best schools that they can for their children. I trust that the Minister in charge of that Department would find it possible to give special consideration to these small settlements at the moment, Point Lance in St. Mary's Bay, I therefore ask that the House would approve of this petition and that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR.T.HICKEY : Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the petition. I am quite familiar with that stretch of road, having travelled over it for a number of years and certainly agree with the hon. member for St. Mary's when he says that that community is among those isolated communities that are left in the Province. The road is a rather hazardous one as well and certainly I do not think any one who is familiar with it or who has driven over it would deny that something should be done with it. I have much pleasure supporting that petition.

MR.W.HODDER Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition

on behalf of the people of Burnt Islands. The prayer of the petition is that a water system be installed in the Town. Burnt Islands is in two parts, Burnt Islands Island and Burnt Island Main. The island has been joined to the mainland by a causeway, a quarter of a mile long, and as a result it is no longer an island. The population of both places is approximately 1000 people, 350 on the island, the remainder are living on the mainland. All the wells in the area are contaminated and something must be done to supply pure drinking water for the people there. I 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.

On motion Petition received:

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select committees:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the matters transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1970 under the provisions of the Labour Relations Act.

I would also like to table the report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for the year 1970 and also the report of the Proceedings of the Minimum Wage Board established under the Minimum Wage Act covering the year 1970. In addition Mr. Speaker, I would like to table certain orders and regulations and schedules under the Industrial Standards Act which are attached to the report. These regulations are (1) the employment notice of termination, record regulations 1970. (2) the elevators regulations 1970.

MR. NEARY:

also, Mr. Speaker, attached to the report are minimum wage orders that were issued in 1970 and industrial standards schedules. There are three industrial standards schedules in 1970, one was with the construction carpentry industry of Gander-Glenwood area, two plumbing and hydronic, commercial and domestic industry in St. John's and three painting and decorating industry in the St. John's area.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question 199, on today's Order Paper (a) Jacobs Engineering Company of California (b) Peat, Marwick, Mitchell on the financial side and the Dick Engineering Firm of Toronto on the practical side.

Question 200 had better be addressed I think to the acting President of the Treasury Board under whom it comes.

Question 216, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's East on today's Order Paper. The answer is yes.

Question 223

MR. MARSHALL: Will the hon. the Premier say who? The answer is yes but I wonder would he tell us the names of the three firms?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. Question 223, on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's Centre, the Leader of the Opposition. The answer to the first is no, the answer to the second is I do not know, the answer to the third is I do not know and the answer to the fourth is that I am not able to answer it at the moment but I will answer it perhaps before the day is over and, if not, some time tomorrow.

Question 286, on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part is no, the answer to the second part is yes and the answer to the third part is none, at any rate no bills, no payments made no bills received.

Question 298, on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. This is the question I think that has already been answered. The report, I believe, has been tabled but, at all events, the question ought to have been addressed to the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of questions on the Order Paper addressed to me and only two or three of them I am able to answer now. Question no. 207, asked by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East. Will nursing schools be established in Central and Western Newfoundland? If so, when? For the hon. gentleman's information, Mr. Speaker, the school in Western Newfoundland has been in existence for little over two years. The matter of a nursing school in Central Newfoundland is a matter of policy and, of course, it is not dealt with in an answer to a question.

Question no. 208, again today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East. Have any requests for prosecutions, under the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act, been made by the Minister? The answer to that question, sir, is no. Question no. 212, the answer is yes. Question no. 213, the answer is no.

MR. MARSHALL: On Question no. 212, could the minister inform when the paper will be tabled?

MR. ROBERTS: At an appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if I could direct the attention of the hon. member for Burin to Question no. 263, which he asked on today's Order Paper. I was checking with our officials this morning on that question, and they tell me that they can get it, on reasonably short notice, that information for educational districts, but to get it for electoral districts would be extremely difficult and a time consuming process, which they estimate might require (I did not go into details on this) several weeks. So, I think, with educational districts, you could strike a fairly rough estimate



Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

as to how it would apply. So, I will undertake to get that information within a day or two.

HON. J. NOLAN (Minister of Economic Development): Question no. 102, Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for St. John's East: Atlantic Sugar Refineries Co. Ltd., Marystown Shipyard Construction Limited..

MR. CROSBIE: Is this a long list?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would consider six firms as a long list, I could arrange to have it tabled. I have named two. Mooring Cove Building Company, Limited, National Sea Products, Limited, Provincial Building Company-Limited and Steers, Limited. The first two, again, Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Sugar Refineries Company, Limited and Marystown Shipyard Construction, Limited.

Question no. 103, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for St. John's East. The answer is, none. Question no. 104, again from the hon. member for St. John's East. The answer: Mr. D. Peper, Chairman; Mr. H. G. Dustan, Vice-Chairman and Mr. H. J. Coombs. The answer to part (2) of Question no. 104: at pleasure and the answer to part (3) of 104, nil.

Question no. 105, from the hon. member for St. John's East. List all loans made by the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation outstanding as of 31 December, 1970 and to give, in each instance, the date of the loan made; the amount of loan; interest rate; schedule of repayment; security held and if fire insurance policies, in the case of secured properties, are hypothecated to Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation? Answer:



March 29th., 1971

Tape no. 54

Page 3

Mr. Nolan.

Atlantic Sugar Refineries Company, Limited. There are sundry dates involved in this in answer to the date's question. The balance as of the 31st. December, 1970, \$2,501,465.

MR. NOLAN: Interest rates eight and a-quarter percent, and eight and three-quarters percent. The schedule of repayment equal semi-annual installments over twenty years. The security mortgages on six trawlers, insurance, the answer is "yes."

The next item Hotel Buildings Limited, again sundry dates, the balance as of 31 st. December, \$6,450,000. The interest rate six and a-half percent and seven and a-quarter percent. The schedule of repayment on demand. Security notes of Crown Corporation and on the insurance question again the answer is "yes."

Next the Marystown Shipyard Construction, Limited, sundry dates again; the balance \$5,070,000. Interest rate six and a-half and seven and a-quarter percent. Schedule of repayment on demand. Security notes of Crown Corporation title in name of the Crown. And on insurance, in favour of the Government and Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority.

Next the Mooring Cove Building Company, Limited, again sundry dates, the amounts \$1,847,000. The interest rates, six and a-half percent and seven and three-quarters percent. Schedule of repayment equal semi-annual installments over twenty-two years. Security lease purchase agreements dated as of 1 June, 1970 with Mooring Cove Building Company, Limited, to be assigned. Insurance in favour of Mooring Cove Building Company, Limited.

National Sea Products, Limited, the date the 16th. of December, 1970. The balance \$1,700,000. The interest rate is eight percent, equal semi-annual installments over eighteen years. Security and mortgage and on the insurance question the answer is "yes."

Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company, Limited, sundry dates again, the balance \$2,500,000. Eight percent. Mortgage to be executed. Title in name of the Crown. No buildings.

Steer's, Limited - 4th. of July, 1969, \$716,485. Eight percent, equal semi-annual installments over twenty years. The security mortgage and the insurance question again, the answer once more is "yes."

Sea Mining Corporation, Limited, sundry dates, \$2,800,000. Interest rates seven and three-quarters percent, equal semi-annual payments over

MR. NOLAN: fifteen years mortgage. The answer to the insurance question once more is "yes."

And finally, Paragon Hotel, Limited, 14th. of July, 1967, a \$133,800. Seven percent, equally monthly installments over twenty years. Second mortgage, Royal Trust as agents.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 153

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSBIE: That question as a supplementary question. In answering question 102, "To whom has Newfoundland Industrial Corporation made loans since 31st. December '68?" The hon. Minister gives six companies. Now, in the answer to 105, which is, "List all loans outstanding as at 31st. December 1970," the Minister has given eight names, I believe. How is it that the answers to these two questions disagree? In addition, looking at the answer to question 222 on the Order Paper of last year, there are other companies listed there to whom loans have been made by Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation which the minister has not listed in the answers to these questions, such as Provincial Buildings Co., Ltd., Newfoundland Steel Co., Ltd., and others. Why the discrepancy?

HON. J.A. NOLAN (Minister of Supply and Services): I can account I think, hopefully, for the discrepancy in the contradiction apparently in questions 102 and also 105. That is; the information on 105 was passed into me just a few moments, while I was on my feet, and as a result there may be a discrepancy there which I will be more than happy to check, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member opposite.

Question 103,

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, on 105, before the minister goes on. The loans advanced, to all of the companies named, are interest payments due? If so, have all of the companies paid their interest at the time they are due? If not, which ones have done?

MR. NOLAN. I will take it as notice of question. That is not the question I was asked, or questions asked. I have attempted to provide the information here that was asked formally.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Will the answers to these questions be tabled Mr. Minister? Is it the minister's intention to table the answers he has just given?

MR. NOLAN: It is my intention to table if necessary, the answers supplied that I have just read. Question 103, Mr. Speaker, the answer is none.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible):

MR. NOLAN: I see.

MR. NOLAN: There is one final one that I missed, and that is no. 153, from the hon. member for St. John's East. I knew I had it here in the papers, and again the answer is none. That is no. 153.

HON. E. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to table the answer to question 222, on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre. Question 238, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, on today's Order Paper, the answer to the first part of the question is thirty-seven. The answer to the second part of the question is two. This is a normal turnover of vacancy, and the project is practically fully occupied. The answer to the third part of the question, as the financial year is not ended, it will be some time before the information requested is available.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question there Mr. Speaker. In connection with the 160 subsidized rental units at Marystown, the minister as at March 1st, 1971, there are two occupied of the.....

MR. DAWE: Two unoccupied I am sorry.

MR. CROSBIE: Two unoccupied, oh that makes a big difference. The first part of the question, thirty-seven occupied or unoccupied?

MR. DAWE: Unoccupied Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister did not say that, so.

MR. DAWE: I am sorry.

MR. EARLE: A supplementary question on 238. Mr. Speaker,, of the houses occupied at Marystown, mentioned in this question, can the minister ascertain and advise the House how many of these houses have been occupied by families receiving social assistance presently, either long term or short term? If so, what rate of rent are they being subsidized in?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot supply that answer immediately take but I can/it undervisement and get the answer for him. I will table the answer. I should repeat this, the answer to question no. 1, thirty-seven unoccupied, question no. 2, two unoccupied. I am sorry that I misread that. In answer to question no. 250 on today's Order Paper, asked by the member for St. John's Centre, I table the answer to that question, no. 250.

MR. DAWE:

The answer to question 249, on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Centre (1) Is an apartment at Pleasantville provided for the use of or rented to Memorial University? The answer is no.

MR. COLLINS: Before we get to Orders of the Day, with your permission, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a very distinguished delegation from the town of Gander are in the Speaker's gallery, in the persons of the Major, Mr. Sheppard; Deputy Major, Mr. Daley; the Town Manager, Mr. Baker; Councillors, Mercer, Ansty and Dawe. I do not know if the Gander Council is recognized as the larger the delegations the more one might take away from the Treasury. You can certainly see that they have come well equipped in terms of numbers. I want to welcome them to the House and hope that they can return to the Town of Gander with most of the things, at any rate, which they are requesting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier a question. Would the hon. the Premier tell the House whether his trip to New York over the weekend had any connection with the request from the Government of Canada that the cost of the wharf and related facilities to be constructed at Come-by-Chance, by the Government of Canada, should be guaranteed by the Province or by the oil refinery project or by Shaheen Natural Resources Incorporated?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Canada have made no such request and that our visit to New York had nothing to do with that or with anything else connected with Come-by-Chance.

MR. CROSBIE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the Committee on Supply. I wish to bring to Your Honour's attention that in my submission the House cannot proceed to Supply at all until the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has been dealt with. Mr. Speaker, I refer first of all to Beauchesne, that great Parliamentary authority, fourth edition 1958, page 188 where Beauchesne states that the House shall appoint the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means at the commencement of every

MR. CROSBIE:

session as soon as an Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's speech. So soon, Mr. Speaker, as an Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's speech.

Mr. Speaker, the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has not yet been agreed to in this House. The Lieutenant Governor's speech was delivered on March 22nd, the debate has not yet started on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and I submit to Your Honour that, since we follow, as the Standing Order states on page 1 of our Standing Orders of the House of Assembly state on page 6, "In all cases not provided for hereafter or by sessional or other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed so far as they may be applicable to this House." Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in our Standing Orders on this subject as to whether we can go into Committee of Supply and Ways and Means before or after the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The matter is covered in the House of Commons. The usages and customs and standing orders of the House of Commons are that the Committee of Supply and Committee of Ways and Means are not to be appointed until the address is agreed to. I therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is the practice that should be followed and must be followed in this House, that the Government cannot move to the debate on Interim Supply now until the Address in Reply is finished and that therefore some other order will have to be moved by the Leader of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think there is any great debate necessary. I will not deprive anybody else, of course, of the opportunity to take part in or discuss this point of order - if anybody wishes to do so, I will not give the ruling now until I have heard them. If anyone wishes to say anything in relation to this point of order which has been raised, I will be prepared to await their help and assistance and give my ruling a little bit later. If not, I can only say this; what the hon. member for St John's West has quoted is exactly correct. I can say as well that (1) it is a little bit late, because we have already gone into Committee of Supply and have taken up part of the debate, (2), we have been accustomed, all down through the



MR. SPEAKER:

years in this House and it has been a well established custom to debate Interim Supply before the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has been concluded and number (3), if I may draw the attention of hon. members to page 201 in the same authority which the hon. member of St. John's West quoted - it says here, I will not read every bit of it but it goes on to show that it is advisable to have the Committee of Supply after the Address in Reply has been concluded but it is not entirely necessary, It is advisable to have it done after the estimates are tabled but it also states that this has been done on other occasions without the Address in Reply being concluded, in any case, even if this authority had not been there, it has been our custom, all down through the years, to have Interim Supply debated in Committee and, therefore, I see no reason why we should change it at this particular time.

The motion is that I do now leave the Chair:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with your ruling. I refer to Beauchesne page 201, there is no time limited, under the rules, for the estimates to be brought down, but the standing order 55 -

MR. SPEAKER: I have given the ruling. The hon. member has stated his case and I have now given my ruling. The only thing that is left for the hon. member to do - I appreciate what he is attempting to do but at the same time we do not debate the ruling. It only can be appealed to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to appeal to the House on two grounds, one that Beauchesne says it is good practice to table the estimates shortly after the address has been disposed of and the second reason, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SMALLWOOD: State appeal, no words, state appeal and nothing else.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please remember that an appeal to the House is not subject to debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, where do we find the usages and customs -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, obey the rules.

MR. CROSBIE: Where do we find, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am informing the hon. member that I have given my ruling, There has been a debate with regard to the point of order

MR. SPEAKER:

which was raised by the hon. member, and I can quite see his point. but I have given my ruling and it is not subject to debate. There is an appeal to the House, if the hon. member wishes to do so.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House, therefore, is that the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye," contrary "Nay"

MR. CROSBIE: Divide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Divide.

MR. HICKMAN: There is no need to divide.

MR. CROSBIE: Divide, divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the House divide.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: All Tories on their feet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CROSBIE: He does not like it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the other Tory Leader?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bring in the other Tory Leader.

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

Division:

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favour of the motion please rise, The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Canning, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. the Minister of Supply, Dr. McGrath, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

Those against the motion please rise; Mr. Hickey, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Crosbie.

I declare the motion carried.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Resolution before the committee is that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide For The Granting Of Supply To Her Majesty For Defraying of Expenses Of The Public Services For the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March 1972. The initial sum is \$99,780,000.

The Committee is now studying the Schedule.

The motion is; "Shall Item (4), Finance, carry?"

MR CROSBIE: Mr Chairman, when we adjourned on Friday, I was speaking on this item, which is a block vote of \$750 for the Department of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, the total vote on Current Account, for the Department of Finance, voted last year, when we had before us the estimates, so that we had some information before us, was \$2,682,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, \$750,000 is approximately one-third of that vote. It is certainly in excess of one-quarter of that vote. The Minister has not given us any explanation whatsoever as to why the Government should now ask this House, today, to vote in excess of twenty-five per cent of the total amount voted by the House last year, for the whole year, for the Department of Finance. \$750,000 is easily in excess of three months

vote for the Department of Finance. Why is this necessary? Why is it necessary to ask this House for more than ten per cent of that vote last year? That would be \$268,000. That should be more than enough to carry the Department of Finance for the next six to eight weeks. Why should the Minister ask this House, Mr. Chairman, and expect us to blindly vote them \$750,000 for the Department of Finance, a third of last year's total budget without telling this House what the total was that the Department of Finance spent last year or whether they are going to ask for Supplementary Supply for the Department of Finance for last year, the year just ending? This is a block vote for Finance. Finance, Mr. Chairman, is in charge of collecting taxes for the Government, including SSA Tax, Liquor Tax and the rest of it. This is the time now for the Minister to tell the House what happened to the \$410,000 that Atlantic Brewing Company, Limited owed the Government of Newfoundland last year, and just what the position is now that Bison Petroleum or whatever company has purchased certain of the assets of Atlantic Brewing Company Limited.

What is the position on that \$407,000? It is time now for the Minister to tell us, Mr. Chairman, whether the Government has done anything to help or to assist the Newfoundland non-secured creditors of Atlantic Brewing Company Limited. The Newfoundland firms and companies who were not secure, had no mortgage on these assets, who were not the Government, who were owed altogether some \$342,000 by Atlantic Brewing Company Limited. Why did not the Government take some action to protect these Newfoundland Firms and Companies? Three hundred and forty-two thousand dollars is owed by Atlantic Brewing, which was the brain-child of the Government, supported by the Government, helped by the Government, given letters by the Premier showing them that they did not have to pay any tax. What is the Government's position with respect to its \$400,000? We are told that the Government is going to get five or ten year bonds from Bison Petroleum. The Government is only a non-secured creditor. How was the Government able to get these bonds from Bison that it did not get for the Newfoundland creditors who were owed

\$342,000 and many of them cannot afford to lose it, what is the story on that? That information the House should have before the Department of Finance is voted \$750,000 for this year. Would the Minister tell the House how he proposes to deal with the huge amounts the Government have borrowed in the past several years, without sinking funds, that have to be repaid in the next two years. From April 1 1971 to March 31, 1973 the Government is going to have to repay, to people who loaned this Province money \$104 million, \$21 million, in round figures, for the Power Commission, \$82 million for the Government direct. The total amount of sinking funds that are available to meet these huge repayments in two years are \$2, 845,000. That is what the Minister told us last year, in answer to question 229. So that this Government has to find in the next two years, apart from all the other borrowing it is going to do, and we know the deposit for this year is \$103 million at least, \$103 million. The Government is going to have to borrow \$100 million in the next two years to pay off old loans that have no sinking funds.

What is the Minister planning to do about that? How does he plan to arrange that? An average of \$50 million a year, in addition to borrowing at least another \$100 million just to keep the Province afloat, the Government afloat. We are going to have our own currency, I think, our own currency. What part of the \$750,000 now being voted is going to go towards that purpose, Mr. Chairman? Could the Minister elucidate on that position for us? Since the Minister of Finance is responsible for the budget and the estimates and the rest of it, could the Minister now tell the Committee, Mr. Chairman, when he is going to table the estimates for 1971-72? This is the end of March, the end of March 1971, can the Minister now tell the House will it be next week, or two weeks time or four weeks time that we will get the estimates for the expenditure for the year 1971-72? Why is it, this delay? Can the Minister tell the House when he is going to table the Public Accounts? When he is going to table the Auditor General's Report? How can the Minister ask this House, Mr. Chairman, to vote

\$100 million without even telling us when we are going to see the estimates for the year 1971-72, that starts next Thursday? The next financial year starts next Thursday. Surely we have the right to expect that the Government can give us the estimates of that expenditure. Why can it not? Last year we were told, when the same situation came up March 11, last year, we were told that the estimates were prepared by the Government in November of the previous year.

When we asked questions in this committee last year, Mr. Chairman we were told, time after time, the estimates were inaccurate, inaccurate because we prepared them last November and now, four or five months have gone by, that is why these estimates are inaccurate, when the various Cabinet Ministers were questioned. Are we going to get that same story this year? Because if the estimates are ready now and were prepared last November, why have we not got them? Why are not the Lieutenant Governor's Warrants filed? How much did the Department of Finance spend last year? Was it the amount shown in the estimates or twice as much? Why does the Minister need in excess of one-quarter of the whole amount he had for last year, to spend in April and May this year? Does not need to be. It is not the water that is spiked around here it is the Government that is spiked. Every day is another spike in the Government.

I am only asking several questions now, Mr. Chairman, I will get down to the serious debate, if the Minister does not answer them. What about the great reclassification of the Civil Service; Mr. Chairman? Last year we were told by the Government that the whole Civil Service was being reclassified, Public Associates, I think the name was, of Chicago, were doing a personnel study of the whole service, there was a new classification scheme, all the civil servants were going to be delighted with it once it came into being. We have not been told a word since as to whether this is now in effect or not. We have not been told what Public Service Associates of Chicago were paid for it. We have not



been told whether the Government has accepted it or not. We have not been told whether this is a subject now of collective bargaining with the civil servants or the Government. In fact the Minister has not told us anything about Labour Relations with the Civil Service, as yet, or the police and the rest of them. Do we have some information on that? All we ask for - we had a little statement about the Minister had sat with the interns, there are about thirty interns in the Province and about 8000 civil servants and about 6000 teachers. The Minister made a statement that the Government has settled everything up with the interns for the next two years. The Minister should read and memorize it.

In the Minister's Department comes Royal Commissions. The Royal Commissions are paid out of the Minister's vote. Last year - It is in order - Every bit in order - Yes, wonderful is it not? The Government should not have to ask for Supply twice. If a Government did its right job and asked for Supply once it would only be debated once. When the Government does not do its job properly and ask for Supply twice, then it is debated twice. Those are the rules we have to go by. The same applies to the Premier.

Under Royal Commissions, in the estimates for the year ending Thursday, there was an amount only of \$40,000, provided for, unless it was increased in the Blue Book, about \$40,000. Could the Minister tell us how many Royal Commissions have been paid out of that since? What did the Royal Commission on Forestry cost? We were told last year that, up to date last year was \$55,000. We were told that up to a year ago the Fraser Commission on taxation, of the city of St. John's, was paid \$23,735. The Fraser Commission was appointed in December, 1965. That has gotten into the fat and has not surfaced yet. We are told today, Mr. Chairman, that the Fraser Commission report on the City of St. John's is not given the Government now. It was appointed six years ago. That beats all records for Royal Commissions, in history, in this Province. A Royal Commission

appointed six years ago, paid \$23,000 up to one year ago. Has it been paid anything since? Why has not the Government taken that Commission away from Mr. Fraser, if he cannot do the job, and given it to somebody else? Why is it allowed to go on year after year for six years? Forestry \$55,000 what else was spent on that Royal Commission this year? There is the Royal Commission on the radiation problem in St. Lawrence, Has that commission been paid yet and, if so, how much? How did that \$40,000 get spent this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is this, that we are now debating Item 4 of the Schedule, Finance, \$750,000. I would like to know from Your Honour if it is in order now for any member of this House to talk, under the Heading of 4, Finance, talk about the Liquor Commission, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Fisheries, Economic Development, Labour, Highways, talk about any one of these items, after Item 4 or preceding Item 4, on the grounds that it is Finance? Anything you like on this sheet, the right hand side, that Schedule is money. It is Finance. Money is involved. Now we are at heading 4, Finance. Does this mean that under Heading 4, Finance, we can talk about anything on the paper because Finance is involved in everything on this sheet?

Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. Chairman: That is not a point of order. The hon. the Premier is asking the Chairman a question, which he knows the Chairman cannot answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, it is a point of order. It is a point of order. I want to know if it is in order for any hon.member of this House, under Heading IV, Finance, to talk about anything in the schedule, because Finance is involved in everything in the schedule?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in case the hon. the Premier has not been listening, I am talking about Royal Commissions which, in the main estimates, are Item 404-03 - specific heading, Royal Commissions. My submission, if Your Honour wishes a submission, is that we are entitled, with a block vote for the Department of Finance, to discuss the business of the Department of Finance and that includes Royal Commissions. Shall I continue? The Aylward Commission at St. Lawrence, has that been paid for? Was it paid for last year or is part of this \$750,000 to pay for that commission. What is happening? Well the Adam's Commission, we know, is not dead. The minister has not spent any money on that. What is the minister going to do about the Royal Commission on the City of St. John's? Is he going to permit it to go on month after month, year after year, piling up bills and not doing its job. Is that what part of the \$750,000 is for? There was \$600,000 spent on Royal Commissions in the last several years. What good are we getting out of them? We have them that will not even report. Would the minister tell us why the minister

Mr. Crosbie,

found it necessary this year to float \$30 million in loans on the Canadian Market direct - Newfoundland Government Loans; a \$22.5 million loan on the U. K. Market; a \$20 million in EURO dollar bonds, February 4, 1971; a \$ 25 million loan on the New York Market, March 15, \$97.5 million? Why did the minister borrow that money this year, in the year just ended? It is gone somewhere. We want to know why the minister found it necessary. His predecessor told us, last year, that he was only going to borrow \$29.5 million. He borrowed \$97.5 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. This Item (4), Finance, \$750,000, is a request of the Government that the House, this committee, then later the House grant, and this interim amount, this provisional amount. This is something on account. If it is in order, in discussing this, to consider and debate the year almost ended, the present year, this is for the coming year but, if it is in order to debate the present year, is it not equally in order to debate the year before the present one and the year before that and any year in our history? If debate is not to be confined to this amount for the coming year, but the debate can range over the year just passed, why not any year and why not any year in the future and why not have a far and wide ranging debate of the type you have when the budget is brought down the full estimates? Because remember, Mr. Chairman, this \$750,000, if the committee votes it and recommends it to the House, the House votes it, and the Government get it, that is not the end of the debate. This amount has to be caught up in the estimates that are to be brought down, the full estimates, a book an inch thick, with several thousands items in it, and under Head IV, Department of Finance, every last individual item, making up

Mr. Smallwood.

this \$750,000 and millions more with it. Every item has to be laid before the House, debated, (debate is proper), questions asked and answered. It is not as though our approving now this \$ 750,000 ends the committee's opportunity or the House's opportunity to debate this. This is only Interim Supply. This is something on account to be followed by the full, complete detail of this amount and a lot more with it. With the Committee of Supply and the Committee of Ways and Means, both committees and the House, with every possible opportunity to debate it, is it proper now to have a far-ranging debate on everyone of these items in view of the fact that the rules of the House provide for a far-reaching debate on all of these items, when the estimates are brought down and the Budget Speech is brought down? What is the purpose of a Budget Speech Debate and a debate on the full estimates, if there can be a full and far-reaching debate now on merely Interim Supply?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Can I reply to the point of order Mr. Chairman? I can or I cannot?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, having read the authorities, the practice is in other places that when the House is asked to vote for what is called in other jurisdictions "a vote in advance," or an "advance on the coming year," the resolution contains a schedule. The schedule shows the money which the House is being asked to vote. Hon. members are entitled to debate any item shown on that schedule to the same extent as if it were the main estimates. On the other hand, they are limited to the item shown in the schedule, and cannot debate anything except what is shown in the schedule. The practice in other places has been to specify, in slightly more detail perhaps, than we have in the schedule which is before us now.

I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that this is a vote for an advance. What the committee has been asked to deal with now will be dealt with again in the estimates. According to the constitutional authorities, and the authorities on procedure in the House and in committee on an interim resolution or a resolution for an account in advance, it is stated quite clearly that the best practice is that there is no full debate held, because the Government is merely asking for an advance and that the whole matter comes up again in the Budget Speech and the debate on the estimates, where there is even a better and a more far-ranging opportunity to members. So that what is happening here, actually, is that members are debating now, at some length, exactly what they will be asked to debate when the estimates are passed down.

In other Houses the time is limited. In other words; in the House of Commons in Ottawa and the House of Commons in London, the time for Interim Supply, a vote in advance, is limited to only say one day and a-half or something of that nature. The debate is limited to a very short time on Interim Supply. Unfortunately or fortunately, as the case may be, in this House we do not have such limitations, and members are free now to debate the heading of these items, bearing only in mind the breakdown which the minister may give at the commencement of a particular resolution. In other words, if the minister gives a breakdown as to how the money is to be spent that he puts here, that is the



only restriction on the right of debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman.....

MR. MURPHY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, Beauchesne 239, says, "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 estimate of that department, which reads as follows in general administration."

Now, as far as we are concerned, we have reached.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): This is not the estimates.

MR. MURPHY: This is a Committee of Supply, Interim Supply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not the estimates.

MR. MURPHY: We know it is not the estimates. Is that not what we are kicking up all the ructions about? Where are the estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Apparently the Leader of the Opposition did not understand me. We have here a schedule which says, under the present item - item 4, Finance \$750,000. Now, when the hon. the minister introduced that item, he gave a breakdown of the headings under which \$750,000. was to be spent. These are the headings that are open now to the widest debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And nothing but.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we do not need the help - you know the hon. the Premier is not the dictator yet. There are some rules in this House even he has to go by, Mr. Chairman. We are attempting to go by the rules. The hon. minister is attempting to get \$100 million without any explanation. What is in a million? Now, it is what is in \$100 million?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that is not a lie.....

MR. CROSBIE: That is not a lie, that is one hundred percent truth. None, no explanation, and the hon. the Premier getting up and sticking you on points of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! order please!

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier knows well what the truth is and what is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down when the Speaker stands up.



MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as the Chair is concerned, that point of order has been dealt with and will the hon. member for St. John's West please resume.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be restricted to what the hon...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Will the hon. member please be relevant to the item before this Committee.

MR. CROSBIE: The item before this House is the Department of Finance, \$750,000. which includes salaries for every branch of the department, general administration. It includes royal commissions, includes pensions and gratuities, it includes Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member does not wish to continue his speech, I will have to ask him to sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the hon. the minister.....

MR. HICKEY: Point of order, are we under the new rules now?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Inaudible

MR. HICKEY: I did not think, Mr. Chairman, that language was permitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! order. When an hon. member of this House is standing, he should be speaking, and he should be speaking relevant to the point before the committee. The point before the committee now is item 4, Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we can proceed, there is a clarification. The Chairman has said that we are restricted to the breakdown the minister gives when he says what the amount is being voted for. Are we to get this breakdown in writing so that we will know what the breakdown is as we go along? Or, are we to go along blindly? If that is what we are to be restricted to, surely, the least we can have in this House, on this side, is a breakdown from the minister of what the items are. All we have had is one short verbal indication by the minister as to what the amount is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may say so, the minister, at the commencement of this debate, gave totals for practically every item under his department, so I do not really know what the hon. member is worried about.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what I thought, Mr. Chairman, but I do not have a record of it. If we are....

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister has had every opportunity to explain these items. Instead of that, his cohorts on the other side say "carried" every time there is a moment of silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: They get carried away.

MR. CALLAHAN: Why not?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, to get back to this, to Beauchesne. Beauchesne states a full discussion of the country's expenditures.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please! The point before the committee now is an item for finance. If the hon. member for St. John's West does not wish to proceed with the debate on it, perhaps he will yield the floor to somebody else.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I will try to be relevant to this particular vote, which is very difficult under the circumstances. I would like to refer to some of the items which are covered under this heading, on which we have no information whatsoever.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. CROSBIE: That is so.

MR. EARLE: We have no information whatsoever. If the hon. minister will

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: If the hon. minister will allow me to proceed, we have no information whatsoever on the things which I am about to question. If I am incorrect, Mr. Chairman, that the information was given on Saturday.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: I will sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: There was no information given on Friday.

MR. EARLE: I will have a seat, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The two leaders are sitting together at last.

MR. CROSBIE: Three cheers for the two leaders, hip, hip, hurrah, hurrah

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two hearts that beat as one.

MR. CROSBIE: Hurrah, no heart, there is no heart beating over there.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, if you please.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, here we are

MR. EARLE: approaching the last day of the Financial Year and we are asked for \$100 million approximately.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$750,000.

MR. EARLE: Included in which is \$750,000.

What I would wish to ask, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the Minister or the Acting Minister of Finance, or the Vice-Chairman of the Treasury Board or whoever is answering these questions, in the light of the fact that he is asking for \$750,000 advance, which is according to my reckoning on last year's estimates three and a-half months supply. This would cover from three and a-half to four months supply, \$750,000. The Department has been provided over recent years with a most efficient, up-to-date system of accounting, the latest types of idea and computers and so on. There is a staff of over one hundred to prepare all of this data. And, yet, here we are approaching the end of the Financial Year and we do not have before us the expenditure of last year, That is why are are being so adamant about asking questions on the projected expenditure for next year. If the hon. minister will listen instead of talking to one of his colleagues he may hear what I say.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: We have in his department the latest of equipment and yet we do not get the facts at this stage, we have nothing on which to base this request for the coming year.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman was not in the House Friday, he does not know.

MR. EARLE: The hon. gentleman knows far more than the hon. minister knows about this particular situation. There is no earthly reason, there is no reason whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, that the Government should not be in a position at this time to divulge to this House all of the facts concerning what was spent last year up to this point. They have the latest of equipment with which to do so. And, yet, they have the audacity to come in here and ask for three and a-half to four months of Interim Supply, in other words, to

MR. EARLE: allow them to pay next year's bills without having explained to us what was spent last year.

I am very sorry indeed that the Minister of Finance himself is not here to answer our questions. I believe he is on a leave absence, and it is unfortunate that he is ill, because, I think that he would do a much more better job than we are carrying the present time. Unfortunately he is one of the few ministers on the other side of the House who has not apparently sought or been given at least an executive assistance. Now, if there is any department of Government which requires an executive assistant, the minister requires an executive assistant. It would be the Department of Finance, the most important operation of Government, in which all our revenues are collected and all of our expenditures are made. Yet for some unknown reason this minister can be given leave of absence, because he is ill, and yet there is no executive assistant to carry on. We are getting it from those who are proported to speak for him, the most meager of information furthermore, we are getting from them the greatest resistance ever, to giving any information, on the pretext that this will all be divulged later on.

Well just how well is it going to be divulged? This is another reason why we are asking questions at the present time. As my hon. friend the member for St. John's West, just mentioned, last year in the Budget Speech on Estimates, which were debated very fully indeed, and we thought we had asked all necessary questions at that time, and received honest, fair answers, but at that time it was stated that the Province would be going to the bond market for \$29.5 million. It now turns out, nearly twelve months later, that they went to the bond market for \$97.5 million. Surely, that item alone, is a sufficient cause for us to question a request at this time for what will be three and a-half to four months money to carry us through the New Year. How do we know in the light of these statements which were made last year, which were not borne out during the twelve months and did not work out as predicted, that any three and a-half or four months supply will

MR. EARLE: we grant now will not disappear in one month, and then the budget will be brought down. We have no evidence to show what it will be spent on nor how it will be spent nor any detail of how it will be spent, and yet, we are being asked blindly to give three and a-half to four months supply. So that they can spend it as they see fit, Based on last year's experience, taking that bond requirement as an instance, it could well be that this much money would be dispensed very hastily in one month, and no explanation given.

Just one point that I should like to make in the matter of the Atlantic Brewery last year. We read something about how this matter has been brought to a conclusion, I hope from certain points, certainly from the employment standpoint it will be satisfactory to the people of Stephenville. But the Government apparently, in making this arrangement or sponsoring this arrangement, made no provision whatsoever for the salaries of employees who lost their jobs through the failure of that brewery. The first claim generally, in the case of trouble of this nature, is to protect the salaries of those who lose their jobs.

The Government apparently has taken some steps to protect its \$410,000, which it was owed, but even that on a very free-and-easy basis insofar as they will get bonds for; ten year bonds, interest free bonds, so that actually the \$410,000, at today's rate of interest, by the time they are paid up will be nearer \$800,000. The Government is just allowing this to go on, These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why we are asking the questions on an astounding sum of nearly \$100 million to cover the first three and a-half or four months of the coming year. Whether I was here Friday or not, I am prepared to venture a statement that no detailed explanation has been given to this House.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. EARLE: There has been no detailed explanation given to this House. I think, if there had been it would have been reported in the press and radio, and I listened intently over the weekend. So there has been no



MR. EARLE: explanation. All that the Government side is trying to do is trying, in their usual manner, to bulldoze and bully this House into accepting every request that they make, without question. If the House had proceeded along the normal lines and told us what they had spent last year, we had been given the opportunity to debate what extra money they require to cover last year's over expenditure, then we would be in a far more lenient mood to approach the coming year. But, not knowing that, and not having any idea of that, and on top of that not knowing in detail what this \$100 million is required for, this side of the House would be more than delinquent in its duty, if it passed a single item covered by that without the most detailed examination.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Perhaps the hon. Minister of Social Services and Supply needs a few extra pencils so that he can draw his little black ass and little white ass, so that they can chase along. Have you ever seen, Mr. Chairman, as infantile as that kind of thing we were treated to on T.V.

MR. BARBOUR: I would like to direct a question to the hon. member for Fortune. Does he really think within his own heart and soul that the Government carelessly, needlessly, dishonestly spend the money? A few moments ago you said; they may spend it and there may be no account given of it. I do not think that this Government is capable of such a thing. And, I think, we are wasting a lot of time in this hon. House, and if you really knew your business, and if you were interested in the welfare of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, you would pass this estimate without any more trouble.

MR. EARLE: That is a question, Mr. Chairman, which I am very happy to answer. I am as interested and more interested in the welfare of the people of this Province, from what I am saying. And furthermore whether it is honest or dishonest, it is most certainly careless the way this Government spends its money.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there are a few points with respect to this vote



MR. MARSHALL: on Finance, Auditor General is one of the items, one of the broad items for which we were given an amount of \$87,000, I believe, the other day. Before this is passed, there are certain questions that should be asked with respect to the Auditor General's staff itself.

Mr. Marshall.

I say before this is asked, there are certain questions that must certainly be answered. The Auditor General's Report, the last Auditor General's Report that was filed here in this House, the Auditor General noted that he had not adequate staff with which to carry out his duties and he needed more staff in order to be able to function properly. There is nothing more important to the business of this Province than that the Auditor General be given adequate money and adequate staff to carry out his duties. I would like to know, I would like the minister to indicate whether and how many additional posts have been created for the Department of the Auditor General? There is also the position that the Auditor General's Department - it has been stated or it has been indicated that the Auditor General's Department is moving from this building. It is moving from the Confederation Building to the Second Floor, Elizabeth Towers. This is a grave mistake. Elizabeth Towers, itself, was a mistake. But to move the Department of the Auditor General, there is no department or division of a department in this Government, which, of necessity, must go from one department to the other more frequently than the division of the Auditor General. We know that the Auditor General, from time to time, has made reports on the Government which have been very painful to the Government. One wonders, whether it is being pushed out of this building so that it will impede its work that much more.

Certainly, it ought not to be taken out of the Confederation Building and certainly it ought not be put into Elizabeth Towers, to further subsidize the mistakes of this Government with respect to that giant colossus on Elizabeth Avenue. The thing which bears scrutiny, Mr. Chairman, is the vote for the Civil Service Commission. I am, in a moment, going to move the amount of \$15,900, which was indicate to be part of this total vote on Interim Supply, be reduced to the sum of \$1.00. We have the situation here,

Mr. Marshall

Mr. Chairman, in the Civil Service, where the Civil Service Commission is not functioning properly, to the detriment of the Province. It is most necessary that commissioners of the Civil Service Commission be appointed from the Civil Service itself. This is the provision in other provinces of Canada. We have a situation here, in this Province, where, at present, there are only two commissioners. Mr. Courage died recently. One of the present commissioners was the defeated candidate of the Liberal Party in the Gander By-Election. The other, I understand, is an individual who had been working in the Liberal Party before. This does not do anything at all to strengthen the Civil Service.

We have a Province of this nature, where the Government are so integrally entwined in the affairs of the country. We have a depressed economy, such as we have, where we need the leadership that we do from the Government. It is most necessary that we have a strong Civil Service. The Amulree Report in the 1930's, which was the harbinger of the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I may say that this is not a budget debate. What we are debating here now is certain, particular estimates. By any stretch of the imagination, it is hard to see how the Amulree Report has anything whatever to do with the \$750,000 which we are talking about here.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I am on the item of the Civil Service Commission for which there is an amount of \$15,900 voted here. I am going to move and I move now that this amount of \$15,900 be reduced to \$1.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The amount recorded here is \$750,000.

MR. MARSHALL: Well I would move that the amount of \$750,000 be reduced by the amount of \$15,900, which is the amount the hon. minister indicated was to be provided for the Civil Service Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is...

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister did not give any information. We have it

Mr. Smallwood.

from the other Tory leader. He gave no information to the House.

MR. MARSHALL: The minister, Mr. Chairman, gave a breakdown. He gave a breakdown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He gave no information.

MR. MARSHALL: The minister gave the amount of \$15,900.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Somebody is lying. Someone is lying. Either the hon. gentleman who is now speaking or the Tory Leader from St. John's West. Someone is lying.

MR. MARSHALL: The amount was \$15,...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It is not that someone is lying, if we get contradictory statements in the House. Would you please continue?

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. the Premier for his usual gentle approach. Now, Mr. Chairman, we come to this Civil Service Commission, and I have made this motion: It is absolutely necessary, as I say, that we have a good, strong, Civil Service Commission. This is not being set up here in this Province. The Civil Service Commission, as we now have existing, appoints, and all you have to do is read the annual report of 1970 to see the numbers that the Civil Service Commission recommends. They are now relegated to very minor points. There are a fair number of Shorthand-Typists there; Officers Grade 1, II, III, IV, etc. But you cannot operate a government (There are very few Directors. There might be about half a dozen)...

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, when a member is speaking, the rule is quite clear. He can only be interrupted if he permits a question to be asked. Mr. Chairman, we are being interrupted by several gentleman opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not quite know what the wish of the committee is about this. Generally speaking, members do not object too strongly to certain minor interruptions. As far as the Chair is concerned, the member is entitled to speak without interruption. This afternoon we have had far too many interruptions.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I thank the hon. member for St. John's West. I can assure the House that the interruptions I have had have been very minor in nature. We come back to the point in issue. I feel that it is imperative that we have commissioners appointed from the Civil Service itself, which is something we do not have, that is number one. Number two, there should be a type of examination system set up within the Civil Service so that appointments and promotions come from within the Civil Service wherever possible. I do not feel that this is being done. I do not feel that the Civil Service is properly staffed. The people who are staffing it now, the commissioners, I have no doubt, they may be competent men in some areas, but it is absolutely and positively essential that the Civil Service of this Province be the strongest type of organization that you can possibly have. I do not feel, as I say, that the Civil Service - the Civil Service of the Federal Government - the Civil Service Commission of the Federal Government operates in an admirable fashion. Newfoundland can expect no less than that.

The Royal Commission on economic prospects points out the lack of a proper type of Civil Service. I think that steps ought to have been taken long, long before this to improve the Civil Service Commission. I would hope that the House would go along with this motion to reduce and cut out, in effect, the Civil Service Commission for the next few months. There is a Bill that is going to come to this House, which will give effect to that which I say. But there are three points that must be borne in mind. First of all the Civil Service Commission ought to be - the commissioners ought to be appointed from the senior Civil Service itself

Mr. Marshall.

Secondly, it is imperative that the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission be widened considerably to include many, many more phases of many, many more posts than it presently considers.

Thirdly, we must establish for once and for all that promotion in the Civil Service is through the merit system. Therefore,

Mr. Chairman, I make that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the amount in Item (4) be reduced to \$734,100. Those in favour please say, "aye." Contrary, "Nay."

The motion is lost.

MR. CROSBIE: Standing Vote, please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Those in favour of the motion please rise. (7)

Those against the motion please rise. (13).

The motion is defeated.

Shall the Item carry?

MR. HICKMAN: One of the items referred to

MR. CALLAHAN: Is the motion carried?

MR. HICKMAN: No, the motion was not carried. That is only wishful thinking on the part of the hon. Minister.

MR. CALLAHAN: Another act to keep us back, I will have to go through it all again.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no that would take you a whole half a minute, that would take the Minister about half a minute, Mr. Chairman, to give the information that he gave to this hon. House on Friday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Would the hon. member please continue.

MR. HICKMAN: One bit of information that the hon. Minister did give to the Committee on Friday was that he required \$29,000. to pay Royal Commissions. Now I think that this Committee is entitled to know what Royal Commissions are to be paid and this would give us an opportunity and give this Committee an opportunity to discuss whether or not Government in its wisdom feels that the work of the Commission and this House feels justifies the expenditure that the Minister has in mind.

I do not know and neither has the Minister of Finance indicated whether any of the monies to be voted or asked to be voted under this particular head is to be paid to Royal Commission on radiation and safety in the mines at St. Lawrence. The last time this...

MR. CALLAHAN: Would the hon. gentleman like me to answer the question now and then he will not have to as well.

MR. HICKMAN: By all means, and the amount.

MR. CALLAHAN: If I did not say it on Friday, Mr. Chairman, the amount to which the hon. gentleman refers in respect to Royal Commissions deals with the Royal Commission on Labour Legislation, it is not \$29,000. it is \$4,500 in respect of that one Royal Commission, and that is the amount we are discussing.



MR. HICKMAN: This is the only Royal Commission that is going to be paid or will the hon. Minister indicate

MR. CALLAHAN: During the currency of the Interim Supply.

MR. HICKMAN: Well in that case, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is an amount that should not be paid at this time, the Royal Commission to examine the labour laws of this Province and if there is one set <sup>of</sup> laws that should be examined and re-examined and brought into the twentieth century, <sup>is</sup> the labour laws, the restrictive labour laws that we have in the Province at this time. The Royal Commission under the chairmanship

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Are you going to keep these yahoos quiet, Mr. Chairman, or are you not? I have a perfect right to speak and I do not have the time to give my speech in baby talk for the benefit of the hon. the member for Bell Island so I assume he does not understand what we are talking about anyway. I do submit, Mr. Chairman, that in 1968 or 69 Dean Cohen, the former dean of McGill School of Law, was appointed to examine the labour laws of this Province and to make recommendations as to how these labour laws can be brought up to date and made more effective, from the point of view of the working people in this Province. That is approximately two years ago.

That Royal Commission, under Dean Cohen, was authorized to hire and did hire at least one expert to assist him in his studies and in examining and comparing labour laws in other Provinces and other jurisdictions. That Royal Commission at the same time was given the services of one or more highly qualified civil servants in the public service of this Province. We have now waited for two years. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that whatever report is handed down or submitted to Government by the Royal Commission on labour laws it will not be submitted in time for enactment during the current session of the House of Assembly.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if out of this vote of \$750,000. monies are to be used to pay the Royal Commission on labour then this Committee should not vote them one single, solitary cent. Is this Committee being

MR. HICKMAN:

asked to buy a pig in the poke, are we being asked to pay for something that Government has not seen, that is not completed? We do not know if it is going to be good or bad. We do know that many good reports of Royal Commissions have been massacred, not implemented, twisted and turned. We only have to look at the statement of the hon. the acting Minister of Labour, on the Royal Commission on radiation in St. Lawrence, to see how the people of that community have been bluffed and cajoled for two years, two solid years since that Commission filed its report with Government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: We are on Royal Commissions.

MR. HICKMAN: We are on Royal Commissions. We have also been told by the hon. the Minister of Finance that the only information that is available at this time for this House is now being made available. We cannot have a Supplementary Supply Bill because we have not reached the end of the fiscal year, we will not reach that until tomorrow. It is quite inconceivable that this has not

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: If the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources wants to resign his portfolio and become Chairman, I am sure that we could drag him kicking and screaming and plank him in that Chair. Until he does that, Mr. Chairman, I intend to be governed by your ruling and nobody else.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Now I think the matter has reached the stage where members are complaining so violently about being interrupted that I will have to say that if there are any further interruptions from this particular speaker, I will send for Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we are dealing with this vote of \$750,000. to quote your very famous speech of last year, Mr. Chairman, where you stated once again what is a pretty strong concept of Parliamentary procedure in the British system of Government, as we know it, that if there is one feature of the Legislative process which requires due and careful diligence of all hon. members, both in Committee and when the House meets in

MR. HICKMAN:

session, <sup>it</sup> is the control and the diligence that must be used over the spending and the expenditures of public funds. There, Mr. Speaker, is where it is relevant, most relevant, to expect of any Minister introducing or participating in the debate or trying to give information (or failing to give information is more to the point under any particular heading in this Bill) that he be subjected not only to questioning from this side of the House but from hon. members in the House generally.

The hon. the Minister of Finance would lead us to believe that we cannot get this information, we cannot get an indication as to how the money was spent last year after this House adjourned, and this is very relevant because, if you know how much the Department of Finance spent last year or overspent, then we can be expected to judge fairly accurately whether the amount now being sought by the Minister is indeed necessary or whether this vote of \$750,000. is substantially in excess of that which need be required in an Interim Supply Bill.

Mr. Chairman, may I draw this Committee's attention to the fact that obviously when you read the report that is contained in the prospectus that was recently filed in New York, in connection with the bond issue of the Government of this Province for 25. million dollars, that it is obvious that there have been many warrants issued under the Revenue and Audit Act during the past fiscal year.

MR. CALLAHAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am under the impression that you have already ruled, Your Honour, on the matter of relevancy in this debate. Is the prospectus recently filed in the United States and the Auditor General's report and Supplementary Supply, are these matters relevant to the item we are now discussing?

I would like your ruling, Your Honour.

MR. HICKMAN: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that under the general administration under the heading Finance there is included loan and debt management. I would

MR. T.A.HICKMAN: be presumptuous enough to suggest that under the category of loans, debt management comes the borrowing powers and the borrowings of this Province administered by the hon. Minister of Finance. I submit that this is a very relevant comment to the debate, insofar as this particular heading is concerned. Thank you!

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, we have already dealt with debt management.

MR. HICKMAN: The Chairman has just made a ruling.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a point of order, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CALLAHAN: A point of order we have already dealt with, and voted upon that item.

MR. CROSBIE: They would not admit that Friday.

MR. HICKMAN: Am I allowed to proceed Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chairman has ruled

MR. CROSBIE: I was just going to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we were not allowed to discuss that Friday. The hon. minister did not want it discussed on Friday.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this committee in trying to ascertain the public necessity for this House to vote the Interim Supply of \$750,000. that is now requested by the hon. the Minister of Finance, is entitled to have laid before it, all information that is presently available to the Minister of Finance with respect to last year's expenditures. We have been told that Supplementary Supply estimates are not available at this time, because, they have not as yet been completed.

Mr. Chairman, may I draw this committees attention to the fact, that under the Revenue and Audit Act, when any warrants are issued, any Lieutenant Governor's Warrants are issued, they can only be issued, (and these warrants are issued for expenditures not authorized by this legislature last year) they can only be issued if the minister takes upon himself the very solemn duty to write the Lieutenant Governor and say that it is of urgent necessity that these monies be spent at this time, even though, they were not voted. Then, the legislature, in order to keep a committee such as this fully informed, imposes

an obligation on the minister that within fifteen days from the opening of the House of Assembly, these Lieutenant Governor's Warrants must be tabled.

It is true that fifteen days have not expired as yet since this House opened, but Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious to anyone that all warrants that have been issued to date are presently available. They are in the hands of the hon. the Minister of Finance right now. There is one piece of information that he could make available to this committee, that he could have made available to this House on opening day, but he chooses, Mr. Chairman to keep it in the confines of his cold, secretive little heart, and we are not supposed to be given this information to enable us to decide on the adequacy and the necessity of voting \$750,000. to the Minister of Finance at this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to me, and I am sure it must be obvious to the other members of this committee, that not only do we have in this committee and in this Bill a marked departure from the British Parliamentary system, and we hear so much about it when it suits Government's purpose...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We are not discussing the British Parliamentary System. It is item 4, Finance, please be relevant.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I refer to your remarks that in other Houses we find in detail.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! my remarks are one thing, and the hon. members are another. Now, the item we are discussing is 4, Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the simple fact that must become apparent to you, Mr. Chairman, and apparent to the members of this committee, is that there is no way that Government is going to submit relevant information to this committee as to how Government proposes to spend this \$750,000. during the next one, two or three months. Unless Government is prepared to do that, then we are only driven to one conclusion, that this theory, this great principle of Parliament's control over the power of the purse is being treated with absolute contempt and disdain by the Minister who now seeks the approval for this vote.

I, Mr. Chairman, feel that any hon. member, and this includes hon. members on the opposite side of the House, who have as little information as we have should never place themselves in a position where they could vote blindly



for this type of vote. When we know of what particular, this is \$400,000. for a commission, and so far we do not know what they are doing and we suspect that it is very little.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member gets his name in the paper, he will stay home again tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: I was down in Burin. You dare not go down there again after closing that welfare office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out now, if I may, that the hon. member for Burin, who was so vociferous about being interrupted while he was speaking, was then carrying on a conversation which was interrupting the Leader of the Opposition. Would you please carry on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which Leader of the Opposition Mr. Chairman

MR. MURPHY: Ho, ho, ho, ho. Mr. Chairman, I think we have discussed, as a matter of fact, I am sure we have discussed at great length this particular vote. Possibly, just to sum up for a minute or two, why the purpose of this debate, I think each speaker in turn has made it abundantly clear that looking for \$750,000. in this particular instance, and a total vote of \$100 million, is not at all necessary at this time.

There are one or two items I would like to refer to myself, and I think the hon. member for Burin referred to the lone segment of this vote. I am just wondering, through this Government's handling of its finances, such as huge sums for Interim Financing, not bringing down the supplementary supply, what effect it is having outside this Province. I think it is rather significant, Mr. Chairman, that a short time ago, or in the process, we are floating a loan of \$25 million which is costing this Province 8.9 percent. Our Sister Province of Nova Scotia is floating the same amount at 7 percent. I believe that our handling of our financial situation has not been too good, as far as handling of loans is concerned in the money market.

I just want to refer now, to the statement made by the hon. Premier, when the House opened, with reference to, if we do not grant this supply, this \$100 million pretty soon, we will meet morning, afternoon and night. I think the



hon. member for St. John's West put forward the case that we are not to be bullied, threatened or anything else. I would like to say, on behalf of the official Opposition, and perhaps on behalf of the other Leader of the Opposition who is not here in the chamber at the present moment, that we do not intend by any means to deprive any civil servant or anyone else that receives allowances in the form of cheques from this Government, of anything for the month of April. We are quite prepared to grant supply for one month, the month of April, to this Government. If they cannot or will not prepare supplementary and have the estimates ready by the end of April, then we will meet again and discuss .....

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is threatening now?

MR. MURPHY: Threatening? I think I am going overboard to accommodate this so-called Government. We will then, at the end of April at that period, if we have not our estimates and our budget over by that time, and there is no reason why we should not have them over. We have been told time and time again that the Government has been working on estimates since last September, that is seven months ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. MURPHY: The hon. the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: The other Leader said that.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. Premier said that, yes, the other leader, the other leader facing me. You do not listen to our favourite program in the morning. That is what is wrong with the hon. minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, we figure that there should be approximately three to four months Supply being asked for at this time. We do not know what the Government plans to do with these monies. The Minister gives a statement, Royal Commission so on and so forth, but is the Government definitely committed to spend these monies if something occurs tomorrow, next week that might be of some political expediency? There is no guarantee that these monies would not be spent for that particular purpose. Last year the total budget of Finance was \$2,434,000. The Government is now looking for approximately one-third of that amount. I presume the people of the Province are getting the message. What is happening here in the House the past couple of days and possibly for the next couple of days is that the Opposition is not blocking any monies to the Government for the running of household expenses, that we are quite prepared to grant these expenses for one month. We do not know, this has been pointed out a dozen times and I think it bears repeating, how many hundreds of millions of dollars over and above the budget were spent since the last time we talked about money in this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say, we have reached a stage where we have discussed things, this matter of Finance, and we have several other large departments to get to, and I now will make a motion that the amount of \$243,400 that the amount of \$750,000 be reduced to \$243,400, which is ten per cent of last year's budget, not one-twelfth but one-tenth, because we realize that there are some increases so on and so forth to be paid and we are willing to agree to at this moment the amount of \$243,400 for the Department of Finance. In our opinion, notwithstanding what the Premier insinuates, this is an indication on our part that we want our civil servants, our welfare recipients, mothers' allowance cheques, pension cheques and everything else should be paid in the month of April. So Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in moving that the amount of \$750,000 be reduced to \$243,400.

MR.W.MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that could be more reasonable than this motion. Interim Supply is for this purpose. We have been told, the Hon. the Premier has indicated that perhaps we should not speak, on Interim Supply about

March 29 1971 Tape 66 page 2.

matters, because they are yet to come up before us in the estimates. But he overlooks the fact that we are being asked to vote on not one, not two, but three or four months of Government spending and certainly in all conscience we would have to inquire into the reason for this expenditure in greatest detail and exactitude before he could allow it to go through. Now the motion that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has made is purely and simply that the Government will be given ten per cent of the amount of its estimates and vote of last year. This is really truly something on account which the Government speaks of. Ten per cent is truly something on account and this is really all the Government should ask for and it is an eminently sensible suggestion. It points up the fact that we in the Opposition are all for the Government carrying on for the very short bit of time it has yet to carry on and to give it funds but we want to control the funds within the bounds of some type of reasonableness and rationality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that the amount be reduced to \$243,400, those in favour please say 'aye'; contrary, "nay". The motion is defeated. Those in favour please stand. Those against please stand. The motion is lost. Shall the item carry? Carried.

Item 5: Provincial Affairs: \$240,000.

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is need for much explanation. The Department of Provincial Affairs, as it is well known, is not a large-spending department. We will be taking care, on an interim basis, of our salaries and of Emergency Measures Projects, if we have any arise. Basically we are asking for what we consider will be necessary to carry on for the next few months, two or three months, and it is approximately a quarter of the expenditure that we are anticipating, well that we have had for the past fiscal year, this fiscal year closing on the thirty-first of March of this year. The gross estimates for the Department of Provincial Affairs for the current year have been approximately \$900,000. Out of that we have had some aid from Ottawa in the form of reimbursement

and this year Mr. Chairman, we are anticipating a little extra expenditure on Capital Account. We had none this current year because we are working on completion of the Department of Public Works is, on the completion of the Culture Centres and the Marine or Fisheries Museum at Grand Bank and the Museum to be at Hearts Content, which means in effect, that we have to anticipate or place orders as quickly as possible, to make sure that when these museums are ready for official opening and so on, that they will not be just without anything in them. Culture Centres at Grand Falls and Gander, there is a recreation centre in process of building at Gander and there is a Culture Centre being completed at Grand Falls. No doubt hon. members saw pictures in the papers at least in the Government Bulletin, showing the skeleton of the building that is now in process of erection at Grand Bank. Apart from that, apart from the provision we are making to try to be up to date with regard to these buildings, which are under the charge of the hon. Minister of Public Works, we have to do certain things about them to get them furnished and everything. Apart from that we have no anticipated expenditures that are going to scare or frighten either the public or the hon. members of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the Minister give us a breakdown under the various subheads of the expenditures?

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member

Mr. Frecker.

would look at the current estimates, they are practically there. I do not have the exact amount on each. That is why I said we have approximated a quarter of this year's expenditure, allowing, as I have explained for practically the same expenditure. Perhaps, a few little increase. For instance, we just recently appointed two assistants in the division of Consumer Affairs. Well we have had to provide salaries there. But basically there is nothing in the Department of Provincial Affairs which is calling for extraordinary expenditures except the cultural centres and recreation centres in the coming year.

MR. MURPHY: What about the Bulletin ?

MR. FRECKER: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government Bulletin; so much maligned, will be looked upon with a great deal of interest by succeeding generations.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the minister, can he advise the committee or give the committee a breakdown of the expenditures to date on the various cultural centres at Gander, Grand Falls and Grand Bank?

MR. FRECKER: As I was just going to say, that comes under the hon. Minister of Public Works. As I have said, we need to anticipate certain expenditures now, very soon now, if we are going to be up-to-date, to keep up with the work that is going on, under Public Works.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry this, perhaps, the minister might be inclined to give us a little further information with regard to the centre at Gander. The swimming pool section is well underway. I noticed it on the weekend, when I was home. I wonder could the minister indicate to the House what the plans are for phase two and phase three, which would be the Arts and Culture Centre, plus the gymnasium, when construction is supposed to get started?

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, I rather feel that this would be better answered by my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works. At the present time, the swimming pool aspect of the complex at Gander is under construction. That is number one. Now when the others will be built, judging by the way the Opposition is acting this afternoon, I could not say when we expect to have the others...

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that is merely dodging the question on the part of the minister. He refers me to the Minister of Public Works. We all know that the Minister of Public Works only gets construction going when some project has been approved. In this particular case, of course, it would have to be approved by the Minister of Provincial Affairs or by the Premier himself. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Premier might be willing to indicate to us when the two phases might be expected to get started?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am very proud. I am very, very proud indeed to be able to say that all three centres, magnificent and noble additions to the culture and recreation of this Province, will all be finished, completed and we will open them in the month of July, the last day of June or very early July. If the hon. member, temporary member for Gander District, is good, if he is on his best behaviour, we might even invite him to be present at the formal opening. I do not know about Burin, the member there. We are not fond of renegades in this Government.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a vintage speech. That deserves a real hand clap. That does - the Government and renegades. What the Government like is someone who will give them a \$100 million cheque without asking any questions. They do not like renegades who want to know what the money is to be spent on.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the Premier is giving so much information of Expo buildings, perhaps he will tell the House what the three buildings are



Mr. Crosbie.

going to cost now, at Grand Falls, Gander and Grand Bank, all together? We will remember the Expo buildings that were going to cost \$750,000 total, not a cent over that. Last year, we were told that up to the end of December 1969, there had been \$1,364,000 spend on them. Grand Falls, \$881,000; Gander \$265,000; Grand Bank, \$217,000. The estimated cost of them all were \$3,400,000. That is Grand Falls, \$1.5 million; Gander \$1,078,000; Grand Bank, \$812,000. That was a total of \$3,400,000, considerably in excess of the \$750,000 that the Premier assured everyone that they were going to cost when these temporary summertime buildings were bought from Expo, from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. What has the total reached now? Is it \$3,400,000 or is it \$5 million or is it \$6 million? What are these going to cost? That is only the construction cost. What is it going to cost to complete them and furnish them? It is quite a change between \$750,000 and \$3,400,000. So, while we are at this \$100 million that the Government are borrowing now - we want it to come out now. The hon. minister is asking for \$100 million. Does not the hon. minister think that we deserve some details of that now on these Expo buildings? Is Grand Bank going to be \$812,000 or \$8 million? Is Gander going to be \$1,078,000 or will it be as much as Grand Falls which is \$1.5 million? Surely, we deserve some answers on that.

While we are dealing with Provincial Affairs and a vote for Provincial Affairs of \$240,000, which is a quarter of last year's total vote, perhaps, the hon. minister will tell us how much is to be spent on Consumer Affairs of that amount of money. Consumer Affairs should be very important in this Province. But last year the amount voted for the whole Consumer Affairs Division was only \$17,500 plus a few dollars for

Mr. Crosbie.

expenses. What does the minister plan to do? Does this \$240,000 include a substantial amount to really give this Province a Consumer Affairs Division that will be active on behalf of the consumer, to this Province, investigating prices, investigating complaints, looking into misleading advertising and all the other things that it should be doing for this Province? What does the minister plan to do with the Consumer Affairs Division this year? That is something we have not heard much about from this Government that was in the Speech from the Throne last year. Is the minister preparing to spend more on the regulation of insurance companies? There is one thing we need more active supervision of in this Province, Mr. Chairman, and that is insurance companies incorporated, under the laws of Newfoundland, which are located here in Newfoundland. How often are they being checked with respect to their assets and how much of their assets are kept liquid to meet their liabilities and the rest of it. This is becoming of greater and greater importance this year in the United Kingdom. The second largest Automobile and Casualty Insurance Company in the United Kingdom has gone bankrupt. That is something that we cannot afford to have happen in this Province, any insurance company with that possibility.

It is the minister's responsibility in this Province (The General and something or other Accident Insurance Company of England) to supervise insurance companies that do business in this Province. Is he proposing to expend more money on that endeavor? That would be well-worth spending.

Emergency Measures - A \$100 million Supply Bill, Mr. Chairman, that comes under the scope of Emergency Measures apparently in this House. Can the minister tell us is any of it for Emergency Measures, Historic Resources Division? How much of it is for the Historic Resources Division? What is the minister's department spending on Placentia to help out there in the developments down there? Is it all being spent by the people down at Placentia?

Mr. Crosbie.

Is the minister going to spend any of it on the Signal Hill Military Pageant that is being cancelled for the past several years because of tight money? Money cannot be tight this year if the minister is asking for one-quarter of last year's budget to spend in the next month or two. These are some of the questions, we would like to hear answered and a little more detail on the Arts and Culture Centres and what the minister thinks they are going to cost the Province altogether and what he thinks it is going to cost to operate them? What does it

MR. CROSSBIE: cost the hon. minister now to operate the Arts and Culture Centre in St. John's? I do not like to interrupt the hon. the Premier when he is talking to the minister. I thought I was asking the minister some questions.. See now perhaps if we can get some of the answers.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. minister wish to answer the question proposed by my learned friend from St. John's West first?

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, and that is the hon. chief of the other side, must realize that the Federal Government is very largely responsible for what is being done in Canada with regards to Consumer Affairs, and that so far the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have restricted itself to affairs having to do with credit negotiations.

We are working on several amendments to the Insurance Act to bring them in line with the other provinces. We are attempting to bring about uniform insurance legislation. not only in Newfoundland but in all the provinces of Canada.

It seems to me that the hon. chief is asking me to discuss the estimates of the coming year. I just do not feel like getting into that, I will do the best I can for him when I am speaking in reply to the Budget Speech. I would say this would be my answer to all hon. members on the other side, The whole thing is so simple and so clear, they have just got to look at the subheads of the various headings of expenditure in our estimates to see what we are doing this year. I have explained that we are asking for approximately one-quarter, based on this current year's estimates, bearing in mind that we have some extra expenditure coming up in connection with our Culture Centres and Recreation Centre.

MR. HICKMAN: Well on restricting my remarks, Mr. Chairman, to the points raised by the hon. the minister with respect to the Arts and Culture Centre, it is my understanding from the hon. minister that his colleague the Minister of Public Works is progressing so swiftly, so rapidly with the erection of

MR. HICKMAN: the Arts and Cultures Centres and the Marine Museum at Grand Bank -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is no quorum.

MR. HICKMAN: You cannot tell the hon. members to come in after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, will the hon.

MR. CROSBIE: A very slow count.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs indicate to this committee the nature of the furnishings and urgency that is attached to placing these orders at this time, because let me assure this committee, Mr. Chairman, that the building that is presently under construction at Grand Bank, my colleague the hon. member for Fortune and myself visited it on Saturday, will not be in need of furnishings in June of this year or anything close to it. We see a few sticks of steel there and nothing else as of Saturday.

I think, this committee, Mr. Chairman, is entitled to an indication from the hon. the minister, because he is the one who brought this to the attention of the committee. He has told the committee why he requires this Interim vote. One of the major items is to buy furniture for the Expo Buildings. Will he please indicate to this committee the nature of the furnishing he has in mind? And will he assure this committee, and I know he is a very honourable gentleman, that, as this comes under his department and as it is his responsibility, that he will insist that public tenders be called for the furnishings to go into these Expo Buildings at Grand Bank, Gander and Grand Falls? Open public tenders.

I think the committee is entitled to that assurance, we are talking about money, This obviously indicates, Mr. Chairman, this is one method to be followed to save money, to insure that we get adequate value for the dollars that will be spent and the dollars that we are asked to approve for Provincial Affairs under head of expenditure (V).

Mr. Chairman, again, Emergency Measures were suppose to have a great deal to do with fire protection throughout this Province. There was a

MR. HICKMAN: scheme administered by Emergency Measures, on a cost sharing programme, which unfortunately died, but still Emergency Measures have responsibility for the administration and it is my understanding that the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, as the minister responsible for this vital branch of his department, insist that municipalities enter into contracts governing the use of firefighting equipment.

Now we have from practically every municipality in Newfoundland a request that they be allowed to partake of the plans and equipment that Emergency Measures will supply or administer in the way of firefighting equipment. We have heard many announcements of firefighting equipment being made available this year, and obviously this firefighting equipment has to be administered by the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, under Emergency Measures, if the Fire Commissioner's Office is going to mean anything at all.

May the committee have this assurance from the hon. minister, (1) as to the type of furnishings he has in mind. Has he consulted with men (I do not know who the gentleman is now, but men of the type of Mr. Webber) skilled in the setting up of centres of Art and Culture, so that the furnishings that will be bought will not be something out of an Eaton's catalogue, but that it is something in keeping a Maritime Museum or a museum or a recreation centre in Grand Falls or in Corner Brook or in Gander. If we do not do that, it will not be a museum at all. If somebody is simply going to come in and sell chrome furnishings to the minister, if someone is going to come in and work a deal without having to go to public tenders, then we should not be asked to vote any money at this time, Mr. Chairman, to enable Arts and Culture Centres and Marine Museums to be furnished.

I would like for the hon. minister, as I know he will indicate to the committee the nature of the furnishings and an assurance that public tenders will be called.



MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, if the minister does not wish to answer his hon. colleague right away, I will yield to him if he does. He does not appear to wish to answer them right away, so just a few comments on this particular vote. The thing which puzzles me, there seems to be some confusion between the operation and, of course, the building of these pavilions. I understand that the building will come under the Department of Public Works, the minister of that department of course will answer questions on that. That is the actual construction of the buildings. But the operation appears to come under the minister's department which we are now discussing.

I notice that in last year's estimates there is approximately \$40,000 for the expenses in connection with Corner Brook, and quite a lot more, of course, the operation of the Arts and Culture Centre here in St. John's. Well the Premier in his remarks at one stage here expressed faith and satisfaction that three more centres would be opened this year. I have to agree with my hon. the colleague, the member for Burin, that the Grand Bank one which we saw on Saturday, <sup>if</sup> they are having an official opening in June, it will be in the nature of an open air garden party, it certainly will not be in a closed pavilion.

MR. FRECKER: Wait and see! Wait and see!

MR. EARLE: Well, if it is, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the work will be extremely shabby, and as I have some interest in that part of the country, I hope that the people will be given a good, substantial building that will last, and will be a credit to that, which it is suppose to represent or is suppose to convey to the people. But, if this building is to be finished by June, I do not think it is possible that such a building can be put up and in conditions suitable for the people of that area and what it is meant to convey. After all there is a great deal of sentiment in that particular area about the affairs pertaining to seamen and men who have gone down to sea in ships, and I feel that nothing but the best is sufficient for them. If there is to be a monument, it certainly must be a credit to what it is representing. There is no doubt that the

MR. EARLE: people in that area will wish to see something established there of a lasting type and of a quality and furnished in such a nature, as my hon. friend from Burin said, that will bring great credit to what it is holding in very, very close memory for the people of that particular part of Newfoundland.

So the point that I was making, when I started to mention these pavilions that, if the Corner Brook one for instance costs approximately \$40,000 a year, and we are to get three

MR. EARLE:

three more open this year on top of ones which are presently established, the hon. Minister's vote will have to be very, very substantially increased indeed and his is one request which perhaps for the first few months of this coming year appears unreasonable because it does cover three or four months. I am quite sure that when we get his total request for the department it must of necessity, if these buildings are completed and occupied, be very, very much more than the amount which was asked last year. Now there will be an opportunity to discuss this in the estimates, so I am not going to say any more about it.

There is one item in his department which we could well dispense with and saving some money so that he could be prepared to meet this additional expense a little later on. He is going to have to find thousands upon thousands of dollars of the peoples money to take care of these very worthwhile Arts and Culture Centres of which we are all so proud. I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in order to prepare for this eventuality that a monument to the Liberal Government's foolishness, which appears regularly, might well be dispensed with in the intervening months, name'y the 'Newfoundland Bulletin' which comes under his department. We could save say \$30,000. or \$40,000. in the next few months. It would serve a double purpose because not only would we be saving that money but the people could go forward into events which are coming up with clear minds, not coloured or not influenced in any way by a lot of propoganda which comes out in that particular bulletin. Therefore, the Government, for once in its life, would be extremely ethical, it would not be trying to, in a subversive sort of way, influence the thinking of the people and at the same time it would be saving the country a tremendous amount of money and, thirdly and most important, it would be providing the Minister with a fund from which he could run these pavilions afterwards and give something really worthwhile to our people.

Therefore I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that this particular vote be reduced by the sum of \$40,000. and that the saving be applied by the immediate cancellation of the issue of the 'Newfoundland Bulletin'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Item 5, Provincial Affairs, be reduced to \$200,000. Those in favour please say "Aye;" contrary "Nay." The motion is lost.

Shall the item carry?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that has already been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John's West is the Signal Hill Military Pageant including in the estimates for Provincial Affairs and an idea has come to mind which should be voiced now and we should not wait until the estimates are called. We all know the value of this Signal Hill Pageant and we all know that as a result of expenditures of Government in other areas that this regretablely had to be curtailed, this particular program. It was of great benefit to the Province and particularly the St. John's area. There were many tourists who saw it in the year that it was in vogue and used here in the Province up on Signal Hill, and it was very disappointing to some people who came back in the previous year and found it was curtailed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Right, but it was a disappointment, it was a good programme and it should have been continued. Most of the people involved in this pageant I understand were university students who took part in the pageant itself. Now we know that the Federal Government has made available a certain amount of money, a large amount of money, to make provision for jobs for university students throughout Canada and I feel that the strongest type of representation should be made by the Government to the Federal Government for the purpose of channeling as much money as possible into Newfoundland with respect to the employment of students itself but particularly you should bear in mind the possibility, the reinstitution of this pageant by utilizing the monies of the Government of Canada. But in any event if that cannot be realized, if we cannot realize that, we should find from our fast dwindling resources, perhaps we can find in the bunker some money somewhere to bring about this particular pageant again to the Province of Newfoundland and particularly to the St. John's area.

It is of great value and it is absolutely necessary if we are to

MR. MARSHALL:

build up any kind of, these types of program<sup>me's</sup> are necessary to build up any kind of tourist industry. That is one point. The other point that we must look at is to take a very close look at the Emergency Measures Organization, its use, its effectiveness and just what kind of a job it can actually do in an emergency. We saw in the city of St. John's when the state of emergency was declared last January that this particular organ of the Department of Provincial Affairs was not perhaps as prepared as it might have been in the circumstances. I would remind the hon. Minister that you cannot have dress rehearsals for disasters and it is a matter that should be borne in mind and this particular division of the department obviously needs to be strengthened and strengthened in a much more effective manner.

The matter of the Newfoundland Bulletin has already been mentioned. It is an utter, complete and absolute disgrace, something that may go over in a place like Soviet Russia but certainly should not be allowed in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just one or two short remarks and the principal ones, I think, are these famous Arts and Culture Centres that we have heard about for so many years, I love them but I like to get the truth about them. If we go back in this House a few years ago -

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in silence by the hon. clown from Port au Port or not? In this House over the years when these famous pavilions came up from Expo, the Premier made several statements that the cost would be very little, that Lundrigans were going to dismantle them, ship them in and so on. We could never get a figure of just what the cost would be but everybody figured it would be just a small amount. I am wondering how many millions now we have gone into, in these famous Expo buildings and the rest of the so called Culture Centres? I presume the one in Grand Falls now is well under way, it was rusting iron there for a great many months. Grand Bank, I saw it last fall, they were starting to do something with it. If it is going to be the great affair that the Minister



MR. MURPHY:

and the Premier visualizes there certainly has to be some change made in it, as far as I am concerned. I think that a great amount of monies have been spent and wasted, I would not doubt but a great amount of the steel had to be replaced for these, because they were just lying around in piles rusting and so on and so forth.

The Minister, when he introduced it, mentioned that they had a Budget of something like \$900,000. last year. As I see it, from the estimates here it was \$678,600. and the department I know is not one of the big spending departments of Government. It has already been mentioned about EMO and I think this great promise of fire trucks in all the departments, I think that will come under Municipal Affairs but --

AN HON. MEMBER: Debt management.

MR. MURPHY: Debt management, salaries. So as I make it up, Mr. Chairman, here they are looking for approximately one-third of last year's total grant and in conformity with our ideas on the thing I move that the amount of \$67,860. be granted to the Department of Provincial Affairs to carry them through the month of April and following the bringing down of the Budget or the estimates, if they are not down in April we will review again what monies are needed to carry the Department through.

I am much pleasure in moving that the amount of \$240,000. be reduced to \$67,860.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Item 5 be reduced to \$67,860.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on the motion, the Minister has not answered or given us any total cost for these Arts and Culture Centres, capital cost or what he expects that it will cost to operate them in a year. I have one other question. I do not know whether the Minister's department has anything to do with this, it might be under Arts and Culture or it could be under Historic Resources but has the Minister's department anything to do with these busts of the hon. the Premier that are now being manufactured, busts and sweat shirts and I do not know what else that are being manufactured at Torbay? Are they to be used with the Historic Resources Division of the Department or is Government going to distribute them in any



MR. CROSBIE:

way to school children or is there any program like that contemplated? Can the Minister assure us that none of this money will be used for that purpose, the Historic Bust Division or something like that might be in the wind?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour, "Aye," contrary "Nay"

MR. CROSBIE: Could we have a count, Mr. Chairman? A count please.

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

Will those opposed to the amendment please rise?

MR. CROSBIE: The historic busters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is lost. Shall the Item carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister was about to rise in his seat to furnish us the information we requested. Could he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Those in favour please rise.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister wants to answer some questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, before -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is rising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6, Item 6.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6 - Education and Youth.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, I ask for a standing vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's West asked for the standing vote after the vote had been declared and the next item had been called.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, how could the item be carried while there were people on their feet attempting to speak and the Minister himself on his feet attempting to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman is not responsible for the fact that certain hon. members do not obey the rules of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to be referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports they have considered the matters to them referred, directed him to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Be moved and seconded the report of this Committee be adopted.  
Those in favour, "Aye," Contrary, "Nay." Carried.

When shall this Committee have leave to sit again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow and I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that rule 50 be invoked in the debate on Interim Supply.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I cannot listen to two people at the same time. There was a point of order made. Would the hon. members proceed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we wish a vote recorded on this report of the Committee. We wish the vote recorded.

MR. CROSBIE:

Stand up, come on.

MR. SPEAKER: There is only one person standing.

Will the House divide? Call in the members.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting might I ask where we stand at the moment in respect of the report of the Chairman of Committee of Supply, where do we stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the report of the Chairman of Committee of Supply be adopted. That is the question before the House.

Those in favour of the motion that the report of the Committee of the Whole be adopted please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Canning, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. the Minister of Supply, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Crosbie.

The motion is carried.

When shall this Committee have leave to sit again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow and I give notice that I will on tomorrow -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The period for notice of motions and questions has been passed. We have gone into Orders of the Day and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that now you cannot receive any notice of motion as that period has been passed on the Order Paper of Monday, March 29th.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was that we asked leave to give notice of motion. Does the House agree that notice of motion can be given?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say what motion it is I beg leave to move tomorrow. That rule 50 be invoked in the debate on Interim Supply.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My point of order is that a notice of motion cannot be given at this time, that that time was this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. CROSBIE: No, we do not agree, we are not giving leave.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am asking leave of the House, not you.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. The period for notice of motion has passed and the request was, as I read it or as I heard it, does this House give leave to present a notice of motion at this particular time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: We have to have leave of the House in order to present a notice at this particular time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can we put a new vote? Can we put a new vote, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We have to have the unanimous consent of the House, in my opinion, in order to present a motion after we have gone through the presenting of petitions, presenting reports, notices of motion and now by leave of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is by majority rule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not unanimous, Mr. Speaker. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, does it say that the House must be unanimous to give leave. I ask leave of the House to give notice now to invoke rule 50. I ask leave of the House and I say, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am on the point of order. I say that

MR. SPEAKER: There is a point of order being discussed right now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that in asking leave of the House I do not need to have unanimous support, I need the leave of the House and the leave of the House can be given unless it is otherwise specifically provided by majority vote. That is my point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on my point of order, just a few moments ago Your Honour ruled that for us to revert to this notice of motion except that there had to be unanimous consent of the House. There is no unanimous consent of the House and I submit to Your Honour that you rule the hon. the Premier's point of order out.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have any further comment?

I am of the opinion and I will take advice on this but I am of the opinion that we have to have the unanimous consent of the House in order to revert to another order after it has passed. That is my opinion. I am satisfied to adjourn for two minutes and look up the authorities on this if the House so wishes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now do you have unanimous consent of the House for that as well?

MR. SPEAKER: May we have a recess for two or three minutes while we look up the authorities on this matter?

Recess for about five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I give a ruling, is there any member of this hon. House who would wish to make a comment?

MR. CROSBIE: The point of order that Your Honour has to decide is whether it is now in order ( The House having gone through the business listed for the day; that is Presenting Petitions, Reports of Standing and Select Committees, Notice of Motion, Answers to Questions and proceeded to Orders of the Day, Committee of Supply ) for the hon. the Premier to give notice of a motion for closure under Rule 50 of the Rules. In other words the hon the Premier wants to institute closure on the House so that debate in the Interim Supply Bill will be curtailed. I would like to refer to our Standing Orders, Your Honour. First page 12; "The ordinary daily routine of (this is Standing Order 14) business in the House should be as follows; except where priority has been given previously by the House to other orders; (a) Presenting Petitions, (b) Presenting Reports, (c) Giving Notice of Motion and Question (d) Asking and Answering Questions. Then the order of business for the consideration of the House and so on shall be as follows, except on Wednesdays, and then it lists the order of business. Wednesday is Private Members' Day. That is on page 12. It gives the order of business. "Orders not proceeded with when called, upon a like request, may be allowed to stand or otherwise shall be dropped." I would like to pass on, Your Honour, to page 21, Standing Order 30: "A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having been given under Standing Order 29. That is a motion may, with the unanimous consent of the House, under Standing Order 29, twenty-four hours notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, Resolution or Address or for placing a Question on the Order Paper. But this Rule should not apply to Bills, after their introduction or to private Bills or to the times of meeting and adjournment of the House. Such notice shall be laid upon the table before 6 p.m."



Mr. Crosbie.

Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, this motion that the Premier is attempting to make has nothing to do with the times of meeting and adjournment of the House. It is a motion to move closure. Twenty-four hours notice, therefore, has to be given and a motion can only be made with the unanimous consent of the House. That is on page 21. On page 35, Standing Order 50, is the order that relates to closure. "Immediately before the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in Committee of the Whole, or of Supply, or of Ways and Means, any Minister of the Crown, who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting of his intention to do so, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned, or that further consideration of any resolution and so on shall be the first business of the committee and shall not further be postponed and so on."

It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, I submit for all of these rules that have governed this House from time in memorial and have governed the House of Commons at Ottawa; that the business of the day is set out in this document that we all received when we come here. We have gone through the business of the day. We are now on Orders of the Day. We can only be on Committee of Supply or Address in Reply or second reading of a Bill given, or one of the other motions on the Order Paper. We have gone beyond Notice of Motion and Question, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the motion the Premier wishes to make to the House will have to wait until tomorrow for notice to be given.

MR. ROBERTS: Further submission is in order Your Honour. I will submit, quite briefly, that the relevant citation is found at page 158 of the fourth edition of Beauchesne, citation 185. It refers specifically to Standing Order 41 or the old Standing Order 41 of the House of Commons at Ottawa, which is almost exactly the same as ours. The relevant parts of the first words of that which read simply: "The distinction between order and

Mr. Roberts.

Resolutions must be considered in the interpretation of Standing Order 41, which limits the giving of forty-eight hours notices to: "leave to present a Bill, Resolution on Address, etc., etc." The only difference between that and ours, sir, is that our rules require twenty-four hours for notice for leave to present a Bill and so forth. In my submission, sir, the motion which the Premier wishes to make is a matter for orders. The distinction is one to be drawn between an order, a Resolution. All that must be done to give notice of an order is to give it at a previous sitting to comply with Standing Order 50. I, therefore, submit that it is in order to give notice at this time.

MR. CROSBIE: Citation, cited by the hon. Minister of health. If you continue reading the paragraph, it refers to examples which are proceeding such, that to divide the Bill into two or more Bills, or making two Bills into one cannot be moved without notice. Being an order and not a resolution, taking place after the introduction of the Bill, that is not a substantial matter Mr. Speaker, as is closure. There can be no motion more substantial than a motion which cuts down debate in this House, and that imposes strict limitations as to time. A substantive motion like that, is not just an order Mr. Speaker, it is a notice of substantive motion.

MR. ROBERTS: With all due respect to the hon. gentleman, a motion such as the one which the Premier has given notice of, is a motion of procedure, a motion of an order, whether it is substantive or not it is a resolution. I think the other sentence which the hon. gentleman, the member for St. John's West was good enough to read, is further evidence of the fact that the motion is in order - the notice of motion is in order at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the two hon. members. I do not want to encourage debate on this, but this is the only opportunity we will have because, I am about to give my ruling.

MR. HICKMAN: It is my understanding that in order for the hon. Premier to give the notice of motion that he now seeks to give, this House has to revert to Orders of the Day. This Mr. Speaker, is a procedure, I do not know how long it has been followed in this House, but I distinctly recall the hon. the House Leader on several occasions asking for unanimous consent of the House to revert which he did receive. The implication was quite clear to me that without unanimous consent it could not be done. Your Honour practically completed his ruling before we adjourned a few minutes ago, and it was very clear then that Your Honour had been under the same impression, was under the same opinion, that unanimous consent is required for a notice of motion of this kind.

Whether you call it an order, whether you call it a resolution, it goes through the very fundamental processes - legislative processes in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is, can - regardless of what the notice is in connection with, the question that is before the House right now -

can an hon member give notice of a motion that he intends to introduce on the next sitting day or some day thereafter. That is the only question that has to be decided. Can he give notice at this particular time? There are certain things with which we cannot give notice, and I thank hon. members for bringing these various sections to my attention.

We go back to our own rules which has been pointed out, which are almost identical with the rules of the House of Commons, but if hon. members will refer to page 157, the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, the only difference is, we have to read twenty-four hours notice in the instance of this House, but forty-eight hours notice in the case of the House of Commons. If we make it applicable to our House, it would read this way. "Twenty-four hours should be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, resolution, or address for the appointment of any committee, or for the placing of questions on the Order Paper, but this rule shall not apply to Bills after their introduction or to private Bills or to the times of meetings or adjournment of the House. Such notice shall be laid on the table before six o'clock, and shall be printed in the votes and proceedings.

A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity (now this is the impression that I had a little earlier) previously explained by the mover be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice. Any member may bring in a motion on the floor of the House at any particular time by unanimous consent, but a notice that he will introduce a motion on tomorrow does not fall into that category, as far as I can see.

Citation 185, on page 158, has already been read and I will not read it again. This deals with matters that can be moved without notice being orders and resolutions and taking place after introduction of a Bill. This does not cover the notice of motion that is before the House.

On page 159, citation 188 states, I presume hon. members have this before them - that as long as the notice is placed on the clerk's desk before

six o'clock, then that notice is in order. I know that we should not move a Bill without the unanimous consent of the House, but the mere giving of a notice of motion can be placed on the Order Paper by leave of the House and by leave of the House we mean by a majority of the membership of the House. That is my ruling in this matter right now.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Leader, with deference I wish to appeal that ruling. The order of business of the House is set under the Standing Orders and we have not reverted to Notice of Motion nor questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Order, order.

MR. CROSBIE: I take my orders from the Speaker only, and I therefore wish to appeal Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling is appealed, the motion before the Chair now is that the ruling of the Speaker is sustained. Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay,"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Those in favour of the motion please rise; the hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. the Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Canning, Mr. Barbour, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. the Minister of Supply, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

Those against the the motion please rise; the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Rickman, Mr. Crosbie.

I declare the motion carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your ruling there is no notice laid on the table of the House before 6:00 P.M.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes there is.

MR. CROSBIE: Not printed in the votes and proceedings of the House for this day. So, I submit to Your Honour that, this purported notice of motion cannot be accepted by Your Honour. It is not in accordance with Your Honour's ruling. It is not laid on the table of the House, and we have not heard it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not called it 6:00 P.M.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is Your Honour's ruling was whether - the question that Your Honour had to decide was whether the hon. the Premier had the right to give notice of motion that is where the whole debate that has now been decided. The hon. the Premier may give notice of motion, but he has not, as of now given the notice of motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the notice has been laid on the table of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I have been advised by the Clerk that it has.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.



MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I wish to table a statement presented to the Revenue and Audit Act, Chapter 13, Section 21, paragraph 9, concerning the hypothecation of securities. And, also, the Public Accounts and the Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31st. 1970. Copies are in the Clerk's office and I assume will be distributed in the normal way.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, concerning Your Honour's ruling, as to whether or not notice of motion has been given and whether it had been given before 6:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been advised by the Clerk of the House that the notice of motion has been laid on the table of the House, before 6:00 P.M. We have not as yet, if we want to get technical, but we have not called it 6:00 P.M. We called a recess. We called a recess strictly speaking and if we want to split hairs at 6:00 P.M. I should have had left the Chair until 8:00 P.M. But, we have not called it 6:00 P.M. and I think that, that was by the feeling of the House I get that, it is still not 6 O'clock, as far as the business of this House is concerned.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of today stand deferred, and the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 11:00 A.M.

MR. MURPHY: On this notice of motion, we have not heard any motion at all yet, someone started to get up and objected to this.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was read and it is now been tabled and anybody who wants to have the exact wording of it, can get the same from the Clerk of the House. The motion is that this House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, at 11:00 A.M. This House do now adjourn.