



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 22

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

## VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

March 10th. 1970

Tape 278

PK - I

The House Met at 3:00 P.M.  
Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all hon. members of the House when I extend a word of cordial welcome to some thirteen students in Business Administration in the College of Trades and Technology, who are here today as visitors with their instructor, Mr. Cyril Power.

The College of Trades and Technology gives training and instruction in a considerable number of fields and some hon. members may be just a little surprized to learn that one of these is Business Administration. By this is not to be understood that the College is a Business College. It is what it says, a College of Trades and Technology. But, it does include a number of courses of instruction, that would not be called either trade or technological, but more in the nature of business and business administration.

I hope that these thirteen students who are visiting us today will find the proceedings interesting, I do not know if it is their first visit to this House, I hope it will not be their last. I hope that they will understand the procedures in the House, which are quite different from the procedures in most bodies, although quite similar of course to the proceedings in all bodies in the British Commonwealth under the British Parliamentary System. We have our own way of conducting business and this way has taken hundreds of years to develop, so that today it is rather unique, and rather different from the procedures found in deliberative bodies outside the British Commonwealth.

I hope they will enjoy it, and I know that the Leader of the Opposition is itching to get up on his feet and agree with me, as he always does, practically every day in this House, although the public are lead to believe that he and I are at each others throats all the time, tearing each other down and scratching and clawing at each other, the truth of the matter is that every day here practically we get up like lambs, in perfect unison, in perfect harmony and join together as one person, you might say, two hearts in the one body, or two bodies carrying one heart. Anyhow, we are similar in our views, we are happy to welcome these students.

I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition, will say the same thing.

MR. ANTHONY J. MURPHY: I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to joint with the hon. the Premier in welcoming these students, and I am sure they picked a wonderful day to come, what we are going to do <sup>with</sup> \$61 million this afternoon will frighten them all to death, I am sure. But I think it will be their <sup>first</sup> taste of big business to

1252

hear about this \$61 million, and what the members on this side of the House particularly think of this \$61 million. But I will join very happily with the Premier, and I am sure everybody in the House is pleased to see these gentlemen here today with their teacher Mr. Cyril Power, and I will just ask them now to sit back and fasten their seat belts, and away we go.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. JOHN MAHONEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from some 312 residents and land owners of the community of Paradise in my district.

The prayer of the petition is, Sir, that the Government take steps this year to up grade and pave the main road through that place, which measures approximately 1.6 miles.

Mr. Speaker, the community of Paradise is on the outskirts of St. John's and is very heavily populated, and the road through that community which is in poor condition carries a very heavy traffic load. As member for the district, I urge upon the Government the necessity of answering the prayer of this petition this year, and I give it my whole hearted support.

I ask that this petition be received by the House, and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. PHILIP LEWIS: I would like to associate myself with my hon. colleague in supporting this petition. It has been the subject matter of rather detailed discussion over recent months with the committee and the public of the settlement of Paradise, they had several meetings about it, and we had some consultations with the Department of Highways in relation to it, and they should be given some encouragement.

Paradise is an area that has developed very rapidly within the last ten years, it is closely associated with the industrial complex that has been established in the Topsail Road section, and there has been quite an influx of outside people into the settlement. But in common with that petition, and the prayer to up grade Paradise Road is the road to the joining settlements the Horse Cove Line, which serves the area of Paradise and the Topsail Road section on the western end, and also the settlement of St. Thomas's. This road also, needs very special consideration and it is only a matter of finding the way with all and due time to do it. I have very much pleasure in supporting

the prayer of this petition.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: I would like to rise and support the prayer of this petition. The road to hell is sometimes said to be paved with good intentions, and I feel that the road to Paradise should be paved, or through Paradise, and not with good intentions, with asphalt or tarmac

I certainly support this petition, Mr. Speaker, the road needs to be paved, Paradise needs some attention. Paradise here in Newfoundland is not perfect, as Paradise is suppose to be elsewhere. And I would certainly like to support the two hon. members for that district in their petition. I hope the Government acts on it, not only with good intentions, but with a good solid asphalt.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker I received a copy of the petition and I too would like to heartily endorse it. It is rather significant - the prayer of the petition says, to ask the Government to stand by inferences made on the occasion of one Federal and two Provincial Election, I do not get the significance myself, but it is in the petition, and I would heartily endorse the petition as presented by the hon. members for Harbour Main, and by the hon. member for St. John's West, I believe 1.6 miles, I mean it is not another Trans-Canada Highway or anything, it is a very heavily populated area, as can be seen by 300 odd petitions, I think that is more than we get on ninety-five per-cent of the petitions from the rest of the Province.

It is a growing area, a farming area, and I feel that this bit of road should not stretch our budget too much, if we ever see that budget.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and adopted and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave, Sir, to present a petition signed by approximately 250 to 300 citizen resident in the community of St. Lunaire, and Cricket in White Bay North, Sir. These people signed this petition Sir and I think include every eligible voter, every citizen of age in these two towns which have one joint Government, the Community Council of the area.

The prayer of the petition Sir is that the Government act to install running water into these communities and that this project be given prompt attention when the departmental estimates are approved. Mr. Speaker I have a great deal of pleasure in moving that this petition be received and be referred to the department to which it relates. There is a great need for this service, I would not in anyway want to detract ~~detract~~ from the needs of the earthly



Paradise, about which we have just heard. But I would submit, Sir, that the need for water is even greater than the need for pavement, as much as the need for pavement maybe.

To that Sir, I should add only that on Friday Evening passed, the Premier and I in St. Lunaire met with the Community Council who organized this petition and had a most useful, and the most fruitful discussion, and we do hope and plan that some steps can be taken to alleviate the conditions in that community.

I move that this petition be received, Sir, and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on behalf of the members on this side of the House to support the petition just presented by the Minister and member for White Bay North. It seems to me that it is not quite cricket to deny running water to Cricket, and I am hopeful that the minister's plea will be taken into account, and acted upon. And when they finally do get running water, that they will have the privilege of naming their member, "Chief Running Water".

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

#### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in reply to Question No. 175 on the Order Paper of March 6th. in the name of the hon. the member for St. Barbe South. I have to reply as follows, there were fifteen applications for the position of senior engineer, and general manager of the new water authority, and no appointment has yet been made. The position of sanitary engineers, sixteen applications were received and Mr. H. T. Doane was appointed on January 1st. The office of accountant, the office manager, fifty-two applications were received no appointment has been made. The position of shorthand-typist, Grade IV, sixteen applications were received, Mrs. S. Ring, appointed February 1st. The position of shorthand-typist, Grade II, eighteen applications were received, no appointment has been made. And for the position of field inspector, two positions, 109 applications have been received and no appointment has been made. (2) The Lee Wolfe Productions of Toronto, Ontario. And that in

1255

1969 the payments made were for film production \$29,000.00; for purchase of prints \$22,000.00; and for conversion of the films to the German language, and purchase of coloured prints for distribution throughout Europe \$1100, total \$52,100.00.

Question No. 208 on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. (1) It was on Wednesday night of the 11th. of the month, when the Counsel General called on me and gave me the information.

MR. MURPHY: The 11th?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The night of February 11th. or was it March 11th? Yes, February the 11th. And it was on Friday 13th. a very notable day, that the news was officially given by the American Authorities. Two nights, on the night of the 11th. and on the day of Friday 13th. are the two dates. To me the

March 10, 1970

Tape #279

Page 1

MR. SMALLWOOD: The sad news was given by the Consul General of the United States on the night of Wednesday 11, and on Friday the 13th. It was given by, publicly by the Commanding Officer at Argentina. Question No. (215) on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. the member for Bonavista North. The first part of this question (and I am answering today for the hon. the Minister of Public Works who is absent) the first part should be directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, as it comes under him. The answer to the second part is; one panelled van - \$3,213.42. The answer to the third part is; ten in number. The answer to the fourth part; if it refers to all land required for all branches of the Government for the whole Government service of this Province; the answer is \$557,309.91. But that was for all departments of Government. Question No. (220) in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West - I am able to answer in part today. In answer to the first part; the amount is \$2,800,000. The answer to the second part is; yes. The answer to the third part is; in part, yes, and in part, I am not able to give the information today, but I will later. The additional amount is what I am not able to name today, but there is an additional amount.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Part one of the question; what are the terms governing such loans, and what security is held? That was the first part of the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The security of course is a mortgage on all the property. The terms I do not recall, I will have to get that and table it. Question No. (225) on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for St. John's. The answer is the resignation was not in writing but was oral, and he retired from the Committee by friendly and mutual consent. With regard to the second part; any correspondence between Mr. Russell and me is privileged.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. (16) on Monday, February 23, Order Paper of Monday, February 23, asked by the hon. member for St. John's Center. In answer to the first part of the Question: \$59,031.50. In answer to the second part of the first question: \$111,390.00, making a total of \$170,421.50. In answer to the second part of the question; the first part of the second question; \$85,696.30. In answer to the second part of the second question; \$25,000. In answer to the third part

1257

March 10, 1970

Tape #279

Page 2

of the question; \$5,737.88. In answer to the fourth part of the question; \$18,331.62. In answer to the fifth part of the question; \$1,412.71. In answer to the sixth part of the question; \$11,488.50. In answer to the seventh part of the question; \$21,830.37. Part (3) of the question; thirty. Part (4) of the question; ninety-three percent.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. the Minister permit a supplementary question? How many apartments are for rent in Elizabeth Towers?

MR. DAWE: I think this could be answered in another question I am going to answer now Mr. Speaker. In answer to Question No. (92) on Thursday's Order Paper, February 26. In answer to the fourth part of the question - Total cost, \$5,395,000. In answer to the second part of the first question; Construction cost of the building and the fixtures; \$5,302,000. Furniture equipment and furnishings; \$93,000. In answer to the second part of the question; Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce; ten years; \$2,500,000. Toronto Dominion Bank; five years; \$1,500,000. St. John's Housing Corporation; \$1,195,000. Average annum interest rate; eight percent. In answer to question No. (93) -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister will permit a supplementary question? You did not say whether these loans were guaranteed by the Government, but I take it they are, are they?

MR. DAWE: Yes Mr. Speaker, they are all guaranteed by the Province of Newfoundland. In answer to No. (93) on Thursday's Order Paper, February 26, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. In answer to the first part of the question; Apartment units - 102, Hotel-type bedroom units: four. Making a total of 106. In answer to the second part of the question - I think there is a little further answer to the first part of the question there Mr. Speaker. One bedroom unit; fourteen. Two bedroom unit; eighty-eight. Hotel-type bedroom unit; four

1258

MR. DAWE: In answer to the second part of the question: Apartment units rented, thirty-two. One bedroom type; ten. Two bedroom type; twenty-two. In answer to the third part of the question; Loss, \$133,750. In answer to the third part of the question; Income - apartment rental; \$253,000. Commercial rentals; \$202,000. Others; \$3,000 - making a total of \$458,000. Expenses; Interest Bank demand loans, \$341,250. Depreciation: \$100,000. Taxes, heat, light and water; \$68,600. Insurance; \$2,400. Repairs and Maintenance; \$15,100. Interest advance, St. John's Housing Corporation; \$38,900. Other; \$25,500. Making a total of \$591,750. It should be noted that both the amounts for depreciation and interest paid to the St. John's Housing Corporation, are internal book entries and do not constitute any cash outlay. These deficits will be absorbed as the bank loans are reduced.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. minister permit a supplementary question? In connection with the answer on the Repairs and Maintenance for this new building. Has the hon. minister been in receipt of complaint of the construction of that building and the apartments, and the windows and leaks and that sort of thing?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, they have not come to my knowledge in any way, of these discrepancies in the building.

MR. JOHN NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to Question (174) asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe South on the Order Paper dated March 6, 1970. I do not think it would be the wish of the House that I would go into reading all, therefore in spite of the enthusiasm of my good friend, the hon. member for Burin - with your permission I would like to table the information as outlined in the documents that I now set forth.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, today's Order Paper has a nugget in the form of question (219) asked by the hon. gentleman for St. John's West. The answers Sir, are as follows: The total number of active treatment beds which can be made available in the physical facilities at the Doctor Charles Janeway Health Center here in St. John's, are 280. Of this number at present only 225 are in use. The second part of the question Sir; the reason that these beds are not open is that the

1259

March 10, 1970

Tape #280

Page 2

Government have been with the approval of the House, pursuing a policy common to governments across Canada in trying to control costs of one area where we are anxious to continue to exercise controls, is in the question of hospital insurance, the programs which pay for these beds, and that is the reason why these beds are not open. I may add that the Board of this hospital as well the boards of other hospitals have been co-operating fully. The third part of the hon. gentleman's question Sir, I am informed by the administrator of the hospital, as the House will realize the Government do not directly operate the Janeway Child Health Center. It is operated in our behalf by a board whose chairman is the hon. Campbell Macpherson. The administrator has given me the information to answer the remaining parts of the question, and on that basis I will gladly convey that information. The hon. gentleman asked if there was a Gastro-Enterology Service, an Allergy Service, a Cardiology Service, a Neurology Service, A Haematology Service, an Endocrine Service or a Dermatology Service? All of these Services Mr. Speaker, are available at the hospital, none of them by decision of the board of the hospital, are organized as a sub-department. I should say Mr. Speaker, none is organized as a sub-department, but all of those services are available. The hon. gentleman asked further with reference to surgical services, a Urology Service, a Neuro-Surgical Service, a Plastic Surgery Service or a Cardio-Thoracic Surgical Service. The hon. gentleman who wrote the question for the hon. member for St. John's West should have briefed me on pronouncements. The hon. gentleman is well informed. The answer again Sir with some pride, I am able to say that each of these Services is available, each of these Services again Sir, is not organized as a sub-department, that is by decision of the board. The fifth part of the hon. gentleman's question asked about X-Ray Services at the Janeway - it was asked what was the waiting period. The administrator tells me that emergency and urgent X-Rays are done immediately. Elective X-Rays are done by appointment, there being an average of two days between the request for appointment and the time the X-Ray is taken. Emergency X-Rays are reported on verbally immediately. Others are usually reported within twenty-four hours. That I can add only

1260



March 10, 1970

Tape #280

Page 3

Sir that on the basis of what I know we have a splendid province-wide facility at the Janeway, which serves the children of all Newfoundland as a referral center and I would be less than fair in my duty if I did not say that we in the Government think it is a simply splendid service, and we think it is a model to which we hope we can improve our other hospitals in due course.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hon. minister's answer to Part (2) of the question where it says Government is trying to control cost, does the hon. minister mean that sufficient funds were not provided the Janeway Child Health Center to operate all 280 beds? That is in essence what he means, is it?

MR. ROBERTS: No Sir, we do not tell the hospitals how many beds they may or may not operate. We do make available amounts of money. With the amounts of money, they do the best they can. The Janeway board like any other hospital board in this Province Sir, would like and no doubt could use more money than the Government have been able to make available to them. In that sense I think the hon. gentleman's question is both correct and incorrect. We neither open nor close beds. We give boards funds with which they operate as best they can. The Janeway is an autonomous organization, Sir, and does not answer to me in detail, although it is paid for out of public funds, it answers only in the general supervisory way, the same for example as Western Memorial Hospital at Corner Brook, or the Charles Curtis Hospital in St. Anthony. And by the way, the hon. gentleman for Humber West is present, he may like to know - I am sorry Humber East. The hon. gentleman for Humber West is also present, his attendance record is better than the hon. gentleman for Humber East. The hon. gentleman from Humber East might like to know that on the week-end past I saw Dr. Thomas of the I.G.A. briefly and he told me that never in his experience ( he has only been at St. Anthony twenty-four years Sir) have any cases been referred. He could not remember any that had been referred to Western Memorial hospital in Corner Brook.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question (212) of today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for the district for Bonavista North.

1261

The question reads: Part (1) have specific Research Studies been conducted by the Research Center Department of Energy Mines and Resources, Ottawa, having special emphasis with respect to the Great Northern Peninsula Newfoundland? Mr. Speaker, I can only suggest to the hon. member that he direct his question to that Federal department which is concerned with such things. The second part of the question. Has a copy of any such a report been forwarded to the Provincial Government? I can only say that I do not know if a copy of any such report has been forwarded. Certainly no such copy of any such report has been received by the department for which I am responsible. Question (214) on today's Order Paper, asked by the same hon. member. And the first part. What criteria are in use by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to select designated areas for the Province of Newfoundland? Mr. Speaker, on that question, I can only assume the hon. member refers to designated areas under the Regional Development Incentives Act, and again Sir I would not presume to enunciate in this House, Federal Government policy respecting anyone of their Acts. The second part of the question; had there been consultations with the Government of Newfoundland regarding the selection of these designated areas? The answer to that is yes. And if so, has the Province concurred with the areas designated? In answer to that Mr. Speaker, I can simply say that our concurrence is not required in any way, shape or form under that Act. The third part of the question, has the department of Community and Social Development suggested to the Regional Economic and Expansion Department, which settlements in Newfoundland should be abandoned and these residents move to larger communities. The answer to that question Sir, is an emphatic "No".

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister says that the concurrence is not required but has in fact his department or the Government concurred with these designated areas? He says concurrence is not required, but have you in fact concurred or made representations about these areas?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on that I have to say in answer to a supplementary question that the same answer I gave a day or two ago to a similar type of question respecting DREE and the operations of DREE, namely, that when

March 10, 1970

Tape #280

Page 5

the DREE agreement is signed, sealed and delivered, I will be bringing it before this House on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and at that time I will be explaining all aspects of the agreement, and all associated aspects. And I will be happy to answer any questions at that time.

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question (132) on the Order Paper of March 3, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. I have to say and I think the hon. gentleman will agree that this information being a matter of public record in the Statutes of the Province or in the Registry of the Crown Lands or in the Registry of Deeds and Companies is equally available to him as to me, and I think not a proper question to be on the Order Paper. And I think that applies Sir in respect of Section 1 and Section 3. In connection with Section 3, I might add that it is I think practically impossible to answer the second part of the question Mr. Speaker, because the people with whom the Government deal, may be anyone from the principle or the principle officers down to any officials of any Company at any particular time. The only answer I think that could be given is that the Government deal broadly with the appropriate officials of any Company, depending upon the nature of the particular contact. In respect of the second part Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that situation about which the question was asked. Question (133) on the Order Paper of the same day.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the hon. the minister, in connection with his answer that this information is on the public registry. Is the hon. minister aware that there is at least with respect to minerals anyway that there are closed registries in his department and that this information is therefore not available to all members of the public?

MR. ROWE (W. N.): They are not closed registries Mr. Speaker. There is a  
Registry

1263

HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): They are not closed registries: Mr. Speaker. There is a working registry in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources which was set up for the purpose of the use internally of the department. There are also Sir, registries of Crown Lands, registries of Deeds and Companies, and various other depositories of information in which the information for which the hon. gentleman asks is available, and I think under the rules Sir, that it is not proper to ask a question in respect to information that is available already, equally available to hon. members as to me.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no such rule, it is not equally available

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. Minister advise when the closed section to the registry of Mines were reopened.

MR. CALLAHAN: I say again Mr. Speaker, there is a registry in the department which is an internal registry in the normal manner of the internal filing systems for the operation of the department, and it is not a registry in the normal sense. I have answered the question

MR. CROSBIE: It is a secret registry closed to the public

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not a secret registry Mr. Speaker

MR. HICKMAN: There is no secret registry closed to the public?

MR. CALLAHAN: The registry is an internal registry for the use of the department, and is so regarded in the department and is not a secret registry by any manner or means.

On the same Order Paper Mr. Speaker, March 3rd., question 133, the answer I am afraid has to be similar to the answer to question number 132. The information is available in the normal way in statutes, in the registry of Deeds and Companies, and in the registry of Crown Lands, and is equally available to the hon. gentlemen as to me. The same answer must apply to part three of that question; the information is available in the first instance in the registry of Deeds and Companies, and in the second instance the Government deals with officials and executive officers of companies over a broad range, in a particular instance, appropriate to the particular matter with which the Government may be dealing at any time. In respect to the second part Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that situation.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary question, is it the fact that the Minister and his department when mining promoters or other promoters ask similar types of questions to this, <sup>14.9</sup> tell them to look it up in the public registries or other registries of this Province?

1264

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, question 156

MR. CROSBIE: The minister wishes not to answer a supplementary question? Contempt of the House these answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the answer to a question is not to be subject to comment even if the comment is disguised as a supplementary question. Will the hon. minister continue.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, before I do may I ask your ruling Sir, as to whether it is proper to place on the Order Paper questions which are available to hon. members in various matters, the answers to which are available to hon. members in various places including the statutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of the House states that an hon. member should not seek information which is as readily available to one member as another.

MR. CROSBIE: Your ruling, on that point Mr. Speaker, I think you said, "readily available." You did not just say available did you? "Readily available." This is not readily available.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is what I said Mr. Speaker

MR. CROSBIE: It is not readily available

MR. CALLAHAN: The Order Paper of Thursday, March 5th., question number 156 in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part, in the first instance is yes, in the second instance question 156, of the Order Paper of Thursday March 5. In the first instance the answer to the question is yes, and in the second instance the answer to the question is 3,646 square feet, the answer in the third instance is nil. The second part of the question in the first instance yes, in the second instance, egg graders and washers, wire baskets, plastic trays, refrigerated space. In the third instance nil, the policy is

MR. CROSBIE: Excuse me, what are you referring to there Mr. Minister? The refrigeration facilities is it?

MR. CALLAHAN: I will read the question Mr. Speaker. In the second line, towards the end of the second line. Does Provincial Poultry Cooperative Limited have the use of any equipment or refrigeration facilities or any other facilities. If so outline the equipment, size and nature and thirdly the amount charged each year. and the answer is in the first instance, yes there is equipment. The equipment is egg graders and washers, wire baskets, plastic trays, refrigerated space, and in the third instance is nil, because, the policy in respect of farm products cooperation facilities for the use of farmers is that they are charged a nominal rate under lease for the use of such facilities. I might say Sir, that



the facilities being cooperative are open and available to all farmers anywhere in this Province who may wish to join.

In respect of the third part, the answer is no, in respect to whether the Government pay accounts, but that would not be a complete answer. The answer is that amounts are paid through Farm Products Cooperation which is a Crown Corporation and have been paid in the year just past in respect of Provincial Poultry Co-op. \$1,618., and I should add Sir, for the sake of completeness and accuracy Eastern Farmers Co-op. \$2,059., I am sorry, I will go back Mr. Speaker to the first one. Provincial Poultry Co-op. in respect of electricity, heat, and water, maintenance and garbage collection \$1,618. Eastern Farmers Co-op. for electricity, steam and water, maintenance, garbage collection and managers salary for two months \$2,059. Now I should explain Mr. Speaker, that Eastern Farmers Co-op. has recently in the season just passed moved into the new vegetable grading facility at Pleasantville. The policy is to assist co-ops. generally over a two year period to get going by absorbing the overhead costs and giving them some help, some starter help with managements services. This is what has occurred in the case of Eastern Farmers.

Central Farm Producers Co-op. Bishops Falls, supplies and manages salary for the period of six months, June to December 1969, electricity up to and including 31st. December 1969, total \$5,268. Slaughter house at Doyles which is operated by the Agricultural Society, cost of renovations, license fee, caretakers salary from August to December 1969, total \$3,743. Slaughter house at Robinsons, for supplies, license fee, electricity, caretakers salary from August to December 1969 total \$1,532., and slaughter house at Comfort Cove, supplies and caretakers salary from October to December 1969, total \$1,714. Just to complete the explanation Mr. Speaker, the practice, the operating practice is that Farm Products Cooperation which is a Crown Corporation of this Government directly build and operate various agricultural facilities or at least build and assist into operation various agricultural facilities ranging from simple slaughter houses to quite complex vegetable processing facilities and egg grading and washing and packing facilities, which are leased in each case on a nominal basis to bona fide agricultural societies or agricultural cooperatives. As I explained earlier the practice is for about the first couple of years to assist co-ops in the matter of overhead and in the matter of management to insure that having spent a large amount of money on these things we will not see them fail for the want of some rather limited and modest assistance in the first year or two of their existence.

1266



Carrying on to part four of question 156, the answer in the first instance Mr. Speaker, is yes, and in the second \$20,700. Question 173, on the Order Paper of Friday March 6th., Mr. Speaker, this is a case again of a private company and I think it is not usual or appropriate to say who the members are. Their membership list is their own list, as is the membership list of any cooperative, and I suggest the question should more properly be directed to the cooperative if the hon. gentleman wishes the answer. I think the

MR. CROSBIE: It is using public facilities is it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is using public facilities Mr. Speaker, yes, but on the contract basis the question asks the members of the coop., and I can think of cooperatives, I know of one in this Province which has I think over 3,000 members and I would not like to

MR. CROSBIE: This one does not though, does it?

MR. CALLAHAN: No it does not, but the principle is the same Mr. Speaker, and I would not wish to burden either the staff of the department or this house with the obligation in future in a question of precedent by having them bring in 3,000 names of a private companies shareholders. The same applies in the first instance to the names of the shareholders are available Mr. Speaker in the registry of coops., which is open to the hon. gentleman, and the names of the members are on the share.....

the members are on the share list of the Co-Op which I would think would be available.

- (2) The same applies in the first instance.
- (3) None, we do not market for any co-op or any other organization.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. minister permit a supplementary question?

With reference to Newfoundland Poultry Producers Ltd. a corporate entity is that a licensed co-op. under the co-operatives Act.

Question No. 200: asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. The heading I might say referred to is not correct Mr. Speaker, the Question says 811-06 and I take it the hon. gentleman was referring to 811-03-06. The answer is as follows:

Wages including Canada Pension & Unemployment Insurance \$12, 885.

- (1) Food and other supplies \$3,029.
- (2) Fuels gasoline oil and propane \$836.
- (3) Repairs to generator and rental of generator for one month \$478.
- (4) Repairs alterations and additions to buildings \$626.
- (5) Construction of dock facility for boats and aircraft \$339.
- (6) Radio telephone service \$220.
- (7) Laundry service \$50.
- (8) Staff travelling and transportation of goods \$148.

Total \$18,611.00.

Question No. 228 asked by the hon. member for St. John's West.

Yes the Government has commenced renovations at Exon House which is to be the Home and Training Centre for severely Mentally Retarded and Physically Handicapped Children. The completion date is not definitely known at the moment the estimated cost of renovations is in the vicinity of \$320,000. The newly expanded facilities will accommodate 120 children some of which will come from the Children's Home at Water Street West. But the larger majority will come from homes right across Newfoundland and Labrador. The estimated cost of operating and maintaining the home will be given in the budget- the estimates.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker could the minister advise the House as to the list he can envisage from different places across Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: I do not have the information with me at the moment Mr. Speaker, but judging by the number of enquiries that pass over my desk every day I would say that this is a badly needed facility in the Province.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Minister what is the estimated number of staff for that institution?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information with me but I would be glad to get it for the hon. member.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker if I could rephrase my question, is the hon. minister satisfied that by accommodating 120 people that this will take care of the number.

MR. NEARE: The answer to that Mr. Speaker would have to be of course not but we will have to deal with the problem to do what we can.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon minister of Justice a question. Last evening the hon. minister tabled certain agreements in connection with the Melville Project (and the Clerk's Office are unable to make copies) could the hon. minister arrange to have copies made on the zerox machines in his office so that some of us can have a look at these agreements, make some copies available.

MR. CURTIS: I think Mr. Speaker, that can be arranged.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 3, that the rules of the House be suspended on the motion for Interim Supply now on the Order Paper and on the Supply Bill introduced pursuant thereto. Is the House ready for the question?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if no one is speaking on the other side I would like to have a few words to say on this. This is a motion Mr. Speaker that members of this House vote to suspend the rules of the House today on the motion for interim supply and on the supply Bill that was introduced yesterday. In other words Mr. Speaker this is a motion that the rules contained in our Standing Orders be suspended today March 10, that they be suspended so that this Supply Bill calling for an expenditure of \$61 million and some odd thousand interim supply for next year can go through this House today without following the usual procedure: the usual procedure being Mr. Speaker, that it takes three days for a Bill properly to go through this House, first reading, second reading and then third reading. Rather than having these three days for this important matter and a day for the resolution stage of the Bill which we had yesterday and that the Standing Orders be put aside. Standing Order 58 says, every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a Bill may, by leave of the House, be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day. Mr. Speaker this will not happen by consent of the House because hon. members on this side of the House will not consent.

Now Mr. Speaker this is a motion that is repugnant to the operation of a

1269

soundly functioning democratic legislative assembly. And we have had too many such motions as this in this House. This is not March 31 Mr. Speaker, if this were March 31st., and the position was that on April 1, the Government would have no money to pay the Bills, to pay its current Bills, but on the following day there would be no salaries to be able to be paid civil servants and others, the Police Force and others. If that were the occasion then one could well see how this motion could be justified and in fact Mr. Speaker, it has been used in other House on occasions like that. But in this House today we have a situation where there are 21 days to go, Mr. Speaker, in March that there is no need for interim supply to be rushed through this House today because we have the next twenty-one days to do it after proper consideration of everything that is contained in the interim supply Bill. There is no valid reason Mr. Speaker, why the rules of this House that are supposed to protect the rights of the minorities in this House, that is what the rules are designed to protect, Mr. Speaker, debate in this House the rights of minorities in this House to make their views known the right of minorities in the House to properly be able to consider what goes through the House that is why these rules were adopted Mr. Speaker,

Yet the Government proposes that these rules be thrown out, why? Because the Hon. the Premier and four members opposite are going to leave St. John's tomorrow to go to Europe on certain business, Mr. Speaker this House can continue its session, can continue meeting even if these hon. gentlemen go, or at least in our opinion they can. The hon. the Deputy Premier and all the other hon. members of the Cabinet will be here. The Government will still have at least 25 votes compared to the 10 in the Opposition side of the House. Why can this House not proceed on with its business? Why this extraordinary indecent positively indecent rush to put interim supply through this House in two days instead of the usual four, what is behind it? Are the members of this House just to be subject to the whims and dictates of the Government and those on the Government side? Is the public business of Newfoundland to be put aside, shunted aside, dumped aside, because certain members of the House had to proceed elsewhere on government business?

Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that Prime Minister Trudeau has just been absent from the House of Commons for the last week, in the North West Territories yet did the House of Parliament creep to a halt, did the House of Commons cease its work because Prime Minister Trudeau is gone? No, because Prime Minister Trudeau trusted his deputies, his government leader of the House <sup>and</sup> other Cabinet Ministers

1270

and left them to carry on with the public business while he went visiting the North West Territories. Why is it Mr. Speaker, that this House must suspend its operations every time the Hon the Premier has to go on a trip somewhere? It is absolutely fantastic. Is there no confidence placed in the deputy-premier? What is the cause of it? And now, this House has been asked Mr. Speaker, to suspend its rules for this business all to be done today. Mr. Speaker we on this side of the House were accused early in the session of obstruction because we were speaking up and asking questions and debating. Now we find this Hon. House is going to be adjourned for two or three weeks at the whim of the government when we are perfectly prepared to carry on with legislation, the Address in Reply, non-confidence motions, questions, public accounts committee, the Select Committee in Public Accounts, we are prepared to carry on Mr. Speaker, we agree that Easter week is a normal period to adjourn for Easter week, but we are <sup>not</sup> planning to go to the Riviera. We are not planning to go to Bermuda, we are not planning to go to the Bahamas, we are not planning to go to London, we are not planning to go to Paris, we are not planning to go to Liechtenstein, we are not planning to go anywhere, except in to power when the next election is called.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman never knows where he can go.

MR. CROSBIE: And that goes for the hon. Minister for Welfare, I was disappointed Mr. Speaker, to see that the hon. minister of Social Services & Rehabilitation is not going to Europe, because I very well think they may need some welfare assistance over there. Mr. Speaker, this a motion that is only palatable that is only decent, that is only acceptable if, there were twenty-four or forty-eight hours to go and this Government were trembling on the brink of being unable to pay the civil servants and afraid that they would not get from the eighth floor out the front door if they did not pay them. It might be acceptable then Mr. Speaker, but surely when this hon. House has three weeks to go before the end of March we do not have to be rushed like this and our Standing Order, the only thing that we had to protect us Mr. Speaker, (and your good self and I know that you will be avid in your protection) that these Standing Orders of this House of Assembly be <sup>not</sup> suspended today for such an unworthy purpose

MR. WELLS: Be suspended period, not just for today.

MR. CROSBIE: It just does not say for the day that it be suspended for this business of the Interim Supply, as long as it takes to ramrod it, to railroad it, to push it, to stamp it, to stomp it, to squash it, to bury it, defeat it, eighteen feet or otherwise through this House that is what it amounts to Mr. Speaker. It is a

1271



March 10, 1970

Tape #283

Page 1

MR. CROSSBIE: is a sad time Mr. Speaker in the history of this House, when such tyrannical advice has to be used for such a petty purpose. We all remember Mr. Speaker, the famous pipeline debate up in Ottawa, and what was the pipeline about? That the Government after months of debate actually suggested that closure should be applied to the Bill. The oil pipeline Bill. Canada Mr. Speaker, exploded in anger at the arrogance and contempt of the Government of Canada, who applied closure to that pipeline Bill. And they went out of office in the next election, and a Tory Government succeeded them, which then vanished later, about five years later.

Perhaps it was because the hon. Mr. Diefenbaker is said to have gotten twelve months interim supply. The hon. Premier says that was the reason, in that he got twelve months interim supply. Well if the hon. Mr. Diefenbaker got twelve months interim supply out of Ottawa, he deserved to lose that election, and any Government that forces two months or three months interim supply out of the House of Assembly, with as little excuse as this one has got. And on March 10, 1970 with twenty-one days to go until the beginning of the financial year, deserves Mr. Speaker, to go down in shattering defeat in the next election, because it is the epitome of the record of arrogance that has overtaken this Government now after twenty-one years in power.

The Government will decide when this House is going to sit. The Government with its majority will decide what will be rammed through the House. The Government with its majority will decide when the rules will be suspended. The Government with its majority will decide what happens on private members' day. The Government with its majority will decide whether we sit tonight until eleven o'clock, or go until breakfast tomorrow morning.

We will decide that Mr. Speaker, if we have enough wind in us to do it. And if it goes beyond eleven P.M. Because we are on an important principle today Mr. Speaker, and as long as the bellows will pump air, we are going to talk on this side of the House against the obnoxious principle of the fact that the Government is trying to pry \$61 million and some odd thousand out of the members of this House, and the public of Newfoundland, in indecent and positively unhealthy haste. Why? Not because tomorrow the money is

1272



needed, or the next day, or a weeks time, or two weeks time, or three weeks time, No, because certain members wish to expedite themselves to England, Paris, and we will have some questions to ask, <sup>in</sup> where else this week. Now Mr. Speaker, they may be going on very serious government business, we have no doubt. But does this House have to falter and shutter to a halt because five of the hon. members of this House are not going to be with us from tomorrow on, for four or five days?

I submit to you Mr. Speaker, that I have much more confidence in Dr. Rowe than is demonstrated by the leader of the Government. I submit that the hon. Dr. Rowe would be able to see that the business of the House was expedited. The hon. the Minister of Education would expedite the business of this House, and we would give him every co-operation Mr. Speaker, where that was deserved.

So Mr. Speaker, we are being asked today, by this Motion introduced by the President of the Council, <sup>2</sup> that that unique Parliamentarian, the President of the Council, <sup>who</sup> has twenty-one years' experience in this House, of Parliamentary procedure, Twenty-one years' experience in expediting matters through the House, <sup>he</sup> moves this Motion today, that we throw out the rules until this Government gets the \$61. million in its rapacious maw for two or three months after April 1, with no assurance Mr. Speaker, when we are going to be called back, no assurance when the Budget is going to be brought down. No assurance on what date we are going to get the Estimates for twelve months expenditure. No assurance, but a lot of jocular kidding around, as to whether there is going to be an election or not in the intervening period. Because Mr. Speaker, there could very well be.

This Government, if this Interim Supply Bill is passed, could go to the country before having to present a Budget, before having to disclose the financial position of the Province, before having to answer the many questions now on the Order Paper, and the hundreds that are going to be added to the Order Paper, without having the debate on the Budget, without having come to grips with the question of Civil Service salary increases, the police increase, the Police Act, the hospital workers' problems, increases for hospital workers. All that can happen Mr. Speaker, after today, if

March 10, 1970

Tape #283

Page 3

we quietly accede to this request that the rules be suspended and allow the Government to quietly get the \$61. million that they wish. Not even Mr. Speaker, not even a request - if the Government came in Mr. Speaker, and said we only want enough money to carry on for three or four weeks, there are reasons why we cannot bring our Budget down, even though we have a majority we would like to co-operate with you. We will explain to you why we cannot bring the Budget down, and we are only asking for four weeks supply. And we will give you assurance if the Government said we will give you an assurance that you will be called back in April, and that the Budget is going to be brought down and the Estimates, with no hanky-panky of an election in between.

If that kind of an approach were made Mr. Speaker, then of course there would be no reason why on this side of the House we would not co-operate, knowing that all these things were going to be gone in<sup>to</sup> detail and when. But on this side of the House we have the direst suspicion that this might be the last day that this House of Assembly meets. We have no reason to believe any otherwise, any other way, and therefore, we are going to act on the basis that this is the last day we will be in this House, the present House of Assembly. And that when some of us reassemble back here, it will be an entirely new House starting again. And we will be on the other side of the House. This is the hon. member's "duck song" and he is ready for any duck-hunter that wants to come hunting ducks wherever he is.

Well at least Mr. Speaker, I am not a dead duck if I can lay an egg. So the hon. gentleman is contradicting the hon. the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I know that the galleries should not comment or engage in this debate, and I am sure they will not.

Now Mr. Speaker, back to this Motion. We all realize that at certain points in the House of Assembly proceedings or Parliamentary proceedings, a government must have certain vital things to carry on. And then any sensible Opposition, and they usually are, agrees. Usually, this is done Mr. Speaker, by consultation behind the Speaker's Chair<sup>it</sup>, it is called - the leader of the Government in the House, and the leader of the Opposition, and the leader of any other group in the House, meet behind the Speaker's

1274

Chair, and they discuss what the Government is proposing and the order of government business, and how the government needs to get money for Interim Supply or whatever. And everyone treats one another fairly, and they agree on matters between them, and the thing is done properly, so on and so on.

That is not the procedure adopted Mr. Speaker, in this House, because in this House we on this side of the House are treated with contempt, and have been all during this Session. Almost impossible Mr. Speaker, to get information in many cases. We saw an example of that attitude here and this afternoon. The hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources refusing on specious grounds, to give information about mineral grants and forestry grants in Labrador. And he does not know whether a company incorporated in Liechtenstein has any rights in Labrador.

Well if a minister of that department does not know whether or not we have been invited by Liechtensteiners, surely he should know -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am finding it very difficult to connect the present remarks of the hon. the member for St. John's West with the Resolution before the House.

MR. CROSBIE: I am sorry Mr. Speaker, I naturally bow to your honour's ruling. I was going to say that even in Liechtenstein Mr. Speaker, they would not bring on a Motion like this, to suspend all the rules. And to put \$61 million through the House in one day. So Mr. Speaker, this Resolution before us today is part of a piece, it is part of a pattern that has been operative in this House of Assembly since it opened on February 18. We are the Government. We have the votes. We are in control. We are the masters. We are going to run things. The House will open and close when we decide. The rules will be suspended when we decide. That has been the attitude. We will give the information that we decide to give, that we see fit to give. That is the attitude of the Government Mr. Speaker, we will decide what hon. members are going to be allowed to have an office near the precincts of the House of Assembly. It is all of one piece. It all fits together. And now the mail<sup>ed</sup> fist not even in a glove, that the rules of the House be suspended, so that this matter, this small matter, this minor matter. \$61 million - a minor matter go

March 10, 1970

Tape #283

Page 5

through this House Mr. Speaker in one day. Was it not the late Mr. C. D. Howe who got into trouble once by saying, "what is in a million"? Well Mr. Speaker, this is a government that says, "what is in \$61,680,000 that should bother any hon. member of this House of Assembly, and what reason is there for us not putting this measure through in one day"?

Block vote. And the rules are to be suspended for that. The rules so often cited in this Chamber by a certain hon. gentleman. We have been told Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times this Session, we were told by the hon. the Premier, "ho ho, ha ha," conversation of the Premier, giggling, chortling with glee, how the hon. members over on this side of the House did not understand procedure. Had a great laugh the hon. the Premier did Mr. Speaker, on the day that the first non-confidence Motion vanished without a debate. Practically chortled to death.

We were advised Mr. Speaker, to learn the rules, us poor clots over here. We were advised to learn the rules, and we have learned them Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman found out yesterday, when on two points of procedure, he was overruled. Beauchesne and these Standing Orders were right on the point. And the hon. gentleman had forgotten about those points. The hon. gentleman never knew them.

We were advised Mr. Speaker, to learn the rules. Learn the rules for what purpose? So that the Government can bring in a Motion that the rules be suspended, abolished, wiped out, run away with, squashed, stomped? So that the Government gets \$61. million in its mitts, enough to carry it probably until the end of June, with frugal spending. And since frugal spending is not a habit of this Government, probably until the end of May in any event. That is what we are being asked to do.

Why for Mr. Speaker, did we spend those weary hours on the rules and on Beauchesne and the Standing Orders to discover that when we started to learn the rules, and we were getting somewhere learning the rules. And we were not exactly fools about the rules. Only to discover that when we got to that stage, the rules were going to be dispensed with. The rules of the House be suspended on this Motion. There are twenty-one days Mr. Speaker, until the end of March, and there is no reason why this House cannot sit during all of them except Easter week. It has been a practice to have a holiday then. Why this unholy rush Mr. Speaker? Why this dubious haste?

1276

March 10, 1970

Tape #283

Page 6

What is the reason for it? We heard several days ago a week ago, that the hon. the Premier and his party, a very attractive group they are. The hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Supply, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the President of the Council, are going on this business. And they were going to come back Mr. Speaker next Monday, and this House was going to meet with Mr. Shaheen and his associates and these gentlemen and the documents, the Feasibility Study, and report. And they were going to tell us where our money was going and gone, and going to go. That was going to happen next week.

Why the change Mr. Speaker? Why now are we to go for the next

1277

MR. CROSBIE: Are we to go for the next three weeks without the House meeting. Does it not tend to arouse a little suspicion in ones mind as to what is up. as to what is happening? No assurance Mr. Speaker that we are going to meet again. No assurance that there is going to be a budget in this House. No assurance that the estimates are ever going to be presented to this House. There is something wrong Mr. Speaker. Something calls out for an explanation. There is \$61 million that calls out for an explanation. What is it to be used on? We will be debating that later, and what for? Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that any hon. member of this House that votes for this motion is voting against the institution of Parliamentary control of the expenditure of Government.

We in this House are representing the people of Newfoundland. It is their money the Government is asking us to grant them. \$61 million of it is going to be taken from them, and as the hon. member for Humber East would say that includes the cent on the chocolate bars that the little kiddies are running around paying, when they want to buy the chocolate bars. Part of that is in the \$61 million. That \$61 million comes from the pockets of the Newfoundland people through taxes, and on future generations of Newfoundlanders because, some of it will be borrowed, but directly or indirectly right from their pockets. This House is asked to vote it blindly, to accept it like a pig in the poke, to have the rules suspended, to put this all through in two day Mr. Speaker, instead of the usual four.

Why Mr. Speaker, is the Government afraid to face the House? To face the Opposition? Face the questions that we are asking, points we are raising in debate? We have been promised Mr. Speaker that we are going to hear an outline of the DREE program, and we have been promised that we are going to have a "white paper" on the health services, and we have been promised I think "white papers" on other matters. All <sup>These</sup> that are going to be debated in this House, and we were promised that the hon. the Premier had only completed half his oration in this House, that half of it was on the Speech from the Throne, ten hours

MR. SMALLWOOD: One third

MR. CROSBIE: One third, ten hours, and the other twenty hours are going to be on the Budget. Now Mr. Speaker, there is a dirty suspicion in our minds that there is not going to be any budget before this House for him to speak on, for the hon. gentleman to speak on. It may be some different House, and it might very well be some different kind of a budget. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that might very well be very much better.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House have to decide whether they wish to support control in financial matters by the Legislature of the executive



branch of the Government or not. Because if we suspend the rules and give this \$61 million out without receiving the detailed estimates first, we are abrogating our duty. Evading our responsibility which is assure<sup>to</sup> the Newfoundland people that the money is being wisely spent, and properly spent. That is our duty. It is the Government's duty to spend it properly. It is our duty as members not supporting the Government to see that they have done that, or that they are going to do that.

Only Mr. Speaker, in absolutely unusual and extraordinary circumstances should any House of Assembly or Parliament suspend its own rules to permit a Government to get for itself \$61 million to go two or three months into the new year with. This is not one of those occasions Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier in this debate, if this ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> March 31st. or March 30th., and the Government had to have Interim Supply to meet its bills on April 1st. we would be the last to try to delay the matter. And if the Government ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> asking for a reasonable amount Mr. Speaker, but it is not doing either. The Government has twenty-one days left in March before it needs Interim Supply, that is one part of it. On the other hand Mr. Speaker, the Government is asking for two months at least, three months probably, Interim Supply which is too much, and is not giving us the estimates even Mr. Speaker, the estimates to look at in detail.

After spending a lot of time Mr. Speaker, cogitating on the rules, reading them over, listening to you Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, and the Deputy Speaker, listening quietly and attentively whenever you make a ruling and trying to remember your rulings, the rulings that you hon. gentlemen propound so well in this House, after all that Mr. Speaker, and looking at Beauschene, putting pieces of paper in to mark the spot, Beauschene our great bible, we discover Mr. Speaker today that after acting on the urging of the hon. the Premier and doing all that research-work on the rules, that now the rules are to be suspended. Well Mr. Speaker, I for one will vote against this motion, I do not say that never should a motion like this be moved because there comes occasions in every Parliament when it is necessary. One particular one being when you need Interim Supply tomorrow and it has not gone through and you have to have it tomorrow. That is one occasion, on other occasions Mr. Speaker, it should only go through by unanimous consent. This is not one of the occasions when anyone can justify this suspension Mr. Speaker of the rules of this House for such a puny purpose.

Tomorrow there is going to be five from forty-one, Mr. Speaker there will be thirty-five hon. members in this House of Assembly left in Newfoundland tomorrow after the hon. gentlemen go to Paris or London. We can carry on Mr.

Speaker, we will promise not to overthrow the Government while the hon. the Premier is gone. We will make that commitment, that we will not defeat them in any substantial votes in the House while the hon. the Premier is gone. We will behave our-selves. We will be quite positive in our approach so that this House makes much progress while the hon. gentlemen are gone, if they will let the House continue in operation Mr. Speaker and leave our rules, leave our rules where they stand now and not suspend <sup>them</sup> ~~at~~ Mr. Speaker. We will agree to that.

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accept direction that we should accept from the hon. the Deputy Premier if he is left in that position. The hon. the Deputy Premier is a gentleman who has I think seventeen if not nineteen years experience in this House. We all know that he is an excellent debater, a little misguided in his views, little misguided as to where his loyalties should lay, but still a very capable and honourable gentleman, and it would be quite a pleasure Mr. Speaker to sit in this House and have a Leader of the Government, a changed Leader of the Government for a few days at least. It may very well be that the hon. the Premier will be where he is now for the next twenty years. But it would be nice Mr. Speaker, in this forty year period to have had this House open for at least two or three days with a different hon. gentleman occupying the seat of the hon. the Premier.

We do not even ask Mr. Speaker that it be someone from this side of the House, that has already been tried, and of course as the House already knows a certain party was squashed, squoozed, skwunched, skrumched, trodden under, eighteen feet deep, overwhelmed, defeated, not shell-shocked unless this is the result of shell-shock. So Mr. Speaker, we are not asking very much, just a few days for a different hon. gentleman to sit in the hon. the Premier's seat in this House and lead the House, because Mr. Speaker, if that does not happen voluntarily then it is going to have to be arranged by the electorate of Newfoundland.

So Mr. Speaker, my position in this matter is clear. I do not agree with the suspension of the rules. The suspension has not been justified, there is no emergency. There is no reason why the rules should be suspended, and there are hundreds of years of Parliamentary tradition behind the rights of members of Houses like this that we should strike a blow for today.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we hope that the business of the House, the present business of the House, voting of Interim Supply to the Government for two months will pass through the House today, and get the Royal Assent. That his Honour the Lieutenant Governor will come here and give Royal Assent to this supply to Her Majesty before the day is over. If we do we will

1280

move the adjournment of the House to Monday, April 6th., and the House meeting on Monday, April 6th. will continue on uninterruptedly except for a possible delay, postponement, adjournment of a day now or a day then, but even a day I do not see, but I make allowance for the possibility that the House might wish to adjourn for a day for some particular purpose or other. Which purpose I do not foresee at the moment, but I make allowance for it. So the House meeting, yes the Tory Convention might happen. Well if the Tory Convention comes on while the House is still in session I am sure it would be the desire of the entire House and all hon. members to have an adjournment for a day or two or three whatever it may need for the hon. members of the Tory Party opposite to take part in their party convention. We would not hesitate a moment to ask the House to adjourn for that purpose.

If anything else happens in the two, or three, or four weeks, or four, or five, or six weeks that the House might need to be in session after it resumed its work on Monday, April 6th., the required day or two of adjournment we would not hesitate to suggest that to the House. And so Sir, the program of the Government, and we hope that the House will support it, we cannot carry it out without the support of the House. We are not a dictatorship, we are at the mercy of the hon. members of the House. We can only propose, we can only suggest, we can only make motions, and it is our duty to do so, that is what governing means. Governing means that you bring in legislation. Governing means that you propose resolutions. Governing means that you make motions. Governing means that you bring business before the House. That is what a Government does, that is what a Government is for. That is not dictatorship, that is democracy.

But the Government fails completely in every move it makes if it lacks the support of the House. The power lies in the House. A majority of the House must vote for everything the Government proposes to be done or it will not be done. If a majority keeps supporting the Government this maybe utterly sickening. This may be revolting, and certainly very frustrating to hon. members of the House who do not support the Government. They may despise the majority who do support the Government. They may despise the majority, they may think that they are slaves, they may think that they are curs, they may think anything of the majority, but the fact remains that the Government can govern only if and so long as a majority in the House support the Government. Now does that make the Government tyrants? Does it make them dictators? If a majority of democratically elected members of this House, and every hon. member Your Honour in this House was democratically elected in a secret ballot in the last general election. Every

member in the House was democratically elected, and we are all here by the democratic vote of the Newfoundland people. And if a majority of the democratically elected members of this House support the Government in this, and in that, and in the other thing does that make the Government tyrants? Does it make the Leader of the Government

make the Leader of the Government a dictator. Does it make the House itself tyrannical? Does it make the whole House of Assembly a bunch of dictators, because they pass laws? But they were elected to pass laws. The Newfoundland people in the secret ballot vote, elected them to do that very thing.

Now when the House reassembles on Monday, 6th. of April, we will go forward with the conclusion of the Debate on the Address in Reply, that will be proceeded with and concluded. And all the legislation that is on the Order Paper will be proceeded with, and I hope concluded. And during that same time, the budget will be brought down. And so will the estimates and all the time that the House may need or may want. They may want more than they need, so be it, all the time that the House may want to use to debate the legislation the House will have. And all the time the House may want to debate the budget, the House will have. And all the time the House may want to debate the estimates of expenditure. The House will have. No tyranny. No dictatorship. No denial or suppression or control over free speech. We wish to get supply granted onto Her Majesty to the amount of \$61 million today. This amount will suffice for two months, it may indeed be a bit more than enough for two months, but it will surely be enough for two months. Next month, and the month after. And before the end of next month, that is before the end of April we are confident and I am choosing my words carefully, remembering that they are being taken down on electronic tape, and that tomorrow or the next day, they will be type and they will be put on the table of the House, the full verbatim report of what I am saying, remembering that I am choosing my words carefully and as I say, we are quite confident that we will have the budget ready to bring down and we will bring it down substantially before the end of April. Because, Sir, before that date we will have come to our final conclusions, as to the rates of new pay, the new rates of pay, that we can afford, that the Treasury can afford to give to the hospital workers and the policemen and the wardens in the penitentiary, the firemen and the civil servants and other direct employees of the Government, we will have made up our minds by then, how much and in what way, how much increase and how the increase will vary from one class of employees to another class, because we have no thought, Mr. Speaker, I may tell your Honour, we have no thought in the Government of having a straight across the board common, uniform rate of increase for all who are to get an increase. That would be easy, six per-cent, seven per-cent, eight per-cent, nine per-cent, ten per-cent, eleven per-cent, twelve per-cent, one simply across



the board uniform rate of increase would be perfectly simple. You count up the number of persons to whom you propose to give the increase, you look at their present pay, you say, if you add five per-cent to that it will cost you this much. Ten per-cent will cost you twice as much, and you wonder can you afford that much, if you can, you will say ten per-cent across the board, that is easy and quick and simple.

But, Sir, in our opinion, it would be wrong. Because in our opinion the different types of workers have different degrees of responsibility, require different degrees of skill and are now some of them, under<sup>paid</sup> too much more underpaid, than others are underpaid, even if we begin with the assumption that all are underpaid, we have to remember that some are more underpaid, than others. So we do not propose a uniform across the board increase. And the minute we so decide, we are up against a tremendous task, and it is tremendous, and we are being assisted in it, by P.A. S. from Chicago, this firm, we have had here for a year classifying the whole public service, they are helping us in it, our own civil service are helping us in it, our Department of Finance are going through one exercise after the other to help us to get it done. And so Sir, I am able to say today, that I am quite confident<sup>we</sup> in the Government, the Cabinet, are quite confident that substantially before the end of April, we will bring the budget down, and with it the estimates of expenditure.

Now, if as we think will be the case, and I am willing to make a bet with anyone that we are right in this, in thinking that it is the case, that the Opposition this year, this session, will pay far more attention to the budget speech debate and far more attention to the estimates, than they have ever done before in twenty years, if I am right in that and I am sure I am. Then, Sir, it may well happen that the consideration of the budget and the consideration of the estimates will take five or six weeks, in this House. And remember, Sir, that the Government have no money on the day the budget speech is brought down, the Government get the money only after the budget speech is brought down, the estimates of expenditure are tabled, and the budget speech is debated, and then the estimates are debated, item by item, and after that is all done, and there is no word left from anyone, and the House votes the money, and the Governor comes and gives it the Royal Assent from that moment only, only from that moment have we the authority to spend the money. From the date we bring the budget down, it may well be three, four, five, weeks before we

1284

get the money voted to us. Because we have no thought anymore in this session, than we ever had in previous sessions. We have not thought of shutting of the debate of closing it, of shortening it, of denying hon. members across the floor every possible opportunity that they may want to speak and debate both the budget and the estimates.

Now, Sir, when you remember that the estimates consist of many, many thousands of separate and individual items of proposed expenditure for the coming year. And that each individual item is considered separately and individually, when you remember that and when you remember, Sir, that any hon. member of the House on either side has the right to ask questions of the ministers concerned, about each individual item of proposed expenditure, when you remember that, and when you remember even the small Opposition here two or three years ago, in a year where I happened to take account, and I think it was seventeen or eighteen hundred questions, they asked in the debate on the estimates, and in this session, you are not likely to have 1700, you are more likely to have 17,000. Remembering that, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see that between the date when the budget is brought down, which will be substantially before the end of April, possibly well sometimes between the middle of April and the end of April. Possibly a little closer to the middle, than to the end, when you remember that between that date, whatever it is, and the date when the last Royal Assent is given, when the Bills are all passed, and the Governor comes and gives the Royal Assent, between these two dates there may well be anything from three to six weeks. You will see your Honour why we want two months supply, not one.

The hon. gentleman from the district of Burin moved in this House, or moved in Committee, that the supply be granted to the Government, yes. Supply be granted to the Queen, but for only one month. In other words for next month. But, Sir, if that were done, if the House had followed his suggestion, and voted for his motion, if the House had done that, then we would be getting supply for one month. And then, Sir, if the House met on the 6th. of April, that is that one month now, the House resumed on the 6th. of that one month, and around say the 20th. of that month the budget is brought down, the estimates are brought down, and the debate goes on up to the middle of the following month, which could well happen, where then is the Government getting its money? Does it then come in for a second Interim Supply? Oh! how silly, how absurd? How absurd? What is the need for taking two bites at it, what is the need to come into the House twice for Interim Supply? So as to have another debate like

this one? Would that be the reason for coming in for a second supply, Interim Supply, so this thing could be done all over again?

Now, I cannot help but remembering, Mr. Speaker, that every statement made here by the hon. gentleman who just sat down, every statement he made to the effect, that the House is asked to vote this Interim Supply for the first two months of the coming year, without information, in ignorance, voting it blindly, I cannot help remembering two things, that seven hon. gentleman of the ten over there, year after year, voted for Interim Supply, year after year, after year, voted for Interim Supply, that the hon. the Minister for Bonavista North who is not sitting in his seat at the moment, he was here a few minutes earlier I noticed, the hon. member for Bonavista North voted again at least each one of six years, prior to this year for Interim Supply. He voted for it, and he did not hesitate to vote for it, but then he was sitting on this side. Now what special merit, what special virtue has suddenly come upon him? After being here for fourteen years, and in six of those fourteen years voting for Interim Supply, he crosses the floor. What special virtue now makes him vote against the thing, that he voted for in over a period of fourteen years?

The hon. member for Fortune Bay has been in the House for a total of, I think, seven years, during five of which he was in the Cabinet, but seven years he has had over here. And he voted four years, four years he voted, for the very thing that he is now taking a stand on principle against. Now does he seriously expect that position to be taken seriously? Does he mean to tell us, that when he voted for it before, it was all right, but it is not right to vote for it now? Why not? What makes the difference? The only changes in circumstances is that the hon. gentleman now is sitting over there. Now that is the only change.

Now none other than that, that is seven of the hon. gentlemen across the way, seven of them. Year after year when ever they sat in this House until this year, year after year, without exception, without murmur, without objection, without a syllable of objection, expressed or felt, they voted for Interim Supply. Why did they vote for Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker? Because on every occasion when they did it, they knew that the budget was not going to be ready for the 1st. of April, Our year begins on the 1st. of April. And in any year when the Government are not ready to bring the budget down, and get it adopted, now they are not to bring it down before the 1st. of April. But bring it down, get it debated, and get it adopted and the Royal Assent given to it, any year that the Government cannot do that, and have it all done before April 1st. the

Government are driven to have no choice but to ask the House to grant it something on account, sometimes it has been four months supply on account, four months Interim Supply for the coming year. Sometimes three months. Almost always three months, this year it is for two months. Now that is a change in the circumstances, that is a change. The seven hon. gentlemen sitting over there have voted for year after year, again and again, they voted for it. Now they are voting against it. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? There must be a reason.

Now the Opposition, this year is the fourteenth year, when the Government brings in Interim Supply— Fourteen years this year now. And in everyone of the thirteen years, before this year, the Opposition, the Official Opposition never, Sir, never, not once did the Official Opposition give more than the barest token opposition to Interim Supply. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but on every occasion for thirteen years, the Opposition did this, the Government brought in Interim Supply and it went through in one day every time. Every time, without exception.

The Opposition helped the Government to put through Interim Supply and did it in thirteen years, in one day. It went through all its stages in one day. Thirteen years, this year it is taking two days to do it. Because we got twice as many of an Opposition. All right, so be it! It is all right, nothing wrong!

March 10, 1970

Tape #286

Page 1

MR. SMALLWOOD: wrong with that. We are now taking two days to do what we did in one day, every time for thirteen years. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. member for White Bay South has told this House that he will in this present Session, bring forward here for the House, the DREE program for Newfoundland. He has told the House he will do that. He has told the House more than that. Not only that he will bring the DREE program here, but give ample opportunity to the House to debate it. Not only that, but that he will try to persuade the House to debate it. That he will be bitterly disappointed Sir, if the House does not give a thorough going debate on the DREE program, because this Government are intensely proud of the DREE program.

And we want it to be thoroughly debated here, and it will be debated because if nobody does on that side of the House, it certainly will be on this side. The hon. the Minister of Health, who is the member for the district of White Bay North, has informed this House that it is his intention to bring a White Paper before this House in the whole field of Public Health. Hospitals, and Public Health. He has told the House that he has been working on it, he and his officials for many months past. And that they are getting close to having it ready to bring into the House.

The hon. the Minister is going with me tomorrow night to Europe and he will doubtless come back with me one day next week. We are not sure of what day it will be. We cannot be sure Mr. Speaker, if we could we would, but we cannot, we do not know when it will be. We have hopes that on Saturday of this week, we will be able to sign the agreements concerning which we are going over across the Atlantic. But it may well be that it will be Monday or Tuesday before the actual signing can take place.

The signing of the documents for the great paper mill in Stephenville took place weeks, quite literally weeks after it was supposed to occur. And at last I went over and the President of the Council, one or two other Cabinet Ministers went with me for that great and historic occasion. The signing of the documents for the great paper mill at Stephenville.

But similarly there can be delay and we have some little reason, not big reason, but little reason, we have some slight little reason to believe



March 10, 1970

Tape #286

Page 2

that the signing may not take place on Saturday, it may very well be Monday or Tuesday, or even Wednesday. We have waited for years for that vast development, and if we have to wait another few days more than we want, it will be a nuisance, it will be irritating, but it will not be fatal. And the hon. gentleman will return with me to Newfoundland from the other side when these documents are signed. And sometime after the House opens on the sixth of April, he will table his White Paper on hospitals and health in Newfoundland, and he will be a bitterly disappointed minister after going through enormous trouble and effort to prepare that White Paper, if when he brings it in here, is not fully debated. He will challenge the House to give it a thorough going debate.

Now furthermore, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, who is the hon. member for the district of Port-au-Port, has been working for many, many weeks past for a number of months past, on the preparation of another White Paper, which will be of enormous interest -

MR. MURPHY: Are we on Motion 3 now Mr. Speaker, may I ask?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are on the same Motion to which the hon. gentleman everything from St. John's West spoke about under the sun -

MR. MURPHY: I am not concerned Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman spoke to, we are talking about the rules of the House being suspended, am I right on this or not. I am getting just a little confused. I would like to speak on it, but I would like to know what this subject is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to speak to that point of order Your Honour. The Motion is that the rules of the House be suspended for one purpose, not Mr. Speaker, as was suggested by the hon. gentleman who spoke before me for the rest of the Session, but for one purpose - if the House will look at the Resolution and if Your Honour has undoubtedly looked at it, he will see and they will see that it is only for the purpose of this Interim Supply. That is what the suspension of rules is for. Not for the whole Session, for this one thing. And I am talking about this one thing why the rules should be suspended, so that we can have a vote on the Supply, and to reassure the House that this is not a dirty political trick, some slimy trick of which we have been virtually accused here - that this might be the last time the House will meet. I am trying to reassure the House that

1259

March 10, 1970

Tape #286

Page 3

they may safely suspend the rule so that we may pass this one piece of Legislation. And if the House suspends the rules, and passes this one piece of Legislation by six o'clock, then between eight o'clock and eleven tonight, we can go on with the rest of the business and not under suspended ruling. The suspension applies only to this one piece of business. That is the wording of the Motion. Now that is why I am in order. I am arguing Your Honour that we ought to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing the Interim Supply this day, this day. And so that the House may adjourn this day tonight at eleven or whatever time it may be, so that the House may be in adjournment during Easter week, that is one week between now and the sixth of April, Easter week and approximately a week while five of the senior ministers of the Cabinet are absent from the House.

That is two weeks between now and the sixth of April. And so instead of coming back in between these two periods, we say adjourn the House, let hon. members go back to their constituencies. Let hon. ministers go back to their work. Let the hon. Leader of the Opposition get ready for his Convention, and then resume on the sixth of April and go on if necessary for the next two months. That is why I am arguing today for this Motion that we should suspend the rules only for the purpose of this one piece of Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some fun I admit, I confess it, I have had some fun tantalizing the Opposition, and the former Liberals and the new Tories. The former Liberals are not yet new Tories, they are still just former Liberals. Some of the former Liberals are now new Tories. There are seven of them. There are seven over there that came into this House under my leadership. I got them in here. I managed to get them in here somehow or other, I got them in here. Seven of them. And I have been having some fun with them, with the three regular Tories, the old lion Tories, the proper Tories, the regular, the established Tories, the Tory establishment. The established Tories. I have been having fun with all of them, trying to put them on their metal, and trying to put them on tenderhooks as to when the general election is coming. And I am continually dropping indiscreet

remarks and apologizing and saying I did not mean to say that. And I just want to keep them guessing as to when the election is going to <sup>be</sup> held. Well now let me put them out of their pain. Let me put them out of their agony. There will be no election between now and the sixth of April. No election, between now and the sixth of April. But on the sixth of April the House will meet and will stay in Session five days a week and four nights a week -

MR. HICKEY: Until the election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until the Budget is brought down, the Legislation or practically all the Legislation that is on the Order Paper, and some that is not yet on the Order Paper, is debated and passed and becomes law. And the Governor comes and gives the Royal Assent to the Supply unto Her Majesty. Until that is all done, and I estimate, I do not see, unless we began to throttle off the Opposition to deprive them of every possible opportunity to debate, unless we are to do that, I do not see how that can be done before if we meet on the sixth of April, I do not see how it can be done before the middle of the following month. At least a month, say roughly speaking a month, or five weeks after we come back. There will be no election until the House meets on the sixth of April, and does its business and concludes probably around the middle of May. Now when is the Convention? What month is the Tory Convention?

MR. MURPHY: May, I think, May the 15th.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May 15th. all right there will be no election this side of that Convention. I guarantee you that here now. I am not such a political coward as to <sup>be</sup> afraid of the Tory Convention and try to run a snap election and catch them napping. I am not built that way. When I have an election, if I have one, it will be ~~fight~~ man-fashion, right out in the open. And I will fight it, if I fight an election at all which is not guaranteed. It is not guaranteed that I will fight an election in any shape or form. I might just go out and campaign for the Liberal Party, but not as a candidate. I might not even be a candidate for election. I might not be leader of the Party, but I might go and campaign for the Party, and help get them back into power again. But none of that Mr. Speaker before the Tory Convention. Now I hope there will be happiness in that

1291

March 10, 1970

Tape #286

Page 5

camp that it should be a great relief because they really have not known, and this has been my doing. I have had great fun doing it. This is the normal fun of party politics, normal, not dirty, not filthy, not slimy, not sinister, just ordinary old-fashioned political fun, of which it surely, is proper to have some in this peculiar world in which we live today.

Well there it is. I asked the House to suspend the rules.

MR. COLLINS: The price of not having an election is \$61 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The price of not having an election is sixty-one <sup>MILLION</sup> dollars.

Now I would like to be able to follow that. I would like to be able to follow that reasoning, but Mr. Speaker, I am not politically bright enough to do it. The hon. gentleman has depths of political wisdom and skill that I cannot -

MR. COLLINS: Batten down again -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is way ahead of me. He has left me away behind -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Your Honour, I fully agree. So I ask hon. members, I ask the House to vote for the Motion to suspend the rules. I ask the House then to get down and consider whether they will vote these sixteen or seventeen amounts, you know \$4. million for Highways, \$11. million for Public Welfare; and \$14. million for Health; \$18. million for Education, for the first two months of the coming financial year, and other amounts totalling \$61. million. I ask them to suspend the rules and then go through this legislation. Take two or three or four or five or six hours, whatever it may take, and debate it and pass it, so that the Governor may come and give Royal Assent to it. Then we would adjourn until the sixth of April to meet and continue and complete the business of the Province.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, as I said I had to do a bit of checking to find out just what the topic on the Order Paper was after listening to the previous speakers, I did not know whether it was that general election we were talking about or the Tory leadership Convention. But I think basically we are speaking on which is our opinion over the years, and I am not one speaking for the first time on such a Motion as this, I could tell now the

1292

how the hon. the member for St. John's West, like a voice crying in the wilderness or just wasted his <sup>sweetness</sup> / on the desert air, we have gone through this. We on many occasions have tried to weigh the facts, I think, I spoke on the same matter yesterday in this same debate on the Resolution. But we have, and this is continually happening each year, where we are called into session sometimes in February or sometimes in March, the Government are the operators of our business, the same as any other business. I imagine the Board of Directors in a company, if they are suppose to have a financial statement down at the end of the month, at a certain time, I presume, if they are efficient they will have that statement down or else. But we cannot or else set this moment in this House because there are not enough ~~opponents~~ on this side to put the Government where they belong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, if there were the hon. gentleman would be over here, and we would be over there.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that will be something that we will see very shortly and I think it will be a great pleasure to look down from the Ivory Tower.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How shortly is very shortly, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MURPHY: All I want is a chance to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, go on.

MR. MURPHY: If anybody wants to check Hansard, it is hard to say who is having the address, or who is asking the question. I would just ask, just for a few moments of the time, the Premier spoke for ten hours the other day, unfortunately I was on the Mainland, I did not even get the echo of his voice. I missed it I know it was a great treat. But I am just trying to make one or two points as sensibly as I can - and to try and bring forth why do we need to suspend the Rules of the House at this time? I think I expalined yesterday, and I think the hon. member for St. John's West did also say, that we have a Governemnt, they have a job to do, and the job is to run the affairs of this Province. The most important, the most basic part of running any business, is the capital, the monies, the plans you have for next year, how much it cost last year, if you have money in the bank, or if you have no money. Now up to this present moment, we do not even know, if we owe a dollar, or if we have a dollar, or if we owe a \$100 million, there was no supplementary supply, so we presume that in the budget vote of last year, there is still sufficient money that carries



us to the end of March, which is the end of the Fiscal Year.

Now this Bill was presented to us requesting \$61 million, and that is a lot of hay, \$61 million. Now, honestly and I think my hon. friend will agree, I do not think the Government is going to split this \$61 million up thirty-five ways. They may be going to Paris, they may be going to London, I do not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We may spend a bit of it over there.

MR. MURPHY: They may spend a bit of <sup>it</sup> over there, I guess when the Bills are in for, and I presume the passage will be first class, as usual, we do not travel second class, or economy in our Government, we go first class. And that is a few extra bucks that it cost the people, but as the Premier says, he answered a question for me last year, he said, "if the merchants on Water Street can fly first class, so can I." But, I think, most of the merchants fly second class, or economy and that is why they have a bank balance at the end of the year.

But, Mr. Speaker, the principle of this, the Premier insinuates that they are tyrants, they are dictators, they are this, they are that, or something else, this is not what I would like to bring before the House, as I say, we had just about twelve full months to prepare for March 31st. for our budget, in Heaven's name why has not this been prepared previous to the time, that it is suppose to be brought down! Now the Premier will smile at that, oh, no Government in the world does it. Oh, this is always a good excuse. No, Government in the world does it, every Government looks for supply.

I quoted yesterday from a paper, it is suppose to be a statement by the Premier, and it was on February 6th. that the budget would be brought in the middle of March.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

MR. MURPHY: Now I am only quoting the paper, I will get the paper if-

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never said that at all.

MR. MURPHY: I take it the Premier wants to deny it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do deny it.

MR. MURPHY: But, in this House and this is my eighth session, I get most of my information from what is happening from the newspapers and from the radio and television.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is why the hon. gentleman is so badly informed.

MR. MURPHY: Well, unfortunately it is the only way the hon. gentleman can get information in a lot of respects, because most of what is happening, I heard yesterday, I think the first official announcement made about this adjournment was over the Premier's Program, yesterday morning I believe, as Leader of the Opposition I heard, it was discussed with the Leader of the House, and he says, we are thinking about taking a recess for a while, and you know it just struck me, how stupid it seemed when we came in here some three weeks ago, afternoon and night, until 11:00 O'Clock. I am repeating some to what I said yesterday, but I think it is important. I sound like a broken record, but you know the Premier got up, and <sup>said</sup> the people are paying you fellows, you are only working three hours, I wish I could repeat, the wonderful expressions he used. Here we were just a miserable bunch of elected members, only working three hours a day, and you are getting paid for it. So we work six hours a day, and also in the mornings which the Premier did not tell the people of Newfoundland, that we have work to do in the mornings. So we have from 9 in the morning, until 11:00 in the night, and no wonder we look all groggy, or just about thunder struck.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do I look groggy?

MR. MURPHY: You never looked better.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must speak against this method of jamming business through the House. I do not say it is dictatorship, or I do not say it is anything else. But, in most cases, a large majority hate to take advantage of their numerical strength, not only in the House of Assembly, but I think anywhere, it is a form to me of being cowardly, where if it comes to a vote, everyone, everyone on that side will vote for it, there is not a doubt in my mind at all about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Everybody over there will vote against it.

MR. MURPHY: And everyone here will vote against it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right.

MR. MURPHY: And if the Party Whip is not on, because after all, <sup>ever</sup> my separated brethren, I have no control, I suppose any more control <sup>than</sup> if I went to the member for Gander.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The key word there.

MR. MURPHY: He would be liable to tell me where go to, and if I did not go, he would be liable to throw me there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The key word there is "brethern"

MR. MURPHY: But, Mr. Speaker, as I say on this we have a very serious proposition here, the Premier got up and he pleaded in his usual way, he did not use today that the civil servants would be without their pay so on and so forth. We have heard that, we can see them there just going home until the first of April, or the first payday everybody heading for the finance companies, says, "look, the Government had no money today, will you loan us a couple of weeks salary?" and you know as soon as the dirty opposition, that dirty miserable crowd pass this Bill, we will get our pay." I think this is the impression that is left, we are intellectually bankrupt, perhaps, which is a favourite expression of one of the learned member's on the other side, but I do not think we are as stupid, as all of that. I think, we try to put before the people what we feel is right. And my deep regret, quite sincerely, is that this Bill could have been introduced last week at sometime, I think, we could have had the three or four days of discussing it, breaking it down, finding out, just what \$61 million is used for, we know it is going to be used for Government departments, but for what purpose. I think, it is the general feeling, and the general custom is that there is some sort of estimates submitted before, where we can size up, well, if the Government want to buy five new airplanes for example, and we say no, the present two or three is enough for flying the members out to open schools or visit some other area, you know, we let certain things go, but I think two extra planes would not be the best. Perhaps, we could put an extra bit of carpet on the great office in Grand Falls, I do not know how many times it is being used by the hon. minister, but I hear he has a very palatial office out there, and a very nice office staff, you know, and we have a beautiful one in Corner Brook, where we were going to hold Cabinet Meetings, I think, once a month. I doubt, if there was ever a full fledged Cabinet Meeting held out there. But these are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, why we want to know what the money is being used for. And I, as I have on previous occasions, I think, the Premier mentioned was seven or four, seven occasions in the past number of years that some of these gentlemen supported, <sup>This</sup> Possibly, they did. Possibly, they did, but as I said the other day, going through life, life is an education in itself. You know, you learn everyday, and every week, and every month, something different. And I am very happy, I am very happy, very pleased particularly

1296

as a member of the Opposition for eight years, and for the people of Newfoundland that we have seven outstanding Newfoundlanders, I say fine intelligent gentlemen, who for some reasons or other, they may be personal, but they are now on this side, and I would like to thank them at this time, because there is a lot of shrapnel coming this way in the passed few sessions, I think a lot of it is left now, and my skin is not burning so much when I get home in the evenings, as it used to be.

But, I do not think, we can block this, we can speak on it; someone asked me whether we were going to speak all night, well I am in no humor to speak all night to be quite honest with you, I think the people of Newfoundland do not expect us to speak all night, on foolish trival things not pertaining to the Bill, I would just like to say that as far as I am concerned, that this thing could be done the proper way, no matter what we say, we have been saying it for seven or eight years, next year the same thing will happen, that they have to have this money. Now we are going to have a three week recess, I believe, last year someone mentioned we were going to be off Holy Week, and everybody gets very pious all of a sudden. I believe, we had Good Friday off last year, and I think we went the rest of Holy Week. It was just Good Friday, and the pressure of business I suppose was not so great at that time, I mean of lot of us would still like to think of Lent as being a devotional season, I know I used to like to go out in the evening, but I cannot now. I still offer up there in the morning for the Premier and his Government that they will see the light, and let us carry on. I try to be a decent gentleman, to the best of my ability. Sometimes it is rather tough, Mr. Speaker, but I <sup>try</sup> you know.

Now, we are going to have this three weeks as I was saying and now we will come back again on April 6th. you will think it is <sup>a</sup> man-of-war coming into this House. We will be driving at 3:00 O'Clock, and back again tonight, and then perhaps the morning, morning we will meet at 10:00 O'Clock the people's business has to be done. We are going to lose three weeks of this, and not a worry about it. Because the Premier, and four of his senior Cabinet Ministers, he said senior Cabinet Ministers, I do not know what seniority is in Cabinet now, but the Deputy Premier, I would imagine is a senior Cabinet Minister. I imagine the Minister of Finance has a very senior post.

MR SMALLWOOD: All the senior ministers are not going.

1297

MR MURPHY: No, you said some of them.

MR SMALLWOOD: Five of them. Five.

MR MURPHY: I think in the Premier's democratic view all ministers are equal. Perhaps he is not saying; you know!

MR SMALLWOOD: Some are more equal than others.

MR MURPHY: More equal than others, yes. As my hon. colleague said a few years ago: "Remember", he said, "most of these people are human beings."

And I think most of us -

One quarter? One quarter of the Cabinet is going. And the House must close down and everything grinds down and, I suppose, in the interval we will have this place fumigated and aired out, so on and so forth, and get it ready for this new session. But it is very significant, very, very significant, and I only thought when the hon. member from St John's West mentioned that the Prime Minister of Canada had spent some days in the north and the House went on its own merry way and they carried on.

We hear the Premier on his announcements when some of these gentlemen resign, that he had perhaps the greatest Cabinet (I don't know if greatest is the word) the finest Cabinet that this Province has ever seen, when he appoints these new cabinet ministers. And I would like one day, some day, to try the metal of some of these fine cabinet ministers, without the Premier. I remember Friday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know if you were in the Chair, but I think it was bliss here Friday afternoon to listen to the hon. the senior member for Harbour Main, on a very interesting address, and a new, complete atmosphere seemed to take over in the House. The hon. the Premier was absent, the hon member for White Bay North. These is nothing significant in what I said about that but it was a beautiful atmosphere there in the House. We all enjoyed it and I think the hon. member went on and he spoke and we asked questions very nicely but there was not this intermittent, "The Hon. Member for St John's Centre", "The hon. the Premier", then "the hon. minister" and then the "Premier", you know it seemed like the sort of thing we have had for so many years in this House of Assembly.

But, Mr. Speaker, quite seriously I feel that this is quite unnecessary. I think it is, I won't say a breach because it is within, I think, the statement is that "The House is master of its own rules", at least I think this is the statement which has been quoted to us so often. I think it is a very serious



I think it is a very serious matter when a Government, such an outstanding government who have had twenty<sup>years</sup> practise, now this is not a new government a government with twenty years experience still has to wait until the last moment to come in and get \$61 million in interim supply. I think after twenty-one years they should be on the ball but, what is the old saying, familiarity, the hon. member is right on the ball, "familiarity breeds contempt," just scared, just a little bit scared Mr. Speaker, that this is another, some more evidence of that same thing that this House, in essence is the People's House but I am afraid that in many instances it is not the House of the people. It is the House of the Leader of the Government and I am very sorry to see that this thing has to happen again this year, as we discussed it last and again we have it, true we have some extra members on this side of the House for debating this thing no doubt about it this supply will be granted but I do not think it will be granted before every member in the House should have a chance to express his opinion on it. We do not wish in any way to delay payments of salaries to civil servants or anything that is absolutely necessary. But I think the people of this Province should know, should know that if such a thing did happen it is not the fault of the Opposition that that would happen but the fault of a government that has grown careless in administration of the various departments and that the onus the blame should be placed on the inefficiency Mr. Speaker on the inefficiency of the government in letting this thing go so long, it is not too long as the hon. member points out again we still have twenty, twenty-one days to the end of the month, We could still be discussing it but the Premier has to go away, there used to be a saying during the war, "is this trip necessary?" Well I think the trip is necessary but closing the House I do not think is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. gentleman remember the famous remark that used to be years ago, "Wait until Bond gets back."

MR. MURPHY: "Wait until Bond gets back."

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Wait until Bond gets home."

MR. MURPHY: No, never heard of it. Is that is what the Premier is then relating now Sir Robert Bond, he is a great admirer of his, and perhaps that is what we have to do wait until, I can wait to see the hon. Premier's name but I could say but - Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be too much longer, I have just tried to put forward what I said yesterday and that is with reference to this unnecessary motion today. I think if things were handled properly as I said the estimates were all approved, I had several phone calls, a lot of people are getting a little nervous, the Premier has cleared up some of their nervousness they felt

for sure that there would be an election called before the budget come down and that would perhaps deprive some of these people who have been promised raises of the raises in the new budget but the Premier has allayed all our fears

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not seen the hon. gentleman so happy, I have not seen him looking so relieved since the House opened as he is now. He is happy and relieved.

MR. MURPHY: I would like to have a correction made in Hansard. I said fears, hopes was the word I meant to use, fears just slipped out on me, that there would be an early election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is so happy, so, so happy.

MR. MURPHY: We have nothing to fear but fear itself. So Mr. Speaker I will too go on record as opposing this motion and I feel that this is a very, very serious matter as I said earlier \$61 million is a lot of coppers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is one way to put it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, and when the time comes I hope that we can debate the various amounts in detail so that we will get some ideas just what these monies are going to be used for.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it seems Sir, that I think we have strayed from the real topic under discussion. Perhaps Sir, it is necessary to show what in our opinion is the obvious reason for doing this, and to set the matter properly before the House, perhaps we had better consider just what the rules are and the significance of having rules in this House. To offer the quote: "That this House is master of its own rules" and let it fall at that is not to say the truth, the entire truth. Of course this House is master of its own rules, it made the rules it can unmake the rules. But this House when it did make the rules originally made them for a specific purpose as all hon. members know, or at least should know. The purpose of having these rules is to regulate properly regulate debate so as to insure that the majority does not just override and ignore the minority/<sup>GROUP</sup> in the House. That is probably the most significant purpose of the rules, there are others to maintain order in the House and maintain an orderly debate. This one particular rule that causes us now to suspend all of the rules and that is what we are doing in relation to this motion, the Government have asked that the rules be suspended on the motion for Interim Supply now on the Order Paper and on the Supply Bill to be introduced. <sup>They are</sup> So, asking that the rule be suspended in relation to this motion and in relation to debate on the Supply Bill, only in relation to those two matters. But we are suspending all of the rules, the primary rule that makes it necessary is the rule that requires that a Bill go through one stage in any

one day. Now why did we have such a stupid rule if we are not going to abide by it. One of the obvious reasons for having such a rule as that is to allow all members of the House an opportunity to properly access the Bill and the matters that come up and to allow time for consideration and re-consideration and further re-consideration that is the purpose of having the variety of readings and so on. That is the reason for the rules, Mr. Speaker, and what we are now asking is that all of the rules including this particular one be suspended in relation to the motion for supply, for interim supply and for the interim supply Bill.

There is not a more significant bill in respect of which the rule could be suspended nothing more important, than is a money bill asking for \$61 million, Now assuming and taking for granted that everything that goes through this House should be properly and adequately debated and fully and thoroughly treated, above, that above everything else, money bills must be thoroughly considered before we can write a cheque for \$61 million and say to the government, here spend it how you please, so long as you keep within the subheads listed, But we do not care whether you pay the whole allotment in respect to Provincial Affairs to the minister, we do not care, That is in effect what we are saying. You must spend \$307,000 in the Department of Provincial Affairs, we do not care how you spend it. Now I know, I can safely assume, I think, that the hon. minister is not looking for an increase in salary from \$12,000 to \$307,000. it is a safe assumption for me to make. But nevertheless Mr. Speaker, that is the significance of it, and the Government comes in and asks us to suspend the rules.

Suspension of rules should only arise in case of an emergency. Otherwise the rules are of no purpose all the government has to do is to serve notice of Motion that it is going to call for a vote of suspension. What value are the rules unless we abide by one of the fundamental rules of democracy that we take this kind of action only in the case of an emergency. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the President of the Council I think, gave notice of this Motion, on behalf of his colleague the Minister of Finance on the Fifth day of March. He gave notice that he would introduce this motion that left him twenty-six days within which to get it through this House before it had to become operative. He could have on the very next day introduced the Resolution, introduced the motion, had the matter considered, and on the next day at Second Reading of the Bill and the next day committee stage and so on, but he did not. The Government instead chooses to try and barrel this thing through all at once, \$61 million, what is \$61 million an awful lot of money for the people of this Province, an awful lot of money. And they ask us to give them a blank cheque not entirely blank

written out for \$61 million but with no direction as to purpose or no limitation of the matters on which they might spend it.

The Government Mr. Speaker could at any time from the day this House opened have introduced such a motion, if they had wanted to. At any time, they could have brought down the Budget, they could have brought in the Estimates, we did not have to debate the Address in Reply, for the ten, eleven now twelfth day, twelfth working day that this House has been in session. We did not have to debate the Address in Reply on all of those days. The Government could have put forward any legislation that it wanted to, in any of those days at any time because the Government calls the order of business of this House. Instead they rush in at the last minute and say it is essential for the good working of Government that we should suspend the Rules of the House and allow a Bill for \$61 million to go through in one day. Solely for Interim Supply with no indication of what the money is going to be spent for or what they are asking for it for, or anything else.

If I were suspicious Mr. Speaker, if I were a suspicious person I might think the Government were trying to stifle debate on the expenditure of \$61 million of public funds by not giving us any indication of what they are going to use it for. They want it rushed through and if necessary we will be kept here until the wee hours of the morning, just so long as we pass this Bill and the Premier and his faithful party can head out for England with Mr. Shaheen and his faithful party to sign us up for another \$130 million. The way we handle money in this House, like we are all used to carrying those amounts around in our back pockets. But it is not our money I warn again Mr. Speaker, it is money owned by the people of this Province that we hold in sacred trust. We should Mr. Speaker, before we approve of this motion before we say yes or no to the motion consider just what we are doing, Suspending the rules that were enacted by this House for the protection of the rights of the members to fully debate everything and to allow full time to consider it, we have still got twenty-one days before any matter could arise. I realize the Premier and a party of Ministers are desirous of travelling to England on tomorrow but there is still an ample number on the opposite side of the House to carry on with the discussions of this Interim Supply and carry it out in the right way and complete the debate on it and pass it in the right way. We do not have to go about suspending the rule. Every time we want to do something we suspend the rules because the Government wants to rush it through or the Government wants to go to England. Nothing Mr. Speaker, is more

1302

indicative of arrogance and contempt that the use of this means of getting business through the House. The use of this suspension of rule except in case of emergency where it is absolutely essential, fine, then there is some justification for it. That is the reason why that provision is there. But only in that situation you do not do it every other day of the week. You do not do it when you have twenty-one days left. You do not do it when you could have brought in the motion days and days before. The Premier mentioned what has been done in past years, in 1966 there was no Interim Supply, in 1966-67 there was no Interim Supply. In 1968 Interim Supply was brought in on the twenty-eighth of March, now I do not know what day of the week that was, it may have been, it was passed on the twenty-eighth of March I do not know what day of the week that may have been, it may have been a Friday, the thirty-first would be very close behind. In this immediate past session it was passed on the thirty-first day of March. *Bill* right if it could not have been brought up, for whatever reason, and if that was not brought up, the Government anticipated having the estimates through, and they are only part-way through, and they could not complete them and they could not get Royal Assent, all right, I can see some necessity for it, but not in this situation.

We are not voting now on whether or not interim supply should be granted, we are voting now on whether or not it is right and proper to suspend the rules of this House, rules by which debates have been



MR. WELLS: debates are regulated, the rules by which Bills pass this House, so that they can be properly and thoroughly treated. And the rules by which the members of this House enjoy a semblance of democracy. That is what we are debating now, not whether or not Interim Supply should be granted. And that is pretty important. It may sound like little or nothing. It may sound as little or nothing as \$61. million, but it is a lot more. It is the rights of the members of this House and through them the rights of the people of this Province. Now all of the people of this Province support the Government, and thinks the Government should have \$61. million to go off and spend in each of those departments the amounts designated as they see fit. Not everyone in this Province thinks that way.

That is what these rules are here for. The Notice of Motion in this case Mr. Speaker, was given on the fifth day of March. There is no Estimates, no indication whatsoever how the amount of \$3,900,000 is going to be spent in the Department of Highways. Yet we are asked to rush it through and suspend the rules of the House to enable it to be done to give the Government authority specifically for this purpose to give the Government that kind of authority. No indication on what is going to be done with \$435,000 for the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Yet rush it through. That is what we want to do. Suspend the rules of the House. Ignore the fact that it is \$61,618,000 of money belonging to the people of this Province.

Forget the rules by which this is debated, suspend them. How Mr. Speaker, can that be justified in this circumstances. I have not heard any justification from the remarks made by the hon. the Premier. I would hope that we will see or hear some justification from some other members, but up to this point we have seen no justification whatsoever for suspending the rules.

If the Premier has the confidence that he has indicated he has in the Deputy Premier, he can surely ask him to continue on while he visits London with Mr. Shaheen. If he does have that confidence and gets this Interim Supply passed sometime before the 31st of March. But no we must suspend

the rules, and that is a pretty step to take. I am interested to know Mr. Speaker, and suspension of the rules is not helping one bit, I am interested to know what the Minister of Economic Development is going to do with \$1,900,000 in the next two months. I am very interested in knowing that. And I am going to try my best to find out. But my point Mr. Speaker is that my ability to find out is going to be seriously limited, if we suspend the rules. Because it is going to be rushed through all stages, hopefully in a few minutes, if we are so foolish as to allow it to happen. But certainly in one sitting of the House, that is what the Government wants, to rush it all through in one sitting day.

The only purpose for asking for suspension of these rules, and there is no emergency that I can see. No value for rushing it, no reason for it, no justification has been given. The Premier made reference to what we as members who formally sat on that side of the House, the seven of us, five of whom were also Cabinet Ministers - what we did when we sat on that side of the House, that we did vote for Interim Supply. I Mr. Speaker, voted for Interim Supply once, that is true. On the 28th day of March, we did not suspend the rules to do it, not that I recall. I do not specifically recall debating a Motion to suspend the rules to allow it to be done.

If Mr. Speaker the Budget were not passed and there was no chance of it being passed on the 28 of March and the House was in Session, we had better get Interim Supply or the Civil Service would not be paid. But this House is in Session, and there is nothing in the rules that dictates it must close when the Premier leaves. He is not the only member in this House, nor is the Minister of Health, or the Minister of Community and Social Development, nor the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Supply, and I believe that is the party to visit England. I think that is the party. They are not the only members of the House. They are not the only ones capable of debating this Bill.

Yet we Mr. Speaker, are asked to suspend the rules. Think nothing of the rights of the people, or the concern for the people. Rush it through because it is in the interest of that group of ministers, or in the interest of the Government alone. That is not justification Mr. Speaker. It is certainly not sufficient justification to expect me to vote for it.

March 10, 1970

Tape #289A

Page 3

And I certainly do not propose to. We are faced with an Interim Supply Bill in respect of which this Motion is now before us, asking for two months supply with all kinds of assurance that we will be back here on April 6. But why two months supply if we are going to be back in the House on April 6? And there is nothing Mr. Speaker that I can find in the Bill that says it is two months supply. Indeed Mr. Speaker, it is open to the Government to use it up in two weeks if they want to. There is nothing that says two months. They are just asking us to sign our names the authority of this House on a cheque for \$61,618,000 and turn it over to the Government to spend in those departments that the Government sees fit, in two day two weeks or two months. No limitation, none whatsoever.

That is bad enough, that is bad enough asking for that, but then on top of it, to have the audacity to come into this House and say in order to facilitate this, in order to facilitate getting us the right to spend \$61,618,000, we are also going to ask you to suspend the rules, that allows such a Bill to be properly debated, and thoroughly discussed.

We are also asking you to suspend the rules. That is affrontery, that is arrogance and that is contempt if anybody wants an example of it. That is a good example of it. Twenty-one days before the 31st of March, they come in and say this and suspend the rules, because we want \$61 million.

No information whatsoever, there is none at all as to why the Department of Economic Development want \$1,900,000. Well I want to know why Mr. Speaker. But I also Mr. Speaker, want to know why it is essential to suspend the rules in order to give it to them in one day. I want to know that too, and that is important. It is important to me Mr. Speaker as a member of this House, whether I am going to be a member in the future or not. I am at the moment a member charged with responsibility to properly protect the interest of the people of this Province. And there is no area where that responsibility is greater than in money matter, when the Government comes in here and asks for supply. No area where that onus is heavier, where the burden is heavier on any member. And yet the Government has the audacity to come in here and say, suspend the rules.

During this Session and previous Sessions a lot has been said about arrogance and contempt on many an occasion. And this demonstrates it quite

clearly, because Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason for asking for suspension of rules. And it is boiled down to it in every instance. There can only be one reason for it, and that is to stifle debate, and that is what this House exists for. That is what we are members of it for, to carry on debate. Oh we have, there is no doubt about it. The hon. minister asks whether or not we have had debates for the last couple of weeks. We have had it. We had one ten-hour marathon that was a complete waste of time in my opinion. Oh I have spoken on <sup>many</sup> occasions, when I wanted to. What the Premier said could have been said in two or three hours at most.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. ROWE: Do you have the right to judge that?

MR. WELLS: And the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources has the audacity to say the Opposition are carrying on a filibuster. No.

MR. ROWE: You are going to have a job to convince the people of Newfoundland of that.

MR. WELLS: The Opposition does not call the order of debate or what is to be debated, that is up to the Government, they do it.

MR. ROWE: We will have to wait and see what the people think of that.

MR. WELLS: That is right. I am anxious to see what the people think of that. I am not sure the minister is so anxious. I am not sure the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources should be so anxious. He may be anxious but from all accounts he should not be so anxious.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is only in this House that the Government calls the order of the debate.

MR. WELLS: No, there is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with the Government calling the order of the debate, that is the way it is supposed to be, but do not then accuse the people who sit opposite of carrying on a filibuster on the Throne Speech debate on the second day of sitting, and that is what the minister did. And he sits and smirks and laughs now.

MR. CALLAHAN: Right.

MR. WELLS: There Mr. Speaker is more contempt.

MR. CALLAHAN: More arrogance.

MR. WELLS: There is a committee out in Stephenville called "the Committee To Abolish Contempt"

MR. HODDER: We should have a serious meeting over here.

1307

MR. WELLS: And they are going to make quite a contribution toward that end shortly, I hope Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: The hon. gentleman hopes they do.

MR. WELLS: Truth bothers a lot of people, and there is no doubt in my mind Mr. Speaker, that the Government have shown utter contempt and no justification whatsoever that they come in here this afternoon and ask, that the rules of this House be suspended. Why, I ask again, Why? What justification?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman should have been in his place all the time.

MR. WELLS: I have been here and I have listened to it. Listened to every word of it.

MR. ROBERTS: And he has not understood.

MR. WELLS: What justification. It does not appear in the Bill which we are talking about. Nowhere in that Bill is there justification and that is what specifically the Motion is about in order to allow this to go through, and only in relation to this particular Bill and the Motion in connection with it. Are the rules to be suspended? That is what the Government is asking. Now where in this Bill does that appear? All I see is \$61 million, \$61,618,000. They have asked us to open the lid on the Public Treasury and then turn our backs and let the Government take out of it what they want, with no justification for what they do with it. What they want, up to \$61 million! Spend it how they like under those particular departments, no justification. And then think that is justification for asking us to suspend the rules. Immediately Mr. Speaker, the rules are suspended, whoever carries the majority, whoever has the majority in the House as your honour knows, has complete control, as soon as the rules are suspended the majority has complete control. Is that the way the hon. minister wants to see this House operate?

MR. CROSBIE: Why does he not give us information when questions are asked?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister has given information.

MR. CROSBIE: Wrong. You told nothing. You gave us nothing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he is quite welcome. I will take him by the hand and lead him to the information if he wishes.

MR. CROSBIE: I will be down tomorrow, what time?

MR. ROBERTS: Any time.



March 10, 1970

Tape #289A

Page 6

MR. SPEAKER: Do hon. members realize that this is going on record? And they are going to have to read it sometime?

MR. WELLS: There is a lot more to what the Minister of Health said than he realizes. There is more truth than humour.

MR. ROBERTS: There always is.

MR. WELLS: There is much more truth than humour in that because some day that hon. minister will have to read this debate about suspension of the rule, and he will look in that debate to find the justification for it, and he will not find it anywhere Mr. Speaker. It does not appear in this Bill. It does not appear anywhere.

On motion the House adjourns until 8 o'clock.

24 referred to back



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 23

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

MR. WELLS: Before Your Honour called 6 o'clock and we left for dinner, I had about finished pretty well what I had wanted to say on the matter, but let me summarize one point so that I make sure that I make the point whether it is heeded or not.

At this stage we are not voting on Supplementary Supply, although that has been the main item discussed, or Interim Supply rather, although that has been the main item discussed. We are Sir voting on whether or not to suspend the rules of this House, and that I suggest to Your Honour and to hon. members of this House, is sufficiently important for us to stop and consider what we are doing, and not just rubber-stamp it.

The rules of this House have sufficient value that we should not just automatically suspend them when there has been no justification offered. I can foresee circumstances where it would be of value and it is necessary in the case of an emergency, but nothing has been offered by the Government except the contents of this Bill, the remarks made by the Premier this afternoon. And none of that I suggest justifies suspension of the rules of this House. Without these rules Mr. Speaker, we are lost.

There is a value and a purpose to their being suspended at the right time, the right occasion for the right purpose. This is not such a moment, and this is not such a purpose. There has been no justification offered, and I Sir would ask hon. members to vote against this Motion. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARLE: Mr. Speaker, if I may make a few remarks on the suspension of the rules of the House for this particular occasion. I think that the main point at issue and the one which we take exception on this side of the House, is the haste, the unseemly haste quite unnecessary haste, an almost indecent haste, for wanting to put this Motion through. After all if we think back a year ago, I was Minister of Finance at the time, this same Bill was not brought in until the 31st. of March.

Also at that time the amount was \$38.million, whereas this year, \$61.6million. This is enough to immediately arouse the suspicion, perhaps non-founded suspicion, but certainly a suspicion as to why such a large amount should need to be put through with such unseemly haste. The Premier this afternoon Mr. Speaker, asked why the change of attitude.

1216

He pointed at several of us over here who have for several years past sat on the other side of the House, and he served for five, six or seven years depending on the time that we were over there, we voted for this kind of a Motion without hesitation.

There is a very important difference Mr. Speaker. The difference being that when we were on the other side of the House, we knew all the background material behind this Motion, and it never ceased to amaze me when I was sitting over there that the Opposition who were then here, accepted such large money Bills without question. Some years there was a moderate discussion on it, but never any great detailed discussion.

And I used to say to my colleagues; my Heaven's above! they are passing twenty, thirty million dollars without a question. And last year it was simply ridiculous. The \$38 million last year went through in twenty minutes I believe.

MR. THOMAS HICKEY: Does the hon. gentleman want to know why we did that?

MR. EARLE: I know why we did it.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): They did<sup>it</sup> because they knew there was going to be a big debate later on when the whole thing could be ventilated.

MR. EARLE: No Mr. Speaker. They were so few and had so little time to think about it over here, that I do not think they gave it the thought that was necessary. And I used to be astounded that such large amounts of money could be passed and agreed with virtually no question whatsoever. And I assured myself that if ever I sat in Opposition that these things would not go through so casually without some consideration. Well at that time Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that I would be over here, but here I am, and now I have the opportunity to ask a few questions and I intend to ask them.

The fact that five ministers are going to London on important business of the Province. We all recognize it as important business, very essential business of course. It probably will mean jobs if it is successful. But why cannot the business of the House go on? There will be plenty of ministers and ordinary backbenchers remaining to assure that under no circumstances can the Government be defeated while they are away. And with all deference

to those who are going, I think that there will be just as good a brains left behind to carry on the affairs of the country. And I am quite sure that these gentlemen can hold up their plank, their end of the plank. In fact I would almost be prepared to go as far as to say that the Premier and his colleagues could go to London with quite an easy mind. But after we had discussed this particular Bill to our entire satisfaction, we would have no hesitation in approving what has been asked. But we resent and we protest the idea of such an amount, such a large amount of money and such a Bill being rushed through in this unheard of manner.

As I said last year the amount was \$38 million. Well that was sufficient for nearly two months. Now we are told that \$61 million this year is only supplied for two months. This immediately raises some questions. Surely it must be for more than two months. If on the basis of \$61 million this year, it would almost indicate that the forthcoming Budget would be approximately \$370 million as against \$259 million last year. Well that indicates a pretty tremendous increase in Budget, if this is the pattern for two months.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): What was the amount last year?

MR. EARLE: \$259,575 -

MR. ROWE: The total Budget?

MR. EARLE: No this is the amount which I took out of the Public Accounts, if the hon. minister will look it up. I am comparing exactly the same amounts, I am not taking in all the facts and figures, but these are the same amounts to which were related under each department here. If the hon. minister will examine these item by item last year, he will see that the total amounts of \$259 million, and the amount indicated by the amount being asked for would now be \$369 million.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Would the hon. gentleman permit the Red Estimates of last year so that the amount voted by the House Sir is \$302 million plus an additional \$40 million for a total of \$40 million for Consolidated Fund Services, which of course are statutory. The total expenditure Sir, gross expenditure current and capital account, \$342.7 million. It is on Page 5 of the Red Book Your Honour from last year.

MR. ROWE: The year before it was \$300 million -

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I took the exact amounts, not capital expenditure -



I took it from the Estimates this year, and I took it down item by item. This Supplementary Supply as I see it, or Interim Supply is not strictly for Capital Account, it is most certainly for the Current Account of the Government. It is not likely to be <sup>very</sup> very much Capital Account spending in this particular field that you are asking for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not? Why not?

MR. EARLE: It is very unlikely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For those two months there will be no Capital Account expenditure?

MR. EARLE: It is very unlikely. Highroads work will not be started.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly.

MR. EARLE: There will be very little capital money spent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so. That is just not so.

MR. EARLE: Well anyhow Mr. Speaker, by and by when we get into item by item, we can take them one by one. I have them all down here with the comparison for last year, and we wish to ask questions on all of this. This is the reason why I think all of us on this side are insistent that there be less haste. Perhaps if I can see that there may be a mistake in the figure I have quoted, this is all the more reason why there should be some discussion and some argument here that these points could be brought out - just what are the comparisons? What are the differences? What are the increases in each department? This is the sort of question the Opposition is here to ask and know. And I am quite sure that the \$61 million that is being asked for at the present time will certainly cover more than two months requirements of the Government that is April and May, unless the expenses of the Government have gone on a rampage, unless the expenses are out of all line with last year. Or unless it is the intention of the Government to give all public servants a fifty percent raise in pay.

This is certainly more than two months Interim Supply which has been asked for. The whole problem with a Bill of this nature, a request of this nature is what I term I saw in "Time Magazine" the other day, called "A Bikini Procedure" everybody knows what a bikini is. A bikini is a very small bathing suit, but what it reveals -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not what a bikini is. No, no, the hon. gentleman

is growing old.

MR. EARLE: My eyesight is just as good as his.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but his knowledge is less. A bikini is not a small bathing suit.

MR. EARLE: It is a very small bathing suit. What it reveals is interesting, but what it conceals is vital.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is on the right side, he is on the right side of the House. He does not know what a bikini is.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Is he on the right side of the bikini?

MR. EARLE: This is the very point Mr. Speaker. A thing of a general nature like this asking for a blank vote of \$61.million can conceal an awful lot. And it is the bounded duty of this House to find out just what is being concealed in this , and what it means in the total procedure for the coming year. What we are letting ourselves in for?

I mentioned yesterday Mr. Speaker that this is almost an unheard of procedure insofar as we have not had a word yet about Supplementary Supply for this year. Last year the same thing happened, I can see that, but within two days of Interim Supply being brought down, Supplementary Supply was asked for, so that the House was aware what had been spent in the current year. And what Supplementary Supply was being asked. So far this year we have not heard one word of Supplementary Supply, and who knows what it may be, what the picture may be for the year we are still in. And yet in spite of that we have been asked virtually to write a blank cheque for \$61.million.

Now there seems to be some hesitation on the part of the members on the other side of the House, some accusation that this is a filibuster, that we are only here talking for the sake of wasting time. I would remind the hon. gentlemen that we listened to a twelve hour speech, mainly history, some philosophy, even verging on the supernatural, talking about some of the old fellows that came back.

Just to divert for a moment: if some of those old fellows, who were called ignoramuses and stupid, particularly referring to some of the fine old fellows that were alive in those days, came back to this House, they would tear it brick from brick. They would not stand that sort of language: talking about the people who founded and built this country. I, for one, felt very annoyed. I could hear the rustle of them turning over in their graves when these sort of terms were used to describe them.

Some of these fellows were striving on nothing, striving to keep an industry together while some of the people, who accused them of being ignoramuses and ignorant people and stupid people, were talking, talking, talking, and the talking still goes on. These were the people who were keeping the lifeline of the Province together, while others were talking. It is an insult, an actual insult to our history to have such terms used in this House.

MR SPEAKER: Order, please! It is extremely difficult to relate the remarks coming before the House to the subject under discussion.

MR EARLE: Sorry, Mr. Speaker! I accept your ruling. But when I am talking about \$61 million I am apt to get off the track because, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon, "that is not hay." And I think it deserves a fair amount of talking.

The fact that five ministers are going across to the other side to negotiate big deals is no excuse whatsoever why this particular debate should be hastened or delayed.

MR CROSBIE: Here! Here! Not when we have a Deputy-Premier.

MR EARLE: We have a Deputy-Premier. We have all sorts of well-qualified officials. I am rather surprised, actually, that in this forthcoming jaunt the Minister of Finance is not one of those going. Certainly what is being undertaken on the other side has a great deal to do with finance. I should think that he would be one of the delegation, if anyone should be. Probably he is preparing his estimates.

1315

Actually, of course, I think all of that should have been done by this time; but it is not. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the budget came down on April 15. We voted \$38 million. And the assertion was made this afternoon and yesterday that if we did not approve this particular Bill there might be some danger that the civil servants would be going without pay or something of that sort. This is absolute nonsense. We could pass this Bill on March 31 and nobody would go without a pay cheque, no welfare recipient would go without his money.

Last year we passed \$38 million on the 31st of March and the Budget did not come down until April 15, and on April 15 I was not standing out on the steps of Confederation Building, with a tin can in my hand, asking for coppers. We still had a few left in the till and I venture to say that the situation is not worse this year. I do not think that if we do not pass this Bill until March 31 the hon. Minister of Finance is going to have to go around begging for money. There will be money available. This is just a flimsy excuse.

MR WELLS: We have it spent for this year, anyway.

MR EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House too long tonight. Others wish to speak, on this. But on the amusing side of the thing, if there is an amusing side to \$61 million, there was so much thrown into the hat this afternoon, discussions on all sorts of things even on the question of an election coming up. We were assured that we can go on and have a happy St Patrick's Day and an even better Easter, that we need worry none at all, that there is not going to be an election until at least five weeks, I think after the budget or something of that time. Quite frankly, speaking for myself and for my colleagues over here, I could not care less. I do not care when there is an election.

MR SHALLWOOD: That is one thing I am sure of.

MR EARLE: I do not care when there is an election.

MR SHALLWOOD: I am sure of that.

MR EARLE: I will be in Fortune Bay: in case somebody wants to get up on the 10:15 program, in the morning, and say that certain people are going down the drain and all this sort of stuff. This is where we learn all about ourselves. It is a peculiar thing but we have to learn the current events of this country at 10:15 in the morning. We do not hear them in this House. We have to dig for them. But at 10:15 A.M. you can hear them all. So that perhaps,

after all this propaganda that is built up and after all that has been said and certainly if they get the \$61 million, maybe there will be an election. Well! Who cares! That is not our reason.

Our reason is on a point of principle. We have been lectured here in this House, night after night, time after time, on the correct procedure. Books have been piled upon the desk and we have been lectured on breaking an oath, Cabinet secrecy, and Heavens knows what. We have been treated like school children. We on this side of the House know our rights, as well as anybody else, and we want a proper discussion for the people of Newfoundland, before we say okay to a blank cheque for \$61.6 million.

MR HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may add a few words.

MR CURTIS: Of wisdom?

MR HICKMAN: Choice words.

MR CURTIS: Never mind.

MR HICKMAN: There are not many left to choose.

The hon. minister is quite correct. The real issue before this hon. House at this time, I submit, is not the length of time that it is going to take to debate the budget, when it is brought down in April, nor is it the length of time it will take to answer the seventeen thousand questions that are going to be asked on the debate arising out of the estimates, when we go into committee. The simple question that hon. members have to ask is whether the exigencies of the situation, the urgency, demands that we now suspend the rules of the House, to allow this Bill to go through in one fell swoop?

If, Mr. Speaker, we were facing this type of request, if we were facing this type of legislation, if we were facing a desperate need on or about March 31, then obviously any hon. member with any sense of responsibility would have to permit the amount of interim supply that the Government requires in order to function. But this is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

The suggestion has been made by the hon. the Premier that a two-month supply, a request for a two months supply is not unreasonable because when we get into our budget debate, sometime in April, and when we get into the estimates, goodness knows that it could go on into May; and then sufficient interim supply would not have been voted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, interim supply usually, in most Houses of Parliament, is requested and asked for during the passage of the main estimates. This is what interim supply, in most Houses of Parliament, is all about. A budget



is brought down, the House is considering the estimates and it is suddenly discovered that more time is being used up in the discussion of the estimates than has been anticipated, and the House has to ask or the Government has to ask the House for interim supply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be nothing difficult, nothing unprecedented, in fact, it will be quite acceptable and quite tolerable if during April the Government have to come before this hon. House and ask for interim supply.

So, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be the reason. It cannot be the reason at all.

The fiscal year begins on April 1. Yesterday in this hon. House there was a motion to reduce the amount to one month's supply. The same argument was used here today; we must have it for two months.

Why, Mr. Speaker? In fact there is no categorical statement on the part of the Government that the amount being sought for is a two month supply; which again is the usual practice.

MR ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is now making a speech, Sir, which I submit might be more in order when we proceed to the Bill.

MR CROSSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, may I speak on that point of order? The same thing came up this afternoon. The hon. the Premier roamed all around the world when he spoke on this motion, and I submit that the hon. member for Burin is not wandering, he is right on the point on this motion in respect to the rules.

MR SPEAKER: In an attempt to guide me? Will the hon. member please continue.

MR HICKMAN: Now that I have been enlightened now I shall continue, all in the same route, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

But the simple fact is that interim supply, and I repeat, interim supply, in most Houses of Parliament, is something is asked for and sometimes on two occasions once the estimates are being discussed.

Mr Speaker, all hon. members will remember that before this House opened, before the session commenced, and on opening day, there was a pretty strong indication given, for very good reason, because public servants in this Province were demanding to know the answer, that the budget would be ready by mid-March. Obviously, if that statement could be made late in February, the estimates must have been ready at that time or so close to being ready that they could be finished within the foreseeable

future. Now we are told that the public servants, because of the difficulties that they are encountering in working out salary arrangements for public servants, cannot conceivably have this ready and the budget ready and the estimates ready until sometime between April 15 and April 30 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, none of this makes much sense. Surely goodness, if experience means anything, the departments and ministers were aware back in September and October that they had to get ready for the next session of the House, that their budgets had to be prepared that their estimates must be prepared, and suddenly there has been a great change of heart, there has been something new that nobody can quite put his finger on, something has happened in the last couple of years so that the budget that was supposed to be down next week, may be the middle of March, cannot now be brought down until April.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government, through the hon. the Premier, in supporting this motion to suspend the rules, has placed great emphasis on the fact that other important business has to be done, that we have to have the rules suspended so that this hon. House can adjourn tomorrow, so that the hon. the Minister of Social Development, Community and Social Development, can prepare his White Paper on DREE; so that the hon. Minister of Health, who announced his White Paper in Marystown last December, can prepare his White Paper for submission to this House; so that the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources can prepare a White Paper, on what we were not told but there is a white paper. Mr. Speaker, you do not know about it. You were absent from the House? Well, whether the hon. minister realizes it or not, the hon. Premier has stated that there is going to be a great white paper come down from the great white father from Port Au Port.

MR CROSBIE: A white paper on boglands.

MR CALLAHAN: The white paper will be presented.

MR HICKMAN: Right! But you need this time to get it ready, M R. Speaker.

MR CALLAHAN: No, this is not so.

MR HICKMAN: But how can we have a white paper, for instance, on DREE when in answer to a question, this afternoon, the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development says that the DREE programme, the DREE designated areas is a matter for another House. Now how are we going to have a white paper on that? How are we going to have that great debate? How are we going to debate something over which we have no control?

MR ROBE (William H.) Why not?

MR HICKMAN: Something over which our concurrence, Mr. Speaker, according to the answer to this question, is not sought nor given.

MR SMALLWOOD: No. That is wrong. That is wrong. The hon. gentleman is talking about another thing all together now.

MR HICKMAN: I know what I am talking about.

MR SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is nonetheless wrong.

MR HICKMAN: Oh, I am always wrong! Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, how can we possibly use this sort of argument as a justification for the suspension of the rules, to get on with this adjournment, which is so essential, tomorrow?

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been great discussion about the prospects of this hon. House operating and doing the business, this business that was so important on opening day that it was announced that in order for hon. members to earn their stipend, in order for hon. members to do work like their counterparts in other parliaments, that we will have to work night and day to get on with this important business. But as of today not one piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been discussed in this House.

The Government, other than on private members' day, have controlled the order of business. There have been no requests, no motions for second reading, not on one piece of legislation. I realize the tremendous importance of passing an Act to License Security Guards, but for some reason all this is held over, this great important item of business and yhrdr htrsy important items of business that had to be discussed, that had to be debated, that had to be worked on day and night, they suddenly disappear and here we are half way through, Mr. Speaker with the Address in Reply and suddenly there has to be a postponement.

Mr. Speaker, notice was given in this hon. House, two days ago or three days ago, of a Resolution to appoint a select committee to examine the Report of the Auditor General. Now a select committee, Mr. Speaker, is going to be required, when and if it is appointed, and obviously it will get the unanimous approval of all members in this House. It is going to have to sit fairly consistently during this session. And what better time for the select committee to sit than while some hon. members are absent on business of the Crown and for other reasons? What better time than during the next three weeks vacation from this House, for the select committee to summon

March 10, 1970      Tape 290    Page 7

ministers and ex-ministers before it to give the details on the Auditor General's Report? What better time, Mr. Speaker?

But for some reason the select committee has now been forgotten. That too has to be put to one side.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday of next week the Shaheen group would be in this Province to meet with the Cabinet, meet with the Government, the caucus and then meet with the House. Some of the meetings would be in private, if information were to be disclosed which would be undesirable in so far as competitive point of view is concerned, but the rest of it will be brought to the attention of the public.

MR. HICKMAN: There are an awful lot of questions that have to be answered in connection with this very trip that hon. members are about to take to the other side. I would submit Mr. Speaker, that this House is entitled to know before any seal of approval is put on any agreements in London, why and the wherefores of the arrangements whatever they may be that this Province will commit itself to. Quite recently in this House Mr. Speaker, there was a question raised I think by the hon. the Minister of Health, or an answer given by him in respect to a comment as to the difference in the cost of building the refinery in Quebec, near Quebec City by Golden Eagle by 100,000 barrels a day, and the one in Come by Chance.

This House was told Mr. Speaker, that it was like comparing apples and oranges. Well I have made some enquiries Mr. Speaker since that time, and I now find that the total cost of the refinery in Quebec is \$70 million which includes \$7 million to be spent by that company on a wharf and storage tank. That the only real difference between the refinery in Quebec and the one in Come by Chance, is that the Come By Chance refinery will be mainly for the production of jet fuel, and this necessitates the installation of a catalytic cracking equipment which in the opinion of the oil experts should make a difference of about three or four million dollars. Not \$70 million Mr. Speaker.

I say Mr. Speaker, that this type of enquiry, this type of information cannot be withheld from this House, nor can this House afford an adjournment at this time, nor can we be expected to view with great enthusiasm the departure of some hon. Ministers from this Province to sign documents the contents of which we know nothing. Mr. Speaker, when I look across to the Government side of the House, and I see that there will be remaining in this Province during the absence of the hon. the Premier and the hon. the President of the Council, and the hon. the Minister of Health, and the hon. the Minister of Social and Community Development, and the Minister of Supply, when I see that there will still be remaining in this Province, and available to sit in this House, its senior member, the leading authority on the rules of this House, I refer to the one man in this House who has had the experience of sitting in two administrations. Sitting in two Houses of Assembly prior to Confederation, prior to Commission of Government the Hon. the senior member for Harbour Main.

There is the senior member of this House, the authority on the rules. He has forgotten, the hon. the senior member from Harbour Main has forgotten more about the rules than hon. members in this House know, and to suggest that he has served in the capacity of acting Premier, I can remember when he fulfilled



the role exceptionally well about twelve to fifteen years ago for a period of about one month during a Vice Regal visit. There was a by election in Ferryland at the time, but he held this position exceptionally well, he ran the Government for over a month. The hon. the President of the Council was in hospital in Switzerland and things were never better. Never better during that time when we were being governed under the administration of the hon. the senior member from Harbour Main.

To suggest that the hon. the Deputy Premier, the hon. the senior member from Harbour Main, who is the procedural authority in this House, the hon. the Minister of Labour who has been in this House for twenty-one years, the hon. the Minister who has been here for fourteen ( he probably thinks it feels like forty) the hon. the member for Placentia West has been here for twenty one years. To say that these members, that these hon. members cannot carry out the functions of this House during the absence of five out of eighteen Cabinet Ministers, it just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, this is not, and cannot be, good grounds for suspending the rules of this House.

Mr. Speaker, even though the Opposition may sometimes be accused of delaying things, if there is one thing that the work of the Opposition has proven during this session of the House, it is that if you keep prodding long enough you will finally get some commitments, you will finally get some information, you will finally get some firm and irrevocable decisions from the Government side of the House. For instance, we now know that this hon. House will reconvene on April 6th. 1970. We now know that a budget will be brought down sometime between April 15th. and April 30th. which we did not know until this afternoon. We now know that this House will sit continuously until the budget has been debated, until the estimates have been voted on and passed, and until the business of the House has been done. This all came from this afternoon's little effort.

MR. WELLS: I think we should cause some more

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, last week we, this House found out from the Government side information concerning the proposed Come by Chance refinery that the public did not know before. We found out for instance Mr. Speaker last week, that there will now be two feasibility studies. We found out from the hon. the Premier that Shaheen Enterprises have appointed and retained Universal Oil Products to do their feasibility study and then under the terms and conditions of the legislation passed by this House, Government in due course will name and approve

its expert or company to do its feasibility study. So now we know there are going to be two. This is the sort of information Mr. Speaker that we are seeking, and that we are beginning slowly but surely to acquire for the benefit of hon. members and for the public.

All I say to the hon. members on the Government side of the House is why did you not give us the information in the beginning? Why is it so difficult to get these facts? If hon. members on the Government side would simply get up and give us the information the debate would have been over long ago.

MR. CROSBIE: VOCM can get them

MR. HICKMAN: But instead of that Mr. Speaker, we had to stay here and listen to long speeches, speeches that are not at all relevant to the issue presently before the House. Not at all relevant, and Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I watch some hon. members debating in this House, and skirting the issue I am reminded of the Galloping Gourmet, where we get rather unpleasant food but you wash it down with wine, but when you try to digest it - it is so painful that you suddenly realize that you have been sold a bill of goods.

Mr. Speaker, the time I submit has come for hon. members on both sides of the House particularly the hon. back benchers to assert, they have one prerogative, they have one right, this is the one occasion when members who are not part of the executive council are supreme. This is the one time, the one part of the process of the business of this House, where the back benchers, the independent members rule the Government, rather than the Government ruling them. Because the purse strings belong to the back benchers. The purse strings belong to the ordinary hon. members of this House.

MR. CROSBIE: The purse belongs to the Government

MR. HICKMAN: I am not putting it nearly as well as my hon. friend the member for St. John's North, but he put it so forcibly the other night that I watched some of the senior hon. Ministers first look with great alarm, in fact they could not take their eyes off the hon. the member for St. John's North after he made his speech. Then he made a fatal error, he decided to wait until an announcement came for a select committee and I know by the look of annoyance on his face this evening that he suddenly realized that that announcement on the select committee may not be worth the paper it is now printed on. But, be that as it may, the position of the hon. member for St. John's North, and of the other hon. members who are not part of Her Majesty's Cabinet is that nothing must happen, nothing must be allowed to happen that would in any way indicate that we are yielding up to the executive council our absolute, supreme control over the

public purse. And if we pass this in haste, if we pass it without adequate information, if we suspend the rules of this House that is precisely what we are doing, and for that reason Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Government's motion.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on the suspension of the rules of the House. All the financial experts have gone before me, the legal experts, and I would like to speak Sir, mainly on some of the rights of the hon. members of this House especially the back benchers as I still claim I think I am on this side of the House anyway.

The Orders of Today tomorrow would have been private members day, and on that Order I had a motion there actually to debate something which I think Mr. Speaker, is of great Provincial and possibly national importance to us, moreso to the people I represent, greatly to the people of all Newfoundland and that was the Bonne Bay Park issue. Now to be told that this may not happen for another three or four weeks seems to put aside all rights that we have here in this House, especially us minor members. We feel that when we came into this House of Assembly to start this session there was some debate about working in the afternoons and in the nights. I for one do not care much about it actually Mr. Speaker, because, I am here, I have my family in the other end of this wonderful island, so therefore I do not care if I work morning, noon and night. I would like to have enough time actually to prepare what I am going to say every day, but even that does not matter actually. So I cannot see why this House will close. It seems to be the idea that the Premier changed it again this week. Last week if I remember correctly, and according to Hansard this was his exact words " a total of five of us Mr. Speaker will fly to Europe to join the conference, to sign the agreement for the construction. The construction and equipping agreements. We will then return to St. John's and on the Monday we hope following, Mr. Shaheen and his whole group will come to St. John's and we will bring before the House here some amendments to the existing legislation passed I think two years ago. On that occasion Mr. Shaheen and his associates will appear before the members of this House, the occasion when the Government introduces amendment to the existing legislation so that members of the House will or can inform themselves of the progress of the project as of that time." That was only last week Mr. Speaker. This week it is changed. All of a sudden the trip is still on, but the rest of the hon. members that look after the Government and they are all mostly senior members cannot afford to take over this part of the House. We have already stated that we will

not defeat the Government, we have given them that assurance. We do not want to. We will recommend that we will be very, very decent indeed, we will watch our P's and Q's, and we will make sure that we do not defeat the Government while the Premier is away.

MR. HICKMAN: We will wait until he gets back

MR. MYRDEN: This debate that I intended to bring forth tomorrow on this great national park issue has a lot of great significance between our people and the people of Newfoundland. It actually has developed into quite an issue over our way. We feel that

MR. SPEAKER:(Noel): Order please. The hon. member seems to be debating the fact that whether or not the House will close, but the resolution I might read for the benefit of hon. members is that the rules of the House be suspended on motion for Interim Supply, now on the Order Paper. Now a supply Bill to be introduced pursuant thereto, and I think that the remarks of hon. members should be constrained to that. Most of the debate seems to be on the question whether the House will adjourn but that is not part of the motion.

MR. MYRDEN: I am sorry Mr. Speaker, I felt that everybody else had wandered all over the place, so I thought that I maybe too. Actually the.....

the thing came up because there has been no questions answered and I will not get on to that anymore. But if we are to debate the rules of spending in this House may be I could speak about the Bill itself if that is in order. I have here a few figures that I have worked out all day today and I was just going over some of them tonight. It states here that, or it does not state actually what the Government has said that they would like to have at least two months interim supply. Well, actually when you look at the figures in some cases 46 per cent of their last year's estimates that they are asking for, in some departments, in particular actually the Department of Welfare, 46 per cent, they want for a two months supply. Forty per cent in the Department of Health. Forty per cent again in the Department of Supply, and 36 per cent of their last year's estimates on Labrador Affairs.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question, Mr. Speaker? The figure with reference to the Department of Health, the figure in the Bill if indeed it is in order to refer to the Bill at this stage. Forty per cent of what figure last year? Mr. Speaker the figure shown in the Bill I assure the gentleman is a gross figure not a net figure, it is an expenditure figure Sir, and it should be compared to the gross figure, from last year not the net figure.

MR. MYRDEN: Yes, possibly you are right Mr. Speaker, this is

MR. ROBERTS: I am right, quite right.

MR. MYRDEN: Alright, this is quite alright. Forty per cent of the net figure. The thing is Mr. Speaker, that of 16 2/3 per cent, it seems that it is gone a little overboard as far as asking for it, for two months supply actually it is something like quite a bit over the 16 2/3 per cent that they need for two months. Now, actually these figures were quite high and I cannot understand the reasoning either because we are supposed to meet again on April 6.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker to a point of order. I would like a ruling from Your Honour as to whether or not these comments are in order I have no wish to muzzle the hon. gentleman and my understanding is we are debating the resolution here. My understanding also is that a Bill will come up and that Bill will contain the details requested by the Government for Interim Supply and at that time all hon. members will debate all items on that Bill if they care to do so, will ask all questions they wish to ask, but I would like to know my own benefit as well as for the House whether or not it is in order right now to be discussing the amounts that are being requested in the Bill.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I have been following the Premier and every other speaker that spoke here about the



MR.SPEAKER(Noel): I think it is in order for the hon. gentleman to refer in a general way, to the purpose for which the rules are being suspended that has been put forward by both sides and I see no reason why it should not continue but not in particular, the motion is that the rules be suspended and the opportunity for debating particular clauses of that Bill will be given to hon. members later on.

MR.MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker I may have been out of order actually but we have been following every other course. If that is all right then I will now, I will debate that later on because it is all there but actually I was thinking of the time we have to spend in this House we are members four of us at least from out of town we do not mind coming back and forth here but we feel that we have a duty to perform so therefore we do not mind staying in here but actually to be closing the House at every other occasion when somebody decides to take a trip seems to be a little unnecessary and suspending the rules and everything else. But I also like to see to understand why we cannot continue there is so many things that we have to debate yet like the hospital workers increase and the policeman's increase the firemen's increase, the civil servant's increase, I would like to say Sir, that as far as I am concerned I am totally against closing the House and I would like to go on record as such. Thank you.

MR.H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I really do not know where to start because I believe that every hon. member if he is going to make a contribution should try and be original and just about everything under the sun has been talked about here today. I was amazed at hon. members opposite who raised a point of order a few moments ago when the member for St. Barbe South was speaking, indicating that he was roaming a little, certainly we have roamed everywhere in this debate from DREE to London to Paris and back again. Sir, in the few short remarks that I am going to make I would like to quote a paragraph or two from the Parliamentarian and this concerns the role of an opposition and it goes on to say after outlining the more important areas of the role of an opposition to say probably the major role, the most important role, a role which they did not perform if the opposition would have failed in their purpose, the major role to put it very broadly and simply is to preserve democratic procedures and fundamental human rights, in other words to protect society from the excesses and corruptions of power that will always be found wherever power finally resides. To this end it is the duty to challenge every abuse of power every breach of human rights, every waste of public funds, every attempt to enlarge bureaucratic procedures and to remove them from public and parliamentary

observation criticism and control. They go on to say here that if the Opposition is to perform its duties the Parliament must be governed by traditionally accepted procedures which no government, Sir, and I repeat no government dare attempt to disregard. Now Sir these are very important statements so far as I am concerned and we must - it is the Parliamentarian - whenever I quote something I always give the source, anything when I do not give the source generally I say it myself and I originate it myself. Hon. members I am sure the public and the press Mr. Speaker, must be amazed to have heard the Premier this morning on Open Line when he suggested that Mr. Diefenbaker that well-known Canadian Prime Minister some years ago, so the Premier says he asked for and received Interim Supply for a period of twelve months. He ran the Federal Government for twelve full months without bringing down a budget.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. That is right.

MR. COLLINS: A few days ago Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when we were involved in the debate relative to the establishment of a standing committee on Public Accounts that I made the statement that the same Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker set the precedent in Canada of appointing not only a Standing Committee but appointing a member of the Opposition as Chairman of that committee. But that did not draw much applause from the other side, that was not in their best interest to agree that this was a good thing and we find Sir, that if we listen to a debate we read Hansard and so on and so forth we find that the Premier is especially and all hon. members opposite seem to try and draw on the best of everybody if it suits their purpose, but if it does not suit their purpose then of course there is no sense in even mentioning it or acknowledging it. Sir, when this session opened - this has been pointed out by hon. members who preceded me - when this session opened the Premier went to great pains to impress on, not only the hon. members in this House but all of the people of Newfoundland especially Sir, I suspect all of the voters of Newfoundland to impress on them that hon. members in this hon. House were working three hours a day, sitting began at three o'clock and ended at 6 p.m. as far as he was concerned this was a pitiful small number of hours for any Newfoundlander to be required to work. He went farther then of course and said that Government had decided that members were going to work six hours per day, in other words we were going to work from three to six, have a long recess of full two hours and come back eight o'clock in the night and sit until 11 p.m., and then to really drive the point home he mentioned the fact that many Newfoundlanders worked ten hours a day, twelve hours a day, fourteen hours a day, sixteen hours a day he went so far as to claim that

on most days he worked eighteen hours himself so it certainly was not asking too much to work the members in this Hon. House for a period of six hours. Then, to justify the reason for the extra sittings and the extra hours and the extra endeavour on the part of all hon. members. There was a little bit of a rush to get things through we had a budget to bring down and we have a DREE Programme to bring in and we had a lot of legislation coming and so on and so forth. We want it to be ready so that everything would fit into a nice pattern all the way through will be pattern will be programme. I do not know if they plan to run up in this computer which they have upstairs or downstairs or wherever it might be, but God Forbid if they put it into a computer according to the results which they have had in the computer so far. But anyway they were trying to programme everything through so that everything would fall into order.

All of a sudden Mr. Speaker we find that the Government now have decided that they must take a trip to London. And of course there is nothing wrong taking a trip to London, there is nothing wrong with the Premier going, there is nothing wrong with four or five cabinet ministers going, certainly they can take four or five cabinet ministers may be six or seven or eight or nine still be some cabinet ministers left, the fact Mr. Speaker, would suggest that they can take twelve or fourteen or fifteen cabinet ministers along. They are taking five and the argument is now that since the Premier is going and five of his greater cabinet ministers I suppose, so they say, four or five cabinet ministers, the senior cabinet ministers are going to London to sign what has been proclaimed as a most important agreement certainly affecting the future of Newfoundland. Now there is not much wrong with that and we all sincerely hope on this side of this House that the agreement which is to be signed in London will be a good agreement, will be beneficial to Newfoundland. We have been accused of opposing it along with other things but we all hope the agreement which is to be signed will work out for the betterment of Newfoundland. But we cannot accept Mr. Speaker the theory that since the Premier is going and five of his cabinet ministers that everything has got to cease in Newfoundland, this we do not get. We all know that not too long ago the Premier made a great noise again about the appointment of a deputy premier, the hon. Minister of Education and I am sure that he is worthy of that title and I am also sure that he would like to get in the saddle as it were for a day or two or a week or so, I am sure also that many of the members on the opposite side of the House would like to see him there, see what kind of a job he can do. Now I believe Sir, that in the best interest of Newfoundland that this

should be done because after all there is nothing which tells us that the Premier might now come down with European flu, when he is in Europe in which case he might be detained possibly be required to take an extensive trip a prolonged trip to the Riviera to recover, may be gone a month or two months so certainly in that particular case we would be called upon to try out the deputy Premier and this would be a real good chance in my opinion to get him in the saddle and see what he can do and I am sure that hon. members on this side of the House would be would welcome that move certainly I would and I think I speak for all hon. members that we would all welcome the deputy premier to get in here and see what he could do, and of course we would all make comparisons how he performed in relation to the man who went to London.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has not presented any reasons why this Hon. House should close for a period of three or four weeks. Now we are told today and following what the hon. member for Burin just said I think there was a lot of information gained today which possibly would not have been gained had we not been arguing and fighting this Government I believe that if for no other purpose that a debate and hearing the pros and cons from both sides because generally speaking it is worthwhile it brings out some of the answers to questions that we have been asking for so long and I would say Mr. Speaker, that certainly no good reason for this Hon. House to recess for the three weeks. To get back to the real reason behind this we are told that the reason for suspending the rules of the House is to bring in this supply Bill and get it passed quickly, without any more debate than is absolutely necessary. But Mr. Speaker, when we think of that we also have to think about the amount of money which is involved. I will not mention

MR. COLLINS: Figure because it is a well known fact to hon. members now that the exact amount of this particular Bill, the amount of money which is being asked for.

I think the hon. member for Fortune raised a very important point this afternoon when he spoke, when he said that I do not know if it is unprecedented or not, but certainly it is not doing things right. Before an Interim Supply Bill, or motion comes before the House, generally it is preceded by Supplementary Supply. We do not know Mr. Speaker how much money this Government spent last year. We do know how much money was voted last year. We did examine the estimates last year and we know how much money was given to the Government to spend. We do not know, and the people of Newfoundland do not know up until this moment how the Government fared. Whether they spent too much, whether they have a little bit left in the "kitty" but knowing the record Sir of this Government down through the years we all must suspect that possibly they spent a little bit more than we gave them.

Certainly then, before they ask for more money, before they ask for money on Interim Supply with no estimates, no reason, no reason given at all Sir, there is no reason given why this money is needed other than it is needed for a month to carry on. Before the Government comes to this House to ask for additional money certainly we should know how they fared last year, and the only way we will know how this Government fared last year, how much they spent over and above their estimates is if the Government comes to this House and requests Supplementary Supply.

However, Sir, that has been mentioned before, I merely call attention to it again because I think it is worthwhile for all hon. members to think about this before they make up their minds just how they might vote on this particular issue. Insofar as the monies which are being asked for now Sir I am certainly of the opinion, and I believe that hon. members who have spoken before me are of the opinion, that before we can feel clear, before we can have a clear conscience in voting this money we should certainly have some idea of what the Government proposes, how they propose to spend it, where it is going and I think that the people of Newfoundland certainly have a right to know that. Of course, the people of Newfoundland are going to find out and it is the role of the Opposition to find this out for them, because I can assure you Sir that unless this problem is prodded and really prodded the people of Newfoundland will not find out where it is going. For those reasons Mr. Speaker, I will certainly not support this motion.



HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this particular resolution, but a couple of points have been made, allegations have been made which I think should be refuted. Your Honour has ruled that we may make general references to the amount involved, and that has already been done by the hon. member for Fortune Bay, whose figures were to my amazement since he was referring to his own budget, the budget that he himself presented here last year, his figures were I believe almost \$100 million off the mark. It is a lot of money to be off the mark in referring to a Budget. My understanding was that he referred to last year's Budget as something of the order of I thought he said-\$259 million, or \$249 million?

MR. EARLE: I thought I made it quite clear that I was omitting the capital expenditure in this. If you look at last year's estimates Mr. Minister, you will see that the total amount is \$342 million. This included capital. Now the argument about capital, I will be quite prepared to defend.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Chairman, when he used the figure \$259 or what ever it was million dollars he made no distinction at that time at all. He gave the impression that we this year, in asking for \$61 million, which by implication is one, roughly one sixth of what the total Budget is likely to be when it is brought down, that we were going to bring in a Budget which would be fantastically higher than last year's Budget. That would have been the implication if we had not drawn his attention to the error, to the incorrectness of his figures. The fact of the matter is that the Budget last year which was brought into this House just a little more than a year ago was \$342 million, and if we had asked for one sixth of that for two months of Interim Supply, then we would have been asking for something in the order I believe of \$58 million.

This year we are asking for two months Interim Supply which incidentally is not the normal amount that has been asked, he referred to last year's, in I would think that at least ten years that we have asked for Interim Supply we have always asked as a matter of routine. We have asked for and received with the unanimous consent of the House three months of Interim Supply. This is what, to use the phrase just read by the hon. member for Gander there, this is the traditionally accepted procedure. Three months supply, however, we are asking for two months supply here now, and the reason, the rationality of that was explained here today by the hon. the Premier. We do not need to go into it. The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, though that in asking for \$61 million if that represents roughly one sixth of the Budget, of the total Budget to be brought down we are certainly not very much out of line over last year's Budget.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Minister if I may, if that is the case, let us say you currently ask for three months supply why was only one month asked for last year on the 31st. March, which is a lot later than it is this time this year.

MR. CURTIS: What about 1968?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): I do not recall all the reasons behind that, last year Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should remember better than I. He should not have to ask me that, he should know the details here, but if his memory regarding that is no better than his memory regarding the total Budget then it would not be worth very much to us here tonight. The fact is Mr. Speaker, that we are asking for two months, and I say again the Premier, I do not need surely to repeat all the points made by the Premier this afternoon. He rationalized that procedure completely in that request for two months Interim Supply.

But the other point I want to make Mr. Speaker is this. Practically all the hon. gentlemen who spoke on the other side have stressed their determination to get Interim, before, no they are not going to have this shoved down their throats, they are not going to be brow-beaten and bulldozed, they are going to get information. For people looking for information, detailed information, it seems to me they have done a tremendous amount of talking. This resolution came in here around 3:30 or something this afternoon, and we have had to sit down for three or four hours and listen them make speeches condemning us for bringing in the resolution. If they are as anxious as all that to get the information

MR. WELLS: To suspend the rules?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): They could have made their points in five minutes and then we could have gone into the Bill, and they could have had two or three hours getting detailed information which they say they are going to get

MR. WELLS: Well let us go on and do it without suspending the rules

MR. ROWE (F.W.): The other, I am going to deal with that point too on the matter of suspending the rules. We, this House, this Administration has been here now for twenty-one years actually, and in that time there have been I believe twenty-three sessions of the legislature. My recollection is that there were two years, I know there were two years in which there were two sessions of the Legislature a spring session, and a summer in one year, and a spring session and a fall session in another. I believe there was also a third year. At any rate we have had twenty-three sessions. In more than half of those sessions Mr. Speaker, in at least fourteen of those sessions, we have come here and the Government has asked for Interim Supply one month, or two months, or usually three months Interim

Supply. Nobody has thought that there was anything irrational about it. Nobody thought that there was anything illogical, anything nefarious, or mysterious about it, that we are trying to cover up something, or we must have some hidden plan, some scheme, the Government is up to something or another. Nobody thought that and I would suggest that there were intelligent men on the other side of the House, intelligent men there twenty years ago, and fifteen years ago, and ten years ago, and experienced men, and yet nobody while they made the token Opposition to Interim Supply, and made the token questions, asked the token questions, nobody really seriously objected to Interim Supply, even though in the majority of cases that Interim Supply was asked for three full months. Not for one month, but for three whole months. And even though in the majority of cases Interim Supply was asked probably two weeks or three weeks or four weeks before the Budget was brought down no more than that.

MR. EARLE: The questions that were asked in the past were answered

MR. POWE (F.W.): Three months Interim Supply was the usual request by the Government, and while there were questions, I concede that, I have said that, and there was token Opposition from time to time, the fact of the matter is that without any undue delay, and certainly without all the pontificating, and all the preaching we have had to listen to here today the Opposition went along with the Government and voted them Interim Supply, knowing that it was a routine, established practice accepted in every Parliament, in every democratic legislature on the face of this earth.

MR. CROSBIE: When they have

MR. ROWE (F.W.): No on the matter of the suspension of the rules Mr. Speaker, I would, again I have to pull a figure out of the hat, but I would guess that on at least 100 occasions this House has asked, been asked to suspend the rules. Not merely for Interim Supply, or not for some great emergency that the hon. member for Humber East stressed so much here today, as he denounced us and accused us, but as almost as a routine procedure. This has been done in other legislatures over and over again, we have put through Bills for example here, a Bill has been introduced one day and passed and made into law the same day. Over and over and it could only be done by a request for, and the granting of the suspension of the rules of the House, and nobody thought that we were destroying Parliamentary privilege.

MR. MURPHY: Four votes in Opposition

MR. ROWE (F.W.): No over and over again, for there were not four votes in Opposition, it was unanimous for the House. I am talking about a routine suspension of the rules of this House in respect of this Bill and that Bill and

dozens of other Bills particularly towards the end of the session, and the Opposition has never objected and said when we asked will you suspend the rules of the House here, will you suspend the accepted principles a privileges of this House so that we can put through the Bills here in the interest of, if nothing else going home and getting a nights sleep. And the Opposition over and over have gone along but, nobody suspected that there was some nefarious scheme at work, that the Government were trying to destroy Parliamentary privileges here.

We have been told here today by hon. members who sat on this side of the House, for years in some cases, who went along tacitly without objecting here or as far as I know anywhere else to this request for Interim Supply, and to the suspension of the rules, and now they find themselves on the other side of the House and they suddenly find, they discover that we are a bunch of dictators over here, who are trying to destroy the great principles of Parliamentary democracy. I am beginning to feel as I listen to the hon. member for Humber East over there, not only on this thing but on the other things that he has denounced us and accused us. I feel like tagging him the great denunciator. I am beginning to feel as if we have been for twenty-one years, or twenty-one sessions that I have been in the House, and for twenty-one years this House, this Administration has been here, and of course for eighty years before that the people who asked for suspension of the rules, or for Interim Supply, for more than one month, or for more than two weeks were criminals. We have been doing something criminal over here.

The first time it has been suggested, the first time it has been intimated, but this is the feeling you get as you hear the hon. gentleman talking about something. There is nothing more mysterious about Interim Supply for two months now than there was five years ago or ten years ago. No Government that I know here or anywhere else has ever abused it, or ever had a chance to abuse it. It is a routine procedure, and what normally happens is that the Minister of Finance goes to his officials and says "look make up a Bill there for two months or three months Interim Supply." They go over it very roughly, and they calculate and keep in mind always that Government expenditures are not made on a pro rata basis. I can think of items under the Department of Education, and no doubt I will have to refer to it when that item comes up, where for example, take for example mother's allowances that we are obligated to send out in the first week of April. You do not send out one twelfth of those allowances on the 1st. of April, or even one sixth of them and there are a lot of other items including of

course capital expenditure my hon. friend thinks there will not be anything done about for two full months, which of course is plain nonsense.

The Government has bills and its commitments, and owes money on capital expenditure, and has other obligations the expenditures have to be made and it is not always made on a pro rata basis. The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that for the first time we discover here that what this House has been doing for twenty-one years, and what this House has been doing unanimously for all practical purposes for twenty-one years is something very unusual, something undemocratic, something dictatorial about it and that for my money is a lot of baloney.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. Minister permit a question.....



MR HICKMAN: Does he agree that the business of this House can continue this week quite satisfactorily, even with the absence of five ministers?

MR ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that, of course, is a leading question. The answer to it is that it is not a matter for me to decide. It is a matter for the Government to decide. It is a matter for the Government and the Party and the Party Caucus. Traditionally (he knows this as well as I do) in this House not only in its present administration but the Premier referred today to the time when Sir Robert Bond was in Europe and the times when Lord Morris, during the 1st World War, and others: when the Premier and the House Leader are away, when they are both away the House has been suspended. It does not have to be, I do not suppose. I am quite sure this Government would not be overthrown. Nobody suspects that. Nobody is afraid of that. Why would it be overthrown with only five gone? We have more than a clear majority of five. I do not suppose the world would come to an end either if we continued on here without the presence of the Premier and of the House Leader. But the fact of the matter is that it is a routine practice. There is nothing unusual, nothing derogatory to be attached to any hon. member of the Cabinet nor on this side of the House nor on any side of the House, it is a routine practice that when both the Premier and the House Leader are both away for the House to be suspended. Anyway it has never been objected to before, until this time.

Why the sudden objections all brought up from hon. gentlemen who went along with these procedures year after year? If they are sincere, if they really mean what they say now, Mr. Chairman, it does not speak too well for their courage nor their intelligence in the years they sat on this side of the House.

MR WELLS: Insults:

MR HICKEY: I should first of all say, Sir, that I feel obliged to vote against this motion which is before the House.

MR SHALLWOOD: Surprise! Surprise!

MR HICKEY: I am full of surprises. You never know what I am going to say.

MR SHALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman, I thought, was going to speak entirely differently.

MR HICKEY: I might if the Premier keeps on. I might even change my mind.

MR SHALLWOOD: Good!

MR HICKEY: I have an open mind, Mr. Speaker. The basis, as I see it, for hon. hon members to oppose this motion is

members to oppose this motion is, I think, the necessity, first of all, for rescinding the rules. I think we have to ask ourselves why we are suspending the rules? Is there an emergency? Is the Government gone broke? Do they need money by tomorrow morning or, if this debate should continue say until 4:00 o'clock in the morning, would they be so hard pressed that they have to get his hon. the Lieutenant-Governor out of bed to come and give Royal Assent?

All of those questions, MR. Speaker, are pertinent, no matter how funny they may seem or may appear. It would seem to me that there is no urgency. If there is, if the Government would admit that there is an urgency to this matter, then what they are admitting is in fact their own inefficiency, that they have not two clues as to what they are doing. They did not know, for example, a week ago, two weeks ago, five days ago, that they needed interim supply. They did not know they were going to need new money for the coming year. They did not know whether they were going to bring the budget down before March 31. Surely, Mr. Speaker, those are things that one would expect a government to be well aware of.

There does not appear to be any crisis developing over the past twenty-four hours, the past forty-eight hours. If there were a situation such as that then one might have some appreciation for it, that is, of course, for the Bill that is before the House, to grant interim supply. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no member on the Government side can stand in this hon. House and give a legitimate reason for suspending the rules of this House, unless there is an extreme emergency. No one! There is not an hon. gentleman here can honestly stand in this House and say that to suspend the rules is the normal thing: for really to suspend the rules is to do in one day what is customary to do in two or three.

MR SMALLWOOD: Sound horrible, does it not?

MR HICKEY: It sounds very arrogant.

MR SMALLWOOD: It sounds horrible. It sounds calamitous.

MR HICKEY: Then again, Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of arrogance in the past two weeks, so it is really not new. The rules of the House, to a great extent, this session, Mr. Speaker, I would think have been ignored and Your Honour, I would think, has had a more difficult task in this session than possibly ever before or certainly for quite a number of years. There seems to be a disregard for the rules of this House.

And to add insult to injury we now have a motion to suspend them all together, throw them out, throw them out the window. We do not need them. Obviously one raises the question: What were the rules made for? Why were they established in the beginning? Whose idea was it to lay down a rule or suggest a rule that a Bill would be given first reading and that would be it for that day, and then go to second reading on the following day? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that rule is to give hon. members on both sides an opportunity to study a particular piece of legislation, to provide the House with the opportunity of thoroughly venturing the subject before the House in essence to give everyone an opportunity to debate that particular piece of legislation. To suspend the rules can only be classed as not a suggestion cutting off the debate but rather taking action in that direction. To advise the House, Mr. Speaker that the rules will be suspended, to advise the Opposition that the rules are suspended, can only mean one thing and that whatever debating you are going to do, you are going to do it today. If you should happen to need some time to study that legislation, you might have some thoughts on it or so suggestions overnight, it will be too late tomorrow because the whole matter is dealt with in one setting. Then, Mr. Speaker, comes the rather strange situation that we hear of wherein the Premier and three Cabinet Ministers or four are leaving for Europe and we must get this business taken care of before they go. As I said, Your Honour, yesterday in a joking way one would almost believe one would think that supply to Her Majesty was going to be actually provided to Her Majesty in person when the Honourable Gentlemen arrive in England. Its too foolish for words, to suggest that the rules of the House are being suspended because the House will adjourn when this issue is fully debated and settled. The House will adjourn until after Easter because four Honourable Minister, three Honourable Minister and the Premier are not going to be here. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the Government had a majority of six or two or three, one could conceivably think that every time the Premier moved outside the Capital the House would close. Government would not dare take a chance for fear of it being toppled. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't imagine there is too much of a chance of the Government being brought down while the Honourable gentlemen are away, so I feel that, as my colleagues do, that the usual business could continue while those Honourable Gentlemen are away on public business and surely there is someone, if not to take the place of the Premier, for we hear

from certain quarters, that there is no man to do that. Surely, for a few days at least someone could hold the fort. I do not know, but the Opposition might even agree to be a little more reasonable and not attempt to bring the Government down while they are gone.

MR SMALLWOOD: Thanks! Thanks very much! I deeply appreciate that.

MR HICKEY: Always ready, Mr. Speaker, to make the odd concession.

MR SMALLWOOD: Very generous! Very decent! Very considerate!

MR HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that has to be reconciled, now that the Premier is leaving, the question of who is going to fill in on the conversations with the Premier in the morning.

MR CURTIS: That is your chance.

MR HICKEY: Would I like to try?

MR CURTIS: You should draw the crowds.

MR HICKEY: Why I do not know but I would, Mr. Speaker, provided I were given the information and I was prepared and capable and had the knowledge passed on to me and the information passed on to me, to make the various announcements that we hear from time to time on that program.

I am afraid, Sir, that we are going to be in bad shape for a couple of weeks or however many days those hon. gentlemen are going to be gone, because not only is the People's House going to be closed but this program is not going to be the same. What is going to happen? The news is just not going to get across to the people of Newfoundland. They are just not going to know what is going on. The only two sources of information available to our people will have been cut off. I think it is a real disgrace.

MR SMALLWOOD: This would be the morning programs?

MR HICKEY: That is right.

MR SMALLWOOD: I have been worried about that.

MR HICKEY: The Premier has been concerned?

MR SMALLWOOD: Yes, I have been deeply concerned about that.

MR HICKEY: Well, I am glad to hear that.

MR SMALLWOOD: About my morning conversations on VOXM.

MR HICKEY: I knew there was a bit of patriotism there somewhere.

MR SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR EARLE: We can always read the Newfoundland Bulletin.

MR SMALLWOOD: No, that is only once a month. That is only twelve times a year.

March 10, 1977      Time 204      Page 5

MR EARLE: We can read it over twelve times.

MR SMALLWOOD: Yes, many people do.

MR HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR SMALLWOOD: Is that a promise? Is that a firm promise that the Opposition will not bring the Government down while I am gone across the Ocean?

MR HICKEY: Well, we would have a caucus on it before.

MR SMALLWOOD: But can the Opposition?

MR HICKEY: Oh! I feel sure! I feel sure!

MR SMALLWOOD: Yes, but does the hon. gentleman know? Can he promise? Can we have it in writing?

MR HICKEY: I will certainly be prepared to take that under consideration.

MR SMALLWOOD: All right, that is fair enough. Let me know what happens.

MR HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, getting back to the subject at hand: my friend, the hon. Minister of Education, suggests that the Opposition of some years ago did not necessarily look upon the suspension of rules or asking for interim supply as being too much of a serious matter. I am just wondering what Opposition he is referring to, because to my knowledge I know of no member of this Party raising any flags when they heard of a suggestion that the rules be suspended or indeed asking for interim supply. I cannot, indeed, Mr. Speaker, see a vote wherein one member of the Conservative Opposition voted in favour of interim supply, as we are being asked to do today. However.



MR. THOMAS HICKEY: However I have not been in this hon. House that long and I cannot speak from experience, therefore I am prepared to give credit to the hon. gentleman that maybe, just maybe there might have been an instance. But I should remind him, I should point out this is 1970, this is not '55. Twenty-one years have passed since Confederation. This Government has been in office for twenty-one years, and Mr. Speaker a lot of water has gone under the bridge. We on this side have never prided ourselves in going over the things, or most of the things that have happened in the past, but we try to be constructive.

We try to talk of the present day and the future rather than digging up the old issues of ten, fifteen years ago. We feel that they were debated well at that time. We regret that the Government in many cases have not learned by their mistakes, but we do not as a rule bring those matters before the House in any of our debates.

We feel Mr. Speaker, on the other hand irregardless of a particular stand taken by an Opposition of ten years ago. Surely goodness that is no reason for an intelligent person, or any intelligent gentleman on the other side to use this as an argument as to why the Opposition of today should follow exactly in the footsteps of someone ten years ago, for indeed we are told by Government on so many occasions of the changes that have taken place, and the progress that we have seen in those years.

Mr. Speaker, indeed we have seen changes and undoubtedly we have had progress. But with that progress Sir, we have had changes for the worse. And with that progress I think we have also got an attitude of Government which probably was not known before, was not present before. I would hope it was not at any rate. I would hope that I am right in saying that the present attitude of this Government is brought on by being in power for twenty-one years, a sort of drunk with power.

A Government that is in office for twenty or twenty-one years, it is a normal thing I suppose for them to feel that they can do just as they please, especially with the kind of majority that this Government has. Well Mr. Speaker, it is always wise to stop and think that on an issue such as this one which is before the House at the present time, while it is

directed primarily to hon. members and especially the Opposition, or its members of the Opposition that have to deal and work under those rules. On the other hand it is directed to the people for the hon. members of this House represent all of the people in this Province.

I heard Mr. Speaker, I heard the Premier say either yesterday or the previous sitting, that it is not the intention of the Government to cut off debate. It is not the intention of the Government to prevent hon. members from debating fully; measures; members of this House from getting what information they wanted. And Sir that is rather hard to reconcile now when we find that we are being asked to suspend the rules of the House, to rush this measure through today.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering for example what would be wrong with adjourning the House tonight in the event that this matter was not dealt with, was not finished, was not voted on. What would be so wrong with adjourning the House until tomorrow at 3 o'clock? Surely Mr. Speaker, the fact that four or five members of the other side are gone, or out of the Province. Surely that is no reason not to carry on the business.

As I pointed out earlier Sir, it would be a different matter if the Government could not be sure that they would get this measure approved, they would get it through. They are confident of that. They must obviously be sure of that, but because of the majority that they have. And so this raises the question, why is this - why are we in such a rush? What is the reason for it? Mr. Speaker, I for one prefer to think of any hon. member and certainly of the Government, in a charitable way rather than in any other, but I am having difficulty in determining what is behind this move all of a sudden to rush this bill through the House. And to wait until this particular time to bring it before the House, and finally to suspend the rules of the House in order to get it through. As much as I hate to think that it is this, I can come up with no answer except that the Government does not want the financial <sup>situation</sup> of the Province debated in the House. That they do not want too much debate on the overall state of the economy, that they want to cut debate, keep it as short as they can. Or Mr. Speaker, that they are being just plain arrogant. And God forbid if it is the latter, because if we are going to come to the point where we are just going to play games, and say the heck with you fellas,

you will not debate this issue because we are not going to let you debate this issue. We are the masters of this House, and we are going to do things exactly the way we want it, and we are not going to let you who are members of the Opposition properly and conscientiously represent the various constituencies from which you come.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government suspends the rules of the House on any issue, whether one believes it or not, this is in essence what they are doing, because surely no member in Opposition, and surely no member on government side stands in his place and projects his views, takes his stand on any particular issue without relating it to the people he represents. And if he is hampered in carrying out this duty properly and in the normal way in which he wishes to do it, then surely it is a direct slap in the face to the people he represents.

I think Mr. Speaker that the present Government whether they know it or not are playing havoc with the mandate that they were given. I think they are pushing the people of Newfoundland a little too far, and I would suggest Sir, that if they want \$62 million so bad that we have to have it voted on today, approved today. If they are going use such things as suspending the rules in order to get it, or if they are going to indicate that salaries of civil servants must be paid, or use initial such as this to justify it, then I would suggest Mr. Speaker the most hon. thing to do, the best thing to do would be take it to the people. Go to the people, tell them that the members of the Opposition would not agree, any of them, none of them would agree to provide the Government with the necessary money.

And I think Sir they would be truly surprised at the answer they would get. \$62 million may not be a great deal of money in the eyes of some people, but I do not think it is to be brushed aside as being a paltry sum, more especially when it comes out of the people's taxes, when it is the people's money we are dealing with, using.

Why is it any of us ever get to the point Mr. Speaker where we adopt the attitude that we are going to do as we please without due regard for the feelings or the opinions of the people, the public, those very people who elected us to this hon. House. What happens a government, or

March 10, 1970

Tape #295

Page 4

why is it that over a period of time they become so lax in their duty. Why do they become so lax in the realization that it is the people who elected them? Why is it they treat those people with contempt? To ask this House for \$62 million and to decide on it in one day, and forget this business of taking your time and fully exploring the issue, to make such a request as that Mr. Speaker, cannot be classed as anything else but contempt. We are in fact saying to the people, we are running the show and while it is your money we are spending, it is none of your business, it is none of your business that we want \$62 million of your money to keep the ship afloat. Do not ask us what we are going to do with it.

what we are going to do with it because that is none of your business either. When you ask any questions we are not going to answer them. And if we have if we get the impression that you are going to ask too many questions we are going to make darn sure that you do not get the answers because we are going to suspend the rules of the House and prevent this kind of questioning which will provide those. Mr. Speaker one can turn this inside out or upside down and you can only come up with one answer and that is it. For some unknown reason there has to be no clear cut explanation, for this \$62 million that we are being asked to vote. As to why the estimates are not tabled or the budget is not going to be brought down before the end of the fiscal year we have gone over that and it is not worthy of mention, because one fully realizes, I simply realizes, I explored that avenue yesterday, and I got no answers and it is only an exercise of futility to go into it at this time.

It is next to impossible to understand why, why we are being asked to agree to the suspension of the rules, to grant approximately two months supply. As I pointed out Mr. Speaker, in an earlier debate and in spite of the fact that the Premier has given certain undertakings with regard to an election or with regard to the budget being brought down. Mr. Speaker, we may joke about an election back and forth across this House and politically speaking Sir, we might on this side be very interested in an election at this time. But we are not prepared to disregard our duty in the first instance and talk of an election. We are not interested in an election as much as we are in properly representing the people that we represent. We are not as interested in making political hay out of this issue just for election purposes. But I submit Sir, that if the rules of the House is suspended and the amount of \$62 million is granted covering a period of two months, I raise the question again, what is to stop the government coming back to this House after two months and saying we would like another two million we are not going to have any discussion, we are not going to have any debate on the issues conditions are such that we are in no position to bring down a budget because our plans and our programmes with the Federal Government are not complete or have not been developed to the extent where we are able to bring down the budget or we would like another \$62 million for another two months. And so we go on, what is/<sup>to</sup> the <sup>STOP</sup> Government from doing just that. I know Mr. Speaker, the Premier has all but guaranteed that this will not happen.

Then again the hon. gentleman is known to change his mind. One heard of retirement on how many occasions, he has changed his mind on that. And certainly



that is his business he and he only know the reason why. I do not think it would be too difficult for him to come with a reason for not opening the House on the date that he suggests he would, for not bringing down the budget on or about the time he suggest he will bring it down. Surely a politician of his calibre who has been able to change his mind on so many occasions and justify it and give good reasons for it, surely on an issue as important as a budget or the opening of this Hon. House I feel sure that he would not have too much trouble in presenting a good reason as to why the House would not be open. Indeed there may be good reasons some of the ones I have just pointed out. This is why Mr. Speaker, that to my mind it is important that this House remain open that hon. members continue the business of the Province continue to attend to the work that is before this House. There is approximately forty odd pieces of legislation distributed to my knowledge Mr. Speaker, not one Bill has yet, except the one that is before the House now, has been debated, here again, one wonders why the House can not remain open and while the Premier and his colleagues are away. Imagine the amount of work that could be attended to, surely this legislation could be all cleaned up and passed by the time they get back. And as one hon. member said today especially when the Premier is away we seem to get a little more work done. Of course that is not to say that he obstructs the business of the House. I would not suggest that. But it seems that he has the way of getting into the various debates and may be Sir, he has got friends in that connection.

So Mr. Speaker, there are so many good reasons as to why one has to vote against this motion to suspend the rules of the House. There are so many reasons why the House not only that, but why the House should remain open after the Premier leaves, why we should get on with the business. I heard Mr. Speaker, I think it was the last speaker last hon. gentleman who was speaking, say something about destroying democracy. Surely, you have been accused of destroying democracy, well, Mr. Speaker, that puts it in the proper context of the only thing that I can say to that is that it is a serious accusation to make to accuse anyone of, to accuse the government, however, on a matter such as one that is before the House today it is difficult to look at it in any other sense. The very basis of democracy is as I understand it is freedom of debate, with no restrictions within reason, there has not been restrictions but I am sure the hon. minister will agree with me that we will not be here tomorrow at 3.p.m. If the Government I will not say we will not, I will not say we will not be here that remains to be

seen but if the Government have their way we will not. Surely that is a restriction one cannot term that anything but a restriction. And Mr. Speaker, we on this side have stated that we believe the House should remain open. We believe that the Bill that we are asking the House to suspend the rules for should go on its regular course. And the Government in requesting suspension of the rules are saying no, we are going to settle it today and there will be one day's debate and that is it. And in fact it would appear that if any hon. member wishes to debate this issue or if this issue is not wound up and settled before 11 p.m. this debate will continue beyond 11 p.m. and Mr. Speaker if it does, this then means only one thing, hon. members are being pushed into the wee hours of the morning to debate an issue of great importance to the Province for what can be more important than the spending of the people's money, for being pushed into the wee hours of the morning to debate an issue that we could and should in fact debate tomorrow afternoon. One does not have to be an intellectual to term that restriction that is as plain as the nose in your face.

I do not know Mr. Speaker, how any hon. member on the other side of the House can really and sincerely vote in favour of this motion, I just do not know. Surely, with all the cries of the Opposition to keep the House open after those hon. gentlemen are gone, surely this must appeal to hon. members on the other side who are not leaving on this big trip tomorrow. How must they feel? They must feel that the Leader of the Government, Mr. Speaker, do not have too much faith in the one's they are leaving behind. This is one interpretation, it is not for me to say that that is it. But certainly this is one interpretation of it. Or if there is confidence in those who are left behind after the three or four hon. gentlemen leave what is there to fear, why are we closing the House? Is the Government afraid that there will be the wrong kind of publicity given to issues that may come before the House. Is the Premier afraid the fact that he cannot keep his finger on the pulse of the Government with regards to giving information that is requested, would that be it? Or is it as some hon. gentleman might suggest that there is just no one available to fill the shoes of Premier, or Acting-Premier while this House is in session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is this getting close to tedious repetition? The hon. gentleman is just repeating the same sentences over and over. Completely tedious repetition.

MR. MURPHY: That is a common failing in this House.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, am I being accused of something? What is it I am being accused of, filibustering? Is that it? Would someone like to make the charge? Would somebody like to stand up and make the charge? If you are going to charge me with filibustering, do not do it under the cloak of repetition, my good God. Who above all people should talk of repeating themselves, the Premier? I will pay the hon. gentleman a compliment right now in this House, and say there is no man in this Province who can say the one thing ten times, and in a lot of cases Mr. Speaker, it is not boring. I guess I have not been in politics long enough to master that as yet, but give me time Sir, give me time. Maybe if I end up in politics for twenty years, I might be able to do it twenty times, who knows?

This Mr. Speaker, brings me back to the word I used before, and I used it in an apologetic fashion, because I do not like the word. But this can make me just a little bit mad. Just a wee bit. No better display of arrogance than we have just heard. If that is not arrogance what is it? We are not only asking the House to suspend the rules, now we are asking the Speaker if I should be told to sit down, because I am repeating myself.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind and to my knowledge as to the rules of this House, I have a certain time limit, and I go that full limit if I feel like it. And if any hon. gentleman does not like that, he can retire to the Common Room. There are nice sofas in there. I have had the pleasure of dropping to see one of the hon. members - much better than the ones in the Opposition. You can even go in there and go to sleep. I am sure the hon. member for Burin would not mind that. Very comfortable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The trouble is it is the hon. gentleman who is speaking is gone to sleep.

MR. HICKEY: What?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the trouble.

MR. HICKEY: Gone to sleep?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: Well the Premier better keep praying that I will not wake up. Because if I do he is in for a fight. Now Mr. Speaker, I sincerely do take exception to the suggestion as to whether or not I am repeating myself. Even if I am surely this is my prerogative. If I want to stand here and maybe in the eyes of some hon. gentleman on the other side, that it might be all hogwash, you know we are quite familiar with this. We are used to this, and I have been abused in this way so often in the past three and a half years, it is now like water on a duck's back. It just does not bother me anymore. I thrive on it. So really I hope the hon. gentleman did not think he was doing me any great injury.

Now Mr. Speaker, all jokes aside, because really - the fact that I am questioned as to whether or not I am repeating, that is the greatest joke of the century. That is the greatest joke of the century, especially by whom the matter was raised. But as I said, apart and aside from that, we are talking about a very serious issue, and I do not think we can just pass over it lightly.

I think that we have to consider the issue along the lines as many hon. members on this side have suggested. Is it necessary that we get this Bill passed today, is it absolutely necessary, is it an emergency? Is it necessary to suspend the rules to permit that? And is it necessary to adjourn the House? Those are the pertinent questions. I submit Mr. Speaker that it is absolutely unnecessary to request that the rules of the House be suspended. It is certainly unnecessary that the House should be adjourned today. I cannot say that, I cannot really and honestly say that it is unnecessary that we grant the \$62 million. I think it is unnecessary, but then again, but we do not have any information on the matter, and we are not in a position at this point until we get some answers to some pertinent questions in relation to that. We are not in a position to say that that is unnecessary, but we hope to find out.

I seem to be given the suggestion again to shut up. I must be awful boring Mr. Speaker, that is all I can say. But if I am, if I am Your Honour, I certainly make no apologies because to some extent then my purpose has been fulfilled, because only God knows how boring it is to sit on this side sometimes and listen to the speeches from the other side.

Now there is a lot of wisdom comes from there once or twice a year, but I guess you cannot have it every day.

Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative Sir, but vote against this Motion. I have no alternative but vote against this Motion, and I would hope that the Government would consider the points that have been raised by hon. members on this side. Let us do this in a man-like fashion. If the Government wants \$62 million all right. Let us come out with some reasonable explanation. Let us have a full-scale debate on it, and let us give any amount of time that is necessary, that is required by the Opposition, who by and large Mr. Speaker, are the members of this House who raised the questions. One cannot necessarily expect the Government or a member of the Government to get up and question that very Government. So at least I think Sir that we could be given the courtesy and the privilege of going through this debate at our own leisure, fully ventilating the subject, so that when a vote is finally taken, there is no doubt in anyone's mind. And would it not really be something if you had unanimous consent of this vote of \$62 million.

Mr. Speaker, that is not impossible, that is not at all impossible, if the proper information is supplied, and if this indication of arrogance is done away with. Indication of contempt for the House and through the House contempt for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do not adjourn at the hour of eleven.

MR. THOMAS BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion for the adjournment of the rules of the House, or the suspension of the rules of the House on Interim Supply, I am afraid that I have too, <sup>of</sup> along with the rest of the member on this side of the House, to vote against the motion.

Everything that could be possibly said about this motion has been said, so all that is left for us is to repeat some of the things that have been said by the other hon. members on this side of the House, but however, the rules do permit that I be allowed to express them. And therefore, I am taking this opportunity to do so. Now the points that were made today Mr. Speaker, the most pertinent points; Number one that the original purpose of the rules of the House are to protect the minority groups in



the House, and to give them debating and House rights in order that they can more efficiently represent the people who elect them to sit in this House. The rules of the House are designed so that orderly debate can be carried on, and the rules are designed to allow ample time for this debate. And when you talk Mr. Speaker, when we talk about suspending these rules, primarily what is happening is that there is an effort to stifle debate, and therefore there is removed for the minority this protection that these rules are designs to assist the minority.

Now it has been stated by other hon. members that the arrogant method where this Motion was put to the House on March 5 without any prior notice whatsoever, that this was arrogant and <sup>in</sup> rebutting those arguments from that side of the House, I have heard various members state that the members on this side of the House who were sitting across the House last year or the year before, that previously we had not in any way shape or form objected to the suspension of the rules. Now I do not think that this was quite accurate, because the few times that I was asked to support a Motion to suspend the rules, at least I was informed some time prior to the Motion being put to the House. And the first indication I had of this Motion was when it was read by the hon. Leader of the Council.

Now I along with other members on this side of the House do respectfully submit Mr. Speaker, that the method which they used was arrogant, which the Government in order to present this Motion to the House. It was arrogant. Now why was it necessary, why was it necessary to get this suspension of the rules?

MR. CURTIS: Do you not know?

MR. BURGESS: Last year the House gave the Government the money to run until March 31, and this is only March 10. Now there is ample time until the end of this fiscal year to carry on the business of this House, this being only March 10. There is ample time, there is twenty-two days wherein this House could be sitting, and because of a decision of the part of Government to close the House, or adjourn the House until April 6, means that there are problems that the various districts that we all represent are encountering and problems which will not be handled, and which will be deferred, or have been deferred, or will be deferred until April 6.

March 10, 1970

Tape #297

Page 5

Now it has also been adequately pointed out by previous speakers that the suspension of the rules should only be used in times of emergency. And I fail to see the emergency, I fail to see any degree of emergency in the matter that the hon. the Premier and the favoured five Cabinet Ministers going to England granted on a matter of importance, granted on a matter of importance to sign documents pertaining to the Come-by-Chance operation. There have been other documents signed for the Stephenville project. There were other documents that were to be signed for Bell Island.

MR BURGESS And now we are told that it is of absolute importance that the business of this hon. House be suspended for another great signing.

No nowhere in listening to the debate which issued on this motion, particularly from the other side of the House, nowhere did I see the true and absolute justification for the suspension of the rules. At not time, as convincing as the hon. the Premier can sound, at no time was the justification for the suspension of these rules presented in this House, at no time.

Then the point on interim supply, the point that was also brought up by one of the members of the Official Opposition: why two months supply when the House will be reconvened on April 6. Now the Premier's rebuttal on that was (and when you talk about a member repeating himself) when the Premier stood up and said the reason why is that the budget is not ready. The budget is not ready. I say: why is not the budget ready? Why is not the budget ready?

The rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, the rules that apply particularly to the spending of the people's money, the rules are designed so that ample opportunity can be given to various members of this House to study how and why these funds will be spent - the people's money. That is why it is a three-day process, wherein the members will be given ample time to study how these monies will be spent.

Then, as it was pointed out, we are told that this is going to be ramrodded through. There is no doubt that it is going to be ramrodded through, like a lot of other things have been ramrodded through in this House.

Then we look at the Bill, and I am not going to refer to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, although I would like to refer to the Bill as other members have done in this House. There is only one reference I will make to it and that is that, as usual, the vote for Labrador is the lowest on the totem pole, \$100 thousand. One hon. member stated that forty per cent of the total budget, in some instances, was here in this Interim Supply Bill. I strongly suspect that one hundred per cent of Labrador's vote is in that Interim Supply Bill. \$100 thousand. That is not enough to put a roof on the chicken house that the hon. member from Labrador South took refuge in.

Then during the debate we heard the very eloquent and passionate speeches of the members on that side of the house when they were talking about the night sessions. How could we be so despicable? How could we

be so lazy as to even criticize the fact that we have been asked to sit down to night sessions. Oh! How abominable, how despicable we were! Now here is the same argument in reverse, when we talk about suspending this House for almost a month.

Now during that month, during that month, Mr. Speaker, the affairs of my district need attention and the affairs of Labrador, the affairs of every district that the members of this House represent need attention. But no, the business of this Province is completely forgotten about.

What about the Labrador roads that need to be built? What about discussions on those? No, the favourite five will be in England. Despite the fact that they have a majority that is even greater than that enjoyed by the Liberal Government today, the Prime Minister of Canada can leave and go about other business, but that does not mean that the business of the country stops.

What about all the civil servants that have to be paid. I quite rejoiced to hear one hon. member ask the hon. the Premier yesterday if he would guarantee that the increases that these civil servants will receive will be retroactive. Well, if the raises are given next December and are retroactive to April it means that those people have gone from April to December without that money. That is no justification to say that you can delay the budget. Just because you are going to pay increases, that are so sorely needed, retroactively. The police workers, the fire fighters, the hospital workers, the civil servants, these people need increases now. They have to buy groceries and going into a grocery store and telling them they are going to get a retroactive lump sum of money is not going to get them any more groceries. They need it now.

Now we will be discussing tonight this Bill, this Bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the needs and the reasons for these sums of money which make up that \$61 million or \$62 million; and next week after the signing of these documents in London we will be saddled with another \$130 million.

I would like this House to remain in session so that I can discuss why Labrador is not included in the DREE program. I would like this House to remain in session to know why strong representation was not made by the Provincial Government to the Federal Government to see that Labrador benefited from the Maritime Freight Rates Tax. I would like this House to stay in session so I can discuss all of the problems of my district.

March 1, 1970 Tape 293

Page 3

We are told in one breath that we are wrong for not supporting this motion and then we are told about all the work that is involved by the various ministers in the preparation of their "White Papers", for the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. This House should be in session so that all of this business can be studied and worked upon and concluded, because we are here for the people's benefit not our own.

So, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that what we are seeing here today, as members, the suspension of the rules, the rules that are supposed to dignify our position, we are witnessing the arrogant acts of a government who make the conditions to suit themselves.

The most profound proposals can be made on this side of the House and just on a matter of principle that side of the House will not accept them. They could be the most profound proposals in this world, and for the good of the Province and we would hear: "Why is it that they vote this way on this side of the House and vote in another way when they are on that side of the House?"

Because it is a matter of principle. I feel that principle dictates to that side of the House that they do not accept profound proposals from this side. As long as we are over here it is our duty, as has also been adequately pointed out, and we are not likely to overthrow anything nor any government until after the next election.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to vote against this Motion. And I congratulate the previous speakers on the depth wherein they described their reasons for doing the same. Thank you!

MR SPEAKER (NOEL)

The Motion is that the Rules of the House be now suspended, on the Motion for Interim Supply now on the Order Paper and the Supply Bill to be instituted pursuant thereto. Those in favour of the motion please say 'Aye', contrary 'Nay'.

In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

Some hon. Members: On division:

MR SPEAKER: On Division: Call in the members.



MR. SPEAKER: The Motion is that the Rules of the House be Suspended on the Motion for Interim Supply now on the Order Paper and the Supply Bill to be Instituted pursuant thereto: Those in favour of the motion please rise :

The hon. the Premier, hon. President of the Council, hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, hon. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Smallwood, hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Captain Strickland, hon. Minister of Education, hon. Minister of Finance, hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Canning, hon. Minister of Health, hon. Minister of Fisheries, hon. Mr. Hill, hon. Minister of Supply, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the Motion please rise:

Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Fickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrdon, Mr. Burgess.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion carried:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in calling Order No. 39, Second Reading of a Bill an Act for the Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Services, etc. I would move that the first reading of this Bill be rescinded and that the House go into Committee once again on the Motion which gave rise to the Bill, the Motion on yesterday's Order Paper, that the House Resolve Itself Into a Committee of the Whole to Consider Certain Resolutions for the Granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

The object of this, Mr. Speaker, is so that in the Committee considering the resolution the various items of the Bill under consideration now have been considered.

MR. SPEAKER: ( Mr. Noel) The Order is # 39. Second Reading of a Bill An Act for Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-One And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service. And the Motion is that the first reading of this Bill be rescinded and that the Resolution be recommitted. Those in favour please say Aye, contrary Nay, Carried. The Motion is that I do now leave the Chair. Those in favour Aye, contrary Nay, Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (NOEL): Order

MR. MURPHY: We carried the resolution, the resolution was carried now we are going back to what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are in Committee of Supply now

MR. MURPHY: Yes

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution was carried in the previous sitting of the committee. The resolution and the Bill have been recommitted. We do not have to deal with the resolution because that has been carried. We now deal with the Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, We are in no hurry to discuss the Bill before this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now section one, and section two, has been passed. No, none of this Bill has been passed well, we will carry on like it was an ordinary thing.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, are we now in Committee of the Whole House? Committee of the Whole after second reading, or are we back in Committee of Supply?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Committee of Supply

MR. WELLS: Do we then in Committee of Supply go over section by section of the Bill or do we only consider the schedule?

MR. HICKMAN: We want to cover the Bill section by section

MR. WELLS: Very well, there will be a further Committee of the Whole on the Bill

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, when is the principle of the Bill discussed? This Bill still has to go through second reading does it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chair is that we are now on the resolution and the Bill. It has been recommitted. The resolution was passed and the previous session, sitting of this committee. Business before this committee now is the Bill, and the clerk has called clause 1, of the Bill, and the motion is, shall clause 1 carry.

MR. WELLS: On a Point of Order Mr. Chairman, can we have the Chairman's confirmation that carrying clause 1 in words will not in any way impair our ability to discuss the principle of the Bill on second reading. I want to insure that that is so or clause 1, I submit we will have to argue principle here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not within the competence of the committee to discuss what might or might not take place in the hon. the House of Assembly. The business before the committee is this Bill, and the motion is shall the clause 1 carry?

MR. WELLS: Then on a Point of Order Mr. Chairman I move that the committee rise report progress, and ask leave to sit again, and that the matter then be referred to the Speaker for confirmation, because the right to discuss the principle of

107 - 290

this Bill should not be in any way inhibited by our now carrying in detail the clauses. If we are going to be asked in Committee of Supply these clauses, our ability to discuss the principle of whether or not Interim Supply should now be grant should not be impaired, and if the Chairman feels that it is not within the competence of the committee to make the House, or give this committee and through it give the House confirmation that the ability to discuss principle will not be impaired, then I suggest Mr. Chairman, that we rise the committee, report progress and ask confirmation of Mr. Speaker that such will not be the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Those in favour please say "aye" contrary minded "nay" the motion is defeated.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, when do we debate the Bill on second reading? When do we debate the principle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that in Committee of Supply we cannot discuss what might or might not take place in the House of Assembly.

MR. HICKEY: Can I just ask another question? I will plead ignorance, I would like to know, would somebody tell me when we discuss this Bill second reading?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please, the motion before the House now, before the committee now is, shall clause 1 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to clause 1 because I am of the firm conviction that clause 1 should not carry. We are now in Committee of Supply Mr. Chairman, and I understand that we can speak in Committee of Supply as many times as we want, and we can range over the whole Bill. Now as to

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. That is not the rule, the rule is that in Committee of Supply a member may speak without the usual restrictions of debate in the more formal session of the House, but remarks of members must be strictly relevant to the clause which is before the committee.

MR. CROSBIE: I admit that Mr. Chairman, now this clause is that this Act may be cited as the Supply Act number 1, 1970 and this is the clause of this Bill that I wish to speak against. Mr. Chairman, the Supply Act 1970, number 1, is the title of this Bill to get Interim Supply, and I would point out to the Chairman Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman I would point out to the House through you that in the last ten years the amounts asked for in Supply Acts such as this have been the following, in 1969 this House was asked to vote and did vote \$38,480,000. Interim Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please, the hon. member must confine his remarks to the section which was read by the clerk. Clause 1, of the Bill.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this, this is the first time I have seen this happen. I would just like to have someone enlighten me on this as to just what is happening that we go into this committee without discussing the principle of the Bill. I have never seen it done before, can we get this information from anybody. Can we adjourn for five minutes to find out what is going on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not here to provide information, <sup>but</sup> simply to get the presence of the committee completed, and the motion is shall clause 1 carry? Those in favour please say "aye" Contrary minded "Nay" Clause 1 is carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to clause 2, the usual practice is to deal with the schedule first, and that is the practice that will be followed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the practice be that we discuss clause 2, the general principle of this Bill first, and that following that we discuss the individual items listed in the schedule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members will understand that if we deal with the practices as I say for this reason, that there is a figure shown in clause 2, which is the total of the schedule and if alterations are made in the schedule then having passed clause 2, the committee could not revert without unanimous consent, and the practice has been that in Committee of Supply to deal with the schedule before dealing with the clause which contains the actual figure so that the appropriate figures or otherwise could be made in the clause 2. For that reason the Chair rules that we will now deal with the schedule, individually.

CONSOLIDATED FUNDS \$200,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this amount carry?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I must rise on this question because it demonstrates very closely the point which I raised and which was in dispute with the hon. the Minister of Education. When I was referring to the Supply Bill here, I was referring to the comparison with last year's Supply Bill and stuck strictly to current account. I was taken to task for that because, I had not included capital. Now the first item of this consolidated fund last year, one seventh of the total budget for the year amounted to \$10 million was capital fund. And in last year's request for Interim Supply there was an allowance for that. If a similar allowance had been made this year on the same basis as this request, and this schedule has outlined the request under item number 1, would be for \$6,756,000. Now obviously there is an explanation for that. The fact must be of course that no heavy debt repayments come in that particular period of the two months. This is the explanation, but it does eliminate, this first item alone eliminates

\$10 million of the capital referred to. I was strictly correct in making the comparison with this year's schedule and last year's schedule when I requested it be debated. There is no capital amount, because the amount asked for is only \$200,000. that is obviously not a capital amount. It is only a pure operating current amount. As this is so obviously wrong Mr. Chairman, I move that the vote under heading number 1, seconded by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition be reduced to the sum of one dollar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the vote under heading number 1, be reduced to the sum of one dollar.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss Sir, to understand, there is no information forthcoming from the Government on the point just what that \$200,000. is for. Last year Mr. Chairman, on public debt services really, we spent \$42 million or \$40 million on debt redemption and including that payments under guarantee services, like Holiday Inns, Memorial University, Confederation Building, that is, payments not to be borne, payments out of consolidated funds. We spent \$40 million. The portion of it that was direct public debt, the total involved there was \$27 million, the total interest alone was \$27,801,000 with the principal repayment of \$7 million.

Now Sir, we find in this Interim Supply Bill an amount of \$200,000. said to be for a two month period with no explanation, no indication what it is for, where it is going, who is to receive it, what credit this Province will get for it if it is applied in a certain way or what is going to happen to it. We have heard the Premier say that I should be psychoanalyzed because of my , obsession with finances, and my total lack of knowledge about it. That came about



MR. CLYDE WELLS: came about as a result of my statement Mr. Chairman, that the interest on the public debt in the year '67 - '68 was \$12,741,000 and last year the interest on the public debt was \$27,801,000. All this has been denied, but Mr. Chairman I refer yourself Sir and the House to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the fiscal year, April '68 to the 31 of March '69 at Page 26. In that we will see the revised Estimate for the financial year '67 - '68, \$12,281,200, the interest payable on the public debt.

And now Mr. Chairman, to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure which we passed in this House last year for the current fiscal year in which we are in the present, that is from the first of April '69 to the 31 March '70, two years later. Again Sir, I refer you to Page 16 under Consolidated Fund Services. The amount is clearly spelled out there, the interest -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order. Your Honour there is to be a Budget brought down and the full Estimates of Expenditure are to be tabled in the House. The House is to go into Committee of Ways and Means and Committee of Supply, and the entire Budget and all the Estimates will be debated, and there will be ample opportunity for debate. Now what I want to know is this Your Honour. Is it in order under the heading which is now before us; (1) Consolidated Fund, \$200,000, to have a full ranging debate on the Public Debt in the interest costs of the Public Debt, and if so, can we then go on to each one of these items and have the same kind of full ranging debate that there will be, that the rules of the House provide for, a full ranging on the Budget. May we not have a Budget type of debate on each of these individual items, on merely on Interim Supply? I suggest to Your Honour that it violates completely the whole principle of the House, when the opportunity is going to be provided, when the Budget is brought down and the Estimates are debated. Every item of this money, every dollar of this money will be contained in the Estimates. This is only on account. The full amount will be in the Estimates, and full opportunity is to be provided under the rules for complete far ranging debate on every item of it. Now do we have two debates on the Budget?

One just on Interim Supply and one on the Budget itself. I suggest Your Honour that the rule of strict relevancy would limit the range and the scope of the debate, to something far less than a full fledged Budget Debate. When the Estimates are brought down, and the House goes into Committee of Supply on the Estimates, we may be here for weeks, dealing with all the individual items made up of thousands. Therefore, we are now precluded by that fact, the fact that there is to be a full fledged debate, we are precluded from that full fledged debate. Can we talk for the next couple days on the Public Debt just on that one item here? And then can we go on for a couple of days on legislative and executive council, and if so, if we can, can we do it all over again on the Budget Debate, and Supply on the Estimates? I hold Mr. Chairman, this would be palpably wrong, because you do not debate the same thing twice in the House. You debate it, you dispose of it, and it may not be brought up again in the same Session. And it may not be brought up again in the same Session. It may in a following Session. We are to have a complete debate on Supply on the Estimates. This is only Interim, and surely there is not the same far ranging right of debate on a part of a thing, which itself is to be debated with the utmost range with scarcely any limit. I hold that the rule of strict relevancy would bar any hon. member from just having a far ranging debate here, or make a far ranging speech here on the Public Debt and the interest in the Public Debt. This is just two months supply, not twelve. And when we are debating the twelve the full range debate will take place.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to that point of order Mr. Chairman. As Your Honour is aware there is one fundamental principle that operates in all British Parliamentary systems. The Government does not get its hands on one cent of the public purse without first giving regress of grievance. That is fundamental Mr. Chairman, and I do not care Sir whether it is twelve months or two months, the same principle applies. The Government now comes in and on this point of order Mr. Chairman, the Government now comes before us and asks for \$62.million, or near abouts \$62.million, and says we cannot debate what they are going to do with it. We cannot debate what was done compare it with what was done last year, and see what they are going to do with this two months supply. That Mr. Chairman, is ludicrous. This is public money, and it is our job Sir, here

in this House and Committee of Supply to ensure that the Government properly accounts, they just do not come in and ask, we want a cheque for \$62. million, and we will not tell you what we are going to do with it. Or we will not compare it with what we did last year or explain it in any way, we just want it. And that Mr. Chairman is clearly wrong. No matter how many Budgets the Government propose to bring in. It is clearly wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Will the hon. member please be seated? I believe the Chairman had enough advice from hon. members. On a point of order the Chairman is permitted to listen to hon. members express their views until the hon. Chairman had his mind made up on it. And in the present situation, the Motion is that the Consolidated Fund, the figure \$200 be reduced to one dollar. Now hon. members speaking to that Motion may only speak with regard to the reasons as to why it should be reduced to one dollar. There are occasions in the system for wide ranging debates. The hon. member mentioned about regress of grievances. That is in the House of Assembly, not in the Committee. This is a Committee of the House, appointed to do a particular job, and the Committee is to examine this particular Bill and the Motion before the Committee, that Item 1 be reduced to one dollar. And members must understand that the remarks must be limited to that point, and to that point only. The House of Assembly is the place where members speak generally. And everybody knows the occasions which they are.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, all along during the debates prior to this Committee, we were told when we were speaking that we would only let the House go into Committee of Supply that we would be told the reasons why these sums of money were needed. And now we are being told that we cannot even discuss them.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman I would like to clarify my motion. I think it is strictly relevant to the point which you raised. The heading of this Bill does not specify that this amount is for any particular period, it is to cover the full twelve months. Obviously last year the total expenditure under this vote was \$40.million. The fact that this Bill does not specify

any particular period just a vote for the full twelve months, \$200,000 is obviously ridiculous. So this is the reason for my Motion, that that amount be reduced to a further ridiculous amount of one dollar.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I submit to Your Honour that my purpose in discussing the matter in the way in which I was in the process of discussing it before I was interrupted, is to point out that there is no apparent justification for this amount \$200,000. It is obviously totally inadequate to even -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The question is not whether the amount of \$200,000 is justified. The question is whether the amount of one dollar is justified.

MR. WELLS: That is what I am about to address myself to Your Honour, that is the matter that I am going to speak on. And to point it out, I have to show that the amount of \$200,000 is not justified, so therefore it should be reduced to one dollar. That is the purpose of the Motion. That there is no justification for the \$200,000. So it is to be reduced to a dollar. And to enable me to point that out. The reason why I say this, I go back to point out to Your Honour, what our public debt is, and how much is required to service it, so that the figure of \$200,000 is ludicrous, when you compare it with \$40 million, which we spent last year to service our public debt. \$31 million or so to service our public debt, but there was additional millions for interest and capital under the heading of 104, under subhead 104. Such things as Confederation Building, Gander Hospital - the rents that we guaranteed under the leasebacks in other words. We have no choice but to vote them. They have to be paid, we cannot turn it down, it is part of consolidated fund services. And I submit to Your Honour this figure of \$200,000 in that context is totally meaningless. Even two years ago, in the financial year 1967-68, we spent Your Honour, over \$12 million on interest on the public debt alone, over \$12 million. Now what is \$200,000 going to do even in respect of two months, or even one month? And in this current fiscal year from April 1, '69 to March 31, 1970, this current year, we are spending over \$27 million in interest alone, so what good is \$200,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not see the relevancy of the hon. member's remarks, that the Motion before the Committee now is that the amount be reduced to one dollar. Now surely remarks directed to the fact that \$200,000 is not sufficient could hardly be considered to be relevant to the Motion that it be reduced to one dollar.

MR. WELLS: May I suggest to Your Honour, that here is why it is relevant, because it is such a ludicrous amount to put in there, that there is no obvious purpose. It cannot even pay a small portion of our interest. There is <sup>no</sup> indication anywhere in the schedule to the Bill as to what is the purpose of that, and we in this House have a duty upon us to know what the purpose is before we say yes to voting money. We must know, otherwise we just give the Government a blank cheque and walk out of here, and come in every now and then and have a friendly little debate. But our duty is to find out what that money is for, and that is what I want to know now Mr. Chairman.

What is that \$200,000 for? I am not satisfied with it as it appears here in the Bill. There is no satisfactory explanation, and I am using these other references to point out just how ludicrous the amount is in relation to what is needed to service the public debt, and to provide by comparison with what is required in this present year for Consolidated Funds Services. Now by comparison it is a meaningless amount.

HON. E. S. JONES (Minister of Finance): Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

MR. WELLS: The question has been asked. I will yield to allow him to ask Mr. Chairman.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, in preparing the various Estimates or Interim Supply, I do not have detailed breakdowns of these various heads numbering in a total I think of twenty. I have been in this hon. House for fourteen years, and in the past fourteen years, there have been several Bills on Interim Supply brought into the House. And correctly or not, I was always under the impression that it was not necessary in an Interim Supply Bill to bring into the House or into the Committee, details of the anticipated expenditures in the coming year. And following the procedure, I believe was followed by previous finance ministers when it becomes evident that Interim Supply will be required. Instructions are issued to the officials



March 10, 1970,

Tape #300

Page 6

of the department, and to officials of Treasury Board to prepare a Bill for Interim Supply. In this case none of these Items was implicit instructions given to officials of the department, and Mr. Chairman, I doubt if they ever were, to bring in detailed accounts. This year we tried to strike an amount, an anticipated amount which might be needed for two months of the year, and hon.

members of this Committee will notice that in every instance of these accounts the amounts are given in round figures. This is an anticipation what the public service of Newfoundland will need in the two months in the coming financial year.

Now Mr. Chairman, it has already been stated, this Bill will eventually be followed by the Budget and Estimates of the coming year, and some hon. members have said that this is a blank cheque for the Government to go out and spend \$61 million. Of course nothing could be further from the truth. These amounts will be controlled and I think all hon. members know this, that the amounts will only be used to take care of needs as they arise in the public service before the regular Estimates are brought down.

Now Mr. Chairman, the remark has been made, and if I was thin-skinned I would take offense, that this amount is ludicrous. I would like to assure hon. members that we do not act in the Department of Finance in a ludicrous manner. Speaking for my officials I would say that they devote themselves very, very carefully to their work, and if they gave me Mr. Chairman, an amount of \$200,000 as need for the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the first two months of the coming year, I must vote against the Motion to reduce this to one dollar. I am prepared without the details, I am prepared to stand by the information given me by my officials that this is the amount required.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, with all due respects to the hon. the Minister of Finance, that is no answer at all. I am no wiser. Maybe the officials in his department are wiser, maybe they know what the purpose of \$200,000 is, or why it is \$200,000 and not \$20 million. But I am no wiser, and I am the person along with all other hon. members of this Committee answerable to the people of this Province, for approving the expenditure of \$61 million. And I do not see Sir how the Minister of Finance, or any member of Government, can come to this Committee and ask approval for the expenditure of \$200,000 in this case, I do not know what it will be like on the other items. But in this particular case, ask this Committee to approve that expenditure and say well I do not know what it is all about,

but I am sure that the officials of my department must have good reason, or they would not have asked for it. Now what House ever voted money on that basis?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman is supposed to be telling the House, the Committee why in his opinion, it ought to be reduced to a dollar. He ought not to be telling the House until this amendment is disposed of. He ought not to be discussing the \$200,000, but why it should be one dollar. And he is not saying a word along that line. He is not giving us any reasons why, in his opinion, it ought to be reduced to one dollar, instead he is discussing the \$200,000, which was in order for him to do before the existing amendment came before Your Honour. There is an amendment that it be one dollar, that we vote one dollar. Now are we going to debate the question of voting one dollar and dispose of it, and then when it is disposed of, take up the question of voting the \$200,000.

MR. WELLS: May I speak to that point of order Mr. Chairman? As Your Honour will recall I was in the process of saying why it should be reduced to one dollar, and one of the reasons I was giving is there is no apparent connection, no apparent reason for the amount of \$200,000. The Government is just coming in and asking for \$200,000 without giving any apparent reason, and for that reason I am suggesting, I am supporting the amendment that it be reduced to one dollar. Now that is what I was in the process of doing when the Premier interrupted before, and suggested I ask the Minister of Finance. And I thought that would yield information, so I did, and that got me nowhere. So we are still back to the point of debating why it should be reduced to one dollar, which I am now in the process of doing. And to point this out Mr. Chairman, why this amount should be reduced to one dollar, I refer Your Honour to last year's Estimates, and any member of the House who stops to look at last year's Estimates, and look at the amounts required there. Even if you divided by twelve, or by twenty-four, or by six, to figure out whether it is for two weeks or two months, or one month or whatever. The amount still bears no relation to the need, the obvious need. The debt charges are listed, so it is quite clear of what we have to cope with this year. It is not identical to last

1370

year, but it is quite clear that we are going to have to pay the interest under Item 10. And that is not enough to do that. So what is it the Government are asking for. They are coming in and asking for \$200,000 -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order! The hon. gentleman is arguing that it ought to be more, not that it ought to be less. He is completely irrelevant and beside the point.

MR. WELLS: Listen to the argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I might just put an analogy. If I want to buy a white horse, I do not have to explain why it is I do not want a black one. I have to explain why it is I want a white one. Now the Motion before the House is that this be reduced to the sum of one dollar. And hon. members must confine themselves to the matter before the Committee.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, or a point of order that I will raise myself, if Your Honour disposed of that point of order. The Government have come before this House, asking for \$62 million and now the Premier included, and the Minister of Finance, and everybody else stands up here and says, do not debate it. Wait until the Budget is brought in. What are we, a bunch of fools? \$62 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order! I asked the hon. gentleman to take that back. I did not say it should not be debated. Sit down. I say that it ought - whatever debate takes place ought to be in accordance with the rules, and in Committee of the Whole, the rule of relevancy is of the utmost importance, and the hon. gentleman is flouting it, he is ignoring it, and he is telling this Committee where we can go. He does not intend to abide by the rules. The rule of strict relevancy. This \$200,000, or this one dollar.

MR. WELLS: I propose to speak to that point of order Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. WELLS: May I speak to that point of order Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it should be impressed on hon. members that hon. members do not have a right to speak to a point of order. They have a right to raise a point of order. The Chair listens to hon. members speaking on points of order, simply for the enlightenment of the Chair, not for the

benefit of the members. And the point of order has been raised, and I have stated at least three times, that in this Committee of Supply, all debate must be relevant to the Motion which is before the Committee. And the Motion before the Committee now is that Heading 1 be reduced to the sum of one dollar. Now that is the Motion.

MR. WELLS: That is the Motion I am attempting to debate Mr. Chairman, and I submit with respect to Your Honour the matters that I have raised are quite relevant. That there is nothing to show why the \$200,000 is needed, and that is the very reason for the Motion. There is nothing anywhere in the Bill to indicate why \$200,000, but that is why the Motion is to reduce it to one dollar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, the rules say sit down. Sit down according to the rules. Sit down or you will be put out of the House. Obey the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I would like to remind all hon. members that the enforcement of the rules rests with the Chair.

MR. WELLS: Your Honour I missed Your Honour's point of order in that heated exchange with one member shouting at another, and ordering another member around this House. That is contrary to the rules too Your Honour. And in the process I missed Your Honour's point of order, and when Your Honour called me to order immediately prior to this exchange.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point I was going to say was that I do not see the relevancy of showing that the \$200,000 has not been explained as being a reason for a Motion for supporting the Motion for one dollar. Now I know what the hon. member has in mind, but the fact of the matter is that the Chair feels that to be relevant to this Motion, the hon. member must show or speak to the point as to the adequacy or otherwise of the sum of one dollar, not the adequacy or otherwise of the sum of \$200,000.

MR. WELLS: One dollar Your Honour is quite sufficient to do what the Government would have us believe that \$200,000 could do for two months of handling the public debt and debt services. It is so ludicrous Your Honour, that one dollar is just as capable as doing it. It is just a nominal figure. I submit to members of this Committee that what appears under Head 1 of the Expenditure is in fact just a nominal figure, and apparently a figure drawn



out of the air, and one dollar is just as adequate to be a nominal figure as \$200,000. That there is no justification anywhere for the \$200,000, no indication of it anywhere. It is obviously just a nominal figure, one dollar will do quite sufficient. And unless and until we get justification for it, the only proper thing to do is reduce it to one dollar. Now if between now and the time we vote on this amendment, some member on behalf of the Government can give us justification for that \$200,000, I would be quite happy to vote against the amendment. But how can I, Your Honour, decide whether I should vote for or against that amendment unless the Minister of Finance, or the Premier or somebody else tells this Committee, why they want \$200,000. How can I decide whether one dollar is enough for \$200,000. I cannot do it with any degree of intelligence. I am just a rubber stamp otherwise, unless I have this information. And this seems to be the crux of the whole matter. The denial of information, the almost refusal to put information forward, when they are asking for funds. No wonder it is amended to be reduced to one dollar. And when this figure is looked at, \$200,000, it is ludicrous in relation to what it has to cope with. So therefore, it must be only some nominal amount picked out of a hat and thrown in there. And that is all that I can believe unless and until the Minister of Finance, or somebody on behalf of the Government, indicates to the Committee otherwise. That is all I am saying. And before I am asked to vote on this amendment, I would like to know, and I do not think that that is unreasonable, in view of the fact that we are voting, public funds.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has informed the Committee that the officers of the Treasury, the sworn, oath-bound of the Treasury, have informed him that \$200,000 will be necessary, and will be sufficient, and both words are essential, or that figure would not be in the Interim Supply Bill now before us. That \$200,000 is needed, and is sufficient. Now the Minister has informed the Committee of that. That is evidence in itself. That is evidence, that the Treasury Board of this Province, and the Department of Finance of this Province, informed the Minister to inform the Committee, that \$200,000 will be sufficient, and will

March 10, 1970

Tape #301

Page 6

be necessary for the two months. That is why the figure is there. Now what additional evidence is needed. When the Estimates are brought down for the whole year, this will be under that heading, head of Expenditure one, to be many millions for twelve months, but for the two months following after the present month, that is to say the first two months of the new financial year, \$200,000 is sufficient, and \$200,000 is necessary. It is rounded out at \$200,000. It might be \$180,000 or \$190,000, but is rounded out, because it is not an essential point in view of the fact that when the Estimates are brought down for the twelve months, the total will run into many millions. So there has been ample evidence given to the Committee, that this \$200,000 is the amount that the Committee ought to vote, because the Treasury consider

MR. SMALLWOOD: Treasury consider that this is enough and that it is not too much. It is the amount needed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I speak in favour of this amendment, and having heard the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Finance, I am even more strongly in favour of this amendment. Because I have never heard such absolutely atrocious reasoning presented to this Committee, for it to vote \$200,000 before in my life. And an attempt to put the responsibility forth on officials of the Department of Finance. Tripe.

Mr. Chairman, we have no Estimates before us, none, no Estimates of this year before us as they have in other Houses when Interim Supply is asked for. We do not know what the Government's Estimates for the year starting April 1, 1970. We have understood all day that when we get in Committee on this Bill, we are going to get the dope as to why the Government needs the \$62.million.

And yet on the first Item, which the hon. member for Fortune has moved should be reduced to one dollar, the Government themselves have amply shown why it should be reduced to a dollar. Because they can give no reasons for asking for \$200,000 other than officials of the Department of Finance have said is necessary. That is an abrogation Mr. Chairman, of the responsibility of the Minister, of the responsibility of the Government for what goes on in Government. How dare they try to put the responsibility for that \$200,000 there on officials of the Department of Finance. What officials? Which clerk? Is he clerk number six, number seven, Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister? It is trying to abrogate their responsibilities to explain to this House and the people of Newfoundland, why \$62.million is needed, and why \$200,000 is needed for the Consolidated Fund in the next two months, for April and May Mr. Chairman.

And we are given this hogwash, that officials of the Department of Finance have said that this is a nice round amount to put in. The Motion of the hon. member for Fortune, the necessity for supporting and voting in favour of it is amply shown by this failure to give this House Mr. Chairman, any information on this Item. One dollar is even too much. I would say that point one cent will be plenty for this Item. A dollar is excessive. And Mr. Chairman, if we are to be dealt with similarly in all

of those items. I say it is the biggest attempt to get \$62 million out of a House of Assembly without giving any information whatever in the history of a Parliament or a House of Assembly. So I am happy and proud to support the hon. member from Fortune's Motion. A dollar is too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the amendment please say "aye", contrary "nay". The amendment is lost.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, Legislative - the total amount Gross Current Expenditure last year 1969-1970 was \$540,800. The amount requested in Interim Supply this year estimated to cover two months' expenditure is \$135,000, and this Mr. Chairman, is the amount which I believe will be required. I move the movement.

MR. EARLE: May I ask the Hon. Minister a question? Just assuming that the statements have been made for two month's supply, which of course is a sixth of a year. If you figure on a basis of \$135,000 that means the total expenditure for the year should be in the vicinity of \$810,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A lot of trash.

MR. CROSBIE: Order! Order! Order! Order! Order!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet, and I resent the term "trash". I think that calls for an apology.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Utter trash.

MR. CROSBIE: Order!

MR. EARLE: I will go on with my explanation. This would indicate that a total of \$800,000 will be required for the year. All I am asking the Minister Mr. Chairman, is this a fair assumption? Because we are told that this is for two months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How low can a man sink -

MR. CROSBIE: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as he would, I would guess, would know, the hon. gentleman should allow people to speak. If the hon. gentleman is ready I will try to answer the question put by the hon. member for Fortune. The amount in Head (11), Sir, is the amount that will be needed in the next two months, in fact, the House, if the members of the House are paid the second half of the sessional indemnity, it is not one-sixth of the year's requirements because the payments out of this vote are not regular. It is not a vote, say, for short-term assistance or the vote

for hospital insurance in the Department of Health. It is not prorated. The actual expenditure will not be anything like six times that. It will be larger than this, but it will not be six times that.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance following the counselling of the hon. Minister of Health, that this amount of money is required to pay the balance of the money which will become due and owing to hon. members of this House. In view of the fact that hon. members will not be paid until the House completes its business, until the Budget has been brought down, then why the necessity for this \$135,000?

MR. JONES: We do not get paid until after the Budget is brought down, debated and the Estimates passed.

MR. HICKMAN: Then why the \$135,000?

MR. JONES: I think the hon. member's question was that if the members of the Legislative Council are not going to be paid until after the House closes, why this Item is necessary at all. I wonder Mr. Chairman, I do not think if this Item had come in with Nil here, that any hon. member would have been quite happy. Nor do I think it would be possible for me to anticipate the closing date of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about the servants of the House?

MR. JONES: And the servants of the House. I was going to mention that. That at this particular time of the year, March, April and May, Expenditures in the House of Assembly are heavier than when the House is closed for the remainder of the year. And I think it right and proper that some provision should be put in here, some figure in anticipation of what we would expect the current expenditures to be.

MR. HICKMAN: Then the answer of the hon. Minister of Health is not correct? Well, if it includes - that is \$120,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Would not pay the grocery bill.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman this little exchange that we have now just witnessed in an attempt to explain that \$135,000 makes it quite clear. That is how ludicrous this whole thing is. The explanation given by the Minister of Health was a noble effort and a good attempt, and at first flush it sounds quite reasonable. The members of the House in order to get the balance of their salaries would take approximately \$110,000 to \$120,000.



And presumably the other officers of the House would have to be paid, and that would take the balance of the \$135,000. But the hon. member for Burin raises the proper question that makes that answer ludicrous. And then it makes it of no value. If this amount of \$135,000 is including \$110,000 to \$120,000 as members' salaries, then why is it in Interim Supply? Why is it in Interim Supply. Because the members are not normally paid until the end of the Session. They <sup>are</sup> paid in two parts. One part as everybody knows is the beginning, and the other part at the end of the Session. Now if that is the straight forward answer, and the honest explanation, then why is it in Interim Supply? A logical question to ask. Because that time we will have heard the Budget, we will have voted the main Estimates. There is no need for it to be in Interim Supply. Why? That amount should be struck out too. Why is it in Interim Supply? We do not have a satisfactory answer, and I am prepared to yield if any hon. member can give me a satisfactory answer.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can give the hon. member an answer that would be considered satisfactory, but I can try.

The salaries, the sessional indemnities paid to us as members, are paid as, I believe, by orders of the Internal Economy Commission, Sir. The Internal Economy Commission decides when they are to be paid. This amount would include, not in its totality (the hon. member for Burin would realize it does not embrace the totality of it). It is quite simple: If the amount is needed and properly authorized by the Internal Economy Commission, it is to be spent and if not, Sir, as has already been said in the debate, all these amounts are covered by the main estimates which will be tabled in the very near future for the House.

MR. WELLS: Now, Mr. Chairman, that makes it quite clear. The minister now stands up and says, if the amount is to be needed it will be spent. But it is quite obvious to any member who sits in this House that under ordinary circumstances the amount will not be needed until this House has finished its business and prorogues or adjourns for a lengthy period of time. The amount will not be needed until then, so why put it in? If that amount of \$135,000 is put in on that thin a pretext, what about all the other amounts? That again substantiates the argument

we made on the earlier amount and got nowhere with it. The whole thing points out a fundamental fact that we are being asked to vote blindfolded. Without the Estimates in front of us, without any estimation as to what it is for, we are being asked to vote \$62 million blindfolded, to rubber stamp it, and included in that is the \$135,000. I move Mr. Chairman, that the amount be reduced to one dollar, and for the reasons I have already given Your Honour, there has been no justification for it being included in Interim Supply. Now mind you I am not so beneficent that I want to wipe out my salary along with the salary all of the other members. When it comes up in the main Estimates I will then not move that it be reduced to a dollar. I will vote for it, and quite happily so. But what I am saying is there is no justification for asking for authority to spend this amount now. None has been given, and I move Mr. Chairman, that it be reduced to a dollar.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, of course we will oppose the motion, but just for the sake of the hon. gentleman, the continuing problem and one which we are still considering, and we would welcome advice from the other members of the House, as to whether members should be paid monthly, Your Honour is familiar with the present system whereby we are paid in two large gobs (if you can call \$2,666 a gob, it is a lot of money). This has numerous inconveniences not the least of which is the bank managers, the overdrafts build up and then they get whacked down. It has been suggested Sir, and it is being considered that we might pay members monthly as is done I believe Sir, in the House of Commons and the Senate at Ottawa, and I think - Mr. Chairman, this is why we are asking for \$135,000 in this head.

MR. MURPHY: According to that I presume starting the first of April that it is the intention to pay the members monthly?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may rise on this very valid point raised by the hon. Minister of Health. This may have a great deal to commend it. But it has nothing to commend it in respect to the present amount being asked for. Because the fact of the matter is that hon. members have already been paid half their salaries, so obviously it cannot be worked out on a

March 10, 1970

Tape #302

Page 6

basis of being paid monthly from here on to the end of this Session. So that again this sum of \$135,000 is totally unrealistic, and it is an obvious attempt to pulling a figure out of the air, and saying that is as good as we can think of right now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might accept the amendment and cut it to a dollar, and let the servants of the House do without any salary, or anyone else. I think for the Government I will accept the amendment. One dollar O.K? No. All right I do not accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour please say "aye", contrary "nay". I think that Motion was lost.

Item (3)

MR. JONES: This amount voted last year was \$409,800 and here again we feel that we will need the amount of \$103 to take care of our requirements for a period of two months in the coming year. \$103,000.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to have it reduced to one dollar because there are certain expenses in there that are of prime importance and are rather obvious even though they have not been explained. Even though the House has asked to just vote the bulk sum without explanation as to why it is that sum, or to what purpose the sum is going to be applied? But if one looks at the 1969-1970 Estimates one can see that included under this head of Executive Council, is the cost of operating the Lieutenant-Governor's establishment. That has to be paid for, and I do not suggest that that be wiped out. The cost of running the electoral office, that has to be paid for, and we are likely to need that rather soon. We are likely to need that quite soon, so I suggest that that be paid for. However, Mr. Chairman, another amount included is the cost of running the Premier's office, and having

and having seen and witnessed the performance, oh we need a premier but having witnessed the performance

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we have not got one.

MR. WELLS: Of the premier in this committee tonight is not deserving of these things, is not deserving of these things. And the amount asked for should be reduced by that amount.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Close the office.

MR. WELLS: Be effrontery to come into the House and ask for, come to this committee and ask for \$103,000 without explanation as to what it is for, No explanation at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I did come into the House but not on anybody's coat tail.

MR. CROSBIE: Look out for your own next time.

MR. WELLS: I am not sure whether that is relevant to the debate or whether it was intended to be a brilliant observation or a humorous observation or whatever, you know, I think though Mr. Chairman it is indicative of what the Premier is worth in terms of salary, and is as good a reason as any other for reducing it. Mr. Chairman, what we have witnessed in this committee tonight the response of the Minister of Finance to the \$103,000 that we are now discussing, the response of the Premier to the \$103,000 that we are now discussing. How can anybody say it is justified to use any portion of that to pay a salary to the Premier? I can not for the life of me see it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody else can either.

MR. WELLS: To come into this House and ask for that and ask for that money for that purpose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Utterly disgraceful.

MR. WELLS: And we can only presume it is for that purpose, there is no other explanation. It amounts again Mr. Chairman, to saying to the House we want you to authorize it, to lift the lid, and take out \$103,000 without explanation as to what it is for, we do not care what you think, that is in effect what is said to us here, we do not care what you think about that \$103,000. We do not care what the public of Newfoundland think we want it and we are going to have it. and we are going to outvote you if necessary to get it. That is British Parliamentary democracy, Mr. Chairman. Classic example of it that is. It sure points up MR. Chairman, the value or the lack of ability in this House to control the purse strings, which this House is supposed to do. We have no more ability to control what happened to that \$103,000 than any man in Hawkes Bay or Burgeo

or anywhere else who is not a member of this House. We have not the slightest ability, and we are not even told what it is to be used for. Now that is not contempt, and effrontery, what else could it be called. There is no reason no justification I have seen nothing to explain what \$103,000 is going to be used on. I am only assuming Mr. Chairman that a portion of it is going to be used to help maintain the Lieutenant Governor's establishment and a further portion of it is going to cover the expenses, for a one or two months period for the electoral office. I can only assume that, I do not know it, yet I am asked along with every other member in this House to say yes give the Government \$103,000 they will spend it, they will be good boys, they will do what they are supposed to do with it. My officials down in my department say that that is what we should have, well, who are those officials, they are not answerable to this House. But the minister is, and the Premier is, they are the persons who are answerable to this House and quite frankly Mr. Chairman, I do not care what the officials ~~say~~<sup>think</sup>, whether they think it is enough or not enough or too much or anything else it does not matter, what I am concerned with is what the Minister thinks and what the Premier thinks, those are the persons that are answerable to this House.

That is the opinion and knowledge that we want, but there is an obvious total lack of it, it is almost incredible that they should come into this House with this lack of knowledge and ask for this kind of money I can not believe it. I can not believe it but there it is. They are asking for it. I do not know and I have not sufficient information to determine how much the amount should be reduced, because I feel concerned about the maintenance of the Lieutenant Governor's establishment. That has to be maintained expenses met during that period. I do not want to reduce it to a dollar but I am very concerned about a Premier who deals with a House in this way receiving any portion of it because he is most certainly not deserving of a single cent of it. To have the gall to come into the House and ask for this under these conditions, unbelievable, unbelievable.

MR. CROSBIE I thank the hon. and humble member for Burin for allowing me to get first I am having difficulty in getting this microphone, it is between me and the hon. member for Humber East. Mr. Chairman, this amount that we are being asked to approve here, \$103,000 Executive Council, is an amount that comprises 23 per cent of what was voted last year under this heading en toto, so it is not just sufficient money to operate the services under Executive Council for two months it is 23 per cent



of what the House voted en toto for this present year ending March 31, 1970 and it is obviously for that reason must be too high. In addition Mr. Chairman, since the Government frankly admits that they are asking for at least two months supply I wish to move that the amount of \$103,000 be reduced in half and half of that would be \$51,500 so that the item, Executive Council would be changed to \$51,500 and my submission Mr. Chairman, in dealing with all these amounts that we are being asked to vote on the same thing should be done one month's supply, interim supply is more than enough, the members of this committee the members of the House the public of Newfoundland have got no information before them in any detail as to how these amounts are going to be voted it is the power of the public purse which we are supposed to be in control of, the members of the House, Mr. Chairman. Apparently there is absolutely no control in this committee presumably we are going to be able to debate the principle of this whole operation this nefarious operation before the night is out, so I think it is amply shown Mr. Chairman, that this is a raid, a raid somewhat akin the great train robbery, that is going on in this House tonight for \$61.6 million and I submit Mr. Chairman that the position this committee should be that we should be able to ask the ministers in charge of these departments any question we want to ask them about the affairs of their departments, about the policy of their departments and that we should be able to express their views on any matter pertaining to that department the same as if the estimates were before the House and I therefore intend Mr. Speaker intend to do that in every item from now on, subject to your ruling. You overrule me on one item then I will try it again on the next because I consider this Mr. Speaker, that we should be dealing with these items as if we were dealing with the estimates. This is Her Majesty's Government being granted supply by the commons and the great commoners are supposed to control what supply Her Majesty gets, and we have no control whatsoever Mr. Chairman, if you do not act to help protect the rights of the minorities in this House so Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and I hope that this money will be used properly for the Lieutenant Governor's establishment and that the hon. the Premier will keep in mind what the hon. member for Humber East has said and perhaps forego his salary for a month until we get through the regular supply I will therefore move that this amount be reduced, be cut in half.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Motion is item 3 be reduced to \$51,500.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may have a word in support of this motion, this

obviously is not one of the items that will cause great hardship by being reduced by 50 per cent. The important function in so far as this vote is concerned is to keep the offices and the establishment of the Lieutenant Governor operating. I cannot completely go along with the suggestion of the hon. the member for St. John's West, the hon. the minister of Finance has not been answering the questions. He has very much to my knowledge answered the questions that have been put to him so far and before I am asked to vote on that and why I have to support this motion but may be the hon. the minister of Finance can change my mind. I am wondering if in this vote there is some items included Mr. Minister that have not been contained in the vote of last year. And in particular I would like to draw the committee's attention to the fact that since the main estimates were approved last year there has been a great revolution within the Province of Newfoundland, a great revolution within this House and a new and responsible highly commendable highly appreciated office has been created that comes under the vote of the Executive Council. Now, I am directing these remarks to the hon. the minister of Finance and I note that he is in close consultation with the new office holder and I have no doubt that he will consult with him before giving his learned answer. And the question and the thought that is going through my mind Mr. Chairman, is this that now that the anxiety of the Government to provide an improved administrative service, and the anxiety of the Government to relieve the hon. the Premier of his onerous and his onerous burden of leading in this Province.

The Government has provided for and created the new office of deputy-premier and obviously the deputy-premier is a very learned gentleman and very patriotic gentleman so that I would think that we would be pushing our imagination a bit too far if we are expecting him to hold this office free of charge, as patriotic as he might be and even if he was prepared to work for nothing obviously the administrative staff that is necessary to make the office of deputy-premier effective will cost a great deal of money and my question to the hon. minister of Finance is this: How much is included in the vote of \$135,000 to go to toward the salary and the office of deputy-premier which was created on or about Nov. 2 according to a solemn statement made in this House since it opened?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a standing rule has been for years I know every since Confederation, supplementary supply, interim supply I am sorry, cannot be used for any new subhead, that any expenditures made from interim supply can only be used under subheads that were approved in the House in the previous year or should I say the current year. So having stated that Mr. Chairman, the answer

to my hon. friend's question is that the amount is nil.

MR.HICKMAN: Does this mean Mr. Minister that the staff and the office of the deputy-premier will have to wait until the budget is brought down and be paid retroactive?

MR.SPEAKER(Noel): Item 3 carried. Item 4.

MR.EARLE: This is along the same lines as the previous question I asked, it would appear in this item as well as several others and indicated increased expenditure. Now I do not have to be told that the expenditure within the department varies, in different periods to different periods, but the department of Finance is one department in which the expenditure from month to month is fairly routine, unless of course included in this amount are the, is the purchase of additional equipment or something of that nature. I would like to ask the minister, in the light of the fact the amount that is asked for is supposedly to cover two months, it indicates a very heavy increased expenditure for that department for the coming year. Is that the additional equipment purchased or something of that nature?

MR.JONES: The amount voted last year was \$3,157,100 Current Account, we are asking for an amount of \$788,000 which as I have said previously is what we anticipated would be needed. These amounts will be spent under the following subheads as the need arises. Minister's Office: General Administration, which is made up of General Office, Audit Division. Taxation Division: Central Accounts: Pensions: Payrolls: Data Processing: Collector of Revenue, General Mail Division so forth and so on. Now I brought in answer to a previous question Mr. Chairman, I said expenditures under Interim Supply can only be applied to subheads already approved, therefore my answer to the, my hon. friend's question is that I do not anticipate any great increase in expenditures in the department of Finance in the coming year and to be answering them specifically if it is, we are anticipating making any heavy expenditures in new equipment or what have you, that Mr. Speaker, would be a capital account expenditure is not under consideration here.

MR.EARLE: The answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, capital expenditure. I have taken the task earlier this season that I did not include capital expenditure the minister now says that capital expenditure is not included in this item. Is that correct?

MR.JONES: Mr. Chairman, in reaching a figure for interim account is not usual to

anticipate expenditures under capital account, that is my understanding.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, quite obviously the Minister of Finance is right and the hon. the Premier was wrong earlier in the day when he said these amounts included, the amounts for Capital Account and the member for Fortune District was quite right and was not so stupid as he was pictured earlier by a certain person.

MR. CROSBIE: Now Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, the amount requested here for the Department of Finance is \$788,000. my mathematician tells me that it is twenty five per cent of the amount that was voted for this present year for the twelve months of this present year. In other words it is enough to cover three months ordinary operation to the Department of Finance.

MR. WELLS: It is more than one third

MR. CROSBIE: No twenty five per cent is what my expert tells me. I have not hundreds or thousands of civil servants to advise me Mr. Chairman. There is just a small group of us here, but one is an expert mathematician. At twenty five per cent of last year's vote, we are told that this is supposed to be Interim Supply to cover two months operations, but in this case it is going to cover three months at least and I therefore am going to move in a moment Mr. Chairman that the amount be reduced, but before doing that the Department of Finance is a department that pays the accounts of various Royal Commissions and we have seen, we have figures Mr. Chairman that show that the Price, Waterhouse Report for example cost \$53,000. The report on economic prospects, the Pushie Report \$328,000. The Kostaszek Report on housing \$104,000. the Bonnie, Watkins Report of recent fame \$14,000. Bonnie, Watkins was supposed to straighten out Pushie because the Pushie Report which cost \$328,000. did not reach the right conclusions according to the Government anyway, or the head of the Government so Bonnie, Watkins was brought on the scene and \$14,000. was spent to have Bonnie, Watkins correct Pushie, but Pushie survived Bonnie, Watkins. The Forristall Report \$20,000. Mr. Chairman. The Royal Commission on Forestry to date \$55,000. which has not reported yet and was appointed two years ago, three years ago, certainly two years ago. The Fraser Royal Commission on the city of St. John's, taxation in the city of St. John's which was appointed in 1966, January 1966 has still not reported but the cost to date is \$23,735.42.

Now all these amounts Mr. Chairman add up to \$600,000. for Royal Commission studies either completed or partly under way, and that is not the full list. There are other Royal Commissions and groups studying various matters. My point is this Mr. Chairman, that I would like the assurance of the hon. Minister that none of this money voted is going to be paid to Royal Commissions or groups whose reports the Government are going to treat so cavalierly as they treated some of the reports that I have mentioned. The Forristall Report the cost of which was shared by the Government and the Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company Limited, the Interim Report is forbidden to be given to members of this House by the hon. the Premier. The final report we are told is not yet in, but



the interim report was in two years ago. Now what has happened to the final report? Surely to God Mr. Chairman, if an interim report comes in two years ago a group of research people, of experts, of engineers can bring in a final report within a period of two years later unless Mr. Chairman, someone does not want them to bring in the final report because they did not like the interim report. So I do not want to see Mr. Chairman, any money in this vote wanged out on studies or Royal Commission Reports that the Government either, does not want to get, or when it gets does not want to implement. The Pushie Report of course is the one well known example of that. \$328,000. for the report of the Royal Commission on economic prospects put on the shelf, the cob webs grew on that after the first going over of it. I asked a question here Mr. Chairman, as to was there any committee or group in the Government continuing to study the Pushie Report, and the answer was that the Premier himself still had that report under consideration.

Well we heard, we heard about the consideration he was giving it. The hon. member was giving it, ninety per cent trash was his verdict on it last year Mr. Chairman, so we can see what consideration the Pushie Report on economic prospects is getting now. We are going to have an economic prospects conferebce apparently to straighten out the Pushie Report, Bonnie, Watkins not having straightened it out. So Mr. Chairman, \$600,000. in that little group of Royal Commissions and study groups, Kostaszek on housing, we never heard about his report in the glorious Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne. So I would like to ask the minister a question; this is just preliminary Mr. Chairman leading up to my questions, and that is whether any of this amount is going to be spent on the Royal Commission Reports, or reports of study groups or other groups. That is one question.

Now to get on to something better. Would the hon. the minister Mr. Chairman inform the House whether a replacement has yet been found for his Deputy Minister? Mr. Groom who we understand, the House understands is leaving the Government service at the end of this month. The Deputy Minister of Finance is the senior Government official, Mr. Groom, anybody who has had anything to do with him has a very high opinion of his abilities. Certainly his ability to raise money has been of great assistance to this Government, and I think Mr. Chairman that we should be told by the minister whether a replacement has been found for Mr. Groom as Deputy Minister of Finance, because, in twenty-one days time Mr. Groom is gone, and we do not know what is going to be in the stable after the groom is left. I would like the hon. minister to let us know what is happening

1000

with his Deputy Minister of Finance.

Of course the hon. Mr. Groom had two functions, one was Deputy Minister of Finance, the other was financial advisor to the hon. the Premier and there may have been another one. Financial advisor to the hon. the Deputy Premier.

HON. F.W. ROWE: (Minister of Education): Point of Privilege Mr. Chairman. If the hon. gentleman wishes to refer to officials of the Government, in this case the highest ranking official of the entire Government, he should refer to him correctly. That gentleman's senior capacity and position is as a servant of this House, one of the two servants of this House. Comptroller of the Treasury. So if my hon. friend is going to refer to him, and I am not joking on this Mr. Chairman, at least he should refer to him correctly. He is, he did have three capacities; and one of these and the senior one was as the advisor to this House as Comptroller of the Treasury. He was also Deputy Minister of Finance and he was also financial advisor to the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have this explanation from the Minister, this information from the minister, because it is not usually so easy to get any information from that hon. gentleman or any other opposite when it is something really important to this Province. I am fully aware of the fact that Mr. Groom is also Comptroller of the Treasury

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Why did you not say so?

MR. CROSBIE: I always like to listen Mr. Chairman to my hon. friend, because his rotund phrases and general fluency is pleasant to listen to. Now to get back to the item under discussion Mr. Chairman, there was a question about Mr. Groom, a question about Royal Commissions, Public Accounts. The Public Accounts Mr. Chairman there is a motion on the Order Paper now to appoint a Select Committee on the Public Accounts, can the hon. minister advise the House whether this will be done before we adjourn so that the committee can meet during the recess, the twenty-seven days we are going to be recessed so that the committee can meet and go about its business and clear up the business of the Auditor General's report and the Public Accounts. If that is not the case can the hon. Minister explain to the committee why this is not going to happen, because once the House goes back into session on April 5th. Mr. Chairman, we are going to be put to it afternoon, and evening, and I got my dirty suspicion that at some point we are going to be put to it morning, afternoon and evening, particularly when the estimates come up to try to reduce the 17,000 questions to 9,000 or 10,000. The proper time for that Select Committee to meet Mr. Chairman, is while this

House is adjourned.

Let us get down to it on the Public Accounts, let us find out all about what the Auditor General has said, whether there is anything much to it and whether this House should take any further action. What letters were exchanged between certain parties. Atlantic Brewing whoever they may be and so on. I think that is three questions Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the House so I will not ask any others until I see what the hon. gentleman's answers are. Just a minute, I did ask the Minister of Finance Mr. Chairman three questions. When the hon. minister nods his head, does that mean that he is not going to answer?

Well Mr. Chairman, in the face of such consummate obstinency, such contempt for the rights of the members of this House when the Government is asking them to vote \$788,000. for the Department of Finance in my wrath I would move that it be reduced to one dollar except that I am thinking Mr. Chairman of the civil servants and that they must be paid. I therefore will only move that it be reduced to the amount of \$350,000. which is plenty for the Department of Finance to get along for one month. It might encourage them to bring the budget down a little earlier and give us the estimates Mr. Chairman. If they are put on the squeeze perhaps \$75,000. would be enough, but being a fair minded individual I move that it be reduced to \$350,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item 4, be reduced to \$350,000.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I support that motion Sir, I did not really have all that much reason to before except, because I did not know. I did not know what the money was going to be spent for and I still do not, but I have a good reason now to support that motion the best reason I have had all night. To see the response of the Minister of Finance to the questions that were asked, to see his response, he nodded his head and said nothing about it, and yet he comes and asks for \$788,000. a portion of which will pay his salary for the next two months. There is one thing that I want the Minister of Finance to take due note of, that whatever amount is voted, that it is the express wish of this committee that none of it be used to pay his salary. He is not deserving of it. A man who treats, a minister who treats the House that way, the committee that way, and still comes and asks ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rules of relevancy are very difficult to apply but very easy to break apparently. The motion is that the item 4, be reduced to \$350,000. and I do not see...

MR. WELLS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, one of the primary reasons for reduction of

that Mr. Chairman is to insure that the Minister of Finance does not receive any salary in respect of the period for which this money is voted. Because any minister who has such contempt for the House, that he will come and ask for that kind of money and then nod, apparently sagely, but obviously not sagely in response to a question asked by a member of the House as to what the money is going to be used for, or whether or not it is going to be used for any of those purposes that he enumerated, and the minister makes no response, gives no answer, and

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. There are many rules in the House and this is one. Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman after having called the attention of the House or of the committee to the conduct of members in insisting on irrelevance or repetition may direct him to discontinue his speech. Apart from the rule of relevancy there is also the rule of repetition.

MR. WELLS: Thank you Your Honour. Those are, the reasons I have already given are only a couple of the reasons. There are a variety of others, but it is rather difficult to make up ones mind as to whether the motion to reduce to that amount should be supported or not without adequate information. One bit of information I would like Mr. Chairman, is whether or not any of these funds will be spent under subhead 402-02, -03, -04 and -05.....

MR. WELLS: whether or not any of these Items, whether or not any of the money that the Minister asks the House to vote will be spent on any of those Items. Will he now answer that question for the Committee?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, if expenditures are required under these headings, it was inadvertently that I did not go through the whole list of sub-heads when I spoke earlier. I did not mean to say that none would be spent on these, but if the need arises for monies to be spent under 4030405 - I think these are the three.

MR. WELLS: 402-02-03-04-05. On Page 19 of last year's Estimates.

MR. JONES: Is my hon. friend referring to the sub-heads -

MR. WELLS: Sub-head 402, General Administration down to Item 02, or down to paragraph 02 Items 03-04-05.

MR. JONES: I can only say Mr. Chairman as I repeated before that if Expenditures are required under these sub-heads, naturally they will be spent. I cannot say at this moment if or not we will need funds under these particular sub-heads.

MR. WELLS: Can the Minister advise the Committee under what sub-heads he is sure he will need money?

MR. JONES: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot assure the Committee under which sub-head I feel that we will need precise amounts of any amounts. This is a provision for expenditures which may or may not be needed in the coming year. For me to say here now under which sub-heads they would be spent, and how much, I am afraid I would be well probably anticipating the Estimates for the coming year in their entirety. But it is at the end of March when our fiscal year ends, we will require expenditures under numerous sub-heads to carry on the public service. But I am not in a position and I am only repeating what I said earlier that I am not in a position. I do not know, I cannot anticipate what the exact and precise expenditures under any sub-head will be come April or May.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, can the minister advise the Committee by what means the odd amount of \$788,000 was arrived at? If he does not know any of these answers.

MR. JONES: All of these amounts as I said again repeating is based on anticipation, but it is not a guess-timate. I will not use the word officials, because when I use the word officials a few moments ago Mr.



Chairman. I was blatantly accused of trying to shirk my responsibility and throwing it over on officials and I can assure this Committee that I do not wish to do that. I have been long enough in public life both as a civil servant and as a politician and a minister, that I know responsibility when I see it, and I hate for any civil servant to think that I was asking them to take responsibility for something which is really mine. Now I take full responsibility of what is in here. I do not want this Committee to think that I want to throw it over on officials.

The question I believe is what computation we used in arriving at this figure. Again I can only repeat what I say, I, I use the word "I" looked at Expenditures for the past year. I looked at probably, looking into the future, as to what I might need in my department for the coming year, at least in the first two months of the coming year. And based on my experiences in the past, and my anticipated needs for the future, we came up with a figure of \$788,000. Now to ask me to allocate this \$788,000 Mr. Chairman, to different sub-heads and sub-paragraphs, would be going into a debate such as one would anticipate in Supplementary Supply, or in the Estimates as a whole. As I said earlier Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, I am subject to correction. This has never been the procedure in this hon. House, and I think every member would agree with me that it has not been the custom in this House, or in this Committee rather, to bring in detailed accounting of Interim Supply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or any House in the world.

MR. JONES: Well Sir, Mr. Chairman, this is the only House in the world -

MR. WELLS: It applies to the House of Commons in Ottawa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour please say "aye" contrary "nay". The motion is lost.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, before Item (4) is carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (4) is carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I stood up when Your Honour said "shall Item (4) carry? Somebody shouted "carried" and went on to (5). I do not know what has to be done. I want to debate it. May we have the consent of the House, the Committee to revert.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. The hon. gentleman is the one who stopped the Minister of -

MR. WELLS: I am not the one, everybody else did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no one else, only that hon. gentleman alone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. WELLS: That is another \$700,000 without authority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (5)

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister of Provincial Affairs or the Minister of Finance as the case may be, I do not know who is more appropriate to answer it. But to advise under what particular sub-heads or general sub-heads it is anticipated that these funds will be needed. Is there any peculiar expenses capital work, or is there any expense included in there for sports and recreation activity and promotion, as normally comes under that department?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, again I say that I am not aware of any peculiar or special extraordinary expenses in the Department of Provincial Affairs, but the Expenditures will be used as the need arises under the various sub-heads as set down in the current Estimates for 1969-'70. And this amount Mr. Chairman, is what I feel that I will need to effectively operate the Department of Provincial Affairs, or at least make it possible for my colleague to operate it. And I move the adoption of Head (5).

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know on what basis if this is intended to be as has been indicated to us, if this is intended to be for a two month period, on what basis the amount now asked for as Interim Supply equalled roughly one-quarter of the amount voted last year for the whole department, which it does. Is there any additional expense that drives it up to that? Or is the the general expense anticipated to go by that, and can we anticipate that the general Government expenditure is to increase by twenty-five percent. Why \$307,000 if it is going to be for approximately two months? Again the Department of Provincial Affairs is a department which has a relatively steady and regular monthly expense? Is there any unusual expense that requires approximately one-quarter of what was required last year for a two month period. Or is this just the figure pulled out of a hat?

MR. NICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to support the amount that has been sought for the Department of Provincial Affairs if

I could get some assurance from the House, and in particular from the Minister of Provincial Affairs, these monies that are unusually high for a two month period will be spent in implementing the announced recreational program three years ago, in Springdale. The Government is now faced with the position where the mining company and the Town Council and the various Service Clubs have indicated that they are prepared to find, and indeed they have found the twenty-five percent of the funds necessary to build an arena, and other sport facilities in Springdale.

This money is in hand ready willing and able to be spent, and all that is required is the announced seventy-five percent that the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs is to put into that arena. In the town of St. Lawrence, the Aluminum Company of Canada has indicated clearly that it will put up its twenty-five percent of the immediate construction of athletic and recreational facilities in the town of St. Lawrence. And they do that for two reasons. (1) That the Aluminum Company of Canada was quite happy to avail of the announced Government policy to contribute seventy-five percent of the cost of that facility and (2) there is no Company in Canada that is so indebted to a town as is the Aluminum Company of Canada indebted to the town of St. Lawrence.

Mr. Chairman, if that vote of \$307,000 contains a provision for the erection of the recreational facility in accordance with the announced policy in Springdale, and in St. Lawrence, and in any other communities that have indicated they are prepared to avail of this, then I am all for it. But I do think that this Committee is entitled to definitive statement and commitment from the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, that the recreational facility in St. Lawrence will be started forthwith. The plans are prepared, the Estimates have been prepared. We know the cost, we know the cost of Springdale. I believe we know the cost of at least one similar facility in the Carbonear-Harbour Grace area, and with that information the only thing that is now preventing the Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs from carrying out his intended purpose. And the obligation that he wants to fulfill is the voting of certain sums of money, and I cannot for the life of me see how \$307,000 could be spent otherwise. There is more than sufficient there to cover the cost of paying the staff of the

1395

March 10, 1970

Tape #305

Page 5

Department of Provincial Affairs. There is more than enough to pay the cost of operating ENO. The thought has occurred to me that there has been a suggestion Mr. Speaker, that accommodation would be found in Butterpot Park under the park underneath the rock there, a cave would be tunnelled to hide the members of the Executive Council in the event of an atomic attack. It could be

that \$307,000 is for that noble purpose, but I can think of a far nobler purpose Mr. Chairman, and that is to provide recreational facilities for St. Lawrence, Springdale, Carbonear, and maybe Happy Valley, they too, and Botwood. Botwood is a supreme example Mr. Chairman. Botwood too - in Grand Bank we have managed to survive and win rather astounding soccer championships without the aid government. We are pinning our hopes on the Yugoslav Pavilion, that too comes under Provincial Affairs, and maybe again that \$307,000 covers the cost of erecting the Yugoslav Pavilion.

<sup>is</sup>  
If that amount for that purpose, it obviously is not to pay the servants of the department Mr. Chairman, because \$30,000 or \$40,000 would cover the salary bills for the next two months. So obviously we are about now to see the great launching of the recreational facility program for various parts of Newfoundland. We are about to see the erection of the Yugoslav Pavilion, and if there is anything left over, there will be a tunnel under the mountain in Butterpot Park to protect my hon. friends from atomic attack, or any other attack that might follow a general election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman ought to have known, and if he did not know, the Minister of Finance told him earlier tonight that in Interim Supply, no new votes are allowed, not permitted. There is no provision in any of these Interim Supply votes for anything new, nothing new. The time for anything new is when the Estimates are brought down, the main Estimates, and the Budget. That is the time, the proper time, and the constitutional time for the Government to announce any new program. Its intention to proceed with this or that or the other, and the purpose of Interim Supply, is to carry on the ordinary routine of government for the period covered. And the announcements of new programs or new schemes, is always made in the Budget Speech at the time that the main Estimates are brought down. So everything that the hon. gentleman has said, is about a matter that will to wait until the main Estimates come down.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we finish this Item, I rise to support the hon. member for Burin in his concern in the matter he has mentioned. I will not mention all the places that he has mentioned, but all that he has mentioned, I fully support immensely. Because I feel Mr. Chairman, that they deserve the full benefits of the recreational program, that the



hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs is going to institute - it was announced by the Government in the Fall of 1967 for the Province of Newfoundland. Now I am very disappointed Mr. Chairman, to find out from the hon. the Premier that there is nothing new in these amounts that we are being asked to vote to the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, \$307,000 for these purposes.

I am sure that the amount does include some money for the operation of our Arts and Culture Center. And I would point out Mr. Chairman, to the Committee, that several days ago, we had a very, very serious recommendation from the senior minister without portfolio from Harbour Main, who said that he was shocked at the kind of production that was being put on the stage at the Arts and Culture Center here in St. John's. Now I am not sure as to what production he was referring. It could be "Tomorrow Will Be Sunday" by Harold Horwood, or it could be "Cat On A Hot Tin Roof" which is like some of the hon. members opposite, when it comes to answering questions in this House about money being voted on. Or it could be "Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolfe", but I just bring this to the attention of the minister Mr. Chairman. He needs to take seriously the recommendations made by his colleague.

Now to get back to something that is more on the point. In view of the information given the House by the hon. the Premier, that there is nothing new in the way of recreational programs, except the usual one dollar voted each year from 1967. I move Mr. Chairman, that the amount of \$307,000 be reduced to the sum of \$150,000, because that is more than sufficient to enable the Minister of Provincial Affairs to carry on his affairs in his department for at least a month, for the month of April, 1970.

The hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs has not presented to this House, any evidence that he needs any money at all except sufficient to pay salaries during that month. I therefore move Mr. Chairman, that the amount be reduced to \$150,000, and I think that in making that Motion, I err on the side of generosity. Still since we have been asked to vote this amount blindly, it is just as well to be generous blindly as it is to be generous with your eyes wide open. I therefore make that Motion Mr. Chairman.

1395

100

MR CHAIRMAN: The Motion is that Item 5 be reduced to \$150,000, those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay. I declare the motion lost.  
Item (6)

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen are so anxious to get information, I am wondering that they do not give a chance for the ministers that have not so far any time been given a chance to stand and give a word of explanation at the beginning. They seem to be more obsessed with making speeches rather than giving information. Now I shall try to give a little bit of, and may I express my solicitude, may I thank the hon. member for Burin for his solicitude about me and my office, my expenses and my salary, and may I in turn extend my sympathy to him. It has not all been roses and sunshine tonight for him either, and he has my solicitude too. We are all in this. Mr. Chairman, we cannot get all that we want anyway. We have to suffer these frustrations sometimes.

Mr. Chairman, the largest amount on this list is for education, and the reason is obvious of course for education is the single biggest expenditure in the Government in Newfoundland, as it is I think in the Government of every Province in Canada. Last year this House voted and I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that it voted an Estimate of just over \$80.million. The bulk of which is on current account. I think my memory is that only about \$6.million of that was on capital account, and about \$74.million or over was on current account. This is pretty standard ratio for again obvious reasons, because in education, the single biggest vote of all in this House is for teachers' salaries.

We have nearly 7,000 teachers, and last year we had to vote I think it was \$32.million for teachers' salaries, and of course we have to keep in mind that even to stand still with teachers' salaries, you have to find each year about ten percent more than you found the year before. The reason for it being three-fold. (1) That in any one year the student population increases by four to five thousand, and translate that into terms of teachers, you have to find in any one year, from 150 to 200 more teachers than you had the year before, which means you have to find their salaries as well. And again in any one year we have about 2,000 teachers studying at the University, and many of them will come out at the end

of the year in May, the end of the University year and go into teaching in September. And because they have been at University for one year, or two or three years, they have up-graded themselves and every year of up-grading means an increase, an automatic increase in salary of over \$1,000 a year. So that if a teacher came in with Grade 1 and spent three years at the University and came out with Grade 4, that teacher would automatically get something of the order of \$3,500 to \$4,000 more than he or she got at the moment he entered University.

And then of course we have a system of teachers' scale, they are based on increment, so that the average teacher, who had been teaching say for four years, will get an increment of several hundred dollars for the fifth year and the sixth year, and however long the scale lasts. And the majority of our teachers would be on scales, so that to stand still, merely for teachers' salaries alone we have to find in the case of a block amount we would have to find let us say the stand-still for next year, something of two and a half to three million dollars more for teachers' salaries than we found last year.

And in general for the education vote, in order to stand still, in order to be like Alice in Wonderland, to run as fast as you can just to stay in the same place, we have to find roughly, and this is not my figure, I do not need to tell the Committee that I do not sit down with a pencil and compute this. We have 7,000 teachers for example who have different classifications, and their salaries depend on classifications, grades, and on years of service, and sometimes there are other factors as well.

Well, these things are all computerized in the Department of Finance, and by officials in the Department of Education. And they come up with a rough approximation. What they tell me that in order for us to stand still in education from one year to another, not to introduce any new service, not to introduce any increase in salary for teachers or any increases in the amount of service like student aid, or grants to boards. In order to stand still we have to find ten percent more each year. So last year we had to find over \$80 million, when I say last year, I mean the year we are now in, and will be ending in a few weeks time. We have to find over \$80 million for the educational plans in Newfoundland, programs

1400

in Newfoundland, this coming year and I am not revealing any secret of the Budget, but this is common knowledge, this coming year, in order to stand still we would have to find roughly ten percent more than that. In other words we would have to find \$88 million merely to stay in the same place.

Now Mr. Chairman, just a few words on the general items of Expenditure. I can refer to just a few of them. For school supplies for example, we voted this past year over \$2 million, that is to purchase the school equipment, text books particularly. For teachers' salaries we voted \$32.3 million, and for grants to boards, we voted something of the order of \$8.3 million, I think it came to. It was over \$8 million anyway last year, and the House will recall that during the year the Government announced that we would, because certain boards were in financial trouble, because of the changes that have taken place, integration and consolidation and so on during the year - the first year this is happened - we were prepared to advance another 500,000 and would ask this House to supply that amount in Supplementary Supply. So our grants to boards then during the current year would have cost us about \$8.5 million or something better than that.

And again in order to stand still for the coming year, merely to stand still allowing for incremental increases in board responsibility, we would have to find something more than that figure for grants to boards. Under our Parent's Subsidy, or the Mothers' Allowance we call it, we voted last year something like \$2.4 million. And that is paid out in two installments. One of those installments is paid out in the month of April in the new financial year, and the idea is of course to get that in the hands of the parents that they may be able to utilize it for their children while they are still in school, in some cases for examination costs and the acquisition of summer clothing and so on.

Then another major vote is for Student Aid, students at the University. Our total for that last year came just over \$2 million. I mentioned school supplies, over \$2 million. Transportation is another major item, and these transportation grants are to boards paid out insofar as is possible on a monthly basis. This year we will spend about \$300 thousand I think it is, and next we can assume we are going to have to find more. Then again on capital last year we voted for \$1 million. Now my hon.

1401

friend is of course quite in that as a rule capital payments are not made in the first month, or the first two months of the year. But there are some capital payments that he must very know that have to be paid in the first months. For example, we have to find capital amounts for equipment for our great College of Trades over here, and for the twelve Vocational Schools we have around Newfoundland. And if on the tenth day of April, they are out of vital equipment, we have to find it, in the same way that we have to find payments for our text books. We have to order our text books, as the hon. member for Fortune knows very well. We have to place the order for text books in the winter and spring months. We have to make payments on those text books, so that we may have them in our hands in time for distribution to the schools during the summer months, so that the schools will have them on the first day of September. You do not have to wait until the first day of September to send out \$4 million worth of text books. Again payments have to be found for those things during the first two months of the year, of the financial year that is. There are a number of other items Mr. Chairman. Scholarships is another very good item. Bursaries for example. We spent \$.5 million simply on Confederation bursaries alone. These are to assist children who would otherwise have to go to one or two or three room schools. To leave their homes and to go to a large school and board say in Corner Brook, or Grand Falls, or Lewisporte, Springdale, or right here in St. John's - there are hundreds of them in here.

MR. WELLS: Any of those amounts paid out in April and May?

MR. ROWE: Yes, they are paid monthly throughout the year. The bursary



The bursary is worth \$500 , on a ten month basis - \$50 a month. Macauley Hall, for example, over here in the Holy Heart of Mary High School, has a large number of students from all around Newfoundland, especially from the East Coast. They come in there and they pay their board there at Macauley Hall. They are depending partially, not wholly, of course, on this, because \$50 a month obviously would not cover their expenses but \$50 a month is a great help. They are depending on that and the institution is depending on that. That is paid on a monthly basis, so we have to find that money, just as we have to find the salaries etc for teachers.

Public Examinations is another fairly large vote which costs between \$300 thousand and \$400 thousand a year, and there are expenses for those. The examinations take place in June so that there are obviously expenses in April and May.

It goes without saying that our staff in the Vocational and Technical Colleges have to be paid, over and above the teachers' salaries that I referred to.

Our grant to the University is amortized on a monthly basis, as well. This was an arrangement we made a couple of years ago. That is a very sizable vote. Our grant to the University last year was \$9.7 million. There you have to amortize that on a two month basis, and there you will have to find upwards of \$2 million. We have other grants as well. Let me say this in respect of other grants - we make other grants to institutions like Dalhousie University and "M.I." (not "M.I.T.") Nova Scotia Tec. There is one for the students there. Only yesterday, as a matter of fact, I received a letter from the Principal of Nova Scotia Tec. thanking me for the cheque that he had received in respect of that particular period. Again my hon. friend from Fortune Bay knows this. He has had the experience there. Most of those people to whom grants are made are just waiting. They owe the money. It may only be a small grant, \$2,000 or \$5,000 to the Morvarians or to the Retarded Children or whoever it is, but most of these people are just waiting for the new year to start because they owe money to the banks, they owe money for other bills, trade bills etc. And as soon as the year starts they are on our doorstep looking for some money, if not the whole amount at least part. Although, Mr. Chairman, I think I have covered most of it here, this year past we voted, as another example, a block vote of nearly \$700 thousand for new district school superintendents all over Newfoundland. This is part of the reorganization and conciliation of boards. That money has to be paid

out on a monthly basis because, in part, that goes for the salaries of those superintendents and in fact most of it does go that way.

The training of teachers at the university, that is the indenture grant, is a very sizable amount, \$600 thousand. And we have curriculum services etc. As I said, I did not sit down with a pencil and calculate like that but I can tell the Committee that on this figure of \$18 million we must bear in mind that a great deal of it has to be amortized on a monthly basis but that in some cases blocks have to be paid out as in the case, for example, of the Mothers' Allowances, which cheques must go out in the early part of April.

These cheques are being made ready now to go in the mail April 2 or April 3. The officials in the Department of Finance and the officials in the Department of Education work in constant consultation on these matters. Their figure, not mine, and their advice to me and to the Minister of Finance is that for two months we would need approximately \$18 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I move that this amount be voted.

MR EARLE: I thank the hon. minister for a very comprehensive statement which I think could be almost classed as a speech.

MR SMALLWOOD: Here! Here!

MR EARLE: It is not quite as good as some that we have heard.

Just one point: This vote would seem to indicate far more than a general ten per cent increase, which the minister says is required to just stand still. We all know that. Those of us who have been familiar with education know that the steady increment there is certainly in the vicinity of ten per cent.

There is one point which he missed and which I would rather like to question him on: As we do not have supplementary supply before us yet, we have no idea if there was an over-expenditure in that department last year, and the indication is here that the expenditure for next year may be a bit higher - I am wondering if, and if so, what part of additional expansion is brought about by the change in the department in so far as the new system of the denominational offices is concerned. These, under the Warren Report, have now been moved outside the department. As I recall it, the same staff are being paid or perhaps a few more, outside the Department of Education. There have been additional experts brought into the department, in various services. I am wondering if the Minister can tell us approximately

what percentage of his budget, in round figures, this would mean in increased cost?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give any exact figures on this, for obvious reasons but we voted last year for those offices, for the denominational executive offices. We must remember, Mr. Chairman, that under the Constitution of Newfoundland and Canada and under the Education Legislation of this Province the churches do have certain not only rights but certain responsibilities in education, certain distinct and tangible responsibilities, and they must discharge those. And it was part of our agreement with the churches that when they agreed to move out of the Department of Education, which was a tremendous concession on their part, which they did not have to agree to but they did agree to move out in order to let us functionalize the department to a greater extent than had been possible before; it was part of our agreement that we would assist them in setting up their offices outside - those offices which were necessary in order for them to discharge their Constitutional responsibilities in education.

The amount we voted for them is very small, \$147 thousand. I am not aware, Mr. Chairman, of any major increase in the expenditure there. There was an estimate but I have not been told that. There could be some small increase there but I do not think there is any major increase.

Where we did have to find more money, a bit more money (and I am speaking now from recollection) where we had to find more money, as I have already indicated, was to enable the Boards of Education, especially the larger boards which started out to consolidate and integrate and were inheriting responsibilities and obligations and liabilities that they had not known a thing about and nobody could foresee those.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, we have nearly three hundred boards consolidate into thirty-seven boards. This was a revolution in education in Newfoundland. It meant, of course, that a lot of these boards had to take in and absorb small boards. The great boards of St John's absorbed other small boards around and the great board out in Gander spread out. Then it was the same thing with Lewisport and Grand Falls etc. And they were taking on all kinds of responsibilities they knew nothing about.

Now here the Government have had to recognize that some of these boards were in very difficult circumstances and we could not see them embarrassed if it were within our means. As a matter of fact, you will remember that at

the time of the debate last spring, at the time that we were discussing some of the reduction of boards, I announced, on behalf of the Government, that during the year, if our financial circumstances permitted us, we would regard additional help to the boards as having first charge on us. And we discharged that obligation, that undertaking, because the first thing that we did do was to find a-quarter of a million dollars more for the transportation of school children and the next thing we did was to pledge another one-half million dollars to the board grants. And in all probability we will have had to find upward (and I do not know if the exact figures have been compiled as yet - that I am aware of) of possibly \$1 million more, which, of course, has to be found in supplementary supply.

However I can answer, finally, to my hon. friend's question, the answer which is this: We can live substantially within the vote that was voted last year, but there will be some on an \$80 million vote, obviously, and if you can come within one or two per cent of that vote you have made a very good estimate. My expectation is that we will not be exceeding that vote by perhaps more than \$1 million or so.

MR WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister for his very thorough explanation. By comparison with what has gone before, it is welcome to see it. It is only what the committee should expect but, by comparison with the others it is quite a remarkable change. I would almost be inclined, Mr. Chairman, if I could, if it would be permitted, to move for an increase in the minister's salary, a small one, mind you, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless an increase. But, Sir, I realize the rules do not permit me to do that.

MR ROWE: Does my hon. friend remember that last year he tried to eliminate my salary completely?

MR WELLS: The hon. minister was behaving differently then, Mr. Chairman. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, on the whole, because it appears that we will have no other means of exercising our proper means of commenting on the principle of granting interim supply, I nevertheless am opposed to granting interim supply in this case, the \$18.6 millions asked for, and I will so vote on this particular issue

But I would explain for the committee, because we have so far been deprived of the opportunity of discussing the principle, and it appears that we are likely to be totally deprived or there has been certainly no confirmation otherwise, I will oppose the vote, Mr. Chairman. I nevertheless

specifically want to thank the minister for his explanation.

MR HICKMAN: MR. Chairman, I would like to join with the hon. member for Humber East. I have some idea what the hon. Minister of Education is facing insofar as a request for additional monies is concerned at this time.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the school boards of Newfoundland are in very desperate straits right now. They are faced with a situation that is without precedent in that within the last ten years the development of educational facilities in Newfoundland there is a great and unwitting discrimination going on. It is unwitting in the sense that it is not the Minister of Education who is discriminating against them. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that in some of our regional high schools in Newfoundland today very essential programs have been curtailed and, Mr. Chairman, we have reached the stage now where I know of one large school board, serving a population in excess of one hundred and fifty thousand persons, which has reached the stage where the staff has been advised they have to curtail on the note paper that they are to use from now until the end of the year. This, Mr. Chairman, is without precedent, as far as I know, within the last ten years.

If the vote of \$18 million will rectify the situation, then the Minister of Education is entitled to have this money voted to him at this time. If it will enable school boards to provide the programs that they are now capable of providing, then the Minister of Education is entitled to have this money voted to him.



MR. HICKMAN: It it will enable school boards, regional school boards to eliminate some of the disparities that now exist, then the Minister of Education is entitled to have this money voted to him. If the vote is simply to meet teacher's salaries, and this is a very commendable thing, then they too will have to be paid their salaries, but my concern Mr. Chairman is this, that if a boy or girl is unfortunate enough from an educational point of view to be caught up in a regional system where the population is somewhat sparse even though they are bussed to this regional high school.

That boy or girl just cannot receive the same standard of education that is available in Corner Brook, or Labrador City, or Grand Falls, or St. John's or some of the larger urban centres. This is one of the great crisis as I see it facing education in Newfoundland today. We find that we can talk all we like and when I was growing up in Grand Bank we were very proud of the school that we had there, and we said this compares very favourably with some of the schools in other parts of Newfoundland. But it was not until I came to university in St. John's that I realized the terrible handicap, despite the fact that I was fortunate enough to have the hon. the Minister for my teacher, and that made up for a multitude of sins, covered a multitude of sins, and it is still covering a multitude of sins Mr. Chairman. Still covering it. But, be that as it may it was only then that I realized the tremendous handicap under which he worked and I worked and everyone else worked. This situation is still continuing, and Mr. Chairman if this vote of \$18 million is designed to eliminate some of this disparity, if it is designed to give the student in Firtune equal opportunity with the student in St. John's, if it is designed to give the student at St. Lunaire where a new school was opened the other day, and where there was a great lecture on the drug problem in certain sections of the Province opposed to others, then I am all for it. But if it is simply to meet current expenditures then this vote Mr. Chairman is not worth the paper it is written on, because, Mr. Chairman, we are not facing up to the problem of providing equal opportunities for Newfoundlanders. For some reason people believe that if you provide buses and you provide a regional high school, and a nice fine building at St. Lunaire, or if you provide a nice fine building in the Codroy Valley, that you are doing a wonderful thing. You are giving Newfoundland students an equal opportunity, nothing could be further from the truth Mr. Chairman. You are not, because this \$18 million, and I am referring precisely to the \$18 million, and I do not want to be guilty of wandering at all, and I will not wander. If this \$18 million is designed to give the student in Port au Port equal opportunity with the student in

St. John's then it should be passed unanimously.

If the \$18 million is designed to eliminate the inequities between the student in Burgeo and the student in Corner Brook, then it should be approved. If the \$18 million included certain payments on capital account to provide the hon. the member for Placentia West with a school that he so desperately needs in Creston, and which he will get probably from DREE, then it should be supported. But Mr. Chairman, if the \$18 million is simply designed to meet the day to day needs of an antiquated educational policy then I feel that this House should not support it simply because the hon the Minister of Education says I need it.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard more speeches, more profound dissertations on equal opportunity in Newfoundland for students in this House, than on any other subject and that is as it should be. But the simple fact of the matter is that we are not even getting close to that. In fact, the gap may be widening and it is going to continue to widen unless Mr. Chairman we can provide a formula, and maybe this \$18 million contains that formula. I believe it does Mr. Chairman, I believe that within that \$18 million there is a formula, there has to be a formula to provide subsidies for teachers who are asked to teach in some of the smaller schools, designed to provide a formula that you can have specialist teachers in Grand Bank as well as in St. John's, or in Burin as well as in Burgeo, or in St. Anthony as well as in St. Shotts. And if the hon. the Minister of Education will assure this House that this is what he is doing with that \$18 million, that he is going to break down some of the old prejudices and some of the ideas of feeding the money to those who least need it, and that rather he is going to give this money, or some of this money to the people who so desperately need it, then I am all for it.

But as of now we do not know what this money is going for, but I have a sneaking suspicion that it will not help the boy in St. Shotts at all. I have a sneaking suspicion that this \$18 million will not help the boy in St. Anthony one iota. Nor will it help the boy in Port au Choix. It will help the teaching profession in Newfoundland on a standard basis that is no longer realistic, it will help the larger schools in St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls, Labrador City, but if we are going to vote monies to Government to spend on education then surely Mr. Chairman we have to be satisfied that this money is going to be spent for the benefit of every Newfoundland student. This I am not satisfied on because, as you know, you Mr. Chairman above all the others, you know that the money has not been equitably distributed in this Province insofar

as education is concerned. And you know the great discrimination that is going on. And anyone who suggests that a boy born in English Harbour East in the district of hon. friend from Fortune Bay, has an equal chance with a boy born in Corner Brook is crazy. He does not have that equality of opportunity, he cannot have that equality of opportunity if this \$18 million is going to be spent proper manner, and this is why I restrict very definitely my remarks to the vote that is now before this House. This is why Mr. Chairman I say that the hon. the Minister of Education has a solemn duty to this committee to give us some details-as to how he is going to eliminate discrimination. How he is going to provide the student in Harbour Breton, or Burgeo, or Port au Choix, or Little Bay Islands with an equal opportunity with the boy or girl who has been fortunate enough to be born in St. John's, or Corner Brook, or Grand Falls, or Labrador City.

If he will satisfy me on that, and he will satisfy the committee on that then this vote should be approved without any reduction. If he cannot do it, if all we get is a statement that this money is needed for the routine operations of the antiquated Department of Education, then it does not deserve passage in this committee.

MR. CROSBIE: This is too important an item to pass over lightly. The hon. member from Burin reminds me of that song "Everywhere I wander" somebody was wondering where he was wandering. He reminded me of the song Mr. Chairman "Everywhere I wander" Now Mr. Chairman, this vote that is requested here by her Majesty's humble Government of \$18 million is 23 per cent of the amount that was voted in this House in this present year for education. 23 per cent, so it is more Mr. Chairman than the hon. the minister needs to operate for one month, and therefore I am going to make a motion in a moment. The hon. minister made a very appropo comment when he started his remarks on this section of the Bill Mr. Chairman. He said how the department, in education you could not stand still, that the costs were rising every year. I just say this Mr. Chairman, that for the hon. the minister to stand still he has to keep running, and he is kept running here tonight. He is asking for \$18 million, no \$18.6 million for the very worthy purposes that he has expounded upon, but the amount is much too much for a period of one month, and by the way Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister mentions teacher's salaries. Teacher's salaries are a very important item here. Why is the hon. minister and the Government of which he forms a part taking pension contributions from the teachers and wanging them into the general revenue and spending them, and spending them as part of the funds of the Government to spend.

Why are not the pension contributions of the teachers of Newfoundland going into a special trust fund where, if the Government does not match those contributions or the school boards do not match them, where at least they can be kept separate and apart and not spent as part of the general revenues of this Province? If we are going to concern ourselves with the interest of the teachers Mr. Chairman, something should be done about that situation so that their pension contributions go where they belong. Go into a separate fund, it is their monies, it is taken out of their salaries towards their contributions, and no Government should be taking those contributions and instead of putting them aside in a special fund, spending them on building roads or any other purposes of the Government.

I submit Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. the Minister of Education is really concerned about the teachers he will start to see that their pension contributions are handled as they should be. So Mr. Chairman, because this amount like all the others is too much, and more than is needed for one month's operations I would move that the amount be reduced to \$9.3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item 6, be reduced to \$9.3 million. Those in favour please say "aye," Contrary minded "nay," the motion is lost.

ITEM 7, JUSTICE:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister is going to make an explanation I will sit down and wait.

HON. L.R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): If the hon. member will sit down and give me a chance, I will.

MR. CROSBIE: This is very welcome news indeed Mr. Chairman

MR. CURTIS: The R.C.M.P. contract last year was about \$2 million. This year it will be probably \$2.5 million. The wages of the police, firemen and penitentiary wardens last year was about \$3.5 million. It is just estimating, just a rough guess, there will have to be an increase. I figure that the police and the firemen will together be between \$6 million and \$6.5 million, and then of course we have the R.C.M.P., I have said the R.C.M.P., so that makes about \$6.5 million to \$7 million.

Then of course we have the dieting of the prisoners, we have the hose for the fire department, we have a lot of expenses which have to be, we have to be ready to pay. You must remember that when this House was open we cannot issue any warrants. We must have a safe margin, and I feel the amount down for Justice is about fair.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, one of the amounts, and one of the purposes to which 1411

some of this money included in the amount of \$1.8 million for Justice should most certainly be, equipping of magistrates courts outside the city of St. John's with some form of court reporting equipment or stenographers.

Now the Minister of Justice, not the present Minister of Justice, the member of the House who was Minister of Justice about this time last year, assured the House that this equipment was on the way. So far there is no sign of it. It was not too long ago that I appeared in magistrates court in Corner Brook, there is no form of reporting whatsoever.

It was a rather important case, a very important case and the magistrate did his very best with it. I accord him that, he made every effort possible, but he is just not equipped to act as magistrate and as court reporter as well. It is too much to expect of any one man. For years and years, that I have raised it here now on several occasions in this House, but for years and years and years, we have spent money to pay for court reporters in magistrates courts in St. John's, and none anywhere else in the island. There is no way in this world that that can be justified. That is improper use of public funds. It is discriminatory use and there is no way that it can be justified. I would certainly like the assurance of the Minister of Justice that some of these funds will be put to this use. I would ask him to assure the committee of this before any report, any approval is given.

We had such an assurance last year from the Minister of Justice, the then Minister of Justice on behalf of the Government, but that is over a year now, or a year gone by and there is still no sign of it. No sign whatsoever. In the meantime, anybody who appears in magistrates courts, outside the city of St. John's appears under that handicap, that there is not a full and complete record of his proceedings and that is most unfair and discriminatory. Justice in fact is not being impartially administered in the Province, for that reason alone, if for no other reason.

Another matter that has not in my opinion been adequately dealt with and should be fully dealt with, is that there should be representatives of the Department of Justice, legally trained representatives of the Department of Justice spotted throughout the Province to supervise prosecution. Now I realize the police officers try their very best, and make.....



and make a fine effort of doing so, but they are not trained in the law. They are not familiar with it and it may sound strange to members of the House to hear me say that I would much prefer in terms of appearance in a court to appear against a person who is legally trained and against the police officer who has not such legal training. It is true, I would, because the police officer does not have the background knowledge and training in the law and so operates by his instinct and these are the claims that he puts forward add to this the fact that the magistrate is not legally trained as well, and we are in an unfair position again for persons outside the City of St. John's. It is different here while in many cases the police are prosecutors as well; nevertheless the magistrates before whom they appear are legally trained and that makes the situation different. In the expenditure of this amount of \$1.8 million, in addition to the purposes which the Minister of Justice named, in addition to those purposes, I would ask his assurance to the committee that efforts will be made immediately to try and correct these situations and every possible effort made at trying to make provisions for a sitting supreme court judge in Corner Brook. Very little expense would be involved. Some of this money would have to be expended for that purpose, probably an additional stenographer would be involved and perhaps one other member for the court's staff. The judge himself would be paid by the Federal Government. The physical court facilities are already there and not used for any other purpose except the supreme court, when they come on circuit to Corner Brook about three times a year, three or four times a year. In reasonable and fairness - in reasonableness and fairness some consideration must be given to this.

I have asked for it on several occasions in the House and I have had assurance of it in the case of court reporters but so far nothing has materialized, and I would asked the minister, if he could now assure the committee before this vote is taken that such consideration would be given.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we do that, the matter of the Department of Justice, of course, is a serious matter and the just society and all of that, but for the hon. minister to ask this House to approve him or his department receiving an amount equal to twenty-five percent of what his department was voted in the present year, that is what he is asking for, Mr. Speaker, \$1.8 million

to receive twenty-five percent over a quarter of what the department was voted in the present year in the regular way is just a bit too much. It is in excess of enough money for three months' operations. It is just not just that this be done. In all justice, we cannot agree to this total amount of money, Mr. Chairman. Before moving on to an amendment, which I wish to put before this committee and which I know will receive serious consideration. It will weigh heavily in every member's conscience before it is voted on, and before proceeding to that, I would like to ask the minister as to what he is doing with the recommendations of Dr. Gushue's study on family law in Newfoundland. We have had this series of studies, many recommendations initiated by the brilliant predecessor of the present Minister of Justice, the present hon. member for Burin. I trust my words are not being recorded by the press.

What has happened Mr. Minister of Justice to these recommendations of Dr. Gushue is a serious matter? We would like you to enlighten us on that. I have another question for the hon. minister who is always glad and available to help us who want information and that is: what are the lawyers doing who are working on the consolidation of the statutes of Newfoundland? The last revision of the statutes was in 1952 and I believe a year or two ago a number of members of the Law Society of Newfoundland were appointed by the brilliant predecessor of the present Minister of Justice to prepare a consolidation of the statutes. Would the hon. minister enlighten us as to how far they have gotten and is there any part of the money now being voted going to be used to meet these expenses? That is another question, Mr. Speaker, and I know we will get an answer, of course. Would the hon. minister consider this problem that some members of the bar of Newfoundland are having and that is; what steps can be taken to expedite the rendering of judgments by judges of the courts in Newfoundland? I know of a case, Mr. Speaker, where it is now three years since a matter went to trial in the supreme court and no judgment has been delivered. Administration of justice is a Provincial as well as a Federal matter. Mr. Speaker, both the Province and the Government of Canada are going to have to consider what provisions should be put in the law to obviate any litigants from having to wait in excess of six months for a judgment to be given as to their rights in very serious matters

before the courts.

This is a matter, Mr. Chairman, and I hope I will not have to practice too much before the courts in the next few years, but this is a matter, Mr. Chairman, which is arousing a great deal of concern among practitioners. I mean it is incredible that people should go to court, have their cases heard and large amounts of money perhaps involved and no decision rendered, not for six months, not for a year, not for two years, but in excess of that and the hon. minister - I would ask the hon. minister to take up with his colleague, the hon. Minister of Justice in Ottawa this question as to what can be done. It is wrong. Justice delayed is not justice. I remember, Mr. Chairman, putting a question down in this House last year. It was ruled out of order on constitutional grounds, to get some statistics on how many judgments pending in the supreme court of Newfoundland have not been delivered since the trials were concluded. That would be an interesting statistic. That is several matters which the hon. minister might direct his mind to. The police and the firemen, well we know that they are going to be dealt with, when the budget comes down. It is a pity, Mr. Chairman, that they have to wait another month or so to hear what their faith is going to be, but I am sure the hon. minister has that under advisement.

Now, because the hon. minister has asked for too much, twenty-five percent of what he was voted last year, his department, I therefore move that the amount be reduced from \$1.8 million to \$900,000 and that it is more than sufficient for the hon. minister to do justice for one month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that the amount be reduced to \$900,000.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there has been some questions asked by the hon. member for St. John's West concerning the administration of Justice, when I was minister. I think I can answer some of the questions and I am sure the hon. minister will not object. The problem with the consolidation of statutes is simply this: that only one volume can be printed at a time because they are so large. They have to destroy the lead. The printers have to do this. I am told that over 400 hours per man have been logged so far on the consolidation of statutes and it is not anticipated that it will be ready until next session of this hon. House. With respect to the point raised by the the hon. member for St. John's West concerning the delay in the rendering of judgments. This is in my opinion a very serious problem in Newfoundland at this time.

1415

It is a jurisdictional problem. Last year the hon. member tried to ask a question on this and it was suggested that it was beyond the confidence of this House to answer it. The fact of the matter is that a similar question has been asked in the House of Commons from another province and the House of Commons ruled that it is purely a provincial matter and that this question is answerable by the province, insofar as the rendering of decisions are concerned. I know of a case that was tried and the hon. senior member for Hr. Main was counsel on this case in 1966 and the complaints that I have been receiving over the delay in this judgment has not been from members of the bar, but from the litigants involved because there is a great deal of money involved and two companies are on the verge of bankruptcy awaiting an outcome of this case. One or the other may very well find itself in that position and, Mr. Chairman, it is not the easiest question in the world to answer because the appointment and the paying of the salaries of superior judges in Canada is the exclusive responsibility of the Governor General-in-Council. Then when you get down to the administration of justice, this is the exclusive responsibility of the province and surely there must be some formula whereby the province in the exercise of its function as administering justice can compel judges to render decisions within a reasonable time and there is no doubt at all, Mr. Chairman that gross hardships and injustice being rendered at this time because of delays in the rendering of decisions and this has now reached the rather disheartening and disturbing stage where litigants are beginning to complain over this delay. If I may answer the question raised by the hon. member for Humber East, the situation on the court recording is that long ago the equipment was ordered but apparently there is great scientific disagreement over the sensitivity of the recording equipment, and they are still experimenting and the equipment is in the Province, but you cannot find any consensus amongst the judicatory as to the type of microphone that must be used.

MR. C. WELLS: The district court got new equipment last year.

MR. HICKMAN: But this is the problem and I am not usurping, I hope, the function of the hon. Minister of Justice in answering the questions, but this delay in handing down decisions is, I think, one of the most serious things facing the administration of justice in Newfoundland today and in this vote, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that there is contained in it, and there will be contained in the budget a provision for - a revision of the salaries to magistrates in this

1416

Province. In my opinion the magistrates are grossly underpaid. I believe that there should be a differential between the salaries paid to legally trained magistrates and lay magistrates and I believe that the time has come and I am sure the hon. Minister of Justice agrees with this theory, when there has to be a salary paid to legally trained magistrates somewhat higher than the others that will attract law graduates and legally trained men to that position, and as the hon. member for, the ex-magistrate for Trinity North knows that a magistrate in Newfoundland is called upon to perform not only judicial functions but his cost of living, because of his social obligations are considerably higher than most people will find living in various parts of Newfoundland. None of these fine magistrates, we have a good magistracy in Newfoundland, none of these men have any money left over at the end of a year, because of the leadership that is expected of them in the community. They are finding great difficulty in making both ends meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion defeated.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get in between the shouts of carry. It is a bit difficult to get in. We are talking now about item (7)? Item (7) has carried. Item (8). Before we go on to consider whether or not item (8) should be carried, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources first, if he could give us a general explanation of what the amount of \$1.9 million as is outlined there is for? What it is proposed to spend that for? The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the general statement made earlier in the day that it was estimated to be approximately two months supply is not really borne out when you consider the fact that it is roughly



MR. WELLS: Really borne out when you consider the fact that it is roughly nearly 25 per cent of last year's vote. Now what is the estimation for this? Is there some additional work being done, or is it the normal increase in the department? We would like to know before we consider it.

HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): I think I can enlighten the committee in a general way Mr. Chairman. The general way and perhaps even in the more specific way. In the general sense the months of April and May, starting during the month of April, around the 15th. of April this is the time of year Mr. Chairman, when the gearing up, the preparation for the crop season and the agriculture season to begin, this is then therefore flowing from that the time when it becomes necessary to hire on people, to start getting in supplies and to start doing work, and preparing community pastures all over the Province to go into operation.

MR. EARLE: "Don't wait for spring, do it now"

MR. CALLAHAN: And this is a in a sense a non-recurring cost. You get ready in the month of April and the month of May, put pastures into operation by the May 15th.

MR. WELLS: How much annual expense is involved in a community pasture?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not have the figures Mr. Chairman, but it is quite a large expense

MR. WELLS: Approximately, approximately

MR. CALLAHAN: Well it depends on the size of the pasture. Essentially what it means is that staff has to be hired, things like fertilizer and limestone have to be purchased and sticked. Equipment has to be put into readiness for use. Supplies have to be obtained for sheep dipping and all the other things that must be done before animals are allowed on the pastures. That is one thing that needs to be done, and it is done generally between the 15th. of April and the 15th. of May. The cost does not arise again during the year, because once it is done generally speaking it is done except for continuing salaries.

The second expense that causes a bulge in the general departmental estimates at about the month of April, around the middle of the month of April is getting ready for the fire season which starts again in the month of May, and usually, officially about the 15th. of May. It is necessary in each year to buy replacement of equipment, fire hoses and various other kinds of supplies and also again to begin hiring on people during that period to start getting the fire protection in operation and into being.

The same thing generally applies to Provincial parks Mr. Chairman,

because, the park season opens on the 15th. of May and the heavy expenditure months again are the months of April, May when we have to start gearing up for the park season, and this year as being the case I think in almost every year for the past twelve there will be more Provincial parks in operation than the year before, and because we have had for many months now an expansion program going on, there will be even more facilities to get into operation and therefore, more expense required to get the parks started by the 15th. of May in this coming financial year.

The other thing that is particularly notable Mr. Chairman in the estimates, or will be in the estimates for the coming year will be monies provided for recovery by contractors in respect of access roads. We have a number of quite heavy agreements for the construction of access roads in this way, in this manner, that by agreement the contractor constructs the roads and recovers the appropriate proportion of cost in the following year. The agreement that we have made in respect of a number of operations is that the recovery would become effective, the effective date of the recovery would be the first day of the new fiscal year. Now these are operations in which, and we do this with many contractors and indeed in the current fiscal year in about thirty different operations involving about 3,000 men, both in saw logging and in pulp wood cutting, where we subsidize almost entirely, in fact, pay the cost of access roads. This is strictly a provincial program which came in at the time of the roads to resources Federal - Provincial program, but after the Federal program was withdrawn the Province obviously had to carry on.

So in some of the very much heavier expenditure cases, in the major operations where the expenditures are quite high, where it was not possible to reimburse the operators during the current year, the agreement was made that on the basis of proof of work done, proof of performance, the operators would be able to be reimbursed any time after the first day of April in the new financial year. The result of this is that the operators will be presenting I think as of the 1st. of April, or very quickly afterwards invoices for payment for amounts of expenditure incurred during the previous, namely the current year in respect of these access roads.

So for all these reasons Mr. Chairman, it is not a fair assessment of the amount that is in the Bill, to say that it is twenty-fiver per cent of expenditure, and therefore in excess of the two months supply, because this is a case where there is as I said, a great bulge at the beginning of the year for the reason that the beginning of the financial year very closely precedes the start

up of operations in a variety of resource areas, and the expenditures in the early months of the resource year, if I may call it that is quite out of proportion with the expenditures say in the months from September on when all these activities start to come down. When the parks close, when the fire season is over, and the expenditures in the lighter months of the year are quite slight and small as compared with the early opening months.

I move concurrence of the committee.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please, the hon. the member for St. Barbe

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. the minister advise the House if there will be any of this money allotted to acquisition of land for the Bonne Bay National Park.

MR. CALLAHAN: No Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, recently there was a pretty strong indication by one of the senior officials in the department of the hon. minister that a community pasture would be established early this spring. I would assume by early this spring he meant March or early April in Danzic Point. Would the hon. the minister advise the committee when and if the community is now under way in Danzic Point, and if some of the funds being asked for there will include the establishment of this community pasture?

MR. CALLAHAN: I cannot answer that Mr. Chairman, I do not have the specifications

MR. HICKMAN: You are aware of where Danzic Point is located?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes I am Mr. Chairman, and I can further tell the committee I am generally aware of where it is located, and I can tell the committee that I have some twenty-two I think it is, requests for the establishment of community pastures. But I also say that the establishment of community pastures falls under capital expenditure, and it is my impression and belief and opinion, that there is very little if any capital money involved in this vote. The capital expenditures will be in the vote of the Department of Community and Social Development, because it come under the ARDA program.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, before that item is carried, the amount that is asked for is in my opinion unreasonable in the circumstances, which I need not go into. They have been outlined earlier this evening Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear that there is no justification at all at this stage for asking for Interim Supply, and in any event the maximum that could be asked for in the light of the fact that the House is proposed to reopen on April 6th. is approximately one month.

I accept the minister's explanation, and I thank him for the explanation

so I move Mr. Chairman, that the amount be reduced to \$950,000. from \$1.9 million.

My motion, oh, that the amount be reduced to from the proposed \$1.9 million to \$950,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item 8, be reduced to \$950,000.

Those in favour please say "aye," contrary minded "nay." motion lost.

ITEM 9

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in the absence of my colleague the Minister of Public Works, I will try as best I can to answer any questions that hon. gentlemen may have under this head Sir. I do not think I need make a general statement because, I think Sir, the committee are well aware of the text of expenditures covered. I might point out that the amount requested under head 9, Sir, is 1.3 million. Last year's red estimates Sir is approved by the House for \$7.3 million so it is near enough to one sixth of the amount approved last year which six times 1.3 is 7.8, but if the hon. members have any detailed questions, I will try as best I can to answer them.

MR. WELLS: One particular question is to what extent does the Department of Public Works generally, and in particularly under this vote that is requested here of \$1.3 million, to what extent will this be used to rent offices for public use such as for the Workmen's Compensation Board, for Boards of Liquor Control, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, and other similar. For example; the facilities that have been rented by the Power Commission and the Workmen's Compensation Board, or are these thing done directly?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, first I may say there are no new projects in this, but secondly as a general matter of accounting treatment throughout the estimates rentals are charged back against the departments to which they relate. For example

MR. WELLS: But in the first instance it is done by public payments

MR. ROBERTS: If hon. gentlemen would permit Sir, the Public Works is a Department which enters into the lease arrangements and, but the estimates show that the, and there is a long appendix and there will be one in this year's main estimates similarly showing charges back to the departments the amount of rentals last year Sir, for example was \$453,000. charged back to departments. Similar treatment is made of telephone bills, mail costs, the whole gambit of services Sir.

MR. WELLS: Would the Department of Public Works rent for example, acquire in the first instance by rental or otherwise physical space facilities for the Workmen's Compensation Board?

1421

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman as far as I know the Board would enter into a lease on their own. In the case of an agency, one which I can speak of with knowledge is M.C.P., which rents space in Elizabeth Towers. The lease Sir, is between M.C.P. which by Act is a corporation and the Towers, and the appropriate charges or rentals are carried in the M.C.P. budget. But in the case of a Government department the Public Works Department would make the lease, and then the charge would be made back against the department. and would show in the estimates of that department as an expenditure item.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, how much is it anticipated of this \$1.3 million, will be necessary to subsidize or sustain the Harmon Corporation or is it now self-sustaining? In last year if I can refer the hon. minister to subhead 9-11, paragraph -03, item -03, \$735,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer it in detail. Last year as the hon. gentleman said it was \$735,000. on the main estimates. The Harmon Corporation is not yet self sustaining Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Far from it

MR. ROBERTS: My hon. friend the member for that district says that it is far from it, but I cannot give the precise amount there. If we were to spend say \$600 thousand this year, Mr. Chairman on that subhead, there might be \$100 thousand of that \$1.3 million destined for that. Again I do not know how the flow of expenditure would be however, but there is something in this definitely, which says Harmon Corporation, which is not yet self-supporting.

MR CALLAHAN: If I may help the committee - the Harmon Corporation's function is not to make money. Its function is to maintain in good condition the property at Stephenville. Its responsibility in that regard is diminished as persons and corporations come in and take over buildings on a care and maintenance type lease. But the corporation still then has the responsibility for all the other property, to maintain it, to keep it in good order, to keep it in good repair and ready for prospective users. The corporation is not set up to maintain and operate and manage the property and in many cases, as explained in the House, I think more than once, the buildings there very often and almost entirely are leased at rather nominal rates, as an attraction. In other words; the Government got them for nothing and does not set out to make money on the buildings themselves



in other words the Government got them for nothing and it does not set out to make money on the buildings themselves, sets out to attract users to come and use the buildings although the users very very often had to put a very large investment into the buildings to adapt them to their particular use. When I say the, as I said to my colleague the Minister of Health that the Harmon Corporation is far from self-supporting I think it should be understood by the committee that it is not intended to be self-supporting and in fact is there providing a service as an agency of the Government to ensure that the property is maintained, in fact in good condition and in good order.

MR. WELLS: I have one further question Mr. Chairman the amount on page 46 of last year's estimates is 911-05 Rental Purchase of Buildings. It amounted to nearly 10 per cent of the entire estimate for the department of Public Works last year we relate 10 per cent, of the \$130,000 of the \$1,300,000 what is that for does it continue on, is that a one shot effort it looks like a continuing thing in respect to which building?

MR. ROBERTS: I can not answer in detail, because I am not minister responsible I would think, I am quite sure because it says capital, that is a continuing item. Mr. Chairman, I just can not answer the hon. gentleman wishes I would have

MR. WELLS: Not this building.

MR. ROBERTS: I think Mr. Chairman if it is in order the various lease-back acts are shown as charges under the Consolidated Funds, they are found on page 16 of last year's read estimates, so I do not know Mr. Chairman which buildings they are I could get a list or perhaps when the main estimates come up we table the list if the hon. gentleman wants it. But I am sure it is a continuing item.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman before we vote I believe under the department of Public Works falls the privilege of looking after Expo buildings in Newfoundland and in reply to a question tabled in this House earlier this year we are informed that I think it is to the end of December 1969 \$1,364,215 have been expended in Expo buildings. Grand Falls \$881,000; Gander \$265,000; Grand Bank \$217,000 and it is estimated that \$3,400,000 will be required altogether to erect these Expo buildings at Grand Falls, Gander, and Grand Bank. In two cases there are to be used at Arts and Culture Centres and in Grand Bank to be used as some kind of a Fishermen's Museum. Now Mr. Chairman, I am not of the opinion that Expo buildings should have priority in the spending of the Government of Newfoundland certainly not in these years of tight money particularly in view of the other requirements

for capital expenditure and education and health and otherwise and I would therefore like to ask the minister whether any of this \$1,300,000 now being requested is for the purpose of expenditure and the construction of Expo buildings.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge and I speak as a member of the Treasury Board as well as minister there is none of this amount of \$1.3 million will be spent or is intended to be spent on the projects which the hon. gentleman referred.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with what we feel should be the case here that expenditure covering one month's interim supply should be sufficient I would like to move that the amount of \$1.3 million be reduced to the amount of \$700,000.

Motion carried.

Item 9 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize Your Honour I thought I heard Your Honour call item 10. These are the estimates for the Department of Health. If hon. members wish although the hour is late I will gladly make a statement in any detail of which I am capable but if hon. members would prefer well, Mr. Chairman generally this money is to run the programmes run by the Department of Health or administered by the Department the two large programmes Mr. Chairman, are hospital insurance under which we pay for the operation of all hospitals in Newfoundland roughly two-thirds of the beds in hospitals in this Province are under the control of boards and roughly one-third are under the direct control of me as the Minister of Health in the Cottage Hospitals which will include for these purposes Gander, Stephenville as well as the hospitals generally considered as Cottage Hospitals. The Medicare M.C.P. is covered under this vote in addition Mr. Chairman the other services provided by the Department which include rehabilitation services or district health services or health inspection services, the TB Control services the office of the Chief Medical Officer which is the Public Health Inspection Services are Nursing Services, our Central Pharmacy, our Central Supply, our Transportation Division, our Central Laundry, and also there is of course the item for the general administration and it would include the minister's salary which is shown under a separate subhead as always. Generally Mr. Chairman these cover the on-going programmes of the department of Health they do not provide for any new programmes.

MR. WELLS: Why is it approximately 25 per cent of last year's vote?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the cost in the department of Health and the hon. gentleman should recall there are very great contributions in aid from the Government of Canada. The cost in the department, I cannot answer in specific detail but I can tell him

MR. WELLS: The vote last year was \$55 million

MR. ROBERTS: The expenditure this current year Mr. Speaker, will be a little more I can assure him than \$55 million. This current year, the coming year Mr. Chairman it will be still higher again. I am told that this is approximately two-twelfths, one-sixth, of the total expenditures in the department of Health this year which would make the - it sounds high Mr. Chairman but these are the figures I have - it may be as well Sir, that there are some payments that are made in less than the even flow. But I am sorry, my colleague the minister of Health tells me that is correct, there are payments which are, I was going to use the word lump sum, that is not the correct thing, that is not the correct term, the flow out is not necessarily even Mr. Chairman, especially in regard to hospital budgets.

MR. CROSSIE: Mr. Chairman, before this item carries the amount requested is \$14,300,000 is wanted for two months which would make it appear as though the department of Health is going to spend \$85,800,000 this year for the full year. The gross amount last year I think was - this present year was \$59,349,100 so it looks as though there is going to be a considerable increase to spend in the Department of Health this year. Now apart from that Mr. Chairman I wonder whether the minister could say anything on the position of hospital workers particularly in relation to the conciliation board reports in reference to the hospital at Grand Falls and the hospital at Corner Brook where the employer the hospital boards in those cases, apparently agreed with the request of the hospital workers and the conciliation boards recommended increases for them but the boards of the hospitals in both cases are funded by the Government of Newfoundland and have not got the funds to make these extra expenditures. Could the minister give us any indication of what is intended in that respect and in addition Mr. Chairman, I believe it was stated sometime ago that the Government was considering amending the hospital workers legislation that was passed in 1967 to provide for some better method of settling disputes in essential services such as hospitals. And could the minister give us some indication of whether or not the Government will be amending legislation a new

legislation before the House in that respect because if something is not done to provide a better solution to the problems of hospital workers there is bound to be Mr. Chairman, a tremendous trouble this year in respect to the labour situation in hospitals. Other items such as the medical school, university hospital can wait until the main estimates come but I think that those are several urgent matters and I was wondering if the minister can tell us anything about that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. gentleman for his quite helpful comments. Let me, the question of legislation Mr. Chairman is one of policy and this I submit is not an appropriate place to go into it I made a statement earlier on behalf of the Government and of course that represents our policy. The question of salaries, again Sir, is a matter for the budget speech and when my colleague the minister of Finance brings down his budget speech next month there will be an announcement of what is to be done. I might add though Sir, I have already given this in reply to a question by the hon. member that the boards at the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls and the Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook were each told in writing in advance of their agreement to go to the conciliation board that the Government would not be able to make any additional funds available to them in the current fiscal year which ends the end of this present month.

We did undertake Mr. Chairman, to take into account consideration the reports of the conciliation boards and I can assure the committee Sir, that this is being done they are being fully considered together with the other relevant material and their appropriate material.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on that particular point the report of the conciliation board in connection with the central Newfoundland hospital corporation the statement that is made in that report that the corporation has been informed by the Government, that is the hospital corporation, that the monies available to it in 1970 will remain at 1969 levels. This is a statement made in the conciliation board report and the report says therefore that the board of the hospital can not do anything about the conciliation report and in the same report it stated that the board heard evidence from Dr. Miller, deputy-minister of Health who explained that as a matter of policy wages to persons in hospitals are frozen until the report on wages and classifications is made to Government by a firm of consultants now engaged. Dr Miller did not know when the report was going to be presented to the Government. Now these statements are contained in the conciliation boards report, the report of the conciliation board in the

reference to Western Memorial Hospital states that, describes some of the difficulties that the hospital and the union are having and on page 3 says the history of negotiations between the union and the hospital has been one of frustration, not only for a union but for the hospital as well. This frustration stems directly from limitations which the minister of Health in implementing certain aspects of Government policy placed upon the hospital in negotiating this particular collective agreement. On page 3 it says the Government would not consent to the hospitals bargaining on wages and



MR. CROSBIE: And it goes on to Page 5, the elimination of those anomalies depends upon the initiative of the Government may require legislation. These statements are made in those reports, and of course are serious statements and illustrate the farce that collective bargaining has become under the legislation of this House has passed. And I wonder if the minister has anything to say in connection with these statements made in official conciliation board reports?

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have of course no responsibility for the statements made by the members of the Conciliation Board. They are free to make whatever statements think best. My Deputy Minister did appear and the policy which he enunciated is the Government's policy. I have already indicated that my colleague the Minister of Finance will indicate what we are going to do. With reference to the 1970 again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer what a conciliation board says, I did not appoint them. They do not answer to me. The only way in which that statement could be accurate would be with reference to the first three months of 1970 because as I have already said to the House, the Government have said, and we have made no secret of it at any point, that we could not authorize, we could not pay to the board, additional funds in respect of the financial year ending 31 March, 1970.

The hon. gentleman's comments on or his reading of the comments on collective bargaining Mr. Chairman, I can say nothing more again as a matter of policy. As for restraints, these restraints of course are put on Sir, they are put on by every Province in Canada, and I would assert with confidence that when the hon. gentleman held the portfolio, he too, through his officials applied restraints. This is a fact of life Mr. Chairman, and I guess it will always be a fact of life. This sub-head of Hospital Insurance involves an expenditure of about \$40 million dollars a year. It is a sub-head that must be controlled carefully and with competent officials, and with the help of competent and dedicated administrators and boards it is controlled carefully.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I was out of the House for a few moments and possibly the minister answered a question I am about to ask, if so I apologize to him. But I notice under the heading of Medical Care in the

Estimates of last year, there was a net cost to the Province of \$685,000. I am wondering if in the coming year in the light of the greatly increased expense indicated by this request here, that Medicare will cost the Province more than that amount. If so, approximately how much?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have not dealt with the question, because it has not been raised. Of course, Medicare - all we can do is predict, and we have not as yet had a great deal of experience. We have not finished twelve months with the plan. The present indication that I have Sir, or that the cost, the net cost of the Province will not be substantially different this year, and in this year it will be less than <sup>from</sup> the \$685,000 we were authorized to spend by the House. A part of that Mr. Chairman, of course is that we are reimbursed by the Government of Canada at one-half the national average of participating provinces. And as we have far fewer doctors per person than most parts of Canada, it means in that sense only we are a low cost Province, and we do receive a large amount of money from Ottawa.

This current year it is to the order of \$14. million per capita, perhead. Fourteen dollars a person, I am sorry, which is about \$7. millions I believe. The Government of Newfoundland do put 3 or \$4.million a year into Medicare in addition to what Ottawa give us Mr. Chairman.

MR. WELLS: On the medicare question Mr. Chairman, can the minister advise the House whether or not it is correct, and I may say that I have no personal knowledge of this. I have heard it now from two doctors, I would say in the last ten days, that the Government's payment to the doctors to the Medicare is falling behind. There naturally has to be some arrears during the time that the bills are submitted by the doctors, and the time that they are processed. They go through a computer, or whatever the process is, and they are processed for payment, and the cheques are paid out. They understand this, but they now claim that as of the last couple of months, in the last couple of months or so, there has been an increase in the rate at which the payments are behind - that they are falling more and more behind. Can the minister advise of any particular reason for this?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge that this is so. I will

ask my officials at MCP on tomorrow if this so. I would be surprised, because I have not heard anything directly. I have here a table showing the payments. We have two problems, the first is that doctors for some funny reason do not want to send their bills in quickly, and we are finding for example that payments made in November were in respect of - you know there was money paid in November Mr. Chairman, for bills for April. The average turn-around time, from the time we get a bill, I am told, is of the order of less than thirty to sixty days. The other problem we are running into Sir, is the operation of course is computerized, and we are still running a very high reject rate of the order of about seventeen percent of the form - as hon. members know, when goes to a doctor, the doctor fills in a form which is sent in to MCP. That is the bill, and the last figure I saw was seventeen percent of these being rejected by the computer for one reason or another, and these then have to be assessed, and sometimes returned to the doctors concerned. But I have no indications Sir that the amounts have fallen off. We did take a little bit of a dip in January payments, but I am told that that is because, or maybe I should not say it, but because the bills have not been coming in as quickly as we thought.

I would be generally surprised if there were. I have not heard from a doctor. I would really be surprised.

MR. WELLS: Well I just might well be frank and honest with the minister. The suggestion was to me, and I will put it to minister if he wants me to. I do not want to suggest it as being truth. The suggestion that the one particular doctor made was that he expressed the fear that there was not quite sufficient funds to keep the payments up to date. Now this is a suggestion he made. Can the minister confirm this as not so?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard the statement before. It is ridiculous in the correct sense of that word. I have no indication. I saw a paper today indicating that MCP would need some funds before the end of March to pay their bills. And these funds were available and were authorized by me. They are well within the Estimates. I might add Mr. Chairman, that as far as I know no bills of the Government are in arrears.

This is the first time in as many years that I can remember that the welfare accounts are at no point in arrears. I think we are paying them thirty days, and as far as I know MCP are right up to date, but if the hon. gentleman knows of an individual doctor, or whether he wishes to give me the name, or asks the doctor to get in touch with me, I will have it looked into. But as far as I know Sir, the payments are going out quite steadily, and I might say that I have a certain direct knowledge of one doctor participating in MCP, and I think he would be quite ready to complain if there were any delay. And he would have access to the minister to lay a complaint in a forceful fashion, and he has not Sir.

But if there are cases I would like to know about them. But I have heard of none.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Medicare, will the minister be in a position later in the Session to tell the House and the public, what the average amounts being paid out to certain physicians are, not what any particular doctor is receiving, but what the highest and lowest amounts are in various categories. I am sure this would be a great deal of interest to the public. And while the minister is considering whether he can do that or not Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the vote under 10 for Health be reduced and \$14,300 to \$7,150,000 which should be quite sufficient to carry the Department of Health for one month, which in our view is quite sufficient Interim Supply to be voted by the House now without any Estimates presented to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has not asked, and I had hoped no hon. member would ask for details of any individual doctor, because I would refuse to table them. I would be quite willing to release general information about the averages, I have some information here, but if the hon. gentleman wants I can go into it. If not, I am told that present projections are that gross income of doctors on an average in this Province will be about \$45,000 this year. It is generally considered in the trade that about one-third of that maybe properly attributed to their expenses. It is the basis on which these schedules are compiled. If that figure is accepted and I think it is pretty generally accepted. Then this would mean the net incomes of doctors on which they would pay taxes. They would

come to the realization that the amount that we are asking for here is close on twenty-five percent of last year's vote. It is around twenty-three or twenty-four percent. Now the reason we are asking for that much interim financing Mr. Chairman, is the same reason as my hon. colleague the Minister of Health gave really. That the flow of money is not even throughout the year, and the hon. member for Fortune Bay who was former Minister of Welfare realizes this, that church institutions and other commitments that we have, they expect to get their money early in the new fiscal year. So you sort of have a peak the first month or two, and then it levels off, and that is why it is almost twenty-five percent of our last year's expenditure.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just a question on that Sir. I believe some minister mentioned that there would be no carry-over of welfare bills this year, is that correct that this new amount is not recorded to pay any old bills?

MR. NEARY: Yes that is correct Mr. Chairman.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, the reasons already given and despite the warning suggested by the hon. the Minister of Welfare, I move that the amount be reduced to \$5,450,000 as it is quite adequate on the basis of the explanation offered for a one month period and Interim Supply should not be granted beyond one month. It is quite adequate for a one month period, and I thank the minister for the explanation that he has given, and I accept it as being quite satisfactory, but I recommend that supply be granted for only one month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Motion is that the Item (11) be reduced to \$5,450,000. Those in favour please say "aye", contrary "nay". The Motion is lost.



MR. WELLS: On item (12), Mr. Chairman. Would the minister advise the committee of the amounts, if any, that are in this figure of \$435,000, the proportion, if any, that are unusual expenses or attributable to the failure of the liquor commission or the Minister of Finance to collect from Atlantic Brewing an amount of approximately of \$400,00. Is that in any way related to that? What is the reason for this particular amount other than routine running of the commission?

MR. JONES: There is no reason at all, Mr. Chairman, except for the normal running of the liquor commission. There is no relationship whatsoever between this amount and the matter referred to by my hon. friend. This is routine operation of the N. L. C., their normal operation costs.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am actually wondering, and I wish to ask the minister why there is any amount in there at all really. The Board of Liquor Control is certainly a self-liquidating body and a very profitable one, I believe, and, if you look at the estimates for other years, it always seems to have a surplus which it turns over to consolidated revenue. Surely in the two months of April and May, the sales do not drop off or there are no additional expenses that require any financing whatsoever.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, although as my hon. friend says, the Board of Liquor Control does show some profits which are ultimately transferred to the consolidated revenue fund. Yet it is the practice and it has been that the wages and salaries in the operating of the board itself is carried as a special subhead in our estimates and that the salaries in the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are not paid directly out of the returns from the sale of boozes. This item, I would say, Mr. Chairman, is mainly salaries.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that item (12) be reduced to \$217,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that item (12) be reduced to \$217,500. Motion is lost. Shall item (12) carry? Item (13), Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. ERIC DAVE, (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a brief summary of this amount. The largest amount here is \$593,000. This is an amount that is due to the City of St. John's as part of an agreement between the City and the City of St. John's Housing Corporation back in 1952. In 1952 the Government did enter into an agreement with the City of

St. John's that they would take over some indebtedness of the City of St. John's as part of the housing area scheme in St. John's and this is the last payment due under the agreement in 1952 and this amount is, as I say, \$593,000. I have estimated in the amount as well, \$100,000 for salaries and the ordinary running expenses of the departments. That includes the housing department, engineering division and the metropolitan board of St. John's and the various departments of Municipal Affairs and I got an estimate of \$400,000 revenue grants to the cities and town councils. There is an amount there of \$400,000 to the City of Corner Brook and included in this amount as well the various councils throughout the Province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this amount is a little high for this time of the year. As you know, most of the councils year in as and of December 31st., 1965 and that the bulk of the tax due comes into the various councils in January and February, and I understand the peak payments on the revenue grant is around March and April and that is why provision is made for this. I have estimated \$200,000 for emergency assistance grants. This is grants to assist subsidization of water and sewage systems for the various councils throughout the Province. For the information of the House, we have seventy-four communities now with water and sewage systems and this amount is provided to help them subsidize interest payments and the bond issue.

There is an amount there as well of \$120,000 for a paving grant. This amount is committed and this is required for the two month period and I have listed here an amount of \$50,000 for maintenance work on the Blackhead and Renewal Scheme in St. John's. I have listed further an amount of \$50,000 for miscellaneous items throughout the department.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, out of the comments from the minister, there arises two questions. One is with respect to the grant to the City of Corner Brook. He indicated that \$400,000 was for the City of Corner Brook. Is that \$400,000 out of this amount or for the year as a whole and the other thing he mentioned was St. John's Housing Corporation? Is there anything in particular in this amount for St. John's Housing Corporation particularly with reference to Elizabeth Towers?

MR. DAWE: No, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in St. John's Housing Corporation, particularly for Elizabeth Towers. As I say this is an old agreement. I am sure the hon. member for St. John's West is familiar with this agreement. It is

the payment of an outstanding loan that was taken over by the Province on behalf of the City and this amount will pay this loan in full and that the City of Corner Brook - this \$400,000 is an annual grant, but I just based this on a monthly basis. A total expenditure for the Province estimated is around \$3 million for revenue grant including the City of St. John's for the whole of the Province and as I say this time of the year this is the peak period for the demand on the department for this revenue grant, as I said before. The bulk of the taxes come into the various councils during this time of the year and this is why I am making provision for this grant to be kept so high as it is.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate to the committee whether any monies are provided in this vote for the continuation of the housing development with particular reference to the shell housing development which is presently underway in Fortune and in Grand Bank.

MR. DA'VE: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision for this in this particular amount, but I think we have only to ask the House to vote for funds for this amount later in the session.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister has given us a very excellent run down on what the purpose of this money is and it is line with his answers to questions that have been tabled by the hon. minister in this House. He has been giving us very complete answers down to the last cent, in reply to the questions that we have asked in this House. I would like to congratulate the hon. minister on his attitude. It is certainly very refreshing. Several questions, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Urban Renewal Project on Blackhead Road, there is an considerable amount of concern in the Blackhead Road area as to whether or not there is going to be money spent in the area in improvements to houses that are already there, expenditures apart from the water and sewage and making the new roads, putting in the new roads and so on? Is there going to be money provided to improve the housing of the people up there who are still living in their old homes? They may have been moved and so on for the new roads. I would like the minister to let us know, if he can now what the position is going to be on that? It is a matter of great concern up there and that is one question. On the shell housing proposal which is in the Speech from the Throne, whether the hon. minister can tell us whether there is any definite indication from the Government of Canada or CMHC that they will participate in financing shell housing in Newfoundland this

year not just an experimental basis but substantial number of shell houses? That is another great question at the moment and number three, if the minister could tell us, - the Come-by-Chance project appears to be about ready to commence after construction - what are the plans of the hon. minister's department with reference to a town site in the Come-by-Chance or in Clarendville? There is going to have to be a great deal of money spent going to have to be spent on public facilities in that area assuming the oil refinery project goes ahead this year. Is there any money in these estimates for that purpose? Or just what he is planning with respect to that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No money is being used.

MR. DAWE: In answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, let us say that this will all be disclosed in capital account budget to be presented to the House, and we are asking for an amount for Blackhead and that we are asking for an amount, an amount for the shell housing and as I say we are definite as to the developments at Come-by-Chance. This will all be disclosed in capital account budget to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in view of the almost satisfactory explanation that the hon. minister has given us in connection with his department. The only almost satisfactory explanation given tonight. I would move that we only reduce the amount of the vote for his department by \$500,000 being one-third of the amount requested rather than \$750,000, because I think that the hon. minister satisfactorily explained that he will need at least \$1 million for a month or a month and a half. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the amount for Municipal Affairs and Housing be reduced by \$500,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that item (13) be reduced to \$1 million. Motion is lost. Shall item (13) carry? Carried. Item (14), Fisheries.

MR. PALONEY: Mr. Chairman, the amount of the Bill on the Fisheries is \$825,000. This is approximately twenty-five percent of the total expenditure of the department for last year. This is the amount that <sup>is</sup> deemed to be necessary for the period in question. I think all hon. members will appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman, that it is at this time of the year that the fishing season is starting and our programs, our activities and our programs and consequently our spending will perhaps be heavier in the months of March, mid-March, April and May than they would be for at any other time during the year. As a matter of fact, during the mid-term summer and early fall, we have very little direct

contact with the fishermen. They are fishing at that time and they are fitted out with boats and gear and engines and the like, but these days, if any hon. member wishes to come to my office, he will find men. Today for example, fishermen from Griquet, in the district of White Bay North to fishermen from St. Mary's Bay and one or two from the district of my friend, the hon. member for the district of St. George. This is the time of the year, when fishermen are getting ready and our expenditures, therefore, under the headings, the main headings in my department which would be fishing gear bounty, boat bounty, boat repairs and fisheries' loans. This is the time of the year, when our



Boat Bounty; Boat Repairs; and Fisheries Loans, this is the time of the year when our expenditures would be heavy so it is not surprising to me that the amount asked for the period in question is of the order of 25 per cent. I would have thought that perhaps it might be a bit heavier, because of the nature of the department. These department activities Mr. Chairman, are concerned for the main part with the inshore fishery and I repeat it is now starting where these are the days when the shop is open all day and if the closing hours or the opening hours permitted it our shop will be open at night we are busy our expenditures will be heavy in the next couple of months.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. minister mentioned bounties or subsidies or boat repairs. I have been receiving some complaints, I do not know if that is the word, complaints, but I guess it is complaints. But bounties are available for the building of new boats, lone-liners even smaller boats, but that this type of subsidy or bounty is not available for the repairing of old boats, am I correct in assuming that a bounty is not available to fishermen for the repairing of their boats or do I understand from the hon. minister's comment that, I may be wrong because a lot of people believe and have been told that funds are not available for the building or repairing of boats personally I think there is something wrong with that type of ~~thing~~ <sup>thinking</sup> and I know the hon. minister thinks there is something wrong with that type of thinking. And if you have a boat that can be repaired for \$5000 and made seaworthy and meet C.S.I. regulations or if it is too small to come under S.S.I. to meet ordinary safety regulations that you cannot get any money to help you do that but if you want to build a new boat at twenty or thirty or forty thousand dollars which will not be that much better you can get a subsidy then. I would be very happy to hear the facts from the minister.

MR. MALONEY: I am sorry to hear Mr. Chairman that the hon. member for Burin that this impression is around. There is on the statutes as hon. members know, should know there is a fishing vessels repairs act which has been in now a number of years. I can perhaps understand why it is not widely known because when the act was brought in many, perhaps 14 or 15 years ago there were in operating in Newfoundland a good many fishing vessels of the two-masted auxiliary type vessel, now these are gone and the modern fishing vessel is the long-liner. And under the Act in order to qualify for assistance under this Act the vessel has to be 15 years old and there are very few long-liners in Newfoundland, 15 years old. I would say perhaps 95 per cent of the long-line fleet, and I think this is the fleet that the hon. member is speaking of, 95 per cent of that fleet is

younger than 15 years of age, and they would not qualify until they are 15 years of age.

MR. HICKMAN: And they would not qualify. Is there a limitation on the tonnage of the boat?

MR. MALONEY: Ten tons is the bottom limit.

MR. HICKMAN: That might be part of the problem too.

MR. MALONEY: Could be very well be.

Item 14 carried.

Item 15:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman on this item of \$1,900,000 there are various very important economic development projects who are not in the Province Mr. Chairman with which this department is concerned, and last night there was tabled in this House certain agreements that were signed in November by the Government in connection with the Melville fourth mill project. The hon. minister of Justice promised to get us copies because there is only one copy tabled. But what I would first like to draw the committee's attention to Mr. Chairman, is that under the , according to the documents tabled in this House last night in connection with the Melville project, the fourth mill at Stephenville, that it appears that the Government of Newfoundland has guaranteed an amount of \$66,102,000 in connection with that project, rather than as we had previously thought an amount not in excess of \$53 million, and I think that some explanation is due to the House. Under Clause 5 of the principle agreement tabled in the House yesterday, dated November 21, 1969 between the Government and Melville Pulp and Paper Limited, and Nalco, and Javelin and Melville Forest Products Limited Clause 5 of that agreement the Government guarantees <sup>re</sup> payment by Melville first

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not think this has to do with this vote.

MR. CROSBIE: This Mr. Chairman, has to do with economic development and the credit of the Province which is been involved in the guarantee of \$66, million. it was previously to cost \$53 million.

MR. SPEAKER: There will be another time and place, right now the motion is that the sum of \$1,900,000 be voted and I do not quite see what this has to do with the amount of this vote.

MR. CROSBIE: In my submission what it has to do with this vote is that I think that the first opportunity the House is entitled to an explanation of how the amount guaranteed has gone to \$66 million rather than as we had previously thought \$53 million.

1446

MR.SPEAKER: We are not discussing economic development we are discussing simply whether or not the committee is prepared to recommend the vote as \$1,900,000 to the department of economic development.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, my submission on that is that unless there is some explanation of how this guarantee got increased that we should not even be prepared to vote a dollar for the department of economic development, because under the terms of the Act, Section 6 limits the guarantee to \$53 million, another section of the Act would permit a further guarantee but there has been no statement by the Government up to date,

MR.SPEAKER: I do not think that we can discuss that here that would be in the budget and on the estimates and any other occasion that might arise not on Interim Supply.

MR.WELLS: Mr. Chairman, one of the matters that comes under economic development and I presume, and I can only presume that at this stage I do not know what that amount of \$1,900,000 is for but I am presuming that some of it is used in connection with the power subsidy, this is the only place in the estimates that I can see where it would be appropriate, and I am assuming that some of it is used in connection with the power subsidy and I submit Sir, that it is being improperly used and we have got to find some way of re-arranging our commitments or trying to re-access our commitments and try and resolve the difficulties that we have with power. We are Sir spending money and we will undoubtedly spend some of this vote on hydro-electric development and subsidy the promotion of it and I submit Sir, that it is unnecessary, what has gone on to date and what is presently going on is unnecessary and that amount of \$1,900,000 is therefore unnecessary or that an amount that large is unnecessary whatever the appropriate amount is and until we hear a fuller explanation we cannot determine precisely what should be the appropriate amount. But I would point out to the committee Sir, what we are doing, at the moment we have 375 megawatts capacity at Bay D'Espoir and in a week or within a week the sixth unit will go on and that will give us 450 megawatts, and when that steam plant at Holyrood comes into operation within the year that will give us another 300 megawatts for a total of 750 megawatts. And at the moment the power commission can only sell at its peak load, this is not its average sale, at its peak load can only sell about 285 to 290 megawatts. That is all it can sell at the moment. Undoubtedly in a year there will some growth in that but that is all it can sell at the moment and I suggest Sir, that we are wasting public funds

to be putting this kind of money and to be using public funds in this way to promote further power development, when it is clearly unnecessary even taking into consideration the possibility and it is only a possibility at this stage that there will be a refinery at Come by Chance and a mill at Stephenville even taking that into consideration we still have far more power than we need and we have the investment far, far earlier than we need. At the moment

At the moment of that power we are heavily subsidizing it, of the amount of 285 to 290 megawatts presently being sold, 130 of that is to ERCO alone at 2½ mills, 130 megawatts. Not quite half but very close to half and we are paying the subsidy of it. When you look at these figures you realize why the Government is now coming asking for interim supply of \$1,900,000. For what purpose, to what end, we end up subsidizing the parent company of ERCO in England the parent company that is in England to the extent that they can close out their English plant at our expense, because we are so heavily subsidizing them for power. Pretty nearly, I do not know what the price to Newfoundland Light and Power is and they take about, I understand their quota is about 110 megawatts 110,000 kilowatts. There are only a couple of other customers, Bowaters, Price and the Steel Mill, that is all the customers that the power commission has. And of those I think we are probably really subsidizing all except may be Newfoundland Light and Power. I am not sure whether we, what kind of rates are going to Newfoundland Light and Power I have no idea. But I have an idea of the rates to Price and Bowaters because they were in on the original ones, they have their own power supply but they agreed with the Government not to expand it and to take 20 megawatts from the Power Commission in order to enable Bay D'Espoir to get off the ground. And they got a rather favourable price or they end up buying power cheaper than the power commission can produce it, and that means that the Department of Economic Development of this Government has to subsidize it and they have to come to this House now and ask for \$1,900,000. And I think Sir, that this committee should give the Government clear direction that it does not wish it to continue this policy until the Government can clearly show to the committee the economic viability of following this course. At the moment with the experience that we have had with ERCO it is quite clear that we cannot continue on this pattern because we cannot afford to. I understand there are some kind of negotiations going on with ERCO at the moment but the present legal commitments to ERCO, present legal ones, that is what I am talking about Mr. Chairman, the present legal commitments to ERCO require us to pay

the differential between 2½ mills and the actual cost of power to the Power Commission. We are required to pay that difference. The Government is required to pay that difference. And we have not got firm figures on it because we have not got firm reports on exactly how the Power Commission is operating or what the cost of production of power is, but we can only go on estimates that it is somewhere in the vicinity of six mills to produce may be that figure is wrong. Until we get firm factual information from a proper study done by qualified people then we are not going to know with any degree of certainty. And I suggest, Sir, that it is wrong for the minister of Economic Development to now come before this committee and ask for \$1,900,000 that through an indirect route ends up in the pockets of the shareholders of ERCO. Through an indirect route albeit but nevertheless that is where it goes. They have been able to close out their mills in England because they can produce phosphorus so much more cheaply here by reason of the power. At the moment Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather significant, quite significant, when we are talking about load growth of power in this Province. It is quite significant that ERCO takes nearly one-half of the power sold by the power commission at the moment, 130 out of 285 megawatts, and we Sir are subsidizing it, without justification I submit.

I am delighted to hear that there is negotiations going on with ERCO at the moment with a view to changing this but presently as the agreement presently stands we are committed to this for twenty-five years. Now I do not know what ERCO's attitude is going to be I hope it is going to be favourable to amending this to give us a better return, we are legally committed to it at the moment. I am not dead certain what the position is with respect to the Steel Mill. But, Sir, if ERCO can get power for 2½ mills I cannot see the Steel Mill settling for much less or the proposed refinery at Come by Chance, or the proposed mill at Stephenville, are we going to go on forever selling to industrial consumers, power 2½ mills when it cost us about six mills to generate, and there is no



MR. WELLS: This is no indication at this stage what the cost per kilowatt hour is going to be for power generated at the steam plant at Holyrood. We Sir, have used \$50 million of the credit of this Province to construct that plant there. In a very real sense that is using \$50 million of public money because, we could have borrowed it in the same way. We are just as responsible for it in this way. We could have borrowed it and applied it to hospitals and schools, or for any thing else. At least we would not have had to continue to subsidize it. We would only have had to repay principal and interest, but as it is now, we continue to subsidize on top of the initial borrowing of \$50 million, and Sir, unless and until the Minister of Economic Development is prepared to lay before this House, or before this committee the full facts in relation to the power development in this Province and the subsidization of this power, the clear situation, I Sir am not prepared to vote any money under economic development as is requested there.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I was not finished my remarks, and as far as I am concerned I agree with the sentiments of my hon. colleague from Humber East. I do not think Mr. Chairman that we should vote more than sufficient to pay the salaries of the people in the Department of Economic Development under this vote.

The Minister of the department has not given any explanation to the committee of what these funds are required for. The Minister of Economic Development has not informed the people of Newfoundland, nor this House to date of the increase in the amounts of monies guaranteed Melville Pulp and Paper from \$53 million to \$66 million. The agreement signed on November 21st, 1969. One would have thought that after that was done there would have been a public statement about it. From \$53 million to \$66 million, it is an open end guarantee in any event beyond that, but it is specific and definite \$66 million.

The matters that my hon. friend has mentioned about power, the minister of this department has refused to table in this House reports that the Government has had done on this very question of power Mr. Chairman, and what it can be sold for. Reports from the Energy Board of Canada; the Power Commission of Newfoundland; International Engineers of California; Mertz and McLellan of London, England; the Economics Division of the Department of Finance of the Government of Newfoundland; Engineers from Stone and Webster of New York; officials from the Department of Finance of Canada; the Department of Energy of Canada; or the Department of Regional Economic Expansion of Canada; all of those reports the minister of that department has told this House have been received by the

Government Mr. Chairman, and there is no issue that is of greater importance to the future of this Province than the question of whether power can be sold at two and one half or three, or three and one half mills, to the heavy industrial users in Newfoundland. There is no question more important to the future of this Province than whether or not power from the lower Churchill can be delivered in Newfoundland at a price that makes it economic for us to attract industry in Newfoundland, and Mr. Chairman, all of these studies were carried out and paid for with public funds to give the answers to those problems and those questions. They have all been received by the hon. the Minister of Economic Development and they have all been refused by that hon. minister to be tabled in this House.

On that basis alone Mr. Chairman, we should not vote any money for that department except enough to keep the civil servants there with their pay cheques for the coming month of April. We want to be fair about that. It is not Mr. Chairman, the civil servants of that department that should suffer. But certainly the members of this House should be given these reports or given some of these answers to enable them to make some judgement as to where we are in Newfoundland on this question.

There is another question Mr. Chairman the minister of that department should be very much concerned about, and that is the possibility of any start on the third mill, Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Mill at Come by Chance. There was another study authorized by the Government of Newfoundland and by the company to consider the question Mr. Chairman, as to whether there was sufficient wood available

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. member is drifting far afield in speaking about future studies and future projects on this particular item.

MR. CROSBIE: What I am discussing Mr. Chairman, is the waste of expenditure of funds which is the previous history of this department. This department has paid out monies for the Forristall International Engineering Company to carry out a study in connection with the third mill which has been before the people of the Province and this House since 1960. Despite that expenditure of funds and the receipt of an interim report two years ago, no report has been made to this House as to what that report contained, or when the final report would be in, or what the exact status of that project is.

Surely Mr. Chairman, it is the function of a Minister of Economic Development to inform the members of this House and the people of Newfoundland where we are in economic development in the Province. Not to ask us to vote

1115

blindly

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. There is another time and a place for that and we are on Interim Supply now, and I think the members remarks and debates should be limited to the amount that is asked for here.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, as always I bow to your judgement, and the ruling in these matters.

MR. NEARY: That is very decent of the hon. member

MR. CROSBIE: I am glad the hon. minister to be rehabilitated agrees with the position I have taken in this matter, so Mr. Chairman, as we do not want to delay the business of the House I will make a motion that unless the hon. minister is going to give us a clear explanation of all these matters which I doubt very much, I would make a motion Mr. Chairman, that the amount in vote fifteen, now I am not going to discuss the full points I am just going to discuss the round amount

MR. WELLS: And the coverage

MR. CROSBIE: That the \$1.9 million be reduced to a sum of

AN HON. MEMBER: \$900,000.

MR. CROSBIE: No not \$900,000, definitely not, that is too much for salaries. To the amount of \$175,000. which should be sufficient to pay at least the salaries for a month or two in the Department of Economic Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item 15, be reduced to \$175,000.

Those in favour "aye," Contrary "nay," Motion is lost.

MR. WELLS: Before we carry the item I would like to ask the minister

HON. MEMBERS: It is already carried

MR. WELLS: It is not carried

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not carried

MR. WELLS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Before we decide finally on that item Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development if he would advise the committee of the means by which his department supervises the books of account of Holiday Inn, or the operating company that operates the Holiday Inns in the Province to insure that the accounts receivable by them are, infact being collected. Now I realize Mr. Chairman that

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): I have said many times.....

MR. WELLS: I realize Mr. Chairman, that the Government may well be entitled to rely on the report of the auditors, Peet, Marwick, Mitchell

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Point of Order, we are talking about economic development and the hotels have nothing to do with economic development. Nothing. We

might as well talk about the United Nations

MR. WELLS: Does that not come under the department?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): No

MR. WELLS: The Minister of Economic Development?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): No

MR. WELLS: Under what? Would the Premier mind advising the committee under what department it does come?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Yes, I would mind

MR. WELLS: I submit Mr. Chairman, that that is wrong information, and that it does in fact come under the Department of Economic Development. It does not appear anywhere else in the estimates that I see. And the minister has advised the House on previous occasions that he is the minister responsible for it. Now unless and until he is going to tell us it is another department we have no alternative but to accept that

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The minister has done no such thing, I have not Mr. Chairman, I have not done any such thing

MR. WELLS: I have no alternative Mr. Chairman but to assume that it is under economic development. There is profit and loss

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): I say it is not, and he must take my word Mr. Chairman. He must take my word.

MR. WELLS: I will take his word when he tells me under what department it does come. I will not accept until then

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): I will do no such thing except to say that - Mr. Chairman I ask that he be ordered to take my word. There is no choice. He must take the word of a minister when the minister gives it as a minister. And as minister I say that Holiday Inns do not come under the Minister of Economic Development. Now he must take that

MR. WELLS: Will the minister kindly tell the committee under

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): No he will not

MR. WELLS: Under what department it does come

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): No he will not

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The minister has<sup>dis</sup>claimed all responsibility for Holiday Inns placed under this particular grant and the hon. member has to accept that

MR. WELLS: I do not accept it

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but he will accept it. I say to Your Honour that under the Parliamentary rules a member of this House must

accept a statement of the minister given in his place as minister or lay a charge and then we will deal with it. Now he must accept it Your Honour

MR. WELLS: Very well I will lay the charge Mr. Chairman

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. The rule is quite clear in that the, that an hon. member has to accept a statement from the minister. But the hon. member does not have to acknowledge accepting the statement or make any overt act that he does accept it. He is not allowed to do anything contrary to the acceptance of it. Now the position is therefore that the Minister of Economic Development has said that, the hon. member must accept it, but the hon. member does not have to say he accepts it.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): And he cannot say the contrary

MR. CHAIRMAN: He cannot say the contrary

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I say the contrary and I lay the charge, and the reason for it

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the hon. gentleman is out of order. The item is item 16, Labour

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order. No member of this House can be ordered, can be ordered to accept anything. How can a member of this House be ordered to accept the word of any one.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): He will pay the penalty if he does not

MR. CHAIRMAN: It does not only go for a minister, my understanding is that when any hon. member makes a statement in this House you know, that has to be accepted as being made by the hon. the member with honour.

MR. WELLS: Agreed, but I challenge it

MR. CHAIRMAN: But where a minister of the Crown makes a statement that he is not responsible for a particular item on the Order Paper, well then that has to be accepted by the hon. member, otherwise the Speaker, or the Chairman is put in the position of having to decide for himself. Now I do not know which department it comes under so how can I decide this? It just have to be left undecided. That is the situation.

Shall item 16, carry?

MR. WELLS: ITEM 15?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No item 16, Labour. Shall item 16 carry?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall Your Honour having put the previous item 15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fifteen was carried

MR. WELLS: I accept it, I did not recall it having been put



MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. the Minister of Labour advise the committee, the basis which was used to calculate this amount of \$220,000. and how it relates to the expenses of the department for a month or two.

MR. KEOUGH: I thought we had gone home yesterday. I did not expect to have to engage in this sort of an exercise in this hour of the night. However, I have not got my estimates with me, but the best breakdown I can give is as follows; The Department of Labour is required by statute to perform certain functions and some of these are crowded into the early part of the year. I think the Boiler Inspection runs to a fairly substantial sum of money, there are a number of new services that have to be implemented this year, <sup>but</sup> that will not wash under the ground rules that had been laid down by the Minister of Finance. It looks like on the basis of the number of requests received so far, that I am going to hit with a number of requests for conciliation boards this year. There is the cost of the Cohen Royal Commission, to bear. There is the cost of the Review Committee set up to examine into the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board to bear, and then addition there are large expenditures for the purchase of courses for apprentices at the College of Trades and Technology, and in vocational schools around the Island. Now it is true that we recover these amounts from the Government of Canada, but we have to lay out the funds in the first instance and very likely a lot of their expenditure had to be made in the beginning of the year.

Now, if all of that does not explain the reason for the diminution of the Interim Supply asked for, well I do not know what in the hell does.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has been very distinct in his comments, and we appreciate of course his explanation, he is one of the few ministers who tried to cover the subject, for he does not have a large subject to cover in the Department of Labour, but the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the vote asked for here for Department of Labour of \$220,000, expensive Labour, is twenty-five per-cent of the amount that was voted in the House for this present year, twenty-five percent to be spend in two months, which is too much far too much, far too much for the Department of Labour.

And, I, therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of \$220,000 be reduced to \$110,000 which should be ample for the hon. minister to go about his business of conciliation boards, whether in hell or otherwise. It should give him plenty of leeway of the month of April. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we do appreciate the thorough knowledge of the course that hon. gentleman has, twenty-one year veteran in this House. A real old political warrior, and we appreciate his explanation, but still, Mr. Chairman, we feel \$110,000 would be ample for one month.

11/50

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Department of Labour receive \$110,000.

Motion lost.

Will Item 16 carry? Carried.

Will Item 17 carry, Highways?

MR. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather peculiar looking vote in comparison with the other. This is one that shows a great reduction, I can only anticipate bearing on my earlier remarks about capital expenditure. There is no capital expenditure whatsoever in this. Because the capital expenditure under this vote last year was \$38 million, and if you flouriate this particular vote here the total expenditure, would come to approximately \$23 million. I take it Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier tonight, there would not normally be a great deal of highroad work going forward in the first two months of the year. But, I most certainly hope, and I am sure all other members hope, that the size of the vote that is indicated here, does not include both current and capital expenditure or there will be no road work whatsoever this year.

MR. T. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I direct these comments to the Hon. Minister of Finance, as he is still the experts on highway construction, in this Government. We have seen an indication within the last few days that has brought great joy to the hearts of the hon. the member for Placentia West, and the hon. the member for Fortune Bay, and myself for the calling of the tenders for work on the road, that the hon. the senior member for Harbour Main, said on Friday, was almost impassible, and no one in his right mind would ever drive over it. Some of us still have to do it, but be that as it may, some tenders have been called, and I believe, there is an indication that further tenders will be called soon. My concern, and I express this to the hon. Minsiter of Highways through his predecessor the Minister of Finance, if my recollection is correct, it takes twelve weeks from the date that the tenders are called in the press, before the first shovel of dirt is moved, and if there is going to be any highway construction and reconstruction and paving in Newfoundland this year, we cannot wait until April or May to call tenders. And I would presume, therefore, that some of the money being sought is for highway construction to commence this year, because there is no point in waiting for the DREE Program, if you wait for the signing of the DREE Program to call tenders, then we are going to fall into the trap, that Ottawa set for us last year, and we fell into, and that we are about to fall into again.

Mr. Benson, who is a man, who seems to take great delight in building up surpluses, regrettably creates his surpluses expense of the provinces, and particularly the expense the provinces must rely on Ottawa for substantial monies for capital accounts and for the development of highways, and health services and that sort of thing. And what happened last year, was nothing short of criminal. The Government of Canada in its program that it announced in its budget in the spring, was to build certain trunk roads in the Province. And this sounded fine, there was going to be \$4 million, \$5 million, or \$6 million of trunk roads in Newfoundland in the passed year, but by the time the tenders and then the low bid went to Ottawa, and then the engineers became very difficult, and then they came back to my hon. friend, who is now the Minister of Finance, just before work started say on the Durin Peninsula Highway, we were in to September or October of later. And instead of spending \$3 million or \$4 million they spend a \$1 million. And then, Mr. Benson, takes great delight in saying, I build up a tremendous surplus. And Mr. Chairman, our friend Mr. Benson is on that same coming course again this year. What he is up to, and what the other officials in Ottawa are up to, is to delay the calling of tenders for the construction and reconstruction of highways in Newfoundland, and in the Atlantic Provinces as late as they possibly can, so that if there is going to be any road work in the Great Northern Peninsula this year, the announcement will come the tenders will be called, but the money will not be spent. And the only beneficiary of this rather protracted and coming program will be the Government of Canada. And we will have great speeches in this House about the DREE Program, and we will be moved to tears about the DEEE Program.

There is no question about it, but the fact of the matter is Ottawa is playing a cunning game with this Province. And the work under the guidance of the hon. the Minister of Finance on the surveys for the road to the Iles, as the hon. the Minister of Justice has been pushing for years, and on the road to Gander Bay, and on the road to St. Mary's, and on the road to the Burin Peninsula, and on the road to Bonavista, to the Town of Bonavista, the Bonavista Highway, the survey work has been done on this for quite some time, and there has been great indication, that this maybe rebuilt, and maybe paved, but the delay, where this fits in, Mr. Chairman, is this, if we have a vote here now, a requested vote is \$3,900,000, and I would hope that some of that vote of \$3,900,000 will go towards the rebuilding, and the reconstruction of the road to Placentia West, and the road to Fortune Bay, and the road to the Iles.

But, if we are going to allow this nonsense and this trickery to continue what happened last year, then there is no need at all to have \$3,900,000, because the tenders will be called, and it is a minimum of twelve weeks and a day that that tender first appears in the paper and I think my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance will correct me, if twelve weeks is not the correct time, but my recollection is that was his statement in the House last year, and we are going to be sold a rather unfortunate Bill of Goods. And the only profit here from this will be the Government of Canada, which once again will show a wapping big surplus, not at the expense of Ontario, or Quebec, but at the expense of Newfoundland.

MR. T. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this vote, and also to direct a question at the minister, in my previous dissertation I explained the fact, that has come completely obvious, that Labrador is apparently not going to be concluded in the DRIF Program, nor does not come under the definition or one of the designated areas of the DRIF Program.

I would like to ask a question of the hon. the minister, as to what portion of this \$3,900,000 has been appropriated, or if any has been appropriated for the purpose of building or maintaining roads in Labrador? Now I have spoken quite often about the lot of monies that was spent the year before last, the last Fiscal Year on the construction of the Labrador highway, what it has been famously named from Goose Bay to Churchill Falls and it is still uncompleted with a large section in the middle uncompleted, and by the time that monies will be appropriated to finish this section in the middle which is not completed, it would be necessary to rebuild the sections that have already been built.

I would like to know what portion of that \$3,900,000 has been appropriated for this purpose, if any? I would like to know what portion of this \$3,900,000 has been appropriated for the maintaining bush roads in Labrador presently, as was promised by the hon. the Premier on various occasions? I would like to know what portion of this \$3,900,000 has been appropriated for the purposes of building a road from Labrador City to the Quebec Boarder enroute to Mount Wright? And if the hon. minister can answer me in affirmative that some portion of this \$3,900,000 based expressly Sir on the fact that we are excluded from the Dree Program, I would be very happy indeed, if he could elaborate or tell me if any portion of this money has been appropriated for these purposes?

HON. WILLIAM N. ROWE: (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT) Mr. Chairman would the hon. the member permit a question? I would like to ask the hon. member



his  
what / source of information is when he states categorically that the Labrador  
portion of this Province is not in the DREE Program?

MR. T. BURGESS: Can the hon. the minister, can you tell me that it is not?

MR. ROWE: (W.N.) I can tell if the hon. member will allow, I can tell him that ,  
will the hon. member allow?

MR. BURGESS: Yes.

MR. ROWE: (W.N.) Last summer, Mr. Merchand came out with a statement to the  
effect that Labrador was not included as a designated area under the Regional  
Development Incentives Act, which is an Act administered directly by DREE, the  
Department of Perional Economic Expansion with enterprises and companies and  
plants wishing to go to certain areas of the Province, and thereby availing of  
certain direct pass incentives from the DREE Program. This, Mr. Chairman, has  
no relationship at all to the DREE Program as such, which is not

It is not based on these designated areas in any way, shape or form, but it is based on something else as far as infrastructure is concerned; namely the concept of special areas and there has been no information released by any one Provincial or Federal to the effect that there will not be one or more special areas which can avail of DREE finances and grants of money under the DREE program.

MR. BURGESS: Thank you. Thank you. I would like to thank the hon. minister for that explanation which is made to the best of his knowledge, but on the other hand the hon. minister cannot tell me that we are included but I know from past experience based on our geographical location, we are supposed to be part of the Province, Mr. Chairman. But based on our geographical location, we do not benefit from any of the programs that apply to the Atlantic Provinces, the Maritime Provinces and based on our geographical position on the mainland, the fact that it is stated that it is Newfoundland and Labrador neither do we benefit from the programs which affect the rest of the mainland.

Now, if the hon. the minister can tell me that positively I am wrong by asserting that we are not included in the DREE program, I will be quite happy to renounce anything that I have said relative to us not coming under the program. He cannot tell me. I strongly suspect and this is one statement which I made and anytime I have made reference to it, I suspect that just like every other time, we are going to be excluded and nobody can tell me any different. I maintain basically, Sir, that it is because we are not getting strong enough representation on the part of our Provincial authorities here in this Provincial House. When I am talking about the Department of Highways about this vote for \$3.9 million, I directed questions at the hon. Minister of Highways and I would appreciate it, if he could answer me, if appropriations from this amount had been made for the purposes of developing or finishing the road across Labrador, if appropriations have been made from this sum for maintaining for keeping open the bus roads in Labrador and if any appropriation has been made from this amount for the purposes in line with the promises of the hon. the Premier of building a road from Labrador City to the Quebec border enroute to Mount Wright?

MR. JONES: MR. Chairman, before I had a chance to say anything, I am speaking on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Highways who is out of the House momentarily. Three hon. members opposite have spoken. I am afraid that I will

1453

have to repeat. No before I repeat what I have said already, I would like to draw the attention of the committee to what I feel is the need for this Interim Supply of \$3.9 million. As I have said earlier, Interim Supply normally does not reflect capital account expenditure. Every year in the Department of Highways, it has been through my experience that in the month of April and May, we were faced with the position that Bills had accumulated from winter maintenance, from snow clearing, from the rental of machinery which had to be paid in April and sometimes as they were received in May month. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, in the month of May, April and May, departmental forces were preparing to go into summer maintenance.

Now without exception, Mr. Chairman, every winter in Newfoundland is a bad winter as far as Highways is concerned. If we do not get snow on the Avalon Peninsula, we get it on the Great Northern Peninsula. At this particular time of the year, it is always found that there is a need for more money; especially Mr. Chairman, if the department is endeavoring to keep itself on a current basis. Now it is quite true, as my hon. friend from Fortune Bay and Mr. Chairman I wish when other hon. members are addressing him that they would not say he is the hon. member for Fortune, because I am quite sure that the hon. member for Burin is quite jealous of Fortune. While it is true, Mr. Chairman, his remarks are true that there is very little road work going ahead at this particular time. It is in a period, when Bills have to be met for winter maintenance which is the new term for snow clearing because these winters we do much more winter maintenance than we do snow clearing, also the changing over of heavy equipment, graders, front end loaders, dozers, what have you from winter maintenance to summer maintenance. All this seems to accumulate at this particular time of the year and I can see every justification for this amount, Mr. Chairman, at this particular time of the year.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Burin in his dissertation on the relationship between the Provincial and Federal Government proved that he too was a bit of an expert on highways. I am afraid that I should ask him to retract the statement, when he said that I was the only one in the House. However, Mr. Chairman, I think to stay within the rule of relevancy that items discussed by him are really under capital account and not covered by this Interim Supply that I am referring<sup>to</sup>, and I am afraid that I will have

b give the same answer to my friend from Labrador West that the \$3.9 million does not reflect any plans for road construction either in the present or in the future in any of these capital account areas. An amount of \$3.9 million, Mr. Chairman, would be a very, very small amount to start any worthwhile capital work.

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, for the reasons again that were given earlier the maximum that should be granted, if any is to be granted. We do not agree that any should be granted, but certainly the maximum should be \$1,950,000 in this case and I move, Sir, that the vote in respect of item (17) Highways be reduced to \$1,950,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that item (17) be reduced to \$1,950,000. Motion is lost. Shall item (17) carry? Carried. Shall item (18) Supply carry?

MR. WELLS: The item in Supply is again approximately twenty-five percent of what was voted last year for the Department of Supply and up to this point, we had no indication of just what the amount is for and before we vote on the amount, I would ask the Minister of Supply, if he would be kind enough to offer to the House a reasonable explanation of what it is proposed to do with the \$205,000 that he is asking for.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, with response to the question from the hon. member opposite. I do not know if this is a reasonable answer or not, but what it is broken down to the best of my knowledge at this moment, Mr. Chairman, is for salaries, stationery, office supplies, equipment which had to be paid on a monthly basis and also I might add in anticipation of taking over services which as the hon. member I am sure is aware will be the Department of Supply and Services and again will be into salaries and other expenditures that will be required and it is for this reason that we have this amount of \$205,000 indicated. I am not sure that this response of mine is as detailed perhaps as the hon. member opposite would wish, but I am afraid that it is the most that I can offer at the moment unless he has some other question that perhaps I could help him with.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the amount be reduced to the sum of \$100,000 again for the reasons, the reasons that we offered earlier. Just so there will be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the unwanted interjection, I appreciate very much the comments offered by the Minister of Supply. I express the gratitude of the committee for his offering them, but the reason for the reduction is our

contention that the maximum should be for one month, if at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that the amount be reduced to \$100,000. Motion lost.

Shall item (18) carry? Carried. Shall item (19), Labrador Affairs, carry?

MR. BURGESS: Would the hon. minister of Labrador Affairs please specify how the figure of \$100,000 was arrived at and before the hon. gentleman answers the question, I would like to make the comment - I do not know whether to be happy or sad about this but Labrador Affairs by this vote or by this request or vote for \$100,000, it represents thirty-six percent of last year's total budget. Thirty-six percent which means that for a twelve month, if we can take this on the same percentage basis that we should have at least voted to the Department of Labrador Affairs for this coming fiscal year \$600,000, because last year, Mr. Chairman, the total budget was \$270,600.

Now first of all I would like to know how the figure of \$100,000 was arrived at and what the reasoning is behind this request for a vote of \$100,000 and what the intended application of this \$100,000 will be?

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I have no explanation except for the normal routine of the operating of the department and whether \$100,000 is too much or not, I am not really prepared to say. There is no other function except for the normal operations of the department.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make the position quite clear. I certainly do not think that \$100,000 is too much. As a matter of fact, one thing that I do regret is that it cannot be voted - you cannot vote more money on Interim Supply than is already there instead of less. You can only vote for less to have it reduced. The figure of \$100,000, Mr. Chairman, as I have said represents thirty-six percent of last year's budget and the \$100,000 to my mind with reference to the actual functions of the Department of Labrador Affairs; it is to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that at all times since the formation, since the formation of this department, the Department of Labrador Affairs which was established in 1966 that it has always been - it never has neither its budget nor Interim Supply, request for an Interim Supply vote - it has never, it has always been the lowest on the totem pole. Now we are talking about a Department of Labrador Affairs. I do not like to even hear the word because it is a colonial attitude. The Department of Labrador Affairs, in other words, we establish a department to administer to the problems of a section of our Province.

1458



Now Labrador of which this department is designed to look after, Labrador is, I do not think there will be any quibbling or any disputes about what I am about to say, contributing in terms of resources and tax dollars and every other wise. It is contributing more to the Province on the whole than any other section, in any other part of the Province and yet it is consistently and always treated as the lowest on the totem pole, when it comes to provision of services and provision of votes for money to administer to this particular section of our Province. Then the question is repeatedly asked, why I or why the people of Labrador consistently feel that they are being neglected.

Now this \$100,000, as I have said and I want to make that quite clear. I will reiterate it ten times if necessary. I do not think it is too much. I would like to see that increased a hundred fold, because I feel that the Department of Labrador Affairs should - it could, if it were operating effectively and if the functions of that department were being carried out or if the functions were designed to make Labrador feel a part of the Province, I think that that vote could be increased a hundred fold. The only function of that department right now, Mr. Chairman, no wonder they only need a \$100,000 - the only function of that department right now is to process applications from people who are receiving a Government rebate on Eastern Provincial Airways and that is the only function of that department. No wonder they only need \$100,000.

There are so many things and further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point very, very clear that if any portion of this \$100,000 is going towards the payment of the directors, the resident directors of Labrador, if I thought for one moment that any dollar of that \$100,000 is going towards the payment of salaries for the resident directors, I would say that it should be abolished completely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It certainly is.

MR. BURGESS: Not reduced to one dollar but it should be reduced period.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well say it, because it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now go ahead say it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. BURGESS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Because the functions of these people, or the performance of these people certainly leaves a lot to be desired, and that is being as kind as I can possibly be. There are so many things Mr. Chairman, there are so many things in so many ways could that department, little as I like the name, the Department of Labrador Affairs. There are so many things that they could be doing to make the resident of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador feel that they belong. And it is just not being done. Now Mr. Chairman, I have been told that portions of this \$100,000 are going to pay some of the salaries of the resident directors, which I think is an utter waste of money. It is like throwing it down the drain, and the only regret I have when I talk on this, on this rule is that I cannot vote with the exception of payment of salaries for these people, for resident directors - the only regret I have is that this thing, this vote cannot be increased one hundred percent.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, before you carry that. Maybe the Department of Labrador Affairs will serve the people better and the people of Labrador West if the hon. gentleman paid more attention to the Labrador Affairs. This hon. gentleman Mr. Chairman has never written a complaint from Labrador West to the Department of Labrador Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right Mr. Chairman. In another breath Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman stated in Happy Valley a little while ago that the Department of Labrador Affairs should be abolished. Now it should be abolished then, and now he says there should be more money allocated to the department. Where is his consistency Mr. Chairman? Why do you not practice what you preach and pay more attention to the Department of Labrador Affairs, and pay more attention to the people of Labrador West. Why do you not write the odd letter complaining about matters in Labrador West. You are a fine chap to make public statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. BURGESS: The hon. ~~minister~~ points out not to make any statement -

MR. WINSOR: Never mind about the statement, I can make the statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (20) Community and Social Development. (19) is passed.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It will be noted Mr. Chairman that the amount appearing in the Schedule is \$2,200,000, which is a fairly high percentage of the amount in this present year's Estimates of \$4,926,000 gross. The reason Sir, the figure appears at that amount now is because obviously, it must be obvious to all members of this Committee that in the next year, in the coming year the Department of Community and Social Development will be expanding both its current on-going programs, and will also be enlarging its programs, and undertaking some new programs. It was with that thought in mind that the proportion represented by the figure of \$2,200,000, there is more substantial ratio to the total of last year's Estimates compared to other departments.

The amount of about \$1 million Mr. Chairman was inserted into that total, included in that total in anticipation of expansion in current on-going programs. But at this point, and after further thought and consideration, in order to be consistent with the rough ratios of around twenty or twenty-five percent which the Interim Supply vote here represents compared with last year's Estimates. In order to be consistent with those ratios and those percentages, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will be moving, I am unable to do it as the minister responsible for that vote. My hon. friend the Hon. the Minister of Finance will be moving when I sit down, that that amount be reduced by \$1 million, bringing it to a total of \$1,200,000 which again bears around the same ratio as the other votes which we have seen passed here tonight.

That amount of \$1,200,000 Mr. Chairman without going into too much detail on it at all, can be taken and pro-rated over the various heads of expenditure which appear in this year's Estimates, and without any exceptions, can be pro-rated over those heads of expenditure for a period of two, 2½ months. And then hon. gentlemen will be able to determine for themselves what amounts approximately are anticipated to be spent before the Estimates come down in the next couple of months, unless the Estimates come down before the amount of money is spent. Also Mr. Chairman, I would mention that some positions, which are not new positions have appeared in the Estimates in the past two or three years, but which have not been filled, will be filled early in the new financial year coming up.

and I refer specifically to Planning Positions, Director General of Planning and Assistant Director General of Planning, and three other Planners who we hope to take on in the Department of Community and Social Development, very early in the new financial year. And so that again accounts for a part of this Interim Supply. The remainder as I say, can be taken of \$1,200,000 can be taken and pro-rated over the existing heads of expenditure, and hon. members will have an idea, a rough estimate as to what we anticipate spending before the Estimates, the main Estimates come down.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I thank my hon. colleague for drawing this which was an honest mistake, to my attention, for the reasons that he has explained, and I want to move the following amendment. That Head (20) of the Schedule to Bill No. 40, entitled "Community and Social Development" be changed from \$2.2million, \$2,200,000 to read \$1.2 million, or \$1,200,000, and subsequently that the total as it now stands at \$61,618,000 be changed to read \$60,618,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Motion is that Item (20) be reduced to \$1,200,000 which would naturally carry the change in the total to \$60,618,000.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may direct one short question to the Hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development? I understand there is a story out of Ottawa this evening, that a Newfoundlander has been appointed to supervise the implementation of the DREE program in this Province. Would he care to advise the hon. House the name of this Newfoundlander rather than have us wait until tomorrow morning to find out.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Again Mr. Chairman, I cannot in conscience anticipate an announcement of a Federal minister. I can go this far and say that the hon. member substantially is correct, when he says that a Newfoundlander has been appointed to this position. Who it is I know, but I cannot announce until Mr. Marchand tomorrow morning makes the announcement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (2) now stands with \$60,618,000.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, Clause (2) of this is really the operative portion of the Bill. It says from and out of Consolidated Revenue Funds. It may from time to time be issued etc. It is a standard form Clause, but it is the basic authority to issue the \$60.million which is the total of all

1462

the amounts that we have gone over this evening. It has been indicated earlier and I want to reiterate and make the point now that there is no justification whatsoever for this Bill, or for Clause (2) of this Bill, the operative part of the Bill. No justification whatsoever for Interim Supply at this stage, none at all. The Government have not put before the Committee -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think that the Chair should really invoke the rule here of repetition. What has been said previously on one or two occasions should not now be said on two or three occasions more. That is about the result of the Rules.

MR. WELLS: Point of order Mr. Chairman. We are debating Clause (2) the operative portion of the Bill. At the request of the Chair, and I think the general request certainly has the majority of the Committee. Instead of covering Clause (2) we went to the Schedule first. Now Mr. Chairman, I submit Sir that we should not now be barred from debating matters that would have come up under Clause (2) had it been debated first.

The fact of the matter is Sir, this is now only the tenth day of March. The original notice of Motion was given in this matter on the fifth day of March by the hon. the President of the Council, yet if we found ourselves here today forced to consider this Supply Bill and going right through it, despite our argument that Supply is not now necessary. There have been occasions in the past when Interim Supply was not voted on until May. Interim Supply Bill was not voted on until May. Why all of a sudden must we do it on the tenth of March, when we got an indication today that the House is going to resume its sittings on the sixth of April? Why must we now do it on the tenth of March, and apart from that, provide for sufficient funds for a two month period, or an estimated two month period or better.

I submit Mr. Chairman, that there has been no justification whatsoever offered by the Government, no reasonable justification at all. The normal time for a Supply Bill to come before the House is very very late in the month of March, or reasonably early in the month of April. That is the standard thing. The Government could on and exist very well in the first few days of April without Interim Supply. It has been done in the past on many an occasion. They could easily exist without Interim Supply



for that period. It is a matter of six days before this House is called together again. Yet Sir, this Bill appears before us now, and I will not repeat the arguments that we have made this afternoon but I think the point has been made quite clear, that there is no reason for all the kaffuffle that there was here today to get this Interim Supply Bill through. And there is no reason for us being here at three thirty A.M. in the morning rushing this through, none at all, except the Government's obstinacy with no justification to come in and ask for now \$60,600,000.

It has been clearly established I suggest Mr. Chairman, that there is no reason for it, and Sir I propose to vote against Clause (2) of the Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if hon. members opposite do not mind, the House is still in Session, and I wish to address myself to Clause (2) of the Bill. Because Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of territory we have not covered yet, and this really concerns the principle of the Bill. Now Mr. Chairman, I know that the hon. gentlemen are all anxious to get home. The hon. the President of the Council is in no hurry, well that gives Mr. Chairman, lots of scope.

I do not want to repeat the points that were advanced this afternoon either Mr. Chairman. Let me just say this that I am checking the record of the last ten years. We have heard about the last twenty-one years, and how Interim Supply went whistling through, whenever it was required for three months. In the last ten years since 1960 Mr. Chairman, this is the record. 1960 Interim Supply was passed on May 30, 1960 in the amount of \$20,942,000. May 30, the Government operated warrants, and apparently had a late session that year. 1961.

MR. CURTIS: How could you have Supply in May?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the President of the Council now doubts what I am stating, doubts what an hon. gentleman of this House is stating. We heard a few moments ago that the hon. the President of the Council should be ordered to accept what I am stating. But I do not ask him to do that. I ask him to look at Act No. 1 of the Statutes of Newfoundland, 1960, and he will see that it is signed or assented to on May 30, 1960

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but how does it read?

1464

MR. CROSBIE: Well the hon. gentleman will have to read it himself.

MR. CURTIS: Just pass it over.

MR. CROSBIE: I just do not carry the 1960 Statutes in my pocket. I have not Mr. Chairman, got an office in the precincts of the House of Assembly to keep the Statutes in. 1961 Mr. Chairman no Interim Supply. 1962, no Interim Supply. 1963 Act No. (1) Statutes of Newfoundland 1963, \$26,035,000, assented to on March 29, 1963. There is a proper exercise Mr. Chairman, of Interim Supply. March 29, only two days to go, when the angry civil servants and teachers would not get their paycheques, so Interim Supply goes through.

The hon. ex-minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources was probably in the Cabinet then and saw that it was done properly. 1964 Mr. Chairman, 1964, Act No. (2) of the Statutes of Newfoundland 1964 in the amount of \$30,780,000, and that was assented to on March 20, 1964. The Government was starting to slip. It was slipping in the direction of arrogance, passed eleven days before the end of March. This is only March 10, Mr. Chairman, or March 11. March 20 in 1964, the Government was getting cocky. 1965, Act No. (22) \$16,285,000. That was a bit more reasonable Mr. Chairman, and that was assented to on April 2, 1965, not twenty-one days before. April 2, 1965. It was just after April Fool's Day. It was not signed on April 1 for an appropriate reason. 1966 no Interim Supply. 1966-67 the first year that some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were in the House, we insisted that the matter be done properly apparently. There was no Interim Supply. 1966-67. No Interim Supply. The hon. minister says shame.

MR. CURTIS: Tell us about '68 now.

MR. CROSBIE: 1968 -

MR. CURTIS: Yes listen now, tell us all about it.

MR. CROSBIE: 1968 -

MR. CURTIS: A letter from the Lieutenant-Governor on March 15 -

MR. CROSBIE: 1968 Mr. President

MR. CURTIS: Yes, a letter from the Lieutenant-Governor March 15.

MR. CROSBIE: What happened, what happened to 1968. Our spirits crushed by our success in '66-'67. Act No. (9) of 1968, \$49,972,000. That was a slip. March 28, 1968. That was when it was assented to Mr. President.

1465

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but it was introduced on the 15 of March.

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, you were up to your tricks then too.

MR. CURTIS: No, you were here then.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister knows he never consulted me -

MR. CURTIS: The Minister of Finance brought in his Budget.

MR. CROSBIE: But I accept responsibility for it. The hon. the President I accept responsibility for it. I am deeply ashamed.

1969 last year Mr. Chairman, Act No. (8). The Minister of Finance last year put up quite a struggle when he got it down to \$38,480,000. Act No. (8) of 1969. What date was it assented to Mr. Chairman? March 31. No wonder Mr. Chairman, no wonder we accepted and voted for it last year. It was brought in on the anniversary of Confederation. The twentieth anniversary. Does not the House remember the great celebrations that went on last year in anticipation of the hon. the Premier's retirement? We were all lightheaded, lightheaded with expectation. She walloped right through on March 31. That was a proper exercise Mr. Chairman of Interim Supply, because on the next day the civil servants and teachers and police, particularly the police, I hate to go out that front door, the police did not get their cheques, because the billieknockers would go to work, and they would not even look for overtime. March 31, Interim Supply was passed. And now this year Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council is coming in, for the first time in ten years. And I do not think ever in our previous history back to 1949, did they come in on March 10 to force through Interim Supply in two days, not four days even, in two days.

Now Mr. Chairman, we do not want to be repetitious in this debate. I just recite that history to put it on the record, because Mr. Chairman, this is twenty days now before the end of the month. Because the House of Assembly can continue meeting even though the hon. the Premier and four other ministers will be absent, because no convincing case has been made that we should vote \$60 million, I have no choice myself for all those reasons, but to vote against this Interim Supply Bill, and this Clause (2) and every other stage of this Bill as a protest against this high-handed, arbitrary and obnoxious approach by the Government for the problems of getting Supply for the members of this hon. House.

On motion that the Committee rise and report having considered the matters to them referred and passed certain Resolutions, with some amendments, and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed certain Resolutions for granting Interim Supply to Her Majesty, with some amendments, and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

MOTION: That the Resolution be now read a first time:

MR. WELLS: Do not our rules require that a report from a Committee of Supply once it has been adopted by the House be referred to a Committee of Ways and Means. Is that not the next proper course on a Supply Bill, whether it be Interim or otherwise? The matter is set out clearly I suggest Mr. Speaker on Page 34 of our Standing Orders, and I will quote for Your Honour as follows: "When the Committee of Supply has completed its consideration of the Estimates and its report has been adopted by the House the amounts are incorporated in Resolutions to be presented to the Committee of Ways and Means. The Resolutions as adopted by Ways and Means are reported to the House, put by the Speaker and incorporated in the Bill of Supply or Appropriation Bill which is introduced by the Finance Minister and given its three readings then and there." I ask for Your Honour's ruling on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: In connection with this we must remember I think to begin with that this is Interim Supply and not the Supply Bill. There is a lot of difference with regard to the debate. I am not going to participate in the debate by saying concerning the debate which has taken place. But there is a lot of difference between the Interim Supply and the Supply Bill itself. When the Supply Bill, that is the main Appropriations Bill is brought before this House, the Committee of Ways and Means is already set up. When the Interim Supply comes in, and this is the practice that we have been following all down through the years of which I have any

knowledge, and that is since 1956. The Committee of Ways and Means has not been set up, and the practice all down through the years, which is the one that I have to follow, by the precedent established here in this particular House, that we have the Resolution go before the Committee of the Whole. After the Bill attached, it is not the Bill that is before the House, it is the Resolution, and the Bill is attached in the same manner as the Estimates are attached to the Resolution when we go into the main Appropriations Bill, or the Resolution on the Estimates that the Speaker do leave the Chair. When we do that in the Interim Supply, the customs we have always followed, we put the Resolution before the House together with the Bill which is passed in its three stages, as a sort of unofficial Estimate, or the Estimates attached to the Resolution for consideration in detail.

The matter is discussed in all its detail, and when it is through, when the discussion on the Bill together with Section 2 as we have it tonight. When the details are discussed and Section 2 is carried and which provides for a general debate on the issue, then the Resolution is read, its first, second time, and the Bill is introduced which is exactly what the Motion before the House is the present time. That a Bill be introduced to give effect to this Resolution. There is no Committee of Ways and Means set up even, and we are using the Committee of the Whole House as a sort of joint Committee of Supply and Ways and Means. Because when the Committee of Supply has finished its deliberations on this Section and the Bill itself and on the Resolution, then the Committee recommends that the Bill be introduced to give effect to the same, and is then read its first, second and third time forthwith as it is cited in the order which the hon. members has just read for us.

It is the practice we have followed as far as I can remember or have had any knowledge of this House. And it is the practice which has been established. The precedent is there and there has never been any question about it before. This is the manner in which we have done it, and I think that all members will agree, who have any knowledge of the House since 1949, that there has been a freer and more expression of opinion on this particular Interim Supply Bill than there has been in the history of the House. Therefore I have to say we have to follow, we will follow



March 10, 1970

Tape #319

Page 5

the practice that has been established down through the years. The Resolution has been passed and we now read the Bill. We read the Resolution twice in the formal manner, and then the Bill is read its first, second and third time.

MR. WELLS: I thank Your Honour, and Your Honour has .

Your Honour has much more experience in the House than I have, and I accept your Honour's ruling quite clearly, but there is one point where I am left with an uncertainty. Your Honour, I think, has made it clear to me that we are operating on the precedent that has been established rather than on what is set out in our Standing Orders. I accept that. But then, does that mean that what follows; namely, "The Resolutions as adopted by Ways and Means" (the Committee are reported to the House. Well now we are taking resolution from Supply Committee) "are reported to the House...."

MR. SPEAKER: As I have already pointed out for the hon. member and I do not want to get into a debate on this; but for clarification I am quite happy to do so. This section that he is reading to the House at the present time is in reference to the main Appropriations Bill, but we have built up by precedent a different procedure in regard to Interim Supply and Supplementary Supply.

MR. WELLS: The point that I am uncertain on, your Honour, is whether the remainder of that applies too, namely that the Bill which is then introduced can be given its three readings then and there?

MR. SPEAKER: That has been the precedent that has been established all down through the years, yes.

On motion Resolution read a first time.

Motion is that the Resolution be now read a second time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: On Division.

MR. SPEAKER: Four members are enough. Let the House divide. Call in the members.

Those in favour of the second reading of the Resolution please stand:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Captain Strickland, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Canning, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. Minister of Supply, Mr. Lane, Mr. Saunders and Mr. Mahoney.

Those against please rise:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Myrden, Mr. Burgess.

On motion Resolution read a second time.

On motion a Bill, " An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-One And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first time, ordered read a second time now.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered read a third time now.

On Motion Bill read a third time and it is ordered that the Bill do passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (President of the Council) I move, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and the House at its rising to adjourn until today Wednesday at 3:00 p.m., when I expect his Excellency the Governor will be here.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House at its rising to adjourn until today Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.