



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 33

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. W.N. ROWE (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a ministerial statement concerning a national award won by one of our Rural Development Committees in the Province. Hon. members will be interested to hear that national recognition has been accorded to the efforts of the Rural Development Programme of the Department of Community and Social Development and of the prominent Rural Development Committee working in the Eastport Peninsula area of this Province. The Travel Industry Association of Canada has advised me that the first prize in their national area promotion contest has been won by the Eastport Peninsula Committee for the development of progress.

A submission prepared by the Department of Community and Social Development in conjunction with that development committee was entered in the national contest and took top honours. The submission gives, by way of written text, pictures, and newspaper clippings the details of a three year self-help development programme, with emphasis on internal and external promotion. The project covered by the submission was carried out by the Eastport Peninsula Committee with Government assistance being provided through the Rural Development Programme of the Department of Community and Social Development. Mr. Neville Squire, field worker for the Development Committee, will be accepting the award on behalf of the Eastport Committee at the annual convention of the Travel Industry Association of Canada in Montreal, from May 2 to May 5. The Department of Community and Social Development will be represented by Miss Christiana Francen, Social Planning Office and Mr. Frederick Cook, Assistant Director of Rural Development. Miss Francen and Mr. Cook will be participating as panalists at a seminar during the four day affair.

In making a statement, Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress that the total

MR. ROWE (W.N.):

effect of this particular project both in the area concerned and nationally, by virtue of the recognition which it has received, is an example of what can be accomplished by means of co-ordinated work and ideas of people in local communities and Government. A veritable precedent and example has been established for the other proposed and existing Rural Development Associations in Newfoundland and Labrador. The people of the Eastport Peninsula, the members of the Development Committee, the officials of the Government who have been closely connected with this programme and all other persons or bodies who have been associated with it are to be highly commended for their efforts and their initiative.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders of the Day I wonder if I might address a question to the Minister of Fisheries? As the Minister undoubtedly knows, there has been appointed by the Federal Minister of Fisheries a committee on seals and sealing. As this is a very live issue at the present time I wonder if the hon. Minister has invited or requested that this Committee meet in St. John's or meet in Newfoundland?

HON. E. WINSOR (MINISTER OF LABRADOR AFFAIRS): I will look into it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J.C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, the leader of the House, whether he will inform the House or the Opposition what the order of business is going to be each day, at least a day in advance? At the moment we do not know whether it is estimates, Budget or Legislation, so could we be informed, particularly if the House is to meet morning, afternoon and night, so we can have some way of being ready for what business is to come before the House?

HON. L.R. CURTIS (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Tentatively, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing to start the Legislation in the morning, the estimates in the afternoon and Budget in the night, that is the tentative plan.

MR. A.J. MURPHY (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders

MR. MURPHY:

of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. This is with reference, Sir, to the great amount of labour unrest in the mining industry. Would the Minister care to clarify statements attributed to him with reference to the phasing out of certain mines in the Province and perhaps to comment on this having an affect on negotiations between the mines and the employees?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day!

MOTIONS:

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice, a Bill, "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Health, a Bill, "An Act To Provide For The Establishment Of A Cancer Treatment And Research Foundation," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act, 1968," read a first time, ordered read a second on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a Bill, "An Act To Provide For A Veterinary Licensing Board For The Province And To Incorporate The Newfoundland And Labrador Veterinary Medical Association," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation Limited (Lease) Act, 1961," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Co-Operative Societies Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act." Bill No. 54.

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, it is now, Sir, a little over two years since the Medicare scheme came into effect in this Province. Medicare, as it has become known, was a revolutionary step forward in the development of our medical services. For the first time in our history, with Medicare no Newfoundlander need feel that financial consideration stand between him and his doctor. Under Medicare as Your Honour knows, a person goes to see the doctor of his choice and the Government pays the bill.

Now it goes without saying, Sir, that Medicare has not met all of our needs for health care. Indeed, Sir, in some ways it may have made our needs greater because it, without any doubt, increased the demand in this Province for the services of doctors. The cause of it, Sir, is quite obvious. People now go to a doctor in cases where formally they would not. I think it is fair to say, I think it is a tribute that should be paid to the doctors of this Province to say that Newfoundlanders always got emergency treatment, always got good emergency treatment, always got that emergency treatment without any concern with whether they could pay or not. If a person could not afford to pay, then the doctor did the work and just wrote it off and did it as a contribution to society.

Under Medicare Sir, this no longer happens. A person now need have no worries about financial matters when he wants to go to a doctor. When first we brought in Medicare. Sir, there were fears expressed that this would mean that all sorts of people would go to doctors and that the doctors would be heavily overloaded and there were, I believe, even those who predicted that the Medical Services in the Province would collapse. But, of course, Sir, that has not happened. Our doctors are working hard, the fact that there are

MR. ROBERTS:

fewer doctors throughout the Province means that they are working harder than most doctors elsewhere in Canada. None the less, Mr. Speaker, I can say categorically that after two years we know of no evidence which shows any widespread or far-ranging abuse by patients of Medicare. We have isolated some cases where people have gone to a doctor a little more often than would seem medically necessary. I do not think Medicare can be blamed for that because almost without exception the people who have taken advantage of Medicare in the sense of going to a doctor for reasons other than medical or strictly medical, those people tend to be among the better off. All that happened, Mr. Speaker, in the past was that they could afford to indulge their hypochondria, could afford to indulge their taste for going to doctors needlessly, whereas now everybody is entitled to indulge his taste and the result is that very few really are going, very few people, Sir, are going without having need to see a doctor.

I state that categorically, Sir, because it is a very widely held belief that Medicare is being widely abused. Well, Sir, I know of no evidence to support it and indeed the evidence that I have, we have quite a lot of statistical data, the evidence that I have is directly to the contrary. It is a strain on our doctors, Any person who tries to make an appointment to see a doctor will discover that, particularly in the rarer specialities, ophthalmology, some aspects of psychiatry and some of the other one of a kind specialities like ear, nose and throat and some of the sub-specialities in surgery. But, Mr. Speaker, we know of no evidence of any abuse. We know that our doctors are working hard.

After two years, Sir, and I have been Minister of Health for nearly the full period that Medicare has been in operation, I have no hesitation at all in declaring that it has been a great success. Let me just give the House, Sir, a couple of very brief examples: During the two years that ended March 31 last, the Government, through Medicare paid the doctors of Newfoundland

MR. ROBERTS:

and Labrador for about 2,500,000 separate services, visits to doctors. That is an average, Mr. Speaker, of about five visits for every person in this Province. The cost to the Government was about \$18.5 million and to that work load, Sir, must be added the work done by doctors in our cottage hospitals.

MR. ROBERTS: and in the other areas where doctors are not practicing fee for service. My own constituency, where the Grenfell Mission provides service as they do in Labrador South, Labrador North, St. Barbe North, St. Barbe South, part of Labrador West, the constituency of Twillingate, part of Lewisporte District, where the Notre Dame Memorial Hospital provides service to the District of White Bay South and part of Green Bay I believe where the M.J.Boylen Hospital at Baie Verte.

There is a tremendous amount of work done in these hospitals Sir by doctors who are paid annual salaries. As just an example of out-patients alone; our cottage hospital doctors saw well over 600,000 out-patients in the past two years.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that the number of doctors in Newfoundland has increased substantially since we brought in Medicare. When it began, there were about three hundred and forty-six men and women registered with the Medical Care Commission as actively practicing medicine in this Province. As of today Sir, the total is 446, an increase of 100. Our doctor-patient, in two years we have gone from 350 in round figures to 450 doctors actively practicing in this Province, Sir, in that two year period. Our doctor-patient relationship is still the lowest in Canada, but we must remember, in stressing that, Mr. Speaker, that in the areas of fee-for-service practice, basically St John's, Conception Bay, Grand Falls and Corner Brook, our doctor-patient relationships are comparable with most other areas of the same size in Canada.

Where we are really short of medical services in this Province still is in the more remote districts, the rural parts of the Province; and that is where our expanded programme of increased district medical practices are going to be placed with, we hope, great improvements.

Now Sir, while we have a very successful scheme in operation, we have run into some problems in administration of the plan. That is the reason that this Bill is before the House today. These problems, I should

emphasize, do not go to the heart of the plan at all. They are almost all problems of administration, the problems that affect certain small aspects of the overall Medicare plan, but they are problems which the Government believe must be dealt with and which we are advised must be dealt with by legislation.

The legislation however, Sir, should be read in conjunction with some regulation changes we have made. We have made some very significant changes in the regulations. The first of these I tabled in the House some little while ago. These regulations, which were made in full agreement - with the full agreement of the Medical Association, changed the fee schedule for some of the items of the services of psychiatrists, ophthalmologists and surgeons. There were some anomalies in the ways in which those fee schedules were working out, Mr. Speaker. The fee schedules were not designed for the purposes for which they were being used, so we sat down with the doctors and agreed upon some changes. The net effect of those, we estimate, will be to save the Province about twenty or thirty thousand dollars a year, but more importantly still, we believe that it will provide a better service and will provide for payment to the doctor more closely related to the service he was giving.

Those changes, Sir, are temporary. They will remain in effect only until a new fee schedule is negotiated, and, as I announced in the House some while ago, we are about to sit down with the Medical Association to begin negotiating a new fee schedule.

Other changes we made in regulations are also temporary, thus the restraints upon doctor's earnings that I announced in the House late in March, again Sir, these were made with the agreement of the Medical Association. I think that shows their concern, it shows their desire to try to correct the problem. We intend to impose these by regulations, to implement the agreements by regulations, and they will take effect as of the 1st. of April. Our legal advisers, however, tell us that we are

going to need Legislative authority to be certain we can implement these proration changes, and accordingly there is a section in the Bill before the House, Sir, which will give the Government authority to implement the agreement we have made with the doctors.

That is one purpose of the Bill, Sir; there is a second, one which is far more important. That, Sir, is the part of the Bill which gives the commission powers to impose certain sanctions on a doctor who has made an improper claim for medical services. There is no authority in the present Act to deal with such a matter, to hold a hearing about it or to impose any penalties if there is anything wrong.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for such powers. This has become quite apparent during the past year. I am not very proud about it Sir, but we have some evidence that a few doctors in this Province have attempted to practice, under Medicare practice medicine in a manner completely contradictory to the spirit with which Medicare was adopted. The Medicare Commission have investigated each of these matters, Mr. Speaker, and in one or two cases we have had the R.C.M. Police investigate through the agency of my colleague the Minister of Justice. Those two cases in particular that have been referred to the Department of Justice are still under consideration. I propose to say nothing more except to say that if we have evidence that there have been deliberate infractions we will proceed to take the appropriate action. We will take it under the Criminal Code, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, these are doctors. I am speaking only of doctors. There are two cases which are in the hands of the Department of Justice, with a possible view to considered prosecution, if the evidence holds out under the Criminal Code of Canada. The prosecutions would be under the False Pretenses Act. I do not know Mr. Speaker, if the evidence will justify it, so I propose to say nothing more about it, except to say that

doubts have been raised. I have, therefore, referred them to the Minister of Justice and the R.C.M.P. are doing the necessary investigations.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other cases where we could not resolve the matters in dispute. I may add that throughout this we kept in close touch with the Medical Association, who represent about eighty percent of the doctors in this Province, represent almost all of the doctors practicing within medicare on fee-for-services. We could not resolve these disputes, Sir, and I think it is fair to say the Medical Association was not able to resolve them either. The doctors concerned took the position, I think, that what they were doing was within the letter of the law, therefore, they intended to do it.

Well, Sir, the fact that the Government are powerless to act is a matter we believe should be remedied, and accordingly we drafted these amendments. The proposals, which we believe will enable us to set straight the situation, are now set forth in the Bill before us, in the form of three new sections which will be added to the main Act if the House adopts this Bill. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, these proposals have been drawn up in full consultation with the Medical Association. I think it is fair to say that while they regret the need to enforce such legislation, they feel that it is necessary.

I am very glad they have taken this position. I think it is a responsible one, and I think it is one that is in the best interest of the people of this Province and of the Medical Profession of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the three new sections, which will be numbered (39A), (39B), and (39C), and which will be found in the Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, as sections four and five, the purpose of these Sir, is to allow the Medical Care Commission, which is an agent, for these purposes, of the Government and acts as our administrative body, to allow that commission to impose sanctions upon a doctor who is not practicing properly and thus is abusing the Medical Care Plan.

The types of situation in which the commission could act are spelled out in the first of these three sections, that is (39A). In reading these sections, Mr. Speaker, hon. members who wish to read them, together with the changes we are going to make in the regulations, the change which we made in the definition of the term 'insured services,'

is a very important change, Mr. Speaker, because, under the Medical Care Plan, payment is made to a doctor in return for the rendering by him of an insured service. Previously any service, with the exception of some items that were spelled out in the regulations, third party examinations, insurance examinations and so forth; any service rendered by a doctor to a citizen of Newfoundland was an insured service.

Under the new regulation, which is now in the hands of the draftsman, and which will be tabled as soon as it is done, the service will only be insured service if the service is rendered properly and adequately. In other words, the Medical Care Commission, in the future, will pay only if the service is proper and necessary. So much for the definition of the situations in which the sanctions can be imposed. Hon. members will see they are referred to in detail in the Act, and the tie-in with the insured services, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen, is with the reference to an offence under the Act. In other words, the providing of the service inadequately or improperly will be an offence under the Act, and that is enough to trigger the application of the sanctions sections.

MR. CROSBIE: Inadequate treatment, as it were, or inadequate claim?

MR. ROBERTS: Improper or inadequate treatment. In other words, the service, to be an insured service, Mr. Speaker, must be provided properly and adequately. I realize that these are matters of judgement, but as hon. gentlemen will see from reading the legislation, Sir, and as I will mention briefly, there is quite adequate provision for enabling that judgement to be made properly and with, I think, the best possible advice

and with all possible safeguards for the people concerned.

Now Sir, under the legislation the sanctions can be applied if the physician submits a claim for services which have not been provided. Sanctions can also be invoked if the commission have reason to believe that a physician practicing under Medicare fails to provide a patient with proper and adequate treatment and advice. They would also apply if the commission have reason to believe that the characteristics of a physician's pattern of practice deviates significantly and improperly from the accepted patterns of the practice of other doctors. It is a technical term, Sir, and let me expand on it briefly: Using the computers - of course all of Medicare's information is on the computers. They cost us about three or four hundred thousand dollars a year, the biggest item in our cost of administration indeed, Sir.

Under the Medical Care Plan, using the computers, we print up and I get regularly, and the officials of Medicare get it, my own officials in the department get information about the pattern of practice of each individual doctor in this Province, or each doctor practicing within Medicare. That includes all the fee-for-service doctors except I think eleven who have opted out, out of about two hundred in the fee-for-practice areas.

That information, Sir, enables us to tell both, by speciality - by medical speciality and by geographic area, what work that doctor is doing. That enables us, for example, to see that the average doctor in this Province may see - the average general practitioner may see 1,500 patients in a three month period, for house calls. We have a physician in this Province who is billing us and seeing 4,500 patients for house calls, in a three month period. Thus we mean by pattern of practice, Mr. Speaker, we can look at this data and see what type of work the doctor is doing statistically. We have no way to judge the quality, but we can of course say that he is doing twice as much as anybody else, or that the average doctor normally takes an hour for a certain type of procedure, and

this individual doctor may be doing it in fifteen minutes. That is what I mean by pattern of practice, Sir. We feel, and I think it is accepted that if a pattern of practice changes significantly, that raises almost what you could call a prima facie case for feeling that there are some questions that should be asked. So, we intend to ask those questions.

Now Mr. Speaker, unlike the change in the fee schedule and the restraints on the doctor's earnings, which I mentioned earlier, these changes are not temporary. If they are adopted by the House, they will be part of the Act, and they will be in effect as long as the Act itself is in effect and assuming always that they are not amended.

The procedure, once the commission feel that there is a case, that a sanctions process needs to be begun, the procedure is quite straightforward and set out in the Act, and we very carefully designed this to protect the doctor and to protect the public. The commission is obligated to consult with a professional body. The Medical Association, in the case of the doctor, or the Dental Association, in the case of a dentist, because, as hon. gentlemen are aware, dental services performed in the hospital are covered under

MR. ROBERTS: Medicare. I think that is important, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission must consult with the Professional Association, I think the Commission need their advice, and I think also the fact professional peers, his fellow doctors, his fellow dentists are aware of the evidence that the Medicare Commission has, I think that, in many cases, is a more severe penalty to a conscientious doctor or conscientious dentist than any other statutory penalty that we could impose in the Act.

I remember the profession myself, although I never practiced my profession, I think I can understand the professional person saying that the opinion of his fellow professionals, his peers, his equals, the men with whom he works, that is of great importance to him. If they feel he has not done something properly and in accordance with the traditions and the code of ethics and everything of the profession, I think that is at least as important to any worthwhile and honourable person that is as least as important as the procedures and penalties that come under statutes.

In any event, Sir, we have provided that the Commission must consult with the Association. There is also provision that the individual physician concerned, who would have been notified before there is any consultation with the Association, will consult only if the Physician cannot answer the questions satisfactorily. The Physician concerned can ask for a hearing, a hearing at which he is enabled to have counsel, a hearing before the Medical Care Commission, for that purpose the Commissioners will have powers under The Public Enquiries Act.

Following that, following the hearing by the Commission, the Commission itself will determine whether they need to take action, Taking of action is subject to approval by the Minister, prior approval, I think that is right and proper, since the Minister must answer to the Government and, on behalf of the Government, to the House, for the administration of the plan

MR. ROBERTS: The penalties that can be invoked or provided in 39(C) they could include withholding from a participating physician any money claimed for services in dispute. They do provide for the imposition of a penalty, and the amount of any money already paid out in respect of a claim, together with an amount of ten per cent, and they also provide that the Commissions can order that the individual patients be excluded from the Medical Care Plan.

This latter action means that any person who wants to go to see that doctor from that day on would have to pay the doctor directly and they could then submit the bill for his services to Medicare. Medicare would reimburse them to the amount they would have paid the doctor normally. That may or may not, Mr. Speaker, be the same as the amount the doctor charges. It is quite a severe penalty, because it makes life very much more difficult for the doctor who must try to collect from his individual patients instead of merely sending claims in to Medicare and getting his cheque once a month.

Mr. Speaker, the other feature in the Bill, to which I draw the House's attention, is the provision for appeals to Supreme Court on matters of law and indeed I believe on any matter that comes before the Commission in its hearing. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is not restricted to matters of law. We think this is a necessary matter and accordingly we have provided the power in the Bill before the House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I draw the House's attention to two minor amendments contained in this Bill. The first is to give us the statutory obligation to consult with the Dental Association, I think that was left out originally, Although an oversight, we think it should be remedied and so we propose the amendment.

Finally, there is a section allowing the Governor in Council to make use of the statistical information collected, We think that is necessary. Medicare has probably the best statistical information of any department of any Government in this Province and I think we have better information than

MR. ROBERTS: the Government of Canada, certainly better information than any other Government Department. My colleagues and I feel this is necessary and that we should have access to this for the purposes of the Government of the Province and this amendment is necessary to enable that to be done.

Except for the Courts, Sir, there is no way in which any personal information will be made public beyond Medicare, beyond the Medical Care Commission itself or those administering it. But the general statistical information; Medicare, for instance, can tell us how many people are living in a community. By far the most reliable indicator we have as to how many people live in any individual community, since the Medicare files are up-to-date and they are all on computers, so we have ready access to them.

Briefly then, Sir, let me in conclusion say that our Medicare plan is a good one. With the help of our doctors we are providing Newfoundlanders with better medical care than they have ever had.

The amendments introduced in this Bill will enable us to make the Medicare Plan even better than it is. Accordingly, I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, when I first read this Bill when it was supplied a few days ago, I thought at that time that certain of the provisions in the Bill, particularly with respect to the taking of a doctor off of the Medicare Plan, were unnecessary and that certain of the sections indeed, in the Act, particularly with respect to the enforcing of this matter, were unfortunate that they had to be brought in. I thought, on reading them over, Mr. Speaker, that there were actually certain phases of this section (5) of the amending Act were repugnant and dangerous to any professional association and indeed to the general public of Newfoundland. After hearing the Minister, although he did explain the situation in which the Medicare Commission has found itself, I still did not change my views because I feel, in the first instance, it is unnecessary. If a participating physician is abusing the system, the Medicare system, or flogging the dog, as

MR. MARSHALL: it were, that it would be much better to deal with the matter privately, it would be much better for the Government to deal with it as between itself and the Medical Association, as such, Although the Medical Association, at this present time, does not apparently have the power, the Government could confer the power on it, to set up proper disciplinary committees. If this did not work, obviously the Government has to have the ultimate say in playing the tune, as it were, and if somebody is patently abusing the system as such, I am of the opinion, regardless of what the Minister said, that the Government could withhold payment under the Medicare scheme, as it presently exists now, and could in effect opt that physician out of the Medicare practice without putting them through the hearings and through the provisions of this Act itself.

So in the first place, I would say it is unnecessary. But even more so than that, Mr. Speaker, I think that the provision in the Bill to which the hon. Minister referred, referable to the pattern of practice of the physician, and that particular section I think is repugnant and certainly dangerous. Not so much that it is repugnant, I know it is a professional association, but it is dangerous because it may ultimately, as a result of this, effect the health and well-being of many hundreds of Newfoundlanders. Now I want to read, refer to this section particularly.

Under section 39 (a) "Where after making due enquiries the Commissioner finds it has reasonable or probable cause to believe that the pattern of practice of a physician;" pattern of practice, you will note, constitutes a significant deviation from the accepted pattern of practice adopted by physicians practicing in the Province, and such deviation is not in the best interest of the beneficiary or is in conflict with the proper administration of the Act, then the various procedures in the Act leading up to the sanctions that are spelled out here come into effect.

MR. MARSHALL: So in one instance then, now I might say at the outset that nobody will have any brief or any regard for any doctor who has been convicted of an offence under the Act or submitted false information. That particular doctor, that physician, should get what he deserves. But when you come down to the business of enquiring or the Government comes to the point of enquiring into the pattern of practice, whether you have computers or whether you do not have computers, all the computers are going to do is to give statistical data and it requires human civil servants, human beings, administrators, to interpret the computers as such.

What does this mean, the pattern of practice? Does it mean that if a doctor has to work sixteen hours a day, that his pattern of practice is going to be enquired into? Who is going to make this valued judgment?

The Minister has made the statement to the effect that he had inquired of the Medical Association before this Bill was brought in or certain executive members of the Medical Association. Well I myself have also made certain inquiries amongst their respective general practitioners, practicing in this Province since this Bill has been introduced, and there is no doubt from what they have told me that they are not very satisfied with this section, with respect to the pattern of practice. From what they have told me; they are not very satisfied with this section with respect to the pattern of practice. After all, how would a teacher, for instance, in the case of the hon. Minister of Education, how would he be able to function if a group of civil servants, as it were, were able to hold an enquiry with sanctions being provided, as to whether or not the pattern of teaching constitutes as a pattern, within the normal norms whatever they are. How would the Minister of Fisheries, as a sea captain, want a group of laymen to conduct that type of enquiry as well or any of the learned members here, the junior member for Harbour Main, if that particular situation pertained.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not going to do any good, Mr. Speaker, and I do not see there is any reason for bringing in this Act; it is unnecessary and repugnant. I am told, I have not done the calculations from the report of the Medicare Commission as yet, but I am told and I will accept it until it is proven otherwise, that we have one of the lowest per capita costs of Medicare, in this Province, It is something certainly that the Medicare Commission and the Department of Health can be proud of. This being so, I wonder why it is necessary to bring in this Act. It should be left, these sanctions I would submit, Mr. Speaker, should be left with the Medical Association itself as between the Health Department. Certainly there has to be a stick that can be used or wielded by the Government if the Medicare system is being abused but it is not going to do the general public any good to have it blatantly set forth in this Act where we have enquiries set up and various courts of enquiry. It is all very well to say; "O.K., you have an appeal to the Supreme Court, they have their rights, etc. etc." But what are we talking about, we are talking about practicing physicians, a group of people who are looking after the health and well-being of this Province, the people in this Province.

Now we have come to the stage where we are going to enquire into the pattern and their nature of practice and this could very much detrimentally effect the overall supplying of medical services. I would urge, I would really urge the Minister of Education or the Minister of Health to reconsider the provisions of this Bill, they are much too strong. Is it really necessary? I do not care what kind of legal opinions or civil service advice, administrative red tape advice the Minister of Health may have, the old situation pertains, the person paying, that is the Government, is not satisfied, has the right to withhold if the services are not being supplied in accordance with the contract, and this is really what should be done here.

MR. MARSHALL: If a complaint is made with respect to this, if there is a hearing, the professional reputation of the doctor involved is going to be very, very much damaged and it is a dangerous situation because the public will get it all out of perspective, completely.

I do not think that this is really necessary. Now I hear the Minister talk about insured services, there are only going to be those services which are proper and adequate. Well I want to know who is going to make this judgment, who are the people who are going to make this judgment as to whether the services themselves are going to be proper and adequate?

Is this going to cause a doctor to sit back and not practice, with the same interest and with the same vigorousness as he practiced before? I am afraid that this is going to materially, could well, I am not going to say is going to but could well adversely affect the health services in this Province and I think the Minister would be much better to bring in the necessary, if there are any necessary amendments to the Medical Association Act, to give the Medical Association power to police.

The Minister is bringing in this, not turn over of private plans at all, just to have the public body co-operate with the Medical Association for the purpose.

There is not doubt, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, from what I have seen in examining this Act, and from what I have inquired before, that this is just a political manoeuvre on the

part of the Health Department, the Minister of Health playing with the health and well-being of the people in this election year. It is absolutely unnecessary. The Minister of Health is a very intelligent individual but he obviously has an old head on a young body and he is practising the same old pork-barrel politics of the past and unfortunately it is beclouding the Health Department to the great detriment of the people of this Province, it could be.

Now he talks about the opinion of the peers of the doctor, of his peer, the accused individual. I note that in subsection (4) of the Act, they say that one of the people on this Committee of Enquiry in this court, this ultimate court that the Minister is setting up, that one of the members of the committee of the Commission should be a physician. I feel quite strongly that that should be enlarged or if the Minister insists on keeping this Bill in, this Bill that could effect immensely and adversely the health and well-being of the people of this Province, but if he insists, he probably will in this election year, on keeping it in, he should at least amend that, to make it, to provide that the physician on this committee should be a practising physician and a physician who is participating himself in private practise in the medicare scheme.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you ever off base, that physician must be a member of the Commission. The members of the Commission are nominated by the NMA.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, the whole point, we are setting up an entirely different system here. We are setting up a Court of Enquiry into the pattern of practise of the doctors, which I am afraid could very much adversely affect the health and well-being of the people of this Province. I would urge the Minister of Health to look at it very, very much more closely than he obviously has done, perhaps could seek

advice outside of the executive of the medical association itself.

MR.ROBERTS: Yes, Kevin Linegar - Ha! Ha! Ha! Ha!

MR.EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I just like to ask the Minister one question under this particular Bill, perhaps he might prefer to answer when we get into Committee on the Bill but in order to give him an opportunity to prepare his facts and figures, I have been searching through the estimates of the Department of Health on the cost of Medicare -

MR.ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman would search on the last page of the estimates he would find the budget for medicare printed.

MR.EARLE: May I just finish, there is a total grant there of \$3,970,000 for the coming year for Medicare. My question is, is that the net cost of Medicare to the Province, because at the time that Medicare was brought in we were told that for at least two to three years it would not cost the Province anything, as a matter of fact we should make money on it. But last year we voted \$3,654,000 and this year \$3,900,000 or practically \$4 million. So I am wondering in the maze of all these grants and deductions and so on, can the Minister clarify for me what the actual net cost of Medicare is to the Province of Newfoundland, is it this \$3,900,000 or is it more or is it less?

MR.ROBERTS: The hon. member for St. John's West?

MR.CROSBIE: Yes, I would like to have a word or two, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why the Minister mentioned Dr. Kevin Linegar's name and then gave a fiendish laugh as though there was no reason why he should advise the Minister on Medicare. I mean he is a practising physician and presumably he is entitled to and is as much interested in this as any other member of the medical profession.

MR.ROBERTS: I will take the executive of the NMA before I would take Dr. Linegar and that was the point the hon. gentleman for St. John's East made.

MR.CROSBIE: I do not see why the mention of Dr. Linegar by the Minister would cause him to laugh so fiendishly, as though Dr. Linegar was somebody

who should just be thrown in the waste basket.

MR.ROBERTS: I would not suggest that.

MR.SMALLWOOD: (inaudible)

MR.CROSBIE: The Hon., the Premier is piping up. He spoke on Mr. Crosbie out at Gander long enough last Saturday morning. I will just let the hon. member speak without interruption for a change. Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act has worked well as far as I am able to discover and as one who had something to do with it, I am still proud that that is the case. Medicare has worked well in Newfoundland. We have more doctors since it came into effect. In fact it was necessary for us to go into Medicare to make sure that we retain the doctors and attracted more doctors to the Province. I have heard very few if any complaints from patients or people seeking the care of doctors about the scheme and all in all it has worked well.

Now the Minister's amendments that he has presented in the House are to deal with, presumably, the points he raised in the speech to the private meeting of doctors in St. John's in January. In that speech which was afterwards published in the Toronto Globe and Mail,

MR.ROBERTS: That is not what the amendments are about.

MR.CROSBIE: Well, I am coming to that, the Minister can answer me when I am finished. That speech was published in the Toronto "Globe and Mail" Mr. Speaker, with a picture of the hon. minister. I must say it probably frightened the doctors of Ontario. The picture of the minister and what he was doing in Newfoundland probably got the doctors in Ontario quite a scare. They were worried that he might emigrate up to Ontario and get in as Minister of Health. The Minister then said that if the Newfoundland Medical Association does not move quickly to curb excessive demands by certain doctors under the Province's Medicare Plan, the Government will have; "no choice but to take action on our own." Now, Mr. Speaker that statement would make one believe that there was quite a lot of abuse by

doctors in the carrying out of the Medicare Plan here in Newfoundland, that if the doctors did not move quickly to curb excessive demands by certain doctors, the Government would have no choice but to take action on its own. I would like to ask the Minister, when he replies, to clarify for me this point, have these amendments that are embodied in Bill 54, have they been approved by the Newfoundland Medical Association or has the Minister received any objections by the Newfoundland Medical Association to these amendments which he has not met or accepted? In other words, I would like to know definitely whether the Newfoundland Medical Association have accepted the changes that are proposed in this Bill or whether they have made representations that the Minister has found that he could not accept. I think that is quite important.

Now the Minister in his remarks said that two doctors or activities of two doctors, in connection with the Medicare Plan, were being investigated by the R.C.M.P and that possibly there may be charges under the Criminal Code against these two particular doctors. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, if that is the fact, certainly that does not indicate that excessive demands by doctors that would leave the Government no choice but to take action on their own. The Minister's statement implied that there were considerably more abuses under the Medicare Plan.

MR. ROBERTS: You have confused it, that speech was directed at doctors incomes and subsequently, March 25, I think I announced that the NMA had agreed with us to curb doctors incomes. That is all my speech in January was about. That is all it was about, it had nothing to do with quasi-criminal or that sort of abuse. In other words, well, it could easily be taken, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. CROSBIE: What can excessive demands by doctors be other than that they are attempting to get more money under the Medicare Plan than they are legitimately entitled to. In other words; they are abusing the Plan. But the Minister clarifies and says that relates to doctors income.

MR.ROBERTS: The doctors who were there know about it, and know full well, I am surprised the hon. gentleman did -

MR.CROSBIE: It is not only doctors were concerned in this, this is a speech that is made public.

MR.ROBERTS: I did not make it public.

MR.CROSBIE: That the public reads. Well the Toronto "Globe and Mail" made it public.

MR.ROBERTS: Yes, I know but I did not give it to them

MR.CROSBIE: I know where they got it.

MR.ROBERTS: Not from me.

MR.CROSBIE: The Minister says that two are being investigated. That does not indicate excessive demands.

MR.ROBERTS: There were 137 investigated last year, two of them quasi-criminal.

MR.CROSBIE: Now, that is more like it.

MR.ROBERTS: All right, 137.

MR.CROSBIE: Now that is more like it, 137 doctors the Minister says,

MR.ROBERTS: That may merely be, you know 135 of them may be quite straightforward.

MR.CROSBIE: The Minister now says that 137 doctors were checked into last year in connection with their claims under Medicare legislation.

MR.ROBERTS: That is right.

MR.CROSBIE: That is a far different matter than saying that only two of these doctors are being looked into with a view to prosecution.

MR.ROBERTS: Right, that is closer.

MR.CROSBIE: I would love to be able to make my speech here without having to answer back, it is not a partisan subject it is about Medicare. There are two doctors being investigated, in other words two were found to be so abusing the claims under Medicare that they have had now been

looking at criminal action. But 137 were checked into -

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Would he re-read the phrase he quoted, allegedly by me, from that speech I made. I think he has misquoted me.

MR. CROSBIE: Here is what the Minister says: This is a newspaper reporting what the Minister said: "If the Newfoundland Medical Association does not move quickly to curb excessive demands by certain doctors, under the Province's Medicare Plan, the Government will have no choice but to take action on their own." This was issued to a private meeting. The Minister went on, this is another quote further down, now he is talking about doctors incomes, "what is sobering however is that it appears that more than half of the fee-for-service doctors will be paid more than \$50,000 this year and more than a tenth of the fee-for-service doctors will be paid more than \$90,000 this year." Mr. Roberts said; "he had no intention of making public the amount paid to any individual doctor under Medicare but the overall figures will undoubtedly will be released."

MR. ROBERTS: What is the hon. gentleman quoting, will he table it?

MR. CROSBIE: "Evening Telegram," March 22, 1971,

MR. ROBERTS: Because I have both the speech and I have the "Globe and Mail" you know, that is not what I said.

MR. CROSBIE: Then the Minister says: "such facts as the fact that there will be at least eight or ten doctors earning more than \$100,000 this year are not conducive to calm, rational debate in a province, many communities, all the people who yet do not earn \$100,000 a year." I could go on but I do not need to -

MR. ROBERTS: Who said that? It is a good speech.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not saying whether it is good or bad, I am just -

MR. ROBERTS: I did not say doctors demand - that is the point.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak uninterruptedly.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, then, to a Point of Order.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please. If an hon. member rises to speak and addresses his remarks to another hon. member of the House, it is very difficult for the Speaker to know just what the attitude of the hon. member is. If hon. members will address themselves to Mr. Speaker it will be much easier for Mr. Speaker to maintain order.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I thought that is what I was doing. I am not addressing myself to the Minister of Health. I am addressing myself to this House. I do not want to be interrupted, in particular, it is not a partisan matter, we are discussing Medicare. What I say is that in the Minister's speech of January he gives the impression that there is widespread abuse under the Medicare Plan. The facts he presented to the House today show the contrary, that there are two doctors being investigated by the R.C.M.P. in connection with alleged fraudulent claims. Now, the minister's amendments are designed to discourage fraudulent claims and other claims of that nature. That is what this legislation is to deal with. So, what I would like clarified is just how widespread is the alleged abuse of the plan. The Minister says there were 137 doctors investigated last year. Let us have some facts on that. We know there are two being looked into for criminal charges. What were the kinds of abuses of the other doctors? Would these be an innocent type of mistake or what kind of mistakes are they? What is the evil which these amendments are supposed to correct? What is the point. Now, when the Minister talks about the excessive demands by doctors, I do not see there being any excessive demands by doctors. If the patients are there and need to be treated and the doctor treats them, then I do not see that there is excessive demands by doctors; there is an excessive demand by patients in Newfoundland. There are a great many more patients per doctor in Newfoundland than there are in any other province.

So the large income of doctors in Newfoundland, if that is the case, is not caused by the excessive demands of those doctors it is caused by the excessive demands of the patients, the large number of patients they have to treat and the rest of it. So when the Minister warns the doctors against excessive demands by doctors, under Medicare, to my mind he is not being fair. Now, if he warned the doctors against abuse or some kind of abuses that some doctors are perpetrating under Medicare, and that this is going to be corrected and there will be prosecutions if these people are caught. Good! Well and good! As I see it, Mr. Speaker, there are not any excessive demands by doctors under Medicare. Now, the Minister has entered into an arrangement with the doctors of Newfoundland, which seems to be sensible, whether it will work out in practise or not remains to be seen, where they have agreed to certain ceilings on their income. In other words a general practitioner will agree that he gets paid

MR. CROSBIE: his ninety percent of the fee schedule up to, I think, it is up to \$4500 a month. That if he sees more patients than \$4500 in one month that he then pays for the excess of over \$4500 on a sliding scale, less than ninety percent of the fee schedule, It goes down, I do not know how it goes down, but it goes down in proportion, and the interim rises for that particular month.

Now that appears to be a reasonable compromise, How it will work or how it will not work, I do not know, But there is this about it, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we have a large number of people for a doctor in this Province, there is a danger that the minister's sliding scale and the minister's ceiling is going to result in people being undoctored. Because if a G.P., a General Practitioner, sees - I do not know, say he sees 600 patients in three weeks and he has gone beyond his \$4500, there is nothing to stop that doctor stopping practice for the next week, take the next week off fishing. Why work for the fourth week, when he is going to be paid on the declining scale. why not just take that week off.

Now there is also a provision that if a doctor misses a month that this can be averaged, if he goes on vacation for a month that he can use that allowance of \$4500 on preceding and proceeding months, which is a wise thing. But, although these amendments are going to curb doctors' incomes, Mr. Speaker, there is a grave danger that they are also going to curb doctors' services. After all, when you consider income tax and these figures are only gross, by the way, When the Medicare figures show that a doctor receives \$60,000, as the minister has pointed out, quite rightly, that is gross to the doctor. He has his office expenses, and the average doctor has his office expenses, at least twenty percent of his gross income, Secretary, office rent, equipment, typing and all the rest of it, amounts to at least twenty percent, so from \$60,000 you can deduct one-fifth, \$12,000, That means a doctor might be making \$48,000. Then, Mr. Speaker, he has to pay, he is then in the fifty percent tax bracket or fifty-five percent tax bracket, at \$48,000 net.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to that silly twittery, ptarmigan. So, Mr. Speaker, he then is paying fifty percent, fifty-five percent of an income tax. What is there to encourage a doctor to continue providing a service, if he is going to reduce income when he gets over a certain amount, in addition to which he has to pay income tax. All of this combined may result in doctors working a lot less during the year, because there is not enough incentive left for them to work. Now whether the hon. the Premier wants a handkerchief to sniffle about that or not, it is a serious problem.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He gets \$4,000 a month and has to pay income tax?

MR. CROSBIE: Not that he has to pay income tax, I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that the doctor may very well decide that when he makes \$30,000 or \$40,000 he is going to practice no more, that the other two or three months of the year he will take off and go south like other people do, or get a condominium somewhere, like other people do, and that he will not be here in Newfoundland to look after the patients here in Newfoundland. That is the problem that I am pointing out, not that the doctors have to pay income tax. Can you, can discuss anything seriously here without a lot of tripe.

MR. CALLAHAN: We are hearing some tripe from over there.

MR. CROSBIE: We are hearing no tripe. We are hearing a problem that the minister has to deal with and he well knows he has to deal with it.

MR. CALLAHAN: The minister will deal with it.

MR. CROSBIE: And if his ceiling on income and the rest of it are too rigid, it will mean that the people in Newfoundland will not be able to get doctor services, they will all take off two or three months a year.

MR. ROBERTS: Pay them all \$150,000 a year.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not saying pay them all \$150,000 a year. What, what a tribe? What a bunch? You cannot discuss any serious problem in this House without that kind of blarney. Pay the doctors a \$150,000, yes, give them all a lease. A liquor store lease.

MR. ROBERTS: Proper thing.

MR. CROSBIE: To help them out that way, like other people are being helped out in this Province.

So that is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has to deal with. And all of these scales and so on have to be carefully weighed with that in view. The minister wants doctors here in Newfoundland, number one, he wants the people who need to see a doctor serviced. If the doctors are treated too roughly, the people here, who need medical attention, are not going to be serviced. That is a simple answer.

So, what I say the problem is; is not the excess of demands of doctors under Medicare, but the fact that there is an excessive number of patients for the doctors of Newfoundland to see. And that the Government are not careful, if the Government are not careful, so that the atmosphere in Newfoundland is conducive to doctors, we will find we have got declining numbers of doctors, and that has to be kept in mind also.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If Newfoundland is going to be as forecast here, just double the number of doctors.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, sure, the Premier is going to double the number of doctors. It is so easy to get doctors for Newfoundland. He is going to double the number of doctors, that is excellent. That is wonderful. So I mention that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Give them \$100,000 a year, and half the year in Florida and double the number of doctors.

MR. CROSBIE: Double the number of doctors. He is going to pull them out of the hat now. The hon. the Premier is going to pull doctors out of the hat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We got fifty a year for the last two years.

MR. CROSBIE: Right by the ears out of the hat. The doctors can make this kind of pay in other provinces.

MR. ROBERTS: Nonsense! Now come on!

MR. CROSBIE: And they can make it in the United States of America.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe in the United States.

MR. CROSBIE: And they can make it elsewhere.

MR. ROBERTS: Nonsense! The doctors are the highest paid in Canada.

MR. CROSBIE: And do you not fool yourself about that. Because the doctors are the highest paid in Canada, if they are on the average,

MR. ROBERTS: They are.

MR. CROSBIE: they are doing more work and have more patients to see than the doctors in other parts of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So, as I say, Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: The minister's speech, Mr. Speaker, gave a false impression, and the minister's speech today gave a false impression. There are two doctors in Newfoundland who are being investigated for fraudulence claims, that is what the minister says. And that is what these amendments are all about. Now the minister says that he is going to amend the definition of insured services, so that, if there is any improper or inadequate treatment, it will not be considered an insured service.

Well, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that is giving the minister and the Commission a very large whip indeed over the doctors of this Province, to decide in each individual case whether a doctor is giving a proper or adequate service. A doctor sees the patient and send him a bill. Is the Commission going to go back to him and say, "look, you did not give John Jones adequate service or you did not give him proper treatment and we are not going to pay your bill." That is what the minister is suggesting with this amendment. Has the Newfoundland Medical Association agreed to that? Yes, they have agreed to that.

MR. ROBERTS: Y.E.S.

MR. CROSBIE: Who is deciding whether they have given adequate or proper treatment?

MR. ROBERTS: That is what the Act is all about.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not what the Act is all about.

MR. ROBERTS: It is what the Act is all about.

MR. CROSBIE: Who decides in the first case? Who decides in the first case whether this doctor has given adequate or proper treatment? We know that the Commission can write a doctor, and he can appeal and the rest of it, but, who decides in the first instance whether his treatment is adequate or proper? The Minister?

MR. ROBERTS: The officials of the Commission.

MR. CROSBIE: The officials of the Commission. Which officials of the Commission?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I suppose Art Knowling, I do not know who handles these down there.

MR. CROSBIE: I mean is it to be a doctor in the Commission, that is what I am asking. Is it to be some layman in the Newfoundland Medicare Commission who is going to decide whether a doctor gave adequate or proper treatment?

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. And some of the things we got, bloody well any layman could do it.

MR. CROSBIE: There is the Minister of Health. There is the Minister of Health.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, tell me about psychiatrist.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a kind of slander on the medical profession.

MR. CROSBIE: Tell me about the psychiatrist who billed for eighty-seven consultations in a four hour period, and tell me a layman could not decide on that.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister should tell us about that. I cannot tell the House about that, the minister can tell the House about it.

MR. ROBERTS: I can.

MR. CROSBIE: If a psychiatrist had made eighty-seven consultations in four hours then he should be prosecuted.

MR. ROBERTS: Why? There is nothing illegal about it.

MR. CROSBIE: Why do the minister not tell the House about it.

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing illegal. Under what power prosecute?

MR. CROSBIE: But now the minister and the Premier are trying to imply, the Premier's comment there just implies, that they are all guilty. His heart is bleeding for the doctors, when someone makes eighty-seven consultations in four hours.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He needs a doctor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I need a doctor?

MR. CROSBIE: He needs a psychiatrist. The hon. the Premier needs two. That is what he needs.

So some official, Mr. Speaker, is going to be deciding some functionary, according to the minister, who might not be a doctor, and the Medicare Commission is going to decide whether a doctor gave proper and adequate treatment, when he sends in a bill. Well, that is certainly not proper or right.

The powers given in this Bill, which, if there are satisfactory explanations, I am not saying I am going to vote against, are certain wide-reaching powers. Section 39(a)(1) where the Commission has reasonable cause to believe that the pattern of practice of a physician constitutes a significant deviation from the accepted pattern of practice adopted by a physician, and it is not in the best interest of a beneficiary, that is an offence. "Or is in conflict with the proper administration of this Act." Now what does that phrase mean? The Commission can decide whether the pattern of practice of a physician constitutes a significant deviation from the accepted pattern of practice adopted by physician practising in the Province. Yes, he can see how they can do that. And they can decide such deviations not in the best interest of the beneficiary. I could see how they could decide that. Or is in conflict with the proper administration of this Act. That is a different quintal of fish. What is this? that the doctor has a pattern of practice that conflicts with the proper administration of the Act? What kind of nonsense is that? Either he has a pattern of practice that is a deviation from what other physicians here do, which might be an offence, properly so, or not, but to say that he has a pattern of practice

MR. CROSBIE: that is in conflict with the proper administration of the Medicare Act, what is that? Does that mean that some functionary in the Medicare Commission decides that this doctor is just not practicing, he is in conflict with the proper administration of the Act, he has committed an offence? That is far too sweeping.

The minister is not interested anyway whether these are too far sweeping or might be changed or not, I gather.

Under the legislation -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, in committee. Under the legislation the physician concerned can appeal, to whom? To a committee of the Commission. In other words, the Appeal Board is going to be a committee of the Medicare Commission, apparently. And when it says a committee of a Commission, does this mean that an Appeal Committee are to be members of the Commission or employees of the Commission or what? "Who is a committee of the Commission, consisting of not more than three persons." I would like to hear more than that.

MR. ROBERTS: The Commission is defined in the Act.

MR. CROSBIE: In other words, this Committee then is to be three members of the Medicare Commission?

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: This is peculiar then, Mr. Speaker. Here is a Medicare Commission which has written the physician saying, your pattern of practice deviates, you are in violation of the Act, and then the Commission receives an appeal from him, he disagrees. There is an appeal. He wants a hearing, and who sits on the hearing? The three members of the Medicare Commission that wrote him in the first place and said that he has committed an offence under the Act. Surely, there should be some better appeal board than that. There should be an independent appeal board.

MR. ROBERTS: There is.

MR. CROSBIE: If the board is a committee of the Commission, it is not an

MR. CROSBIE: independent appeal board.

MR. ROBERTS: The Commission makes the determination, then there is an appeal to the Supreme Court on any matter, fact, law, mixed fact and law.

MR. CROSBIE: Never mind the Supreme Court. First there is an administrative board.

MR. ROBERTS: If he does not like it, I do.

MR. CROSBIE: A Committee of the Commission is the first appeal.

MR. ROBERTS: Makes the determination.

MR. CROSBIE: So the first appeal -

MR. ROBERTS: There is no appeal.

MR. CROSBIE: So the first appeal is heard and determined by an interested party who has charged the doctor with an offence. Now that is not right.

MR. ROBERTS: Nonsense.

MR. CROSBIE: Then the sub-Committee makes a report to the Commission. Then, after the hearing, and, by the way, after the hearing but before the Committee of the Commission, they can withhold from the physician all or part of the monies which he claims to be owing and so on, in the meantime that can all be done. They can estimate and impose a penalty on them. They can deem him not to be a participating physician for purposes of the Act. They serve the order on him, then after he gets an order and has agreed, he can in sixty days appeal to a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, by serving a copy of a notice of appeal.

Now thank heavens the minister has got that in there, that is some kind of a safeguard. But, Mr. Speaker, that does not gainsay the fact that the original appeal committee - and why should a doctor be forced to go on to the Supreme Court on an appeal to get justice? It would be much better for the doctors, if this could be settled by the Medicare Committee. It does not have the publicity and so on, that an appeal to the Supreme Court will have.

So I feel that it is wrong in principle for this appeal to a three member Committee of the Medicare Commission. It should be to a board comprised of three members, one suggested by N.M.A., one suggested by the Medicare Commission and one agreed upon by them or appointed by the minister, some

MR. CROSBIE: impartial Chairman. There should be an independent board for that appeal.

Now we had the Medicare Commission Report, by the way, Section 39 is something the minister should think about, 39(c). That the physician has to serve his notice of appeal on the minister and on the Chairman of the Commission. Now the Chairman of the Commission is part-time.

Mr. Crosbie

That gentleman may or may not be in Newfoundland. He might be off for thirty days or sixty days going somewhere. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the copy of the appeal should be served on the executive-manager or on some official who is going to be available to have it served on them. Sixty days could go and the man would be unable to find the Chairman of the Medicare Commission to serve his notice of appeal on. So that should be changed. It should say: "served at the offices of the Medicare Commission," or some wording like that. The figures that we ^{see} in the Medicare Commission Report were for 1969. I feel that there are questions asked that ask for more up-to-date figures on medicare for the year 1970. The figures should be available now to show what incomes were during 1970, under the different categories.

MR. ROBERTS: They are not available yet.

MR. CROSBIE: They are not available yet .

MR. ROBERTS: It will be a few days or a couple of weeks.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point in this. The minister says at the end of May they are going to be negotiated with on their fee schedule. In other words, and I agree that the present fee schedule in this Province and in most of the provinces was drafted in the day before medicare. It was drafted to suit a situation where the individual patient paid or did not pay the doctor. Now that doctors are all paid by the Medicare Commission ninety per cent of the fee they charge, then obviously it is time to revise this fee schedule, in light of that fact, which the minister says is going to be done. I would like to know if those negotiations have started yet?

MR. ROBERTS:No.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the department or the Medicare Commission have a suggested new fee schedule?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: They do. How does the Medical Association view the changes suggested in Section (6) of this amendment, where there can be varying rates for different classes of physicians or for the same class of physicians in different circumstances or locations. That certainly gives quite a wide discretion that a doctor can be paid at a different rate, depending on where he lives and what his location is or because of different circumstances. It seems to me quite a sweeping discretion to give the minister or the medicare commission. What representations have been received from the N.M.A. on that point?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the doctors of Newfoundland are doing well under medicare. I think that they are doing well by the Province of Newfoundland under medicare. I agree that it is quite easy for a politician, when he can point to a small group like doctors, to try to turn the public against them by saying that there are doctors making \$100,000 or \$90,000, \$80,000 or \$60,000. It is easy and cheap to do that. What has to be remembered first, Mr. Speaker..

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not cheap.

MR. CROSBIE: What has to be remembered first is that the doctors of Newfoundland or in any other Province did not invite medicare. They did not invite medicare. The Government enacted medicare. I favour medicare. It is governments or legislatures that have enacted medicare. It is not that doctors have asked for it. So, if doctors are making high incomes under medicare and doing it legitimately and ninety-nine per cent are not submitting fraudulent claims, they are not to be blamed, to my view, if they make high incomes. It is the Government that made it possible for them, the Legislature, to make those high incomes. I do not think any cheap advantage should be taken of them. The hon. the Premier sneers about the incomes they are making and the rest of it. The doctors that are making those high incomes, if they are not submitting fraudulent claims, which most of them are not, are working very, very hard for it. As I heard the minister

Mr. Crosbie

himself on the analysis programme a few weeks ago talking about that. The minister said that there was a general practitioner making in excess of \$100,000. The minister said that he was working eighteen hours a day. He will go out any time of the day or night, whenever he is called. So that G. P. is making \$100,000. So he deserves to make \$100,000 a year, because he is doing the work. The point is that if the man is prepared to work like a horse like that, if he will go when anyone calls him, if he will go to the Blackhead Road, when they call him to the Blackhead Road or wherever..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. gentleman lose his patience, lose his patience at the eighteenth hour of the day?

MR. CROSBIE: If he is doing the work, then the Government can hardly point their finger at him and say what a racket the doctors are making out of medicare. That is cheap insinuation.

Now perhaps he should be discouraged from working over ten or twelve hours. Is it the aim of the Government to eventually put them all under rigid control as to how many hours they can work and what income they can make? Is that what the Government are aiming for? I would not think so. I would think that there has to be a reasonable compromise. I do not think you would find that doctors will accept the Government telling them how many hours a day they can work, Mr. Speaker, which is what the hon. Premier suggests he would like to see happen. So, I would like to hear the minister answer some of these points, Mr. Speaker. I think that there are controls needed. I feel that there are some deficiencies in the legislation that we have before us now which can be dealt with, if the Government agree in committee. So, therefore, I will not vote against the Bill at this point. I want to see whether the minister is open to considering a few minor changes, that is minor in the sense of wording that could improve this Bill. As I said, when I started, I think medicare has worked well in this

Mr. Crosbie

Province, Mr. Speaker. There are improvements to be made. There are a few who have taken advantage of it that have to be checked. That is why the amendments are needed. But as to pointing the finger at them and trying to make them the fall guys and saying that the doctors are really, you know, lashing this scheme and making it appear as though they demanded it and that they are now taking advantage of it, is wrong. The minister has not done that previously when I have seen him on television and so on. No, but one of his colleagues, the hon. the Premier tried to give that impression.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear some of the answers to those questions.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have just one or two words. I do not propose to review what the other hon. members have talked about. The question of income of doctors practicing in this Province is a two-edge sword, I submit, and one problem I am sure that the hon. the minister is aware of and a problem that could become of serious proportions unless more benefits are made available to these particular doctors, is the effect or the difficulty in retaining doctors in the areas of Newfoundland where they are most needed. In that respect, I refer particularly to the district medical officers and to the cottage hospital doctors. True it is that with medicare there has been an improvement in the number of doctors staying in Newfoundland and the number of doctors coming to Newfoundland. That, I think medicare was the prime reason for it, but I do suggest that a change in recruiting methods also contributed to that as well. But whatever the reason is, the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: That could very well be but the recruiting method was changed under a previous minister. The cottage hospital doctors, in my opinion, and

Mr. Hickman

the district medical officers are the most over-worked members of the medical profession. I saw a study, and I am sure that hon. minister has read it. It was prepared prior to this Province entering medicare. It showed that if the cottage hospital doctors elected to go on a fee-for-service basis that a fair number of them would make close to \$100,000 a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a far cry from a doctor staggering at 11 p.m. into somebody's house for the purpose of picking up another fee. Because here is what is happening, Mr. Speaker, in the cottage hospitals and district medical offices in this Province: When the doctor appears in his surgery, he has got a line-up stretching outside the hospital. Now what can he do? True it is that come 6 p.m. or 7 p.m. or 8 p.m., he can get up and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I will see you tomorrow. I am on a salary. I am going to work the hours prescribed or suggested or the hours that I feel are adequate for me for the income I get." But instead of that most of these doctors are staying at their posts. But, you cannot expect a doctor to go into a cottage hospital, work seven days a week and try and perform the quality of medicine that 1971 dictates should be given, if it means that he gets six hours at home at night and he is subject to call during the evening, if it means that he gets two weeks vacation a year or three weeks vacation a year and that is all he gets. His family will not put up with it. I suspect that one of the real reasons why we have so few doctors, and Newfoundland doctors at that, staying in the cottage hospital system is because their families are insisting that the doctors spend more time at home. This he knows he can do, if he moves to St. John's or Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Gander and go on a fee-for-service basis.

Now the salaries that are being paid to cottage hospital doctors are pretty good. They are good compared to what they were making in the past. They are not good compared to what the men on fee-for-service are making. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the cottage hospital doctors who are really , carrying the load and this is where the real crunch is going to come.

Mr. Hickman

One cottage hospital doctor was kind enough to let me read a brief which he submitted recently to the hon. the minister. It is a good brief. It sets forth very clearly the problems that cottage hospital doctors are facing. Now many cottage hospital doctors come back from medical school under the Government's scheme. They regard it as an area where the apprenticeship is good, where you get a broad general practice for a couple of years and then they go on and they do post-graduate work.

But, Mr. Speaker, some of them would like to make a career of practicing in rural Newfoundland. They would like to make a career of practicing in the cottage hospitals. But if they are not going to do that, if the work load is so heavy that they just cannot possibly handle it, and this is happening. It has to affect patient care. There is no question about that. You cannot have a doctor in Stephenville or Grand Bank working from 7 a.m. until 12 at night, night after night after night without it affecting not only patient care but his health and obviously he is not going to stay. Now what is the answer? Obviously, you cannot pull fifty doctors out of a hat if you need them. The medical school will help produce, hopefully, more doctors. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is where the Federal Government let the provinces down very, very badly when medicare first came on the scene. When the Hall Commission Report recommended universal medical care throughout Canada, it had to know, in fact, it knew and it found that in a country where there was already a dangerously high patient-doctor ratio that this was bound to get worst not because - I do not particularly agree with what the hon. member for St. John's West says when he suggests that there has been patient abuse. I do not think there has been any real patient abuse of medicare. I think a lot of people who should have gone to see doctors, who should have received medical attention, postponed going there, because they simply could not afford it. Now that they can afford it, they are going. But whatever the reason is, there is no question at all that the work load on the doctor no matter:

Mr. Hickman

how generous he is, no matter how charitable he is, the work load has increased. It has increased tremendously. I am subject to correction by the minister on this, but I believe that our doctor/patient ratio in this Province is still the highest of any Canadian provinces, particularly the district and medical cottage hospitals.

Now salary obviously is not the only answer. There has to be an increase in the number of doctors going into the cottage hospitals and hopefully the retention of doctors in that particular branch of medicine must increase. If they want sabbatical leave, then I believe they are entitled to have that kind of leave. Maybe the medical school at the University will improve the situation if doctors can get back and forth to the medical school to do certain post-graduate studies and to listen to certain papers presented by experts in their field. The other possible solution is one that was recently mentioned by the hon. the Minister of Public Health and Welfare, Mr. Monroe. He, now, is instituting and I believe this is being done with the approbation of the medical profession, a pretty intensive study into the type of practice that is being carried on by medical doctors throughout Canada. Because obviously it is a waste of a doctor's time to treat a person for coughs and colds. Yet at this time if a person anywhere in Newfoundland feel that he or she is suffering from a cough or a cold that is worrying or discouraging to them, they have to call a doctor. Any nurse, any para-medical worker properly trained could do that work and free the doctor to practice a more sophisticated form of medicine. Now these are problems and the hon. minister is aware of them as I am. But I think that these things have to be taken into consideration when you deal with the quality or practice, the type of practice that a doctor is carrying on. If you have over-worked doctors in this Province, then obviously the standard that you impose and the degree of scrutiny that you impose must be in the light of that type of burden that they are carrying. There is no question about it, they are carrying it.

Mr. Speaker one other small suggestion and I have no doubt at all that the medicare people or the minister thought of it

MR. HICKMAN: There is a question that has been asked of me by many people who have seen doctors since Medicare came in. There is a suggestion to maybe keep better control. When we went into Medicare every Newfoundlander was issued a charge plate, it looks exactly like a charge plate. It is the same size and they have their number. Now as I understand it, if I go to a doctor today his secretary will ask me to produce my card and she copies down the number and my name and I leave. The suggestion that I have heard from many quarters is that each doctor, each participating physician, should have in his office the same sort of thing that you find in the service station. That when I go in, that little charger plate is put into the machine, pulled across, the secretary writes on it the reason for my visit and I sign it. What the doctor charges is no concern of mine, but at least the Medicare Commission or the computer when it picks it up, they know - well house calls may be a problem, but at least...

MR. ROBERTS: That is two-thirds of the service.

MR. HICKMAN: There still should be some signing by the patient.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would it not be better when he is leaving not when he enters?

MR. HICKMAN: Well either way. I do not care if it is when he is leaving or when - sometime, when the visit is over or when the work is being performed, there should be a place where the patient signs. This then is proof positive to the computer and to the Medicare Commission that the services have been rendered.

MR. ROBERTS: Proof positive that a service has been done, there are 5,000...

MR. HICKMAN: Oh I realize that, I realize that there is no way that you can - that if I sign, or even if it is put in medical terms, I may not know whether that is the service that was rendered to me or not.

MR. ROBERTS: If a doctor is going to cheat, all he is going to do is see you for a five dollar item and put in a fifty dollar item and you are no wiser. So it does not stop cheating, as I see it.

MR. HICKMAN: I am only passing on a suggestion that is coming from the general public, you know.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a new one.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot see anything wrong with it.

MR. ROBERTS: I can, I will explain it.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, there may be administrative problems, but not that many.

MR. ROBERTS: Enter two million claims a year by hand.

MR. HICKMAN: No, not two million claims, but they still go through the computer, they still go through the computer.

MR. ROBERTS: What does the computer do?

MR. HICKMAN: The computer authorizes the payments and my understanding is that if there has been in the opinion of the computer too many claims emanating from one doctor, the computer will spit back the claims, then the claims manager at the Medicare Commission will review them. When he is reviewing them, if he sees that John Jones has signed that receipt, he knows at least that the doctor visited John Jones or alternatively John Jones visited the doctor's surgery. That is out of the way, he may then have to go on and ask whether the standard or pattern of practice is one which indicates that the doctor should be paid for the number of claims that he is seeking.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I see nothing wrong with this Bill except that it should be made abundantly clear to the medical profession that this Bill is not designed to invade their pattern of practice. Because, whether you can arouse sympathy or not for the income of the doctor, it is really not relevant. This Province above all Provinces cannot afford to lose the good will of the medical profession. The only Province that ever lost the good will of the medical profession was the Province of Saskatchewan under the N.D.P. Government, and immediately thereafter they paid the price of it.

MR. ROBERTS: Quebec had some trouble last fall.

MR. HICKMAN: Quebec, well we will see what the results of Quebec's loss of favour was. We cannot afford to lose the good will of the doctor. Whether the doctor can make less in Nova Scotia, or whether he can make more in Ontario, it is really not that relevant. The relevant thing is that any qualified doctor today, who is prepared to put in ten or twelve hours work, can make a more than satisfactory living, and if we lose their good will they will make it in other places.

Mr. Speaker, this as I see it is the one thing in that Bill that I think is incumbent on the minister to make abundantly clear, that the pattern of practice of medicine is not going to be interfered with by Governments nor lay commissions nor any one else.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will try to conclude by one o'clock so we can dispose of the item one way or another, but I do want to try to deal with some of the points raised by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

First, with reference to the points made by the hon. member for Burin. I think most of what he said made good sense. I am not so sure that - let me touch just very briefly on two points he made, or three. First of all the cottage hospital doctors, I am not so sure that is relevant to the Bill, but, what he says is correct and this is where the real attention should be paid, and where it is being paid. The letter from Dr. Patey at Grand Bank, who is one of the best men we have in the cottage hospital service, and that means he is one of the best among a great number of very good men, has some good suggestions in it. I understand that it is to be published in the Medical Association, they have a little news letter that comes around, I think the November 1969 one has just come out. They are a long way behind, but it is to be published in that.

The bit about signing, Mr. Speaker, signing for ones services is a suggestion that has been put up a number of times. I have looked at it a number of times, but it never seems to make any sense. If it is merely to certify that a doctor saw a - the only thing it could do, Sir, is that a doctor saw a patient, and anybody who thinks for a minute would

realize that the couple of thousand items in the fee schedule, and there are a couple of thousand items in the fee schedule, Sir, the average patient does not know whether the doctor is charging them correctly or not, especially when you realize that on the forms that are used the service is not written out, there is a code number.

Now, the only thing that could indicate is that the doctor...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: If the facts are as I have them that is straight criminal. That is not a matter of anything else, We found out about that. The interesting thing is, Mr. Speaker, that the only thing it could prove is that the doctor actually saw a patient. Now we would have to find a way around the business of house calls, which is a very significant part of the work-load. I do not have ready figures, but it might be as much as half of the work-load under Medicare. Half of the services are house calls. Also we would have to find a way around the problem of what happens when a person forgets his card or loses it. I do not know about every member, every person in this Province, Mr. Speaker, but I do not carry my Medicare card with me. Occasionally when I go down to see a doctor I find that I have forgotten to bring it away with me.

I have had occasion...

MR. CURTIS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and as my colleague says, the gentleman has my number and the secretary fills it in. What we do instead, we do two things, using the modern methods, and these are the modern management methods, Mr. Speaker, not anything we have dreamt up. They are not unique to Newfoundland. First of all we spot-check. We send out notices, some hon. members may have gotten them or hon. members may know of people who has them. Dear, so and so, the doctor says you saw him on such and such a date, did you? Please check and send back in the stamped self-addressed envelope. We get a fair number of them back and in most cases the doctors are honest. One of the cases to which I referred as being possibly fraudulent involved that sort of situation. I may say, we checked it out and it is almost impossible to

prove one way or the other, because the doctor says he did see the person and the person concerned said, "well, I am not so sure."

There are cases you run into, Mr. Speaker, where a person sees the doctor six times in ten days, and these are usually house calls. The other problem with them—the other thing we do, Mr. Speaker, is when a doctor's pattern of practice is significantly different one asks questions. One wants to know why. Why there are people in this Province who have seen the doctor two hundred times in the past two years, why? It is most unusual, but why? Every person who sees a doctor more than thirty-nine times in a year the computer picks them out, the way it is now programmed.

In 999 out of every 1,000 cases, perfectly straightforward. The person has a bad illness and is in hospital — the person has a continuing condition. I have a problem with my eyes and I see a doctor maybe once every two or three months. You know, many people have continuing conditions that require continuous visits to doctors.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot reveal details of whether the hon. gentleman on the far left has seen people or not, no.

Let me now deal Mr. Speaker, briefly with the hon. gentleman from Fortune....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ho! ho! ho! ho!

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think the hon. member from Fortune is a laughing matter, but if the hon. member for St. John's West does, then I will defend the hon. gentleman from Fortune. He needs help, but I will defend him. He asked about the net cost of Medicare and he is quite correct. He has just forgotten one point. The grant to Medicare is of the order of \$4 million a year and is so recorded in the estimates. We will come to it in detail when the Committee on Ways and Means — the Committee on Supply deals with it. We are making money on Medicare because, the amount — making money in the sense that, and this is the only way in which that term was ever used, the contribution we get from Medicare in respect of services

we were already providing. Childrens' Health Plan, the Cottage Hospital Plan. Mr. Speaker, the money we have to pay out under Medicare is less than we get from Ottawa, therefore, we are making money.

Now I do not know if the hon. gentleman follows me, let me try an example. In the past, our services would come to say, \$4 million for the cottage hospitals, district medical practice and the childrens' health plan. The net cost under Medicare which has replaced those plans is less than \$4 million. In this current year, it will be between three hundred and five hundred thousand dollars. Of course we will not know until the year has ended. In the year just ended, the figures I presently have are that we have made if one wishes to use that term, about \$300 thousand on Medicare.

I do not know how long that will last. The question of how quickly the costs goes up, because our costs are one half the national average per capita cost.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The average we expect to make they told us was about \$4 millions a year net.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, we are getting \$4 million worth of services for the cost of \$3.6 million. I was not in the Cabinet a couple of years ago Mr. Speaker, so I...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is three to five hundred thousand, and it is not a net saving. We would have been spending the \$4 million anyway, that is the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS:

It is roughly on, yes. The average cost of Medica Care across Canada is rising considerably, our per capita cost is very low something of which we should not be proud, and for that reason we are ahead. It is low even though our doctors are far higher and their incomes, this is where the fewer doctors per person works out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the points raised by the hon. gentleman from St. John's West and then I will attempt to deal with the points raised by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East. The hon. gentleman from St. John's West must let me first of all assure him that, he mentioned changes, if there are any changes which would improve the Bill then, of course, the Government are quite prepared to accept them. I think we would have to look very hard at any changes that affected the principles in the Bill because we have talked them through and discussed them and consulted, as I will explain in a minute, but any changes that will improve the wording of any section, within the principles we have adopted, of course we will undertake to have a look at them.

It might expedite matters if the hon. member could let me have copies of them so I could have them checked with the law officers because, as he will recall from his days in the Government, it is bad practice for a Minister to accept amendments on the floor without checking with the legal advisers to make sure they are properly tied in. I think the hon. member from Burin would concur that that is a -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I will deal with ophthalmologists simply by saying that under the present Federal-Provincial relationships optometry is not included as a service that can be provided and we have taken the position, we have made representations to Ottawa that it should be included and we have taken the position that when Ottawa will include it, then we will include it and find our half of the cost.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The ophthalmologists are doctors and accordingly their services are covered. There is an area of service, Mr. Speaker, that both ophthalmologists who are the doctors and optometrists who are not medical doctors do provide in common that is the so called refraction, measuring your eyes and it is most unfair. I see an ophthalmologist because my problems are far more than just measuring an eye. He measures my eye for glasses, sends the bill to Medica Care, Medica Care quite properly pays it. The hon. gentleman may wish to go to see an optometrist to have his eyes measured, quite confident and quite in order to have it done but the hon. gentleman must pay the bill himself. It is an anomaly. It is not unique to Newfoundland, I think about seven Provinces have the same thing and the other three they have picked it up and go on with it.

MR. HICKMAN: The other problem is that the optometrists are more inclined to travel around the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, true, true.

MR. HICKMAN: So that that is the only eye care that is available.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh agreed and I have had some long talks with the optometrists. I am a little worried about the fee schedule, which seems to be rather high, and we have been talking with them about Legislation, as their present incorporating act is not a very good one and we may be able to bring in a new act this session.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. John's West, really, I think his comments fell into two categories. The first was founded, I think, on his misapprehension of the speech which I made to the NMA, at a meeting here in St. John's in January. Now the speech was largely printed in the "Globe and Mail." I did not give it to the "Globe," I did not cause it to be given, I did not know it was being given, but I know how it was given, I have since discovered. I agree with the hon. gentleman the picture is not a very good one, but he might want to ask the "Evening Telegram" because they supplied the picture to the "Globe

MR. ROBERTS:

and Mail" not me. But I think he misunderstood or misread the speech, Mr. Speaker. At no point in this speech did I refer-"demands by doctors." The hon. gentleman seemed to think I did. Apparently there was a report in the "Evening Telegram" saying that I did but, if so, the report is not correct. "The Globe and Mail" had a copy of the text of the speech, which I have here I have the "Globe" cutting, and there is no mention of "demands."

The whole point of that speech, Mr. Speaker, the whole point, the only point was that the level of doctors incomes in Newfoundland was getting too high. The doctors themselves recognize this and the proof of that is that we were able to negotiate with the doctors the restraints on earnings, call them proration, call them variable ceilings, call them what one will, Mr. Speaker, they were negotiated and agreed with the NMA. The NMA were not enthusiastic about it, of course not. It will cost some doctors a lot of money or it could. But, Mr. Speaker, there was no talk of demands by doctors, it was merely the situation that was caused by the fee schedule which was inappropriate. Fee schedules were not designed for Medica Care plans, they were designed for private insurance plans and as a guidance to private practice medicine where some people made more so other people could pay less or nothing, as the case may be, that is the way they were.

Doctors incomes in this Province leaped dramatically following Medical Care and the rate of increase was too high in our opinion. So I went to the NMA and I made a speech in June and we had some talks throughout the fall, both myself, on one hand, and the Commission and then the NMA. Then it culminated in a meeting where I made the speech referred to, no mention of demands. I made no public reference at the time, I marvelled that the press did not pick it up. There were 150 doctors at that meeting in the Grace Hospital and there was no mention of it. I made no statement, I made no reference until I made an announcement in this House that the negotiations had been concluded. They were concluded, the NMA agreed. The only connection

MR. ROBERTS:

between that situation and this Bill is that this Bill, as I mentioned, gives us, in the view of our legal advisers, the option to implement that agreement. That is particularly so with reference to the section (6) the hon. gentleman mentioned. If the hon. gentleman reads the section, again in that light, I think he will see it is designed to implement the agreement we made with the NMA.

The NMA have accepted it. All these amendments, Sir, were discussed with them. I know they had their solicitor meet with them and go through it. I had a meeting with representatives of the NMA, the executive; Dr. Parsons, the President; and Dr. Way, their honorary secretary. Some of my officials had further meetings. I do not know, it is fair to say that the NMA have agreed to this Legislation but I think it is fair to say they were consulted and they raised some objections and I think we have met all the fundamental ones and met nearly all the procedural ones. I do not think they are any more happier over this, Mr. Speaker, than the Government are at having to bring this Legislation in.

The other points raised by the hon. member for St. John's West dealt with the procedure to be followed, and I think he is quite wrong, Sir. The procedure, he made a lot of noise, a lot of heavy weather about an appeal to a Commission that was the complainant. He felt that was wrong. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with him except that is not the way the Act reads. The Act, Sir, provides that if the Commission feels that an offence may have been committed, an offence is defined in Legislation, they will get in touch with the doctor concerned and say, in effect, "Well, look old man we have some questions. You are a psychiatrist and you have seen more people than one would normally expect." Bearing in mind the psychiatrists fee scale is tied to time, it is one of the few areas of the fee scale which is specifically tied to time, and that was at the psychiatrists own request when the original fee scale was negotiated, a little over two years ago. The hon. gentleman was probably Minister at the time, I do not know if he was involved in the negotiations or not.

MR. ROBERTS:

If the psychiatrist or the medical person in question cannot satisfy the Commission of Enquiry. I do not know whether it be made by - I assume it would come through the medical director - it may well be a clerk who notices it first, if he cannot satisfy it, then the matter is referred, The procedure is all spelled out in the Act, It is referred at that stage to the Medical Association for their opinion. It is still a private procedure, we will not be putting notices in the newspaper. The doctor can request a hearing if he wishes, if the doctor wishes, and if he does not it goes forward. Following the hearing, if one is to be held, and following consultation with the Medical Association or the Dental Association, the Commission make a finding. So there is no appeal, Mr. Speaker, that is the first finding. They say, "Well, look old man we have heard you out and we are not convinced. We still think there is a problem, we still think there is an offence, we still think we should invoke this procedure, these sanctions." So, with the consent of the Minister, they therefore invoke them, they make an order.

At that stage, Mr. Speaker, an appeal may be taken, an appeal may be taken quickly to the Supreme Court, to a judge in the Supreme Court, and I know of no better place for an appeal to lie. I would be reluctant to see an appeal go in effect in an Arbitration Board. I think this is a matter where a man could appear to his lawyer before a judge and the Commission be represented by a council, the matter would be argued out, evidence would be had witnesses would be heard and then the judge would make a decision and that is final. So I think the hon. gentleman's point is based incorrectly, I think it has no foundation and, accordingly, I do not see any need to change the Act. I think his criticism is not valid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is one o'clock and I would need another five or ten minutes to deal with some of the incredibly stupid points raised by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, who either has not read the Legislation or does not understand it - but it is one o'clock and - Should I move the

MR. ROBERTS:

adjournment or should I just call it one o'clock? May I call it then one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I will deal with this quickly after we return.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now one o'clock I do leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M.

This House stands recessed until 3:00 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 34

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

Before the hon. minister continues his speech I would like you to welcome to the galleries some fifteen students from St. Patrick's Central High. They are Grade VIII students. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Vicars

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, when the Chair called it one o'clock I was just finishing my remarks in reply to the points made by the hon. the member for St. John's West, with respect to his speech on the second reading of this Bill, the amendments to the Medicare Act.

There are, I think, two further points the hon. gentleman made to which I will make some reference. The first was a question he brought up and said it was a concern to me and to the Government, and it was to him and I would agree with him. He is correct. It is of concern to us, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the effect upon the doctors of this Province of the restraints upon incomes which were negotiated between the Government on the one hand and the doctors on the other, the restraint which I announced to the House at the end of March, in a statement.

Now, Sir, he waxed relevantly eloquent, well for him, Mr. Speaker,
AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: For him it was eloquent, when he drew a picture for us of a doctor working for six months and a doctor going to Florida for six months, because he had reached the ceiling. Well, I think he was slandering the doctors of the Province. I do not think he meant to, but I think he was doing them a very serious disservice because, of course, the doctors of this Province, I think, are not motivated by money. Of course, they expect to be paid for their effort. That seems to be the basic principle of our society. But, I do not think they are motivated solely by money, and I do not think there are any doctors around who would knock off simply because they have reached the income ceiling.

In any event, in case there are any who are so strickly conscious of money, of course, the agreement, and I think this was suggested by the doctors -

MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure, but it was agreed by N.M.A. and this applies to monthly incomes, not annual. So a doctor then would have to, you know, in effect to do as the hon. gentleman then suggested, knock off every fourth week.

I do not think the doctors would do that, Sir, The restraints as we have negotiated them will not affect all that many doctors. The President of the N.M.A. has estimated that it may affect, over a course of a year, one-third. I am not certain of that, Sir, I think, we will have to wait and see. But, I do not think there are any doctors in Newfoundland who would sort of have a cash register mentality and will say at the twenty-second day of the month "Sure boys, I have racked up my \$4500 gross for the month, I am going to take the next week off and not do any work." I do not think there are, Sir, I do not think so. I do not think that is what makes doctors tick. That is not what motivates them.

If there be any such, then. I would be prepared to engaged in a public debate with that doctor. If the only think that concerns them is making that sort of money, I think, there is a legitimate ground for public debate in there. This is the point the Premier touched upon, and it is one that is of great concern to the medical profession. I have a lot of dealings with the medical profession, Mr. Speaker, a lot of them, in my capacity as a minister, and I get it from all angles, I get the official C.M.A. line across the breakfast table. The hon. gentleman told us this morning, the doctors did not ask for Medicare, that somehow was relevant. I get that every morning at breakfast. I have a brother who is in third year medical school and, like all third year students, knows all about medicine. He knows everything there is to know. I know one or two doctors, personally, and there are other connections, indeed some of the people, to whom the hon. gentleman is close, are close to me. Perhaps, my ties are ties of blood and not social and friendships, but we have some contacts in common.

The doctors are becoming concerned across Canada, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that some doctors are working much too hard under Medicare, working much too hard, apparently from monetary reasons. Now I do not mean doctors who are one of a kind. We have specialities in this Province, but we only have

MR. ROBERTS: one or two men. And I wish we had, you know, five or six men, because we need them. Those men worked extremely hard, because of the fact they are alone. They are the only ones in the Province with a skill in this particular field. And the restraints now that have been negotiated allow means to deal with these.

However, the hon. gentleman made a point and I did want to comment upon it, I do not think it is especially a sound point, but I do agree, we have to be concerned and should be concerned and are concerned with making sure that we do not do anything in Medicare or outside of Medicare that will harm our efforts to attract more doctors and to hold the doctors we now have. Along those lines, I think the comments from the hon. the member for Burin, were much more to the point, because the real problem is holding the doctors in the cottage hospitals service in the district medical practices and the I.G.A., Baie Verte, Twillingate areas. These are the areas where our concern should increasingly be put and I can assure you it is the area where our concern is being put more and more.

I also mentioned, I think probably during an interjection, that we had 137 doctors whom we investigated in some stage last year. That is true, but I think, perhaps I should expand a little on it, because to leave a statement like that, Mr. Speaker, gives the wrong impression. Last year, for example, during the month of November, to show you how the 137 figure is made up, during the month of November, the Medicare Commission investigated every consultation for which they were sent a bill. Now consultation, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows and the House is aware, is where a specialist doctor has a patient referred to him, because the doctor originally treating the patient wants a second opinion. It is a very valuable part of medicine. It is a very integral part of the operation.

But, during the month of November, we ran a check on every consultation. Because a consultation, Mr. Speaker, is paid at a higher rate than a first reference, a first visit. We wanted to make sure, we had some evidence that maybe it was not so. We wanted to make sure that every consultation for which we had been billed was a consultation and not just a first visit.

MR. ROBERTS: However, to come a little more to the point, and I should say we investigate all doctors and dentist claims by routine audit. But up to March 31, 1971, over the two years, a total of twenty-seven physicians and thirteen dentists have had their claims completely investigated over specific periods of time. Not to indicate that there is anything wrong with any of those men, Mr. Speaker, indeed the contrary is usually the case. Just that this is the normal administrative, on-going routine, day to day operational audits that we make on all claims. We have had talks with the Medical Association about, maybe a dozen doctors, maybe a few more; patterns of practice have been very unusual. There is a continuing liaison between the Medicare Commission, Dr. Knowling, the Medical Director and the Medical Association through the so-called Medical Review Committee, Medical Advisory Committee, and they do discuss details of individual practice patterns. Individual claims are discussed in detail there. We turn over to that Commission, which is made up of doctors, we turn over a great deal of statistical information.

I would not want to leave the impression that there are 137 doctors or dentists in this Province who are in any sort of trouble with Medicare. They are not. They said there are only two cases where we felt it necessary to ask the Department of Justice to investigate. One of those cases the investigation is nearly completed, the other one is in progress.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The psychiatrists have not been involved with the Department of Justice in any way. No, no.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the claim for the eighty-seven patients?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that was not referred to the Department of Justice, which brings me to the point, really, because those claims were perfectly legitimate. They were insured services. And this really, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the point of the analogies that were muttered, not muttered, but were spoken by the gentleman from St. John's East.

I think it is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that the two former Ministers of Health, who sit opposite me, the member for Burin and the member for St. John's West, each of whom spoke in this debate, each of them made a very

MR. ROBERTS: intelligent and worthwhile contribution. It is not to say that I agree with what they say any more than they did not agree with everything that I say. But, I think, they showed their knowledge.

The hon. the gentleman from St. John's East I am afraid showed that he does not have any knowledge of the Bill under discussion nor has he any knowledge of the Medicare scheme itself. I do not know where he gets his advice, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. But, he is not getting good advice, I can tell him.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. the gentleman from St. John's East - I made some rough notes and if I do him the discourtesy to misquote him, I do hope he will set me straight, They were rough notes and of course the Hansard will not be available for a day or so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, maybe the hon. gentleman did not write the speech, I do not know. He read it badly anyway.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said he found the amendment offensive, repugnant, somehow quite contrary to the whole spirit of things and suggested that we deal privately. Now I never before, Mr. Speaker, heard the suggestion that a programme of \$14 million in public funds each year, should be dealt with privately, and measures to make sure that, that money was spent for the purposes for which it should be, which it was voted by the House, the purposes for which the agreements were negotiated, ever before heard a suggestion that should be dealt with privately. If there is a Tory doctrine, there is such a thing as a Tory doctrine, then that is it.

I can point out further, I can point out further that the very reason these amendments are here, is that these matters cannot be dealt with under the present legislation. The hon. gentleman makes me wonder if he ever read the Act. He stands there as the critic. He is of the opinion that we could opt out doctors under the present Act. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might choose to look at the Act. There is no such power in it. Then he thought, we could withhold money under the Act. I will tell the hon. gentleman that

MR. ROBERTS: we cannot. I think an order would lie against us, Whenever insured service, as it has been defined, has been rendered by a doctor practising in this Province, to a person resident in this Province, we must pay. I have heard a lot of stupid nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and I am not speaking in partisan politics, I am just speaking of straight, actual, stupid nonsense. That is all it is. If he does not like the principle of the Bill let him attack it, but, let him at least know what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

He stood in this House and accused us of playing politics. I do not know what in the devil the politics are; our coming in and saying we have problems administering the scheme, we have problems in making it work properly, we have been told we need new measures in the Act. We sat down with the doctors and we have hammered them out. Here they are. This is what the Government brings in, and then he sits there and says that is playing politics. He thinks we should maybe act illegally. He thinks, we should say to a doctor; 'you are not practising inside of the Act any more.' He said that here, Mr. Speaker. I am not making it up, He said it this morning in this House. We have no such power. Stupid nonsense! Then he said we can withhold money. Then, again, stupid nonsense!

I mentioned problems of psychiatrists, and, I think it was well known to all members of the House, not officially, but, I think it is well known to anyone who has any connection with the Medical profession in this Province, any knowledge of them or any involvement with them. Those psychiatrists rendered insured services. But, I think their own profession - I spoke of peer group pressures. Mr. Speaker, there were peer group pressures on those psychiatrists, very strong and definite pressures from their fellows, who said that is not proper. And there were negotiations over a period of months. Finally, an agreement was made Those doctors agreed to settle and to accept far less than the normal fee schedule in return for the services which they rendered. They rendered

MR. ROBERTS: the services, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt they rendered them and that, as the Act and regulations now stand, we have to pay them for them.

Nonsense, no doctor in the Province would stand and say that that is right. No doctor defended those psychiatrists and there was not one doctor did that. They said it is wrong, it is against the spirit of it. Well Mr. Speaker, we negotiated and solved it, but that is not the way to run a public programme, a public plan. This year Medicare will spent about \$17 million of the public's money, money the Government of Canada has given to us and money from our own Treasury, which we put into Medicare to pay for the services, not to deal with it privately. Then he went on, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the Courts of Enquiry should be held privately. Now there is no suggestion in the Act that they will not be private. There is no suggestion at all, but I will point out this is the same as to show the face of it, the face of a robber's horse. Half of a robber's horse is what the hon. gentleman has the face of. But the speaker went on to suggest that they be held privately. This is the same hon. gentleman who earlier in this session moved the Bill, it may be still on the Order Paper, that all public enquiries be private. Now if that is not playing politics, what is Sir? What sort of inconsistency and illogicality and impracticality and irrationality? I do not mind getting into debate, I enjoy it, but to listen to the nonsense that I had thrown across Chamber this morning, by a gentleman who obviously has not read the amendments, (even though we made an effort, a week past, to have them delivered to him and to all hon. members opposite, during the day the House was not sitting, so that they could study them at their leisure) obviously has not read the Act has not had the wits to find an adviser. There are advisers around, if he does not know the names of them, I can give him some who would gladly advise him and capably advise. He says I should not take advice from the Executive of the N.M.A. From whom should I take my advice, Mr. Speaker? The Newfoundland Medical Association

MR. ROBERTS: Executive, is elected by the doctors, the eighty per cent of the doctors in the NMA, with whom should I deal, some back door arrangement? No, I will deal with the Executive of the NMA, They do not speak for the doctors in the Province, they speak for eighty per cent of them though Sir, And he had the nerve to say "talk to the doctors but not the Executive!"

cheap, dirty, partisan politics, not only that, Mr. Speaker, he is wrong, If he wants to play politics, let him, but let him have his facts straight. Let him know what he is talking about and let him not stand in this House or go outside this House and make attacks.

I am fed up with the hon. gentleman. I had hopes, I had high hopes when I heard the absent Leader of the Opposition name him to the shadow cabinet. I thought there maybe something more than a shadow to it. I do not mind criticism, the hon. gentleman from St. John's West, the hon. member for Burin, have both been critical of our health policy, perhaps they will go on being critical. More power to them, I will defend it, we will argue, but not the hon. member for St. John's East, he does not know what he is talking about. So let him do his homework and let him stand up.

The hon. gentleman is certainly a shadow without substance, that is just what I was saying, precisely what I was saying. Let him do his homework, or if not I would welcome the hon. gentleman from St. John's East Extern, who at least when he gets on his feet, and Lord knows he and I disagree often enough. At least when he gets on his feet he knows what he is talking about. If he is criticizing my colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, the hon. member for the Extern knows the subject, but not the member for St. John's East. The member from Gander, when he talks knows what he is talking about. even the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly my friend the member from Fortune Bay and the member for Burin but not the member for St. John's East, I think he has proven that this morning.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman suggested, had the gall,

MR. ROBERTS: the nerve, to suggest that the problems of the Medicare Plan, which is a public plan, we are not in discipline of doctors, Sir, we have nothing to do with that, that is a matter for the Medical Board, a Board established under a statute that was adopted by the House of Assembly in about 1896, before the turn of this century. That is a matter for professional discipline comparable to the Law Society of Newfoundland of which the hon. gentleman and I are equal members, as there are others members in this House.

This is our publically run plan, taking money raised from taxpayers in Newfoundland and money raised by the Government of Canada, from taxpayers across Canada, and used; an agreement under a contract to pay doctors for their services, to suggest that we turn that over to a private body, of all the Tory trash. Mr. Speaker, the Tory Party has an honourable, intellectual tradition and I do not subscribe to it, I do not believe in it. My inclinations, philosophically and politically, are Liberal not Tory. But there is an honourable Tory tradition, men like Burke, even Montague, I could name twenty. There is a worthwhile, intellectually honest, straightforward, honourable tradition of Toryism. If the people of Newfoundland want to have the men who believe in that administer their Government and form their Government, to take care of their affairs, then, so be it, that is the way it should be.

But not the Tory trash, we should take an \$18 million a year plan - between \$17 and \$18 million this year is what Medicare will cost and turn it over to a private body, and then he said we should give them disciplinary powers, we should make every doctor in Newfoundland join the N.M.A. The N.M.A. has never asked for that, never asked for it. He thinks we should say to them "Thou shalt join." It is not a union. A union would be a certification vote - but join it as a condition of the right to practice, of all the absurd and trashy ideas I have ever heard, the nerve. The hon. gentleman from St John's Centre is almost ashamed to have to sit and listen to that. Ah! Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might well be bored. He might well be bored, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the hon. gentleman is bored if he cannot understand. I know he has some misunderstanding, I do not hold it

MR. ROBERTS: against him. It is not his fault.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a good one. If we could make improvements in Committee, I will gladly look at them if they will improve the principle of this Bill, improve the way in which they are put in effect, we will look at them and, if they are an improvement we will go forward with them.

We believe this Bill is a responsible way to go at it. The present Act is not adequate, Sir. The things the hon. gentleman from the East suggested are not legal, they are illegal. They are not proper. They are not possible and I am surprised that, as a member of the Bar, he should know that. Obviously he has not even read the main Act, for his reference, it is found on page 301 of the 1968 statutes.

The hon. member from St. John's West knows the Acts well, the hon. member from Burin knows them well. We did not hear any such nonsense from them. Let the member from the East read it.

Before he accuses this Government of attacking and trying to make the medical business, The Medical Care plan a political thing, let him do his homework, let him find out, I have consulted with the Newfoundland Medical Association at great length on these amendments and they represent a consensus. I do not know if they agree with them or not, it is our responsibility as a Government to account for this money and to be responsible for administering it, but we have consulted. They have not disagreed. They have not come to me and said "no", They may want to, I do not know. It is not our responsibility to ask people whether we should bring in legislation. We are the Government. The House supports us, fine, if not then the constitution provides. But this Bill is a good one. It is for the benefit of the doctors of this Province, it protects their interest, it does it straight-forwardly, provides for appeals, provides for hearings. It provides for a private involvement of the doctor first and then a private involvement of the Medical Association and then a hearing, if he wants it, and if he does not want it there does not have to be a hearing.

MR. ROBERTS: A hearing at which he may have counsel, from which he gets a written statement. The administrative laws are set forward, some of the best Bills we have every had, the Administrative Law. Then an appeal to the Supreme Court, What more could we ask for Mr. Speaker? Offences are defined. Is anybody going to stand up and say we should pay for services rendered inadequately or improperly?

Under the present legislation we must. Why are we changing the regulations? Because the NMA asked. The NMA said; "do it by regulation. Do not do it this way." I said; "all right!" But is the hon. gentleman maintaining that we should pay for service rendered inadequately? Of course not. Who should judge? The process is set down here, Sir. First the doctor. First the doctor and the Medicare Commission - the doctor individually. He may have good reason. It ends there. If not, he can have a hearing before three commissioners, one of whom must be a doctor. And if the hon. gentleman wants to read the main Act, he will see that that doctor must be nominated by the NMA. Now whether he is in practice or not, that is up to the NMA. They send the list in. They sent a list to the hon. member for St John's West when he was Minister of Health. From that two men are selected, put on the commission. That is the procedure. I have followed it. It is laid down in the Act. So that then the hearing is there, and if it is not satisfied, if the commissioners are not satisfied, the doctor is not satisfied, then the commission make an order. Up to then it is all an in-house investigation thing. The NMA are involved, a professional body. They can give professional advice as to what is good practice and what is bad. Then it goes to a court, if the doctor so wishes or if the commission wishes.

Mr. Speaker, that to me sounds like sound legislation. It is a publicly run plan. We are responsible for administering it. We need these powers because the present powers in the present Act are not enough. Literally we have to pay for any service, be it adequate or not. It is incredible that the hon gentleman would oppose it. I am sure he does not

MR. ROBERTS: mean to. I am sure that when he thinks it through he will come to his sense on it and go for it. It is good legislation. It is necessary legislation. I have very much pleasure, Sir, in moving that this Bill be read a second time.

On motion a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister of Finance was in his place a moment ago. We have all observed the minister is under a certain amount of physical disability and we are not surprised but quite sympathetic that he has to absent himself every so often from the Chamber, but I am so happy that he is back in the Chamber now and ready to go forward with these estimates. He absented himself from the Chamber, I hear, to confer with a delegation of citizens from the constituency that he represents so capably in the House but, now he is back, we can proceed. The delegation will be very happy when they go back.

Consolidated Fund Services, 1V:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, Consolidated Fund Services, we would like to discuss them. There are some questions to be asked about them, Now whether they are discussed under this heading

MR. CROSBIE: under this first item, or whether discussed under Minister of Finance, surely, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to ask question on these interest figures and how they are arrived at. For example, under interest, treasury bills, last year paid out \$300 thousand. There was a million, three hundred and fifty thousand dollars provided for in last year's estimates. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why there was only \$300 thousand spent in interest on treasury bills last year rather than one million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and why only an amount of \$20 thousand is in this year for that item. The same question arises in respect to demand loans. Under interest there is only shown \$50 thousand interest on demand loans, whereas, last year, it was \$850 thousand spent under that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): Unless there is some question as to the accuracy of the actual figure in the item. The rule is that we pass these statutory items without debate because there is no point in debating them.

MR. CROSBIE: The point is, how do we know that these are the correct amounts - statutory amounts? These are amounts that have to be paid from the consolidated revenue, under that statute, but surely we are entitled to ask how these amounts are arrived at. Are these the correct statutory amounts? I mean, the discrepancy here in the first two items is \$800 thousand in interest on demand loans, and \$280 thousand in treasury bills.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Discrepancy is not the correct word.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a discrepancy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There may be a difference but that does not mean discrepancy.

MR. CROSBIE: Well then, that is why the question is being asked, Mr. Chairman, how do we know that these are the right amounts to be voted - not voted, to be passed under...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because the minister says they are, and if the hon.

the member...

MR. CROSBIE: The minister has not said they are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He prints it and presents it to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: I am saying this, that the minister owes this House an explanation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a Point of Order. The House has already dealt with this in passing the Statute.

MR. CROSBIE: Not at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only question arising is, are the figures printed accurately in the estimates. The minister says they are, now let someone prove that they are not.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on that Point of Order. That is not so at all, Statutes were passed some years ago providing that certain payments, such as interest, debt repayments and so on, do not have to be voted by the House. Yes, that is so, but this House has not passed on these items and we now have here total amounts of money for consolidated fund services amounting to some \$34 million. The House surely is entitled to know how these figures are arrived at, particularly when there are large differences.

Last year, \$1,350,000. provided in the estimates under treasury bill interest, and this year \$20 thousand. Last year, \$850 thousand spent in demand loans, and this year \$50 thousand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! As I understand it, when the minister rises to present his estimates, that is in effect a motion before the Committee that the item carries. Then the Chair puts the questions as to whether or not the item should carry. The motion has been made by the hon. the Minister of Finance that item 101-1 carry. Now as to the question of relevance to the issue, since these are statutory amounts which we are obliged to pay, the only question before the Committee is whether or not the figure there is accurate. That is the only question.

In past year we have always passed these without any comment.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the point that I am raising, Mr. Chairman. It is just that point. I would like the minister to advise the Committee, and surely I am only asking for information...

MR. SMALLWOOD: (First part inaudible) he presents them as correct.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, this is a complete outrage.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, this is terrible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Another outrage.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh definitely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bully boy, bully Crosbie again.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the minister...

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first time it has ever happened in the history of the House.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care if it is the first time it ever happened. It should have happened long ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Should it?

MR. CROSBIE: In the estimates for last year, I am asking the Minister of Finance to show how accurate the \$50 thousand is for interest on demand loans, when last year the revised estimates show \$850 thousand spent on that account. Surely the people of this Province have a right to know why the difference. Why the difference of \$800 thousand? That is the question. Is this figure accurate? How is it arrived at?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not carried, Mr. Chairman, it is not carried. It is a question asked, the Minister of Finance was just getting to his feet to answer it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not carried.

MR. JONES: I am sorry, I think it is customary when you go into Committee of the Whole that the minister is given the opportunity to have at least one or more of his officials that are familiar with the various details

of these estimates. I was trusting that hon. members of the Committee would give me the same indulgence. It will only be a matter of a few seconds and I can have somebody here to advise me on this.

MR. MURPHY: We can adjourn for ten minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We do not adjourn.

MR. NEARY: There is no need to adjourn. We can move on and let the item stand Mr. Chairman.

Motion, 10-1 stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 10-2 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: 10-2 Mr. Chairman, is debt management expenses. There have been questions put down, unanswerd yet, as to what debt management were during the last year in connection with the \$97 million in loans of the Province, what these debt management expenses are. For example; could the minister tell us, in connection with some of these loans, what are the expenses and legal fees and commissions paid to the investment dealers and so on? This is information we would like to have under the heading of 10-2.

There was a question asked in the House as to what law firms any money has been paid to in connection with debt management expenses. I believe Government has to pay counsel for the investment dealers and borrowers, and we would like to know what that all came to last year, and who was it paid to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if the questions are on the Order Paper they will be answered in the normal course when the Government are prepared to do it, which is not at this moment. What has that got to do with passing the statutory amounts?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on that so called Point of Order, we have heard the hon. the Premier say how many thousands of questions are answered when the estimates come before the House. This is the time, we have questions on the Order Paper not answered, there have been no questions answered in the last three or four days. We are now in Committee of this House when the money is voted. This is the time to ask the

questions. We want to know what law firm? How much had to be paid out last year in connection with all these bond issues? To what law firm? What were the expenses of this \$97 million of borrowing? Debt management expense we are dealing with now, and is this projection here accurate?

Here is \$150 thousand allowed for this this year, when we know the Government has to borrow \$154 million, almost twice what it borrowed last year. Last year it was \$126 thousand, according to the revised estimates, this year, \$150 thousand. What is the explanation when the Government has to borrow \$154 million this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a ruling? Are we going to debate the Statutory amounts? Going to have a debate on it are we, for the first time in the history of Parliament?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! order please. I think the hon. the Premier is under a misapprehension. The item we are on now is 01-201 which is not statutory.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page (6).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Page (6), what item Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 102-01

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, might I refer the Committee under this item, outstanding debts, to page (81), appendix (1) interest and debt retirement estimates 1971 - 72, where it is spelled out in detail.

MR. CPOSBIE: What is spelled out in detail, debt management expenses? We are now on item 102, debt management expenses.

MR. HICKMAN: The minister is back on 01.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item before the Committee is 102-01. Item 101 is standing.

MR. JONES: The entire item Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The entire 101 is standing.

MR. JONES: I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 102-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I have asked questions about debt management expenses. This is the Government's cost, the expense that the Government has in connection with its borrowing. The Government is projecting an expense this year of \$150 thousand. This covers, Mr. Chairman, monies paid to the Government syndicate of investment dealers for the work they do in selling Government Bond issues. It covers legal fees paid to the counsel for the investment dealers, paid to counsel for the borrowers. It involves legal fees the Government may pay on its own behalf in connection with these bond issues. It involves all expenses the Government has in connection with bond issues and issues of debentures. I have asked the question, what is the breakdown for last year? Apparently \$126 thousand was spent. Is the \$150 thousand sufficient this year, in view of the fact the Government has to borrow \$154 million? Surely these expenses are going to be up a lot higher than that. We want to know, how much of this breakdown is in legal fees? Who gets the legal fees? Is there a sufficient amount in to cover all the borrowing the Government projects this year? These are the questions we are asking.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John's West, in asking these questions has answered them, in that he outlines in great detail the various items which have to be paid under the subhead, which I think is for legal fees and what have you. Now I recall, as he has already said, there is an item on the Order Paper - a question on the Order Paper asking for a breakdown as to whom these amounts have been paid in the past. This question will be answered in due course. I regret I do not have that breakdown of information here at the moment.

As to whether or not, in view of an anticipated larger borrowing next year over this year, I am advised that we in finance feel that this amount is sufficient.

MR. CROSBIE: Then Mr. Chairman, what is covered in general expenses? What expenses does that cover, legal expenses? What are these expenses as compared to commissions? What is covered under the heading general expenses?

MR. JONES: General expenses, legal fees, printing, transshipping of bonds, moving bonds back and forth, the usual sort of general expenses, in connection with bond issues.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Committee would be agreeable to the Minister of Finance remaining seated in giving answers, giving information. I believe that the rising, standing and sitting back and forth are not doing him any good, The slipped discs in his spine will not be helped by his rising and sitting. Perhaps the Committee would be agreeable to his remaining seated.

Agreed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, does the Government in connection with these legal expenses retain counsel to act for the Government in connection with these bond issues? I notice in this prospectus of the bond issue of March 15th, 1971, that the counsel for the Government is said to be the Minister of Justice. 'Legal matters pertaining to these debentures to be passed upon in behalf of the Province by the Hon. L.R.Curtis O.C., acting in his capacity as Minister of Justice, who will rely in all matters of the U.S. law on the opinions of Messers, Rose, Guthrie and Alexander of New York, and on behalf of the seven underwriters Messrs, Curtis, Dawe, Fagan, Mahoney, Russell, Bonnell and Althouse of St. John's, and so on.' Are these the legal fees the minister referred to?

First we have to have our lawyers to represent us, and secondly is it not correct that we pay the legal fees of the lawyers who act for underwriters and others?

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to sit, but I find getting up and sitting down does not hurt too much, and I would hate for the Committee to get the idea that I was being floored by the hon. member opposite. The answer is, that invariably, Mr. Chairman, we do engage solicitors in all bond issues, but as is the common practice in Government, ultimately the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice, is responsible.

as the Committee I am sure is aware, for all legal aspects of all dealings of Government. It is only normal then for him as the prospectus reads to rely on this other firm outside.

Any mention that is made to him in this particular instance he is the legal adviser to the Government. He depends on others as it states in the prospectus.

MR. CROSBIE: In connection with legal matters, in connection with bond issues in this Province in the last year, or the last two years, what firm has the Government engaged in Newfoundland to advise them in connection with these bond issues? Is it the firm of Curtis, Dawe, Fagan, Mahoney and so on?

MR. JONES: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the firm. There has only been one Newfoundland firm?

MR. JONES: I cannot say, Mr. Chairman, if there has only been one, but the legal firm of Curtis, Dawe and Fagan has been engaged.

Motion, 01 carried.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just one question on the commissions. It seems almost a trifling amount, \$30 thousand. Could the hon. minister explain to the House if that covers the full commission paid on the total borrowings of the Government during the current year? Is that the commissions paid to the people who sold the bonds for us? Is that the total amount or is there some other commission or fee involved in the sale of these which is not disclosed under this item?

MR. JONES: This I understand, Mr. Chairman, is a commission paid for the cashing of coupons. This does not include the fee, as my hon. friend from Fortune Bay indicated, as paid to brokers and others.

MR. EARLE: Might I ask the minister, is that item of commission shown elsewhere?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 02 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: No Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jones.

I am advised that this item is included in (01) Mr. Chairman, under General Expenses.

MR. CROSBIE: In connection with that, Mr. Chairman, 102-01, General Expenses. Is the minister suggesting that last year on the \$97 million worth of debentures that the Government had that the total commissions paid to the financial syndicate that sold these bonds and others, the Rothschilds and everyone else, Hornblower & Weeks Hemphill, Noyes, A. E. Ames and Company who sold \$25 million in March, the people who sold the issue in England for \$20 million at the beginning of March, the people who sold the other bond issues totalling \$97 million that they received as commission only part of \$75,000 because that just cannot be sold? Is it not the fact that one way they may be paid is that the bond issues are sold at a discount or they buy them at a discount, i.e., Newfoundland sells their bonds at \$97.00. For every \$100 bond, it gets \$97.00 and that these underwriters keep the \$3.00 and that is their commission? I mean, in my view, the commissions paid to underwriters on the \$97 million worth of bonds last year would total hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars probably in excess of \$1 million, not just part of \$75,000. Is that not the case?

MR. JONES: The \$75,000, Mr. Chairman, would be the proportion of the cost that we would pay in this year.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, there must be some misunderstanding here on this because it is quite obvious that the total of general expenses and commissions of \$100,000 does not in any way go near the cost of our sale of our millions and millions of dollars of bonds. I would hazard to guess that it is somewhere upwards of \$1 million expenses involved. There must be some figure somewhere which was not disclosed in this. Now whether it is done by the brokers in the sale of the bonds at a discount or something of that nature, I am not sure. But I think the House is entitled to an explanation, because most surely the people who sell our bonds for us do not or are not

Mr. Jones.

satisfied with an earning of \$13,000 a year. That is so ridiculous it does not stand up. There must be a great deal more money than that involved.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman on that point, the minister tabled an answer to a question. The question was Question No. 246, which asked what was the total amount of money borrowed by the Government during the past year? It shows here, i.e., the \$25 million issue that was sold March 15, 1971 in New York was sold at a price of \$98.50 per hundred and \$97.00 per hundred giving an effective rate of 9.05 per cent. Now surely the difference, Mr. Chairman, between the \$100 - for every \$100 bond, we only receive \$97.00. That \$3.00 was retained by the underwriters; Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes and A. E. Ames and Company. The same thing is true with an issue of \$20 million sold on March 2. They were sold at \$99.50. An issue before that was \$6 million. It was sold at \$98.75. An issue before that of \$9 million was sold at \$98.75. An issue before that of \$5.25 million sold at \$98.75. Before that \$9.75 million, \$98.75. The underwriters who are selling our bonds are not doing it for nothing, Mr. Chairman. We are entitled to know what they are making. When the hon. the Premier stands up in this House and blows about how lucky we are and how wonderful it is to have A. E. Ames and this great syndicate selling our bonds and advising the Government, They are not doing that for nothing. They are a client of the Government of Newfoundland. They are making very, very substantial amounts from the Government of Newfoundland. Their advice is not just impartial. They advise when it is best to go to the market, when you may be able to sell here. When Rothschild sells \$30 million or \$60 million of EURO bonds for Newfoundland, Rothschild does not do that out of the goodness of his heart. He does that because he makes money at it.

Now last year an amount of at least \$1 million possibly \$2 million or \$3 million had to be paid by the Newfoundland Government to the people who manage our syndicate and to the Rothschilds and the rest of them. I submit

Mr. Crosbie

Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to know just what it cost the people of Newfoundland to have all those bonds sold by these great syndicates last year. There is one thing we can be sure of. It cost a very great deal more than the \$75,000. The estimates show \$65,000 under General Expenses and \$20,000 under Commissions. The committee is entitled to be told just what did we pay A. E. Ames and Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill & Noyes? What did it total?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does that come under this particular item?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes it does.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does it come under this item?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is saying that the item here is not correct,...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is saying it is not correct?

MR. CROSBIE: I say it is not correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are saying that it is not correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well then the minister says it, so we will vote on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister has no say in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well he does not need to vote on it. He can treat it with silent contempt if that is his choice.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, yes, the Government can treat all requests for information with silent contempt. That is what the Government are doing. A part from this item, this is the heading: Debt Management Expenses and one of those expenses..

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the House is asking..

MR. CROSBIE: One of those expenses are the cost of bond issues to the people of this Province. We are asking the question: "What did that \$97 million of bond issues cost us last year?" They are now asking the House to vote additional money this year. How much did A. E. Ames, Hornblower & Weeks

Mr. Crosbie

Hemphill, Noyes and what not, what were they paid in commissions? What was Rothschild paid? What were the rest of them paid? Surely that is legitimate information. What did it cost the people of Newfoundland to borrow all that money last year apart from the interest they have to pay? The issues are all listed here. There are six major issues. There are six major bond issues: \$97.5 million and another \$18 million, Canada Pension Plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The question has been raised as to whether the hon. member is relevant. Now the question before the House is whether or not the sum of \$30,000 will be voted for commissions. As all hon. members know, an hon. member cannot move that the amount be increased. The hon. member for St. John's West is saying that the amount of \$30,000 cannot be correct and that seems to me to be relevant to the matter.

MR. JONES: If my hon. friends would refer to the Public Accounts for the Province of Newfoundland, March 31, 1970, and turn to page six and notice an item there: Discounts and issue expenses incurred during the year, \$1.7 million. Now that is the figure for the year previous and I will be quite happy, Mr. Chairman, to dig up this information for my hon. friends.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It should not be on this item.

MR. JONES: It is carried as a capital account item. I am just trying to help my hon. friend.

MR. CROSBIE: I am glad the hon. minister is agreeing to help. Well then, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the minister will let us know what it cost last year under "Discounts and issue expenses incurred during the year."

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend opposite asks me again, I will say no I will not.

MR. CROSBIE: I understand that that is what the hon. minister is going to get and that the amount for the year previous is \$1,776,000. That is the information we want Mr. Chairman that commissions on bond issues are not just amounting to \$30,000 a year or did not just amount to \$20,000 last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here we go again.

MR. CROSBIE: It amounted to that amount plus \$1.7 million..

MR. SMALLWOOD: That does not shut him up.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, are we discussing the estimates?

The Premier hates to give information. The cost of borrowing to the people of Newfoundland then was at least \$2 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Another speech.

MR. CROSBIE: Or some figure that the minister will get for us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On this one item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if I had not been constantly interrupted I would have had the information long ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is completely out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please! The House is in committee.

The hon. member is speaking on item (02) and there is no time limit and the only thing he cannot do is repeat himself over and over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that is what he is doing.

MR. MURPHY: The Chairman is Chairman of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: The fact is, Mr. Chairman, which we are trying to establish is that our Debt Management Expenses, are these commissions plus the discounts and so on and the issue expenses incurred during the year, which a year previous, the year earlier, were \$1,776,000 and this year will be some amount the minister will give us, obviously in excess of \$2 million so that when we discuss Debt Management Expenses that is not costing the people of Newfoundland just \$150,000, as as look at the estimates might suggest. It is actually costing the people of Newfoundland well in excess of \$2 million and this year, in a year when the Government are going to borrow \$154 million, it may well amount in excess of \$3 million. That is the point that is now being conceded. The minister says that he will get us the exact amount .

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I would like to ask

MR. MAPSHALL:

the minister on this Debt Management Expenses. Where does he draw the line? Would he be able to tell the committee where he draws the line between Current Account and Capital Account with respect to the overhaul Debt Management Expenses? He has stated that a certain amount, \$1 million and some hundred thousand dollars, are on Capital Account. I want to know how and by what method he divides one in Current and one in Capital?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that under this item?

MR. JONES: My advice is that it shows - it is written off as a financial surplus over the life of the bond issue. That is the Capital against the financial surplus. The figure shown here would be what is currently spent in this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! May I draw the attention of members to the fact that when the item is called, if a member has a question to ask or something to say, he should stand on his feet and say it, because once the order is passed we cannot revert back to it. Now on these last two items members have stood after the question has been passed by the committee. So, I just ask the co-operation of members in standing quickly so that once when we have the item called and carried, that we are not continually reverting.

On motion (02) carried.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman on (04), Crown Corporations - how would that effect Crown Corporations under this Debt Management Expenses, may I ask, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman these are trustee fees, insurances on transporting debentures and normal costs involved as between Government and the Crown Corporations.

MR. EARLE: Newfoundland Buildings Corporation is a Crown Corporation - does this item here provide for any capital sum that may be advanced for

Mr. Earle,

the oil refinery, for instance, we saw from special warrants that \$27 million was advanced. Now if this is a Crown Corporation, does this Debt Management Expense cover the expense on that \$27 million?

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, that will show under another department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On motion (04) carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, are we going to revert now to 101?

MR. CHAIRMAN.: The Law Clerk tells me that in previous years we have not put to the committee a vote on these statutory amounts, unless there is some inaccuracy in the figure that is shown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, that is of British Parliamentary practise.

MR. CROSBIE: Where is it? Cite it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Statutory Votes in the House, the House merely notes them. It does not even discuss them. It does not ask questions. It certainly does not vote. You merely pass over the Statutory and come to the ones that the House either votes or does not and, if the House votes, the Government has authority to spend. If the House do not vote or the committee, the Government have no authority to spend. It is the spending estimates that require the authority of the committee and later the House. The Statutory amounts are never voted on. They never have been in any House in the world.

MR. CROSBIE: On that point, Mr. Chairman, we have been over this now three or four times. We know that these are Statutory amounts. The question, Mr. Chairman, I have raised is how can these figures given here be accurate in view of past experience under these headings? Here is Demand Loans, \$50,000 shown for this year. Somebody had to compute that amount. Somebody can be wrong. This House is entitled to ask have the Government properly computed the amounts that are going to come out of Consolidated Fund this year for interest on Demand Loans? Last year, the total was \$850,000.

Mr. Crosbie:

That is the Revised Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Law Clerk has checked the past years and these items have always been taken as just been a purely formal vote.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, supposing that was the case in past years that, in my view, was the wrong practice in past years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So the "Bully" does not like the past practice.

MR. CROSBIE: Is there something to hide here, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the present practice all over the world.

MR. CROSBIE: Where is the Parliamentary authority that says you are not allowed to question how figures were arrived at - where is the authority. Mr. Chairman? Where is the authority in Beauchesne.?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! As the Chair sees it, the House is or the committee is obliged to pass these votes because they are Statutory and the only possible question could be asked, if it were to be, it would be: is the amount correct? The minister is moving the amount and, therefore, I presume that it would be just a waste of time. Anyway it has not been done in previous years.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on that point..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Vote on it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman on that point, the point is this: That if those figures are too low

they therefore helped to convey a wrong impression as to the state of this Province in view of the budget. If these figures in the estimates for Consolidated funds Services are too low -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please: I have my mind made up on this, what the Chairman is going to do, we are going to pass over these Statutory amounts and I will give the consideration afterwards and, if we have to have a debate on it, or the debate is going to be on it, I will make the announcement then. We will go on now to the ones on which there is no question.

MR. CROSBIE: In other words you are going to give a decision later. The Chairman says he is going to make a decision later.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Chairman, can only go -

MR. CROSBIE: Give the public the facts. What are you hiding here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Shall the total of 102 carry?

MR. SMALLWOOD: - on the statutory amounts I object. We cannot vote on statutory amounts.

MR. CROSBIE: Why is there a difference of \$1 million? To give a false view in the budget. Falsity.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Sit down, sit down."

MR. CROSBIE: False.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Bully boy, he will get his medicine shortly.

MR. CROSBIE: You just try it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will try it. I tried it before and I will try it -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. page 8, Item 2 Legislative.

MR. CROSBIE: Out in Gander speaking for an hour and -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. John's West please be silent, I am standing. Now the Item is item (2) Legislative, page 8. Shall 201-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: We are elected to this House Mr Chairman, to speak on every item when it comes before the House, if we wish to speak on it. I am now going to speak on it and neither the Premier nor any one in

this house is going to stop me. I am going to speak in accordance with the rules in this House on Legislative and every other item I want to speak on. There is only one thing going to change that that is the electorate, no one else is going to change that.

Now, Legislative: This is the first item, Mr. Chairman, under Legislative so we can speak generally on Legislative which is what I am going to speak on here now. The barbarity with which this House is treated by the Hon. the Premier. Here is a House that does not know from minute to the next what the next item of business is going to be. What a foul disgusting way for any House to be led. We do not know from one day to the next what our sitting hours are. We do not know if we are meeting from eleven to one, three to six, eight to eleven, never told in advance, we hear it on the radio programme this morning that from now on the Hon. the Dictator is going to have the House meet from eleven to one and from three to six and eight to eleven. There is not one democratic parliament in the world that is treated with the contempt, the disgusting contempt that this House is by the majority opposite.

The question is asked of the Leader of the House this morning what is going to be the order of business. For the first time we are told; in the morning legislation, in the afternoon estimates, in the evening the budget debate and how long that will be stuck to we do not know. We do not know until six o'clock arrives every evening in this House whether we are going to meet that evening, when the Hon. the Dictator makes his mind up as to whether we will come back that evening. If this House meets, Mr. Chairman, from eleven to one every morning, from three to six every afternoon, and eight to eleven for every day the rest of this session, how are we, we have another hundred Bills we have not looked at yet, or sixty or fifty, when are we supposed to study them on this side of the House and we have to be here morning, afternoon and night? How

does the Government explain that? Listen to the ignoramus hum hum over there reading his paper. He does not have to do that kind of work he is sitting in the Cabinet has to do nothing. Or sitting in the back-benches. Never mind the hum-hum -

MR.NOLAN; Mr.Chairman, surely we have some rules in the House is the hon. member allowed to say things like this?

MR.CROSBIE: Yes, certainly.

MR.CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member wishes to raise a point of order he must state what it is.

MR. NOLAN: The point of order is that the Minister has just been referred to as an ignoramus by the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR.CROSBIE: On that point of order,Mr. Chairman, when I was speaking the hon. gentleman went hum-hum and he is there reading a paper, if that is not ignorance I do not know what it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bored to death.

MR.CROSBIE: He is bored like the Hon. the Premier is bored. He does not want to hear anyone but himself. This is not a Cabinet meeting, this is the House of Assembly. We do not have just to listen to the Premier. We can speak ourselves.

Legislative, Mr. Chairman, how is this House run? How the House is run. Just listen to it. We ignore the barking of the minor curs and the pack we are going to concentrate on the first cur, the important cur.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order please, I think the hon. member should -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. I demand that to be taken back, the complete retraction of that. A complete retraction.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order please, I have to rule that the point of order has been raised that it is not parliamentary for one hon. member call another hon. member a cur and ask the hon. member for St. John's West

to retract his statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Of course it is Your Ruling Mr. Chairman, I will retract my statement that anyone is a cur. Now to get back to the Legislative. So here we have a House, Mr. Chairman, where last week the Address in Reply ended quickly, on a Friday. The Government that had been shouting to the housetops that there was obstruction in this House that the House only opened March 22, it had its first full day on March 25, the Government, the Premier was out shouting to the housetops, obstruction in the House of Assembly because we dared speak in the Address in Reply, and moved non-confidence motion. So the cry throughout the land on VOCM and the rest of it was obstruction. So the Address in Reply ended on a Friday evening, and the Government got caught with their Legislative pants down. We had very little to do in this House the following week, what happened, after all the cries of obstruction. We met two mornings only and no night. But now we have the Budget before us. Now we have these estimates, now we have other legislation so what is going to happen. The Government is going to force this House to meet morning, afternoon and night, without any consultation with the Opposition, so that we will not have a chance to study this and so that the people of the Province will receive less information from the House. The Hon. the Premier knows that the Press can only report so much. That if this House is meeting eight hours a day all that happens in the House has to be reported on three main news bulletins during the day, so that the longer the hours are they drive us through, the less news gets out of the House. That is what the Government attempts to do now by driving the business of the House through like this. No consideration for members of the House or what the people hear, what is happening, what the Premier calls the People's House, what nonsense. It has not been the People's House for a very long, long time, it was the Premier's House until two years ago. Now,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, it is Crosbie's House. Bully Boy's House now.

MR. CROSBIE: When he had to listen to others it is no longer the People's House, put it through quickly, shut everything down, shut them up, that is how this House is run. There are no meetings, Mr. Chairman, between the Leader of the Government or the Government Whip and the Whip on this side, or the Leader of the Opposition to discuss when business might be brought before the House, as there is in Ottawa as there is in every other House. There is no cooperation when the Budget debate is called. We will not know who is going to speak on the other side, if any one, in the Budget debate. Cheap tricks, like the Address in Reply. The Budget will be called tonight, if nobody stands up on the Opposition side to speak they will try to force a vote. So we are forced to get up to speak. Instead of having arranged with the Government side rotational speakers, this is the way this pitiful, this pitiful House of Assembly is run.

If the people of Newfoundland could see how it was run they would certainly change the Government and darn quick. A question will come up, should the House be televised? Is that discussing the House of Assembly do the Leaders of the various parties discuss it? Is there a meeting behind the Chair? No, you pick up the paper and you see, there will be no TV coverage of the House of Assembly, says the Premier. The Dictator has decided there is no discussion in the House. Well, we all know why he decided that. We had that Shaheen debacle in here last year and the people of the Province had a chance to see what was happening in the House, and to see the people who were using the credit of this Province for their own enrichment. So, the Premier does not want this House televised. I will say he does not.

The Hon. the Premier is afraid to go on TV with the member for Burin and myself. He certainly does not want the House televised. He will not permit any of his little Cabinet Ministers to go on with them

either, told CBC he would not go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell the House what I said, tell the Committee what I told the CBC. I did not associate with treacherous traitors. That is what I told them. I meant every word of it. I do not associate with treacherous cutthroats.

MR. CROSBIE: The Hon. the Premier told them - Afraid, afraid. Who do the Hon. Premier call something worse than that. If you want me to repeat that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. A little bit more relevant to -

MR. CROSBIE: That is television coverage of the House, Mr. Chairman. Answers to Questions, the feet are starting to drag now on the answer to the questions. We have not had a question answered for three or four days. No question answered in the House today. There was some flurry of activity - there is an example of how the Government treats the House on a private members day they spent all afternoon answering questions so that private members would have no time to debate their business. I cannot get mad at the Minister of Economic Development, he knows no better. That is the way this House is run.

Legislative, Mr. Chairman, when the estimates came before the House last year there was not enough money included to cover the salaries of the staff of the House so we find a Special Warrant for \$30,000 passed during the year. What is the excuse for that? It is the same kind of slackness, the same attempt to mislead, how much money is going to be spent by the Government each year, so that the Budget will look that little bit better.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to correct the hon. member. I doubt if the staff got the \$30,000 this was discussed the day before yesterday.

MR. CROSBIE: Well that can be discussed here now. This House of Assembly is in the control of the majority group in the House which is

the Government. The way it is run depends on how the Government sees fit to run it. We see this great powerful Government, that is so powerful so confident it is going to win an election this year, impose closure this year. Closure has not been imposed in Ottawa in the last fifty years except on legislation that went on for weeks and weeks and weeks, debate on one Bill that went on for weeks and weeks like the Pipeline Debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman is this in order?

MR. CROSBIE: This is closure - legislation - the Government imposes closure the rules of the House, closure. In Ottawa it has not been done since 1920 -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please - we cannot go over the whole field of the past year in a simple motion as to whether or not the allowances for the members of the House of Assembly will be passed.

MR. MURPHY: We are talking about voting money to this House of Assembly and all members - in the hon. members opinion he may not want to vote any money to continue the House the way it has been - I think it is perfectly relevant - he will get to it eventually, when he gets a chance, if he is treated with the courtesy that Standing Order says, he will get a chance eventually.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the vote is \$404,000 allowances sessional allowances to the members of the House. That is what the vote is before the House at the moment. Now I suggest to you Your Honour that within certain narrow limits, pretty narrow, it is proper and in order to discuss the House but not the whole general attitude of the Government, the whole general attitude of the Cabinet, not the whole conduct of the House but the question of salaries, salary rates, the hours of the House meeting, the affairs of the House as a House not the attitude of the Government. Even that should be pretty strictly limited. The Government comes to the Committee and asks the Committee to authorize the Government to spend money to pay salaries and allowances to the members

May 3, 1971 Tape 432 page 8.

of the House. Now, that is a pretty debatable matter, you can be in favour of it, you can be against it. You can argue for more, you can argue for less. But to use that as the occasion of an Address in Reply type of speeches, obviously wrong, it is out of order, because -

MR. SMALLWOOD:

there is only one Address in Reply because there is only one Speech from the Throne. So the debate on the Address in Reply gives hon. members the widest possible kind of latitude to talk about almost anything under the sun. Now there is another such occasion each session and that is the debate on the Budget Speech, but this is the case where the Government comes to the Committee and asks the Committee to vote money to pay the salaries of the members and a little further down their travelling expenses and expense allowances, office books, bindings, printing of journals, the expenses of the House of Assembly. That is surely not the occasion for a general Address in Reply type of speech because, if so, then can that not be done on almost any vote in the estimates? Can the Address in Reply debate be done on every item in the estimates? Clearly this is not so, clearly it is not so because one of the great principles of Parliamentary practice, in the British system, and that is our system here, is that one thing is debated once in a session and is disposed. Then other things are debated once each and disposed of. You do not go over the same ground again and again because that destroys the efficiency of Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this to Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think now the Committee has heard both sides of the question,

I think that what both the hon. the Premier has had to say and what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had to say is correct and, of course, the problem is for the Chair to decide, in each case, whether or not a member has been relevant or not. I think hon. members have heard the two sides and it is up to the Chair to make a ruling in particular cases.

MR. CROSBIE: As I understand it also, Mr. Chairman, on the first item for each department we are allowed to discuss the activities of the department. When we get -

MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to that question that was just raised by the hon. member for -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down while the Chairman is speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the rules of the House say it.

MR. CROSBIE: When the Premier stops I will sit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, do it.

MR. CROSBIE: I will take no orders from him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to say, on the question just raised by the hon. member for St. John's West, we might just as well settle it now since we are starting on the estimates.

In previous years it was by agreement that all members of the House agreed that, if the Chair permitted a little wider latitude on the first item, then we could get through the other items with practically no debate. Now the strict rule, of course, is that there is no more favour to be given to the first item than to any other item. I do not know whether the Committee wants to continue this year with the practice that we had then, of having an agreement that a member could speak a little more widely on the first item in the hope that we would go through the others. But the rule is, of course, that you must be relevant at all times.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, on your statement there, just for my own and the House's general clarification, I still think it is a very important point of issue. The conduct of the House in the past has been that as we come to each department heading, as you will remember, we go into a great deal of discussion on the activities of that department. I have heard, to the best of my memory, one and two hour and sometimes three hour addresses on a department, particularly one like Mines, Agriculture and Resources, where you go into hog breeding land clearing and goodness knows what, but it goes on and on, on the general principle of the thing. Now this Legislative item which we are on at present, Mr. Chairman, I take it as the only opportunity we have to discuss the conduct of this House. I think all members here today, in the light of what has happened in this session, would like to have an

MR. EARLE:

opportunity, within the bounds of this vote, to discuss the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Is there not ample opportunity in the Address in Reply and in the Speech on the Budget?

MR. EARLE: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ample, ample opportunity.

MR. EARLE: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree because we all have own fields to cover in the Budget debate and in the Address in Reply and we are limited on this side to ninety minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before you make any ruling, I want to refer to Beauchesne because there is nothing more fundamental than the point that is now being discussed because, if we are going to be cut off in debating the estimates we are going to be in a pretty sad way. Page 201 of Beauchesne, section 238; "It is good practice to table the main estimates shortly after the Address in Reply is disposed of" and so on. "Each grant is a separate motion which must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question. When it has been formally carried no reference can be made again thereon." Down in section 239, Mr. Chairman, the whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way when the Committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the estimates of that department which reads as follows: "General administration," (that is in the Federal estimates). The discussion must not be extended to any particular item mentioned in the estimates of that department. If however the words, "General administration" cover all the expenses to be incurred during the year, as shown, for example post office estimates, it is relevant then to criticize every phase of the department totally or in detail.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the first item is called, my submission is, based on Beauchesne, that the whole management of that item we can discuss but, if there is a vote down below, aircraft operations, or if there is a vote

MR. CROSBIE:

down below say in Mines, Agriculture and Resources, there is a vote, Farm Products Corporation or a specific vote that we can discuss Farm Products Corporation, then we do not discuss that in our general remarks. But the only chance you have to discuss what the Minister is doing and his department generally is on the first item, and I submit that is the practice that should be followed here, in accordance with page 201, section 239 of Beauchesne. Is that all right?

Well, now then, I am discussing Legislative, as the first item I am discussing Legislative and I was just discussing, Mr. Chairman, a closure which is part of the Legislature, one of our rules and the way it was applied here a few weeks ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me now. I do not really think that when we are talking about the grant for Legislative here that we can get into the whole recapitulation of everything that was said and every decision that was made and every vote that was taken in the House. I do not think that is it. I think that when a member begins to speak about particular things that have been decided and voted on and over and done with, I do not think that is really what is meant by that.

MR. CROSBIE: I agree, Mr. Chairman. I am just discussing closure as part of the business of the Legislature, how the Legislature is conducted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that -

MR. CROSBIE: Well, then I will not discuss it, if the Chairman does not think it should be discussed. I will pass on to something else. Mr. Chairman, the rules call, and here is a serious infringement of the rights of this House, an infringement by the Government. Under many of the pieces of Legislation passed by this House, the Government has fifteen days after the House begins a session to table copies of agreements, regulations, special warrants and the like in this House. That is an order passed by the House of Assembly of this Province, a law enacted, that the Government must do certain things.

MR. CROSBIE:

We have a situation in this House of Assembly where the laws passed by this House of Assembly are being ignored and flouted by the Government. Now there is one particular example, the Industrial Development (Incentives) Act, 1968. That Act provides that within fifteen days of the opening of the House any agreement passed, under the Act under which power is to be subsidized, is to be tabled in this House. Mr. Chairman, there was no such agreement tabled in 1969, there was no such agreement tabled in 1970, there was no such agreement tabled in 1971, to date, yet we know by the estimates that five million odd dollars were spent last year by the Government on this incentive and we know from the Minister of Economic Development that there have been seven agreements entered into like that. Yet this House opened on March 22, it is today May 3 and no agreement has been tabled - deliberate decision by the Government not to comply with the law of this Province.

Now that affects the Legislative, how this House operates. The House of Assembly is supposed to be the fount from which the power comes to the Government. It is exactly the other way around, Mr. Chairman, in this House. When you have a docile majority, led by a certain type of leader, it is completely the other way around, it is turned around. This House is now only the servant of the Government, kicked, bullied, beaten and bruised. The Government does with this House what it wants to do. When we bring to the attention of the Government that they are ignoring and flouting the law, that they are prosecuting people outside this House - every day there are people outside this House being prosecuted for offences against Provincial Law. Yet here is a government that is prosecuting them, defying the law itself and refusing to table in this House agreements under different pieces of legislation.

Now under Standing Order 100 of the Rules of this House, Mr. Chairman, "It shall be the duty of the clerk to make and cause to be printed and delivered to each member, at the commencement of every session of Parliament, a list of the reports or other periodical statements which it is the duty of

MR. CROSBIE:

any officer or department of the Government or any bank or other corporate body to make to this House." We have no such list. We have not been provided with any such list. There are dozens and dozens of pieces of Legislation passed by this House that, because we have no list, we cannot even check on the Government to see are they complying with them. We do know from a number of Acts that come to our attention, for example the Melville Agreement Act and the Industrial Development (Incentives) Act and a few others, that the Government is flouting the law in that respect. That is the way, Mr. Chairman, the Government that controls this House acts.

Look at the question of pay for members, Mr. Chairman, how that is handled. Last year a serious point was brought up here as to there should be some changes made so that members who live out of town, there are a few members in this House who do not live in St. John's, they do not have their homes here but they live on the West Coast and outside the city, that there should be a change so that they would get greater expenses than the members who live in St. John's, to cover their travelling back and forth when the House is open, to cover their hotel and meals and the rest of it when they are in St. John's. That seemed to me to be pretty sensible. There should be some arrangement like that, some allowance for the out of town member; the member who lives in Gander or Corner Brook or wherever, who comes back and forth every week to this House. That was not done. What was done was a hurried \$1,500. increase for every member of the House put through.

There was supposed to be a study made of other improvements that could be brought about in the House. There was no such study made; there were no proposals from the Government in that direction. There is no consideration given to the fact that some members of the House do not live in St. John's. No, just an opportunity taken to bang through a \$1,500. increase for everyone without the serious, the more serious, the more fundamental problem being dealt with at all. That is the way the problems

MR. CROSBIE:

of the House are dealt with.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who made the motion, by the way?

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier made the motion and all members of the House with the exception of the member for Bonavista North voted for it.

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. gentleman vote for it?

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. gentleman had not, he would have made that plain.

MR. NEARY: Who raised the idea anyway?

MR. CROSBIE: I raised the question of out of town members and the fact that they should get additional allowances for travelling back and forth to the House and other members raised other points. What I am saying is that that was not dealt with seriously. All that happened was that everybody got a \$1,500. rise which did not deal with the point at all. Opposition members, there has been some progress made on that, but there has to be more, Mr. Chairman. There is going to have to be larger Opposition room ready next year most likely when the hon. gentleman opposite, and half of them have to fit into that small office there. There is no provision made in the rules of this House for third groups or parties. There are at least three parties in this Province and several groups. There is no provision in this House, we now have an office that used to be for the Minister without Portfolio, but there is no provision in the rules for them.

When is something going to be done on the rules? Is it not time that we ask some Parliamentary expert, someone in the House of Commons at Ottawa, to spend the summer to draft some decent rules for the conduct of the business in this House, not this inadequate

MR. CROSBIE silly little green book that is now far out-of-date and obscures more than it clarifies. Is it not time that somebody who knows parliamentary rules is asked to do a job and get us some decent rules, that everybody can read and understand and follow? Of course that will not do us much good, if the Government that is running the House are going to pay no attention to the rules any way. So these are some of the points, Mr. Chairman, when we are considering this legislature. I can only hope that the next Government, whatever it is, is going to improve upon to make this House a much better place to operate in. If the public cannot grasp, and of course, this is why the Government are quite happy to let things go on this way, cannot grasp the burden that is imposed on any member of the Opposition who tries to do a decent job, when he is faced with meetings, morning, noon and night, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, and unless we do not meet Friday night. He gets a little break on private member's day, but if he has a private member's resolution, he has to do some work in the morning and get ready for it. While he is in this House trying to question the estimates, trying to speak on the Budget Speech, trying to be sensible when legislation comes before the House, he has no time to look at all this other material. It is barbarous, it is not done in Ottawa. In Ottawa they meet afternoons and evenings, except they do not meet every evening of the week, I think, three or four evenings a week and afternoons. Yet in this House the Government wants to stuff down our throats that we are going to be supermen, either shut up and throw up our arms and say, in all we will give the attempt, or we are going to meet morning, afternoon and evening.

I mean the contempt, the contemptibleness of it, is atrocious. Yes, afternoons and evenings, we can do our job and meet afternoon and evening, or morning and afternoons, we can do our job. But for the Leader of the Government to pretend what he knows is not the truth, to get on the radio and say these fellows in the House of Assembly are only working three hours a day or five hours, and we are just going to make them work an eight hour day, so that the poor man who has never seen the House knows no better

MR. CROSBIE: down in Joe's Batts Arm or somewhere else, the fishermen who have not had the chance to observe, will think, yes, they should meet eight hours a day. That cheap, despicable, tactic, untrue, false propaganda spread on the radio, that the only time we are doing anything is the few hours we are in the House, What about the hours when you are outside of the House getting ready for it? You cannot stand up here and just use your imagination; you have to have a little fact, you have to read the estimates. The Leader of the Government is on the radio spouting all of the time, work, work, work. He is working morning, afternoon and evening, eighteen and twenty hours a day; he says. Well, he is not the only one.

Members of this House, Mr. Chairman, have to work morning, afternoon and evening, twenty hours a day, under this regime; that the Government now plans to put us under. There is nobody here wants to obstruct the business of the House. But, we want to have an opportunity to speak on the points we feel need to be brought out. Not to be put under pressure by the Government and then, when we get up on the estimates, have the silly arguments we had this afternoon, before we are even started. It is not good enough. It is despicable. It is bullying. The hon. the Premier says, bullying, when I am up speaking. Bulling? Here is an independent member, one member of the House of forty-one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. CROSBIE: It is the Government that are bullying, Mr. Chairman, that is my point. Yes, we can just do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, now, now, just rave on.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen; he could the wind record. The hon. wind tunnel. The hon. wind tunnel. He spoke here once for twelve hours, fourteen hours. Any-one else speaks, he is going to object. Look, what a comedian. What a comedian. Wind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a bore. What a bore.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to him. It is boring to have questions asked. It is boring when you will not give the answers. Where is the \$1 million that is falsely hidden away in Consolidated Fund Services, to make your pitiful budget look a bit better? Now that is all I will say on this item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what is wrong with this House, we got a dictatorship of a Government, a bullying Government, a Government that will not even give the people the truth, that will try to deceive the people about what the members of this House are doing, a disgusting, nauseous performance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on this particular vote. Most of what I have to say I am afraid agrees with the hon. the colleague for St. John's West.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hon. colleague?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, colleague.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hon. colleague?

MR. EARLE: Hon. colleague. It is on this side of the House, which

MR. CROSBIE: Your hon. colleague will not even stop and listen to his hon. colleague.

MR. CROSBIE: Time out to have a cigarette, I will be listening to every word.

MR. EARLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I was about to try and say is very aptly interrupted, and this has been the pattern of this House all the way through. To me it is apparent silly and childish, the way the conduct of this House carries on. If we were all worthy of our salt, we would say, that if we believed that this sort of thing would be perpetuated in the parliament of Newfoundland, of Newfoundland, we would say that the vote of \$585,000 should be cut in half. Because, I do not think that the people of Newfoundland want to pay for this kind of trash that is going on in this House today.

Now some jackass would get on the air or go in the paper tomorrow and say, oh, but you should see the House in Great Britain, or you should see what they do in Ottawa. I do not care a hang what they do in Great Britain, nor what they do in Ottawa. It is time for Newfoundland to show common sense some gentlemanlyness and some decency. We get this sort of bully-boy stuff going back and forth across the House costing the people of this country, last year \$624,000. It is time we got down to business and got on with this

MR. FARLE: without all this nonsense that is going on in the House. But even more apparent and horrible than that, that the whole dignity of this House has been completely underscored completely undermine by the fact that we hear day by day on a radio programme predictions of what is going to go on in the House, how the people's business is going to be conducted and what is going to be done. What on earth is the use of paying \$624,000 for a House of Assembly, when the business of the people that should be discussed here, is discussed quite openly on radio programs, when disclosures are made that should not be made outside of the walls of this House. Furthermore, a matter of a few weeks before the House opened, there was a so-called Economic Conference, somebody called it a "Disarmament Conference," to disarm the people of Newfoundland.

This Conference, as this session of the House has borne out, was only a repetition of what was to take place in this House. Practically everything that was said then has been repeated in this House. Why? If the people of Newfoundland were to be informed that these programmes were going forward, why was it not done in the proper place, which is the House of Assembly? Why a few weeks before that had all of this stuff to be made public for the people of the Province, literally doing away with the necessity of the opening of the House of Assembly, entirely. I declared at that time that things were being said at the Economic Conference which were in effect disclosing plans and estimates of the Government which we are now discussing. This, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is a complete denial of the rights of this House. When the public are being informed in this loose and disorderly manner, when their own House gets the information second-hand and discusses it second-hand, it is too disgusting to say anything.

I feel that the contention that we are only working here three hours a day, which is so often said on radio, is such a falsehood that the person who utters it should be ashamed ever to go on the air again. Because it is well known that what we have to do in preparation for this work certainly is not a three hour job. Sometimes it is almost a twenty-four hour job a day to keep up with this, to do it properly. Besides which all of us here, of course, if we are elected members and doing our jobs properly, are

MR. EARLE: trying to attend to our constituents and their demands. Which, if a person serving his district are quite large and quite demanding.

Therefore, for anyone to go on the air and try to insult the members of this House, on both sides, and here I refer to Government and Opposition, and it is an insult, and I am wondering if the members on the other side have not got the courage to get up and say that too. To insult a member of this House and say, he works three hours a day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who said that?

MR. EARLE: The hon. member who asked a question on it, and says, they only work about three hours a day, we may as well go on morning, afternoon and night.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who said that?

MR. EARLE: The hon. gentleman who is asking the question, across the way. I have heard on radio programmes, it is only.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean, I said that?

MR. EARLE: Yes, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When the hon. gentleman sits down I will deal with it.

MR. EARLE: It is only a matter of three hours a day in the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will deal with that.

MR. EARLE: It is only about three hours a day, when we are working all of the time, if we are attending to our constituents properly.

Now this is borne out furthermore by the fact that when the Government deems necessary they can send this House into morning, afternoon and evening sessions at their whim. Because they want to rush through something which should now be discussed to give information to the people. Therefore, they put on the pressure, they immediately start to meet morning, afternoon and night, when all of a sudden something happens like five ministers have to go over to London or something the place is closed down for two weeks. It does not matter, there are plenty here to carry on the country's business. There are plenty of elected members to keep the House opened and to keep on with the people's business and to cut down all of this unnecessary expense

MR. FARLE: and all the protracted debate and so on. Yet some fellows go off and go off everywhere, they may go to Europe, they may go to Louisiana, they may go anywhere and the House closes down. Is that the way to conduct the country's business? Then when they come back, oh, there is a tremendous amount of business to be done, so we must open morning, afternoon and night. The conduct of the thing is so childish, so foolish, I wonder that the Newfoundland people have any respect at all for their House of Assembly. It must be obvious to them that this is being run at the whim of the Government that it does what it likes with the people's House, it opens and closes when it feels like it. It keeps what hours it likes. And then it turns around and then they say; would you kindly pay \$624,000 to keep this circus opened.

This is so foolish it is beyond any reasonableness at all. Mr. Chairman, a vote of this nature, we are not going to discuss it in any great detail. I do not think, the individual items in it, when we come to it, because it covers such a general expense, a general field, that it is hardly necessary. But the bases of this vote is the \$624,000 to keep this House running. And, I feel, as one elected member of this House, that, if the people of Newfoundland are to spend that kind of money to keep this House functioning that this House should function properly and not in the way it has this session and in past sessions.

And, furthermore, I do not think any impingements upon members of the House, on either side of the House, should be made, publicly or otherwise, to say that they only work a few hours a day or they can meet morning, afternoon and night because they literally have nothing to do. Now this in itself is an insult to members on both sides of the House. And I think the conduct in general, the publicity that is given outside and the sort of comment we hear about what is the business of the people's House, is down-grading the House of Assembly to the point that the Newfoundland people could very well get fed up with the whole show.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely amazed, completely amazed and flabbergasted to hear anyone in this House say that I have described the work of M.H.A.'s as occupying two or three or four hours a day. I am the one person in this Province, more than any other person, more than any other person, who has insisted publicly again, and again, and again, that to describe the work of a M.H.A., as just the work that he does while the House of Assembly is opened, whether it be three hours or four hours or ten hours a day, is plain silly, wrong, inaccurate and certainly unfair.

MR. EARLE: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have said publicly a thousand times, I said it as recently as the other morning. I was on open air, and somebody rang me about it the same morning that the Leader of the Opposition rang me, that same morning. And even in that broadcast, and that was only last Friday morning, I think that was - no, Thursday morning, Thursday morning, as recently as that on the radio, I said, that a member of the House of Assembly, from the moment he is elected and so long as he remains a member of the House, is the member of his district, twenty-four hours a day, three hundred and sixty-five days a year. Not just the few weeks he may spend in the House of Assembly, whether the days be five in number each week or whether the hours are four or five or six in number each day. Regardless of the length of the session, regardless of the number of days in a week and regardless of the number of hours in a day, a member who is elected as a member to represent a constituency, is the member twenty-four hours a day. And he is on tap, he is on call for his constituents. They have a right to approach him any hour, any day, day or night, And not only have they the right to do so, but they exercise their right, as every hon. member knows. It is the vilest misrepresentation of the work and the responsibilities of an elected member to say that they are limited to the few weeks that he sits in the House, while the House is opened. Does this mean

MR. SMALLWOOD:

is anyone so ill informed or so stupid as to think that when the House meets each year then for the first time that year the member of the House from some district becomes member and when the House is adjourned or prorogued then he ceases to be a member? Is anyone that ignorant, is anyone that misinformed or anyone that stupid?

Mr. Chairman, every member of this House knows and I have said publicly countless times, which is why I resent so bitterly being told here today that I say that a member's work is three or four hours a day, I have never said that.

MR. EARLE: You give that impression.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not give that impression. I may to a stupid man, only to a stupid man. Only a stupid man could get that impression from anything I say because I am the one (more than any other member of this House) who has said more frequently and more publicly that a member of the House is a member twenty-four hours a day. Here is one member who is and they are all over this House. I speak for myself, other hon. members can speak for themselves, on both sides of the House. It is just stupid to say that our work begins and ends at three o'clock here or six at night or ten or eleven at night, that it is only while we are sitting in the House that we work. Let me tell the Chamber this, that the only rest I get is sitting here in this Chamber, that is the only rest I get. While the House is in session it is for me, if I spend ten, twelve hours a day in this Chamber, that is the only rest for the day and if the House were in session five days a week, fifty-two weeks a year, I would have a fairly easy life because the real work is outside the House seeing your constituents, they call on you, some members get to their constituencies quite frequently and visit many, many people, others cannot go so often but they are visited by their constituents.

Your Honour, I would venture to guess that at least anything from fifty to one hundred of Your Honour's constituents call on Your Honour every

MR. SMALLWOOD:

week-day or night at your office, at your home, here in this building because Your Honour does not represent them only while Your Honour is sitting there or up in the Chair. The same thing applies to every member. I bitterly resent, I resent bitterly this imputation that I have said any such thing. Only a thick-headed stupid man could accuse me, of all persons accuse me of giving that impression, when I happen to be the one, in justifying the rights of pay that are given to hon. members, in justifying the expense allowance that is given to hon. members, more than anyone I have pointed out that a member's duties and a member's work are not performed only when he sits here in this Chamber, that the work that he does outside the Chamber is incomparably more arduous and more extensive than anything he does here in the House.

Is there any hon. member in this House, on either side, who does not take home an armfull of material every night? The hon. member for St. John's West, I do not think he has deliberately set out to give the impression that he is the only one who takes home armfulls of material to read and study at night. Every hon. member does it. Look at the letters we have to write now. There are some hon. members who can dictate hundreds and even thousands of letters and others, as for example myself, I have four or five secretaries and they write a hundred, a hundred and fifty letters every day, every day five days a week for me to read and sign, and there is never a day goes by in my life for five days when I do not read and sign one hundred and fifty to two hundred letters. Now it is true that in my case I have secretaries to type them for me; this is a great help. Other hon. members do not have that opportunity. They have to sit down and dictate the letters themselves or write them out in handwriting. But the correspondence that any member gets, the letters that pour in on him, the delegations that come to see him, the individual constituents that come to see him, is that work? Remember, Mr. Chairman, when a constituent comes to you and says, "Can you get me a job?" that interview may take five or ten minutes. But do you think that is

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the only work the member has in connection with that case? What that member has to do then is to go and try to get him a job. He goes to this contractor and that contractor and this job and that job tries to get work. Every member of this House is a recruiting agent, every member here is an employment agent.

I must get jobs for a thousand men a year, I do myself and every other hon. member here and some of them gets more than I do. Is that work or not? Now only it is getting jobs but is getting rooms, is getting houses, it is solving all kinds of problems, it is going to Deputy Ministers, to assistant Deputy Ministers, heads of this Department, heads of that Department doing work for constituents. None of that is done here in the Chamber, all of that is done outside the Chamber. If anyone is so simple, so thickheaded and simple as to think that getting elected to be a member for a district is a snap, a soft snap, that there is nothing to it, that you come in here and you sit down and you twiddle your thumbs and you read the newspaper and that is all there is to it, anyone who is that simple had better not try to get elected because he is in for a sad awakening.

I am sorry I had to intrude on the House and use up so much of our valuable time. I am not trying to obstruct but it did touch me on the raw to be told that I have given any such impression.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the Premier is saying the Premier must realize that to be prepared for the business of the House we have to have some time outside the House also. Why then can the Government not agree that we will meet morning and evening several days a week and on Friday morning and afternoon or some sensible arrangement for the business of the House? Two sessions a day is all that we are capable of preparing for and doing preparations properly. Members have all the work the Premier has outlined. So will the Premier or the Government consider having the House meet two sessions a day instead of the three that he has forecast? Could the Premier answer us on that?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to speak to this particular vote because I have a chance in the near future but I would just like to, after listening to the Premier- I am so pleased and so happy, apparently we have a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde in our midst because on more than one occasion I have had reason to comment on statements made by the Premier over radio, where they are being paid big salaries in the House of Assembly, they are only working three hours - this actually came, it is a pity we cannot get these tapes, Mr. Chairman, and this is the only reason I am rising that if the Premier speaks with forked tongue I am getting the wrong fork apparently. I have heard this on many occasions and I have had occasion to phone the radio station and give the lie to this, that we only work three hours a day. I have heard it on many occasions, and now the Premier gets up today and he says, you know, that we work like dogs-

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not go quite that far, I did not really go that far. I did not say that at all.

MR. MURPHY: It is only an expression. But, you know, this is the point I am making at this time, For the past five minutes we are the hardest working people, we work, we do our work, we are faithful. Still you turn in at 10:15 A.M., on more than one occasion, and we are meeting morning, afternoon and night you know, there is work to be done, after all they only work three hours a day, they are getting well paid for it and this is when we object to three sessions. So what is the actual fact? I would like to get a tape of some of these occasions when the Premier made these remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: You do not want to listen to the tape again? Well, I just want to clear that point, Mr. Chairman, and that is the only reason I stood at this time.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if I may-

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here we go again. I know, I know it is not obstruction.

MR. HICKMAN: We have beaten this to death about how long we should sit, I

MR. HICKMAN:

would imagine hon. members are fully aware now of the responsibility that they have when they are elected to this House and it goes without saying that you spend more time than just the time you are in the House. When we are dealing with this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the year 1971 what this Legislature should be looking after is how the people of this Province can get better value for the \$404,000. or whatever the amount is, six hundred and some odd thousand dollars that will be paid to run the House of Assembly. I do not think they are getting anything like full value for their money and I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is at all necessary for the Government to find itself in the position where it has to come to the House and ask the House to sit morning, afternoon and evening. It is not required in other Provincial Legislatures and there must be a reason for it and there must also be a reason why in other Provincial Legislatures the back benchers on both sides of the House contribute a great deal more, get an opportunity to contribute a great deal more to the governing and the functioning of the House than they do in this House.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the answer is as plain as the nose on your face, that in the other Houses the back benchers do get a chance to participate in Government, they do get a chance to participate in the Legislative process of the House of Assembly. How do they do it? They do it by way of committee. Before the hon. the Minister of Fisheries or the hon. the Minister of Mines brings Legislation before this House, he goes before a bi-partisan committee. You do not get into bi-partisan arguments, political arguments but he is given an opportunity to explain to these committee members, who are appointed by their caucus what this Bill is all about. By the time it reaches the House of Assembly then you can have a genuine debate on principle and nothing else.

The same applies to this Committee here. We are going to see now simply because members of this House who are outside of Government, and they

MR. HICKMAN:

are on both sides of the House, have no idea what is behind the individual votes that come before them and the only opportunity that the back bencher gets to find out is if he generates a debate over each particular item.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know you cannot compare say the Legislature of Ontario, which sits ten months a year probably or nine months anyway, and where they have massive Budgets to take care of, but I think we can very properly and very sensibly take a look at our Legislature as it compares to the Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the Province of Nova Scotia their Budget is about twenty per-cent higher than ours, about that amount, and I did a check on the amount of Legislation, the number of Bills that were passed in that Legislature during the period 1966 to 1970 and each year they passed about thirty Bills more than we did, about thirty Bills more. Yet that Legislature, by tradition, opens six weeks to the day before Good Friday and it closes Thursday afternoon before Good Friday, occasionally they get into night sessions but the work is done, obviously it is done. Their Budget is passed, the Legislation is passed, we do not hear any of these violent exchanges that have become so much a part of this Legislature and if they have closure they do not use it. It was last used in Canada, it has been used six times in the history of Canada. Maybe they have it by agreement, it is not a closure, what they have is not a closure at all. I know what the hon. Minister is referring to. They have what I think is a very sensible arrangement.

The Opposition party have spokesmen on each particular department. The Minister of Health gets up and he introduces a Bill that relates to health matters in the Province, the health critic and no-one else in Opposition replies, because that person puts the position of the Opposition, the Health Minister puts the position of Government. Nobody else on Government side need to get up and support it and say that I am supporting this Bill because obviously if the support was not there it would never have gotten out of

MR. HICKMAN:

caucus and if it does not get out of the Government caucus how does it come before the House? It cannot if the caucus functions properly. This is why you get the point of view of Government, the point of view of the Opposition and all the recriminations, all the personal vindictiveness disappears and the work of the House is done. That is one way and the other way is the Committee system when you get into matters like the detailed analysis of important Bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the time has long since passed for the implementation of a working committee system in this House and I believe if we did that then we could do our duty to our constituents because their demands right now, I would say this, the demands to find jobs for constituents is higher than it has ever been since 1949. This is where they are coming to the members right now but we are in the House from eleven until eleven. If we had the committee system we could do all the business of this House and more, within a reasonable time, by sitting in the afternoons and sitting in the afternoons only.

Mr. Chairman, just one more point on this business of the Legislative and I suspect that what I am going to say voices I hope the sentiments of all of those who came into this House in 1966 and I do not care on what side of the House they sit and I am not concerned on what side of the House they were elected. When a group of younger men were attracted into the political life of this Province in 1966, and I do not propose to mention this again in another debate, I think that we felt that if we were fortunate enough to be elected that we would be entering a Legislature that would be conducted according to the rules and that would be conducted with a great deal of sanity and a great deal of deference to other members in this House. Now I am as much to blame as anyone else, do not get me wrong, I am accusing myself as much as I am accusing anyone else. But what I would like to mention is what I consider to be the duty of an elected representative on both sides of

MR. HICKMAN:

the House I have -;my conception is that when Government is elected to carry out certain programmes that it has put to the people that it has an obligation to see that these programmes are implemented into Legislation and I think it is up to the Government and their supporters to convince this House and to convince the people of Newfoundland that these Bills of this Legislation, that these programmes are good and that they are so good that any Government who would bring them in deserves to be re-elected.

I think it is equally the responsibility of the Opposition to point out to this House and to the people of Newfoundland that these Bills may not contain the type of programme that best suits the people of Newfoundland or it may not contain the programme that was promised definitively when the election was last held and that the Ministers or the Government as a unit, the way in which they are administering the laws of this Province and the finances of this Province, could be better done if it was in the hands of the Opposition. This is as I envisage what Parliament is all about, but this is not what I have seen in the last four years. I have seen more personal abuse in this House than I ever dreamt was possible in an elected Legislature

MR. HICKMAN: in the British Commonwealth, and I repeat what I said here a few weeks ago. An experience that meant very little to me at the time, but in 1949, the day we went into Confederation, I was one of three practicing lawyers in Newfoundland who was a Confederate. I was very proud of it and very happy the day that the Interim Government was sworn in. I was coming down on the street car from Water Street West, where I then boarded, and I was sitting next to a Rev. Gentleman, who was then getting along in years. He too was a Confederate, and we were both you know, rejoicing over it. But he made one comment to me that at that time had very little significance. He said; "it is unfortunate that there are people around today who are involved in, or who remember what Responsible Government was like." I said, "what do you mean?" I would think it would be very much to the advantage of Newfoundland, to have experienced legislators going back into the public life again." He said; "no, you just do not realize how bad it was. Any man who ever went into public life in Newfoundland, prior to Commission of Government, he took his reputation in his hands, he put that on the line, he put his family up for public abuse." He said; "I am scared that this will happen again."

I thought he was talking through his hat, but I am not so sure that he was not right. I think it is wrong, because I think, Mr. Chairman, we are going to face, I know we are this year, a general election. Whatever party wins, fine. But if we are going to have the kind of Legislature that young Newfoundlanders want and the kind of Legislature that Newfoundlanders of my generation are determined that we are going to get, then we have to be able to attract the best brains of this country unto the hustings in the next general election, for both parties, or three parties, or however many parties decide that they are going to contest the next general election.

Do you think we are going to attract young, able Newfoundlanders? The worst thing that could happen to them would be to be elected. If they are going to get into the House and they are going to be subjected to

abuse within the House, and more abuse outside the House. More snide remarks outside the House and more mutterings and rumours - there are more rumours factories in this - look if we wanted to start an industry we have enough rumour factories here to employ everyone ten times over.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is what is going to endear this House of Assembly to the people of Newfoundland. You may say, 'well fine, what difference does it make? If the Government overplays its hand, if it becomes too domineering, then the people will throw it out.' But that is no consolation, that is no consolation at all. If you have a change of Government, and everyone says that is the smart thing to do, and if this practice is going to continue - now I do not propose referring to this again, but it is something that has bothering me since the first time I took my seat in this House. I thought, I hoped that we would not see it. I hoped that people in politics would be prepared to accept - disagree by all means, if you want to say that Alex Hickman is the most foolish, stupidest fellow in the House of Assembly, say it, but do not attribute ulterior motives to any hon. member of this House. Accept the fact that any hon. member, I do not care who he is, be he the youngest or the oldest is in this House - maybe he has pet projects he wants to see implemented, or maybe he simply wants to be a part of the scheme of things, but we are not getting that opportunity to be part of the scheme of things.

The backbenchers are not getting the opportunity to participate in the proper functioning of this House because we do not have the committee system. All of us, I submit, are being subjected to unnecessary, totally unnecessary abuse, and slander that approaches the criminal.

Mr. Chairman, it is no commendation, no sign of encouragement for the people who are sitting in the wings today and who I would like to see out on the hustings in the next election.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on this item there are a few observations I would like to make. First of all, the hon. the member for Burin was

quite right when he referred to this Province obtaining value for its money with respect to the allowances paid to members, by the people. I can certainly agree with him on that. There is no way that proper value can be obtained by implementing the rule or the procedure that has been dictated by Government to meet morning, afternoon and night. This to my mind is really a form of indirect closure. We are now talking about the estimates. I know it is just as hard on the hon. member for Burin, and for St. John's West and the hon. member for Fortune Bay who had been members of the Government for some period of time.

Consequently, they are perhaps a bit more familiar with the everyday workings of Government than the people who were not in Government. However, because of the way that the Government has been operated for twenty years, maybe that actually that is not so. Certainly they had more opportunity to become familiar with the workings of Government than other individuals in this House who have sat in Opposition. It is virtually impossible, with the research and the study that has to go into the various aspects and heads of Government that we are discussing here in the estimates, to do any kind of justice whatsoever to your constituents, to represent them properly, if we have to meet day and night.

There is no time. By the time you get home at eleven o'clock you do not want to sit down and read reports and Royal Commissions for bedtime reading. It is absolutely impossible and it is intolerable. I say that when you are talking about receiving value for your money, we should abandon this policy that the Government, and of course the majority rules, I know, but the majority has to respect the rights of the minority, which is what it is not doing when the Government leaders decide that we are going to meet day and night.

After all, the most important aspect of Government is the spending of the people's money, and if Government is not prepared to give the Opposition the fullest opportunity to closely scrutinize the expenses which are going to be made, which they propose to make, call the Government to account for its stewardship of the people's money, then

surely it is not exercising its rights of Government or its mandate properly.

There has been talk also, Mr. Chairman, about the abuse of this Legislature. I would like to again, just for a few brief moments, refer to the diminution of the power of this Legislature that has occurred, over the past twenty years, to dilute completely the effectiveness of the Legislature itself, to depreciate it beyond that which the British Parliamentary system requires and contemplated when it evolved many, many centuries ago.

We have already spoken about the borrowing in Cabinet, about the way in which this Government presents Supplementary Supply to this House, after the fact. When this House, after delegating these powers, cannot really refuse the Supplementary Supply because it will have a bad and adverse effect upon the credit of this Province. The situation has arisen, that because this House is no longer able to participate fully in public affairs and public discussion, except after the fact, when it is too late, the public matters are not aired properly, they are not brought to the public attention properly, not discussed. The public does not know what is going on. Consequently, moves which Government may make from time to time which may be well intentioned, are painted with sinister motivation, and the net result of all this is public suspicion, probably out of all proportion to that which the measure merits. Be that as it may, that is the situation. The blame has to go really, on the Government side of the House.

There is no doubt whatsoever, that the rules under which this House operates, although they serve well, and they have served well for many years, and some of them are still good, but they are archaic in this day and age. In this day and age, where we have increased communication, increased information given to the public, the rules of this House, I say, are completely archaic and should and must indeed be up-dated. There must be and there has to be, in order for this Legislature to operate

properly, there has to be a committee system working as works in all modern jurisdictions of Canada and, indeed, in the Western World. Then and only then can we operate properly. Then and only then can the Legislature acquit its duty in a proper manner.

There is one other point that I should like to make, Mr. Chairman, with respect to these allowances. Last year I was elected to this House and sat here for one week. In view of the fact that the Premier is not going to support me in the next election, as he says, that he got me in in the last one, perhaps I should use every bit of ammunition I can to further my own self in this House. The impression of a few people around, abroad, is that I came into this House for one week last July and received the full allowance of a member, that is \$10 thousand. This I did not receive. Quite properly the Government did not pay it to me. I did not seek it, as I know the hon. the Leader of the House, the Minister of Justice would indicate, he had a discussion with me about it. I actually received a sum of \$500. for that period of time. I had to mention this, because, as I say, the impression is abroad that I did receive the sum of \$10 thousand which is not the case. As I say, I was not looking for \$10 thousand, I do not look for it now. I only mention it to clear the record in the minds of some people -- some people, that is on the outside, in the public.

That is it, Mr. Chairman, these are the only points really that I want to mention, but certainly, I think the most important thing with respect to the vote that we are taking here now is to point out, point out, Mr. Chairman, that in effect, what we are having and what we are going to experience, and what we have been promised over the next few weeks is indirect closure in this House of Assembly.

Motion, 201, Sessional, carried.

MR. MURPHY: 202-01 Mr. Chairman, if I may say just a short word on it. It is the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The vote last year was \$6,500. and it is cut back to \$2,000. this year. I have had the pleasure to attend at least, I think it was two of these. I was somewhat amazed

May 3, 1971, Tape436, Page 6 -- apb

and delighted as a matter of fact, speaking with representatives - and I think most members of the House are aware of what this association is - the bringing together of representatives of Parliaments or Legislatures, for perhaps a week or so from different areas of the Dominion.

When we talk of our House of Assembly and our rules and everything else, I am somewhat amazed, Mr. Chairman, to find that we do not have something here where we bring a member in for his first time possibly and he knows no more, nor is not taught any more of what happens in this House. We often hear referred to, Standing Orders and so on and so forth, but what I gather from representatives of other areas of the Dominion, and

MR. MURPHY

the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs attended the last one with me and the Chairman of Debates here at the present time. I do not know if they reacted as I did as to how those people liked to discuss Parliamentary procedure; their positions in the Houses and this type of thing. While we were up there - I do not believe, Sir, but I may be corrected on this, that in the number of years that we have been associated with this group, I doubt that there was ever a meeting of members of this House to discuss matters such as contained in the Constitution and so on of this Parliamentary Association. I imagine and it struck me quite forcefully that it must be an intriguing thing and a very educational matter where you could sit down in this House, when we are all brought together after an election or subsequently, and have someone come in and lecture us or talk to us on the actual work that this House is supposed to accomplish. I wonder just how many of us have gone to the trouble, for any length of time, perhaps, without checking through Beauchesne, and really study the Standing Orders of this House or to study Beauchesne or study Parliamentary procedure as it should be? When I see this decrease here in this grant, and it is not a matter of life and death nor bread and butter, but I sometimes feel, Mr. Chairman, that the time is long past where in Parliament such as ours, where there should be something set up to bring together all members of Parliament and to sit down and discuss what our actual duties are in this House. We know that we are sent here to represent a district and perhaps say a few words every now and then. But there must be more to being a member of the House of Assembly than these few items, Mr. Chairman. I am rather surprised that this vote is being decreased from \$6,500 down to \$2,000, because in my opinion, and here again I may be speaking out of turn.

In my eight years in this House, there has been no educational programme as such to teach us what happens in a House, not to insult the Liberals

Mr. Murphy

nor the Liberals to insult the Conservatives nor the Opposition to insult the - so on and so forth. But what we are here for and what Parliamentary procedure actually means, I would suggest, Sir, at this time that perhaps someone would explain why the vote is cut. I understand that it is every year in different provinces, I think the year before last we had the honour, I believe, I think it was the year before last to be the hosts of the other nine provinces. We had a great many distinguished people here from the Parliament of Canada and from the other legislatures. To me, quite frankly, I ate up every word because I really enjoyed hearing other people speak and get their viewpoint on different things. It is a bringing together, Sir, of a group of people who should be the most professional in their field, knowing what is happening in their own provinces and this type of thing. Last year we had the meeting in Ottawa. I think it was a wonderful occasion. Possibly with this we should set up our own group within our own House of Assembly here and give other members of this House a chance to go to at least one of these things, as I see it, and I have gone and attended three. This year actually I travelled at my own expense, because I was not one of the delegates chosen from the House. We had one representative here. But the Parliamentary Association as such hosted six in their own city. So, I went and took advantage of that. But I paid my own travelling expenses. Ordinarily I think there are six from our Province invited to go but we only pay for five. So, I went as the sixth one, as I have said, and I am just restating this, that I paid my own travelling expenses from St. John's to Ottawa and back. Because I wanted to avail of this. It gave me a week to get in Ottawa and find out what was happening.

So, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there is someone who can tell me why this vote is being cut and who is responsible? Is there a department of Government responsible to foster this Parliamentary Association in our own group, so as we can come together and sit down as Parliamentarians, if you like, and try to enlarge our knowledge or perhaps try to educate us from

Mr. Murphy

the start as to just what our actual function is in this House. So, I would just like, Mr. Chairman, as I say, and I did not mean to take up so much time on this item, because I think for most people it is a sort of minor item. But I believe it is very, very important and this association, saying, in my own opinion again, could go out. We had these Model Parliaments, these Youth Parliaments, and I believe that this House, as such, should try to get to these people and perhaps bring them into a bit more professional status than perhaps some of what we see is happening now.

So, I would suggest, Sir, that this vote - I do not know what the \$2,000 is going to cover this year. But perhaps someone could tell us why the decrease? And possibly give me some information or give the committee some information on what and how we could tackle this problem of becoming active members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We are a part of the smaller group within Canada and then, I believe, the Speaker or perhaps the Deputy Speaker is also a member of the greater group within the British Empire. I think they travel, perhaps, to various areas and bring back information on what is happening.

I feel, Sir, because I am quite interested in what goes on in this House and what my attitude should be and what my education should be with reference to my position in this House, and possibly someone, Sir, might give a little information on what I said earlier - not repeating myself, as to why this vote is cut from \$ 6,500 to \$2,000? Is there any way that, we, in this House could get together and perhaps create a very active arm of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association here in the Province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, we do not think that in this present year, this election year, that it is very likely at all that there would

Mr. Smallwood

by any visit abroad, by any members of this House, to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meetings and so we have reduced the vote substantially.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, as to how we can get together and you know..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at this moment. This would require some discussion and I cannot do it right now.

On motion 202 carried.

On motion Block Provision Canada Pension Plan carried.

On motion Block Provision Salary Adjustments carried.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, before we go - Salary Adjustments. Now I want to bring up again a matter, and I am repeating myself again - I brought it up on three occasions, and that is the staff of this House. What vote are they covered under? I do not see them in this Legislative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is 201 allowances.

MR. MURPHY: Allowances - that is members. I am talking about the staff. I am talking about the staff who sit at the table who were promised an increase. 201-01 that all comes out of allowances. No, I would like to say a word on that, Sir. I brought it up at our Supplementary Supply (that there was a vote of \$30,000 which I understood covered a raise promised the officials of this House, and I am speaking mostly of these people who sit at the table here) and in the dying moments of last year's session, I was assured quite emphatically that this would be taken up, as we did not have time to discuss it on that particular day. But I understand since that this has not come forward, and I would like this House to give consideration, because as I said earlier that the members voted themselves a raise and the page boys

Mr. Murphy

I think got a raise but the hard-working staff here at this table, Sir, and I do not want to embarrass anybody, I feel should get some consideration because it was promised last year. The promise was not kept. Something should be done this present year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will undertake to bring the matter to the attention of the Internal Economy Commission, under whose jurisdiction the matter comes. Perhaps if the Internal Economy Commission agree to deal with the matter and if they deal in such a way as to require that they recommend to the committee an increase in any of the Vote, this will be done.

On motion total legislative carried.

ITEM III - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two items in this whole vote, Executive Council, page nine, Head III, to which I would invite the attention of the committee. In the first block, 301, there is to be a new car for the Governor. The present car, I think, is four years old. It has continued to cost the Government a lot of money for repairs of all kinds. It would be cheaper now to buy a new car and sell that one. So the vote is up from \$1,500 to \$1,5000. The Governor's car is the most expensive - well, certainly, the most expensive car in the Province paid for with public funds. I think there are private individuals, citizens around who have even more expensive cars, such as Rolls Royces and the like. Then under 302 Election Act Expenses, the amount is up from \$111,000 to \$175,000. This is to cover the balance of the cost of taking the voters' list and also for the expenses of the general election, which it is rumoured will take place this year.

I think these are the only - when we come to the individual heads, Lieutenant Governor's Establishment, Electoral Office, Premier's Office, Executive Council Office, I will, of course, be glad to answer any questions that I am able to.

On motion 301 Lieutenant Governor's Establishment.

302 Electoral Office.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, 301-01, Electoral Office. Could the Premier (I presume Executive Council comes under the Premier) tell us whether the new voters' lists are now completed? Have they gone to the publisher? When is it expected that they will be completed? When will they become available to members of the House who have been elected for the various districts?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know the answer to even one of those questions, but the Attorney General says quietly here that he believes that they are nearly completed. What he means by that, I do not know.

MR. CURTIS: There are some districts that are not quite completed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean they are not printed yet. Printing or compiling?

MR. CURTIS: No, they are being printed. They are going to the printers now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are on their way to the printer, apparently.

MR. CROSBIE: When do we get them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no idea.

MR. CROSBIE: When the voters' lists are printed, when will they be made available to members of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not sure that they will - they will certainly be made available to all election officials, returning officers, deputy returning officers, clerks and all the officials of elections and then candidates are entitled to get them, when they become candidates.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the point is this that these lists, even before they are printed, are in the possession and hands of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No true. It is a lie.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not a lie .

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a lie and I believe it was meant to be a lie. It is not true.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the use of the word "lie" or "liar" is

Mr. Crosbie

unparliamentary and I would like for the hon. the Premier ..

MR. SMALLWOOD: The making of a lie is also unparliamentary.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like a retraction, Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right I retract it, but it is absolutely untrue.

MR. CROSBIE: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when these lists are printed, they are going to be available to the Government and the hon. the Premier can call it what he likes. They will be available to the hon. the Premier and his candidates long before they are made available to candidates of any other parties.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a good way to bring that about, I would say, makings statements like that.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the position. What I want to ask, Mr. Chairman and what I want to say is this, that those lists, when they are published, should be made available to present members of the House, if they wish a copy of them. They should be made available to candidates before twenty-one days just previous to the election. Anyone who is already nominated as a candidate or any one who is a member of this House, who states that he is going to run to be re-elected, should be entitled to those voters' lists as soon as they are printed. They will be available to the hon. the Premier the moment they are printed. He will have them. The hon. the Premier will have them I am positively sure of that. Those who he wants to have them, will have them I am positively sure of that. The same is true, as in 1966 will be true in 1971. There is only one

MR. CROSBIE: proper and fair way for the voters' list to be dealt with, Mr. Chairman, when they are printed they should be made available to the members of this House and to anyone who has been already nominated as a candidate and to people as they get nominated. Why should they have to wait until just three weeks before the election to be permitted to have a voters' list? Anyone nominated at anytime, there were some people nominated last year for the election this year, they should be entitled to have those voters' lists as soon as they are printed. The numerations on which the voters' lists are based took place about two months ago, a month and a-half ago. I know the numeration for St. John's West was finished a long, long time ago. The advertisements were in the paper. The courts revisions held. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that the member for St. John's West should be entitled to have that voters list as soon as it is printed. Not three weeks, not just three weeks before the election comes, while the candidate, chosen by the hon. the Premier to run in the district, has it weeks and months ahead of time. That is not fair and right.

Now on this Electoral Office, Mr. Chairman, there is the business of changes to the Election Act that are needed. Today, we have an Election Act that states that a minimum of twenty-one days notice has to be given by the Government, when an election is called. Twenty-one days only. That is obviously unproper and unfair. It is not the case in any other province. More notice is given in every other province. If this Government thinks that it is going to win the election as easily as it pretends, why then not bring forth an amendment to the Election Act this year, so that, at least five weeks notice is given of the day of the election? Not the bare twenty-one days that the hon. the Premier, with his well known sense of fairness and British justice, will give. That great exemplar of British justice and fairness and fair play, will call the elections, as he has done before, with bare twenty-one days notice. If the same gentleman is confident and sure when he talks privately that the Government will be re-elected.

In Gander on Saturday morning he made it clear he was not that confident, every inch of ground had to be fought over, that is what he told the meeting. It was trench-warfare. Draggd out even the basket cases, they

MR. CROSBIE: are going to vote Liberal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: The basket cases have no legs or no arms. That is why, Mr. Chairman, this Government so confident that it can be re-elected, should now bring in some amendments to the Election Act that it will make the game a bit fairer. A bare twenty-one days notice for an election, the Federal Government gives six weeks. Other provinces give four and five weeks. The Provincial election in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia last year, I remember New Brunswick gave six weeks notice. Nova Scotia was at least four to five weeks. Yet in this Province it is completely dominated by the hon. the Premier for twenty-two years. And the hon. the Premier and his cohorts are completely confident, so they say, that they are going to sweep the boards in this election. Twenty-one days notice is the only notice the Law - now they can give a greater notice. The Law does not say that the Government must give only twenty-one days, it says that there must be a minimum of twenty-one days. And that is all that the hon. the Premier will give, because he is scared of this election. He does not want to give twenty-eight days notice. He does not want to give forty-two days notice. He would sooner call the election - the change we may get is an amendment that there is going to be no notice, forty-four hours notice of an election. The hon. the Premier might like that better. Why not bring in that change? Why not deal with the matter of the boundaries of districts?

Here we have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where with a vote of forty or forty-two percent of the popular vote, a party might form a Government in this Province. Because of the lopsided way the districts that Joey-mandered, one district having 1200 voters, 2000 voters, some having 2500 voters, a few having 3000 voters or 4000 voters. St. John's North having 16,000 voters or 18,000 voters, St. John's West 13,000 voters or 14,000 voters, St. John's East Extern 14,000 voters or 15,000 voters. The same city, St. John's East only having 5,000 voters to 6,000 voters. It is not geography that dictates that. That St. John's East would only have a total number of voters, one-third of that of St. John's North, and less than half of St. John's West, or South, that is Joey-mandering, or gerrymandering it used to be called in

MR. CROSBIE: the United States. It is time that we had a redistribution of seats for this election. So that the total vote, that the majority elected will represent a majority of the popular vote.

Now we all realize that there have to be some districts, because of geography, who are going to have a lot more voters than others. We all know that Labrador South is going to have a small number of voters, we cannot change that. Labrador North and West, because of the geography. But, to have the rest of the districts so much out of line, at the very least the Government could do, Mr. Chairman. if they will not readjust the boundaries we have got, is to divide up some of the large ridings we got. St. John's, for example, should have at least four or five more members, based on population. Corner Brook should have another one or two. I do not know the population of Grand Falls district, it is perhaps 8,000 or 10,000. They could perhaps do with another one there.

MR. POWE, F.W. Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Of the voters, you know, not population.

But the present distribution of boundaries of districts, Mr. Chairman, is very unsatisfactory. And it is quite possible in this election that a party that could get a majority, scrape through with a majority in twenty-three districts, would have very likely only forty percent of the total vote. If they lost by a large majority in St. John's area, Corner Brook area, Grand Falls area, but managed to carry some districts with smaller numbers of voters, they could form a Government, having about forty percent of the popular vote. Is that the hope? Is that the strategy? Probably it is. Hang on. Hang on by the finger tips, if necessary. So why not some action from the Government? This is the year the Government are reforming things or pretending to. Why not some action now on reforming electoral boundaries? And what about some action as they have had in Quebec, Mr. Chairman, on reforming election expenses? On making the game a bit more equitable by providing a system, like they have in Quebec, where there is a maximum amount of money a party can spend in each district or a candidate. And there is a contribution from the Public Chest towards the cost of each district and a

MR. CROSBIE: maximum beyond which you cannot spend. That is the modern trend in jurisdictions where they are interested in reform, and making the battle more even. It is not the outmoded system we have here where the party in power has an ample treasury, campaign funds, while the party out of power has to scrape along on next to nothing, because they have not got the same plums to handout. What about some changes there? After all a Government, that thinks it is so popular with the people of Newfoundland led by a Leader who feels he is so popular with the people of Newfoundland, cannot afford to take these risks. A Government that feels it is on the thin edge of the line, that feels that the people may be tired of course, will not make these changes. It will not take the change, but a Government composed of men led by the hon. the Premier, confident that the great majority of the Newfoundland people favour what they have done in their great record and the rest of it, what can it harm them to change the rules?

I was told by one hon. gentleman today, who feels that he is going to be a candidate for the Liberal party; he probably will now that the constitution is being gutted, and the Premier has now got to approve every candidate. He told me that the Liberal party is going to get thirty-seven elected. But, of course, the man has got megalomania.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is a little far a field from the Electoral Office.

MR. CROSBIE: My point is, Mr. Chairman, if the Government feels, if this is the Government's propaganda, that it is going to do so well, why not just make the rules a little bit fairer. Do the right thing. What has the Government got to worry about? The hon. gentleman opposite? Why does not the Government make the thing a little more equal? How about hearing from the Premier on some election reform? There he was on the radio, before the House met, he was going to raise the women of Newfoundland up and pay them the same as the men, That was not raising them very far, because the men of Newfoundland are not getting paid much anyway. But he was going to do that, it was a great reform. And in his Speech from the Throne he announced some reforms. He adopted several of my suggestions in that letter, as he himself admitted. But, he did not say anything about electoral reform. Why is that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CROSBIE: How long will we have to wait for that voters' list? While the Premier looks it over and gives his picked candidates a voters' list, all the other candidates of other parties are going to be without it. When is that going to change?

These are some of the questions or points I am raising, questions that I am asking. I do not expect that they will be answered. Because this is a debate on the estimates, where the Government are suppose to provide information, but where it does not provide information. I expect to have someone jumping up in a moment and shouting, obstruction! obstruction! The Government does not want to be obstructed, on its attempt to get back into power. That is the only obstruction.

MR. F. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Just a couple of comments to make on points that have been raised by the hon. member for St. John's West. That great paragon of fair play will, I am sure, want to have the records set straight here. He has given the impression that there has never been more than twenty-one days notice ever given in any election that has been called since Confederation, called by the Government of Newfoundland or by the Head of the Government.

It has been twenty-one days alone as far back as I can recall, I think it goes back to '49 and that twenty-one days I could well understand, even twenty years ago, some persons, especially the candidates concerned, objecting to having twenty-one days, when all Labrador was one political district, and when all of St. Barbe, Labrador is now, as everybody knows, three districts, and even when I was a member Labrador West was in the picture. Labrador West was in the picture as early as 1954, 1953. All of St. Barbe was one district. All of White Bay was one district. Most of the districts in the outlying areas were much larger than they are today. By outlying I am speaking relatively. Outlying in the sense that they were difficult to get at. They had no roads, no road communications and, for that matter, very little communication by air.

I could well understand anyone objecting to the twenty-one days then, but now the majority of those large districts have been made much smaller, much smaller. Where you had two districts on the south coast, you have three. I am talking about where there was one district, you now have three districts, in fact for a time there was two and now three. Where St. Barbe was one, you have two. Where White Bay was one, you have two. Where Labrador was one you have three and where Grand Falls district included all of what is now Gander district and part of what is Lewisporte district. In effect what was Grand Falls district is now three districts. It is true that Lewisporte district robbed a little, sort of speak, from Twillingate but

MR. ROWE (F.W.): essentially there are three districts now where there was one there. And the same thing applies to Conception Bay North, where you had one district, you now have two districts and there are other examples as well. St. Mary's was carved out of Placentia. St. Mary's-Placentia was one district and now it is two districts and so on.

In other words, the great majority of so called difficult districts, from the standpoint of travelling, communication and accessibility have been made much smaller and, in addition to that - I know there are more people in most of these districts, I am coming to that, in addition to that, the great majority of these districts now are accessible by road, where there was no road at all in St. Barbe, no road at all in White Bay, very little in Notre Dame Bay at all, very little, and very little in fact in most of districts apart from the Avalon Peninsula, today the majority of those districts, with a couple of, of course, obvious exceptions, three or four obvious exceptions, the majority are easily accessible by road.

Take a district like St. Barbe North, it is theoretically possible for the member or a candidate to cover that entire district in one day. Now I know that he will not spend very much time there, but he can do it in one day if he wanted to. And the same thing applies to St. Barbe South and so on, you could go on.

So the argument for increasing the length of time between the Proclamation and polling day, if it is true now, if it is so serious now, how serious must it have been fifteen or twenty years ago, and yet most of us got through somehow or another.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifty years and seventy-five years ago.

MR. ROWE: Most people managed to get through the districts. Sir Robert Bond, with a pretty short period, managed to cover all of the great Notre Dame Bay, which then was one district only. Just the one district but he still managed to do it.

And the other point made, the other inference made, had to do with population. Where there are heavy concentrations of population, usually that is a

MR. ROWE: relatively small district geographically. Maybe obvious examples are right here in St. John's. True, St. John's North or South or any of the St. John's districts may have big populations, as mine has. My own district has twenty odd thousand people living in that district, but I can cover, it is theoretically possible for me to cover that entire district within three or four hours. I will not have meetings everywhere but I can get over that district in three or four hours easily, no difficulty at all, and it is even truer here in St. John's.

MR. MURPHY: The minister will have to spend more than three or four hours this year.

MR. ROWE: The minister will spend more than three or four hours anytime, and if the minister runs, as he has every intention of doing, at least of offering the services, he will be spending more than three or four hours. Indeed, I will do as I did last time. I do not care who knows it, I will go out there and I will spend the entire period available to me in my district, which is the duty and obligation of any candidate running for public office, at that time.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point on this, and it is this: If one were to listen to the hon. member for St. John's West, this is some sort of a nefarious scheme concocted by a dictator, to put the opposition at a disadvantage. Only the twenty-one days notice, twenty-one days notice, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many days there are between now and December 10, or whatever the legal date is, I think it is December 10. I know the first session was November 30 and I always understood we had to have an election before November 30. Somebody tells me that it is December 10. I do not know how they arrived at that.

The first day the House met was November 30, which will be five years ago on November 30 coming. I always understood we had to have an election before that date, November 30.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would assume - already some of the candidates have been named or selected, for some of the Parties, I understand. I would assume that sometime within the next two or three months, over that period, all of the

MR. ROWE: candidates are likely to be nominated and selected, I would assume that, and certainly from now to November 30, every candidate or potential candidate or would-be candidate has all of that notice, not three weeks notice, he has a notice of however many days there are between the 4th. day of May or whatever it is and the 30th. day of November. May, June, July, August September, October, November, six months, one hundred and eighty days notice, that is what we have. Assuming that it went to November 30 and for anyone to argue, that a candidate or a serious candidate has only three weeks notice, is utter hogwash. It is nonsense of the first order, because everybody knows that there has to be an election within the next five or six months and any would-be candidate is likely to be, if he has any political acumen at all, he is already at work, and why he would need, at this particular time, more than three weeks of formal notice is beyond me. I do not need it. I do not see any member here who needs it.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister is right, in 1971, There must be an election this year. What about 1968, and 1969, should we have had a Nominating Convention?

MR. ROWE: The other point, I will make that point, I made it just now, I do not know if my hon. friend, I think one of the Leaders was over talking there in that direction at that time. He may not have heard it.

I do not recall, there may be one, now somebody can probably name it, there may have been one, but I do not recall one single election when there was barely twenty-one days notice. There may have been one, but I do not recall it.

Most of them, I know the last election had more than twenty-one days notice. The last elections had more than twenty-one and most of the elections had four to five weeks notice.

So Mr. Speaker, this business at this particular

point in time of kicking up a fuss over the twenty-one days now, surely they must be looking for something to talk about.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might refer to another problem. I have been asked to bring this to the attention of the Legislature by a group of deep-sea fishermen who are now unionized. That is the provision that is in the Election Act, for advanced polls. I do not know and I have not been involved in that many elections and I do not know if advanced polls have ever been held in a Provincial Election. The Act does not say that advanced polls shall be held, there is a provision in the Act which says the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may order that an advanced poll shall be held in any election. In 1968 the Election Act was amended to say that this would ~~still the word "may" is there~~ that it can be done for the members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of receiving the votes of persons qualified to vote at such election who have reason to believe that on the day fixed for polling in such election they will be absent and unable to vote.

My understanding is, that certainly it is in the Federal Act and I am pretty sure you will find it in the Provincial Acts. There is no discretion left in the Lieutenant-Governor in Council as to whether or not there shall be advanced polls. This is mandatory. There must be an advanced poll. The group who contacted me in March of this year, some of them have been fishing now in the deep-sea fishery all their lives and two or three of them said they have never been able to vote in a Provincial Election. Never been able to vote, because they were never fortunate enough to be in port on that particular day. There is where you get down to again the question of twenty-one days. How much notice should you give for an advanced poll? Because remember these people come into port, and it is not only mostly, this applies primarily

to deep-sea fishermen. There are a fair number of them, certainly there are five or six districts, Ferryland and all the south coast districts are affected, and maybe Trinity North with the fleet out of Catalina. These people have just as much right to cast their ballot as any other Newfoundlander. It is not their fault that they are at sea when the election is called. They know that if they were fishing out of Lunenburg and there is an election in Nova Scotia their dory mate, he goes in, he could vote in an advanced poll in a provincial election. Why are these people robbed of their franchise, which they are? What I would like to see in this session of the House, Mr. Chairman, is a provision, not permissive legislation which says that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, because in the last election to my knowledge there was no advanced poll. But that, upon the issuing of the writ there shall be an advanced poll eight days or ten days from the date that the writ is issued, and that advanced poll will be held on two days or three days or four days.

This gives the Newfoundlander not only the deep-sea fishermen, because if you have an election in the summer you have a lot of mid-water fishermen and Labrador fishermen who are not in their districts at the time, who are not in port at the time.

MR. MURPHY: You have a lot of carpenters working in St. John's -

MR. HICKMAN: Well, whatever it is you do not have to stretch your imagination very much to think of many, many instances in this Province and probably more so than in many provinces because, not only do we have fishermen going away to work but you have carpenters and others who are moving out of their district to work too.

For instance, the hon. member for Bonavista South is nodding his head in agreement. It is quite true that many of his voters will lose their franchise, if there is an election called between now and the end of October, if an advanced poll is not there.

MR. BARBOUR: I have lost many -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, they have a perfect right, but they were robbed of the opportunity of voting for the hon. member.

MR. BARBOUR: For a great member.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, for a great member, They have been sitting home in tears, languishing ever since. But we do not. - Mr. Chairman, I would like an indication now from the Government that before this House closes the provision will be made for an advanced poll, that Newfoundland fishermen will not be robbed of their franchise as they have been in the past of their right to vote, and they have been. I can speak with a great deal of certainty in so far as deep-sea fishery are concerned and I have no doubt it applies equally to other fishermen and seamen sailing out of this Province, as well as to the voters referred to by the hon. member for Bonavista South.

Right now the law does not make any provision for it; any "provision" is not the word, any "compulsion."

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

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings; Consolidated Funds Services . Item 102, Legislative: Executive Council Item 301, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report of Committee received and adopted.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite catch Consolidated Funds Services only 102 is mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: This is correct.

May 3m 1971, Tape 440 Page 4.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn that it adjourn until 11:00 A.M. Tuesday.

Motion, that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 11:00 A.M, not carried:

MR SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 P.M. I do leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 35

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. L. R. CURTIS: (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I notice we are about finished the vote we were considering in supply. I think there is just one page left, and if the House is willing, I move that we refer to Committee of Supply to finish that one page.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Half a page.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall 302-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before that carries I would like to answer what was a very feeble reply of the hon. the Minister of Education, what I was saying in connection with the Election Act.

The Minister of Education suggests that because for the last one hundred years, it has been the practice in Newfoundland the Election Act only required twenty-one days notice of an Election. And this meant that was perfect and that is what it should always be here in Newfoundland. Now how contrary is that to what the Government does and says every day? Every day the Government tells people over and over again how things were in Newfoundland in 1949 and before 1949, how wonderful they are today and what advances have been made in the twenty-two years since Confederation. Yet, when it is suggested that more than twenty-one days notice of an Election should be given, the hon. the Minister of Education thinks that he has effectively squelched all the arguments for a greater notice, by saying that is the way it has been in Newfoundland for the last hundred years, forgetting entirely that in other provinces, which have kept up with the times and kept up with modern campaigning, of political techniques, that the minimum time required as notice for an Election is at least four to five weeks, and six weeks with respect to the Federal Government.

The minister suggested that it was possible for any candidate to cover a district in twenty-one days notice of an Election. That is not the point, whether a member can cover a district in twenty-one days. The point is

MR. CROSBIE: the whole election campaign of a political party, the Government have the advantage that it knows that any time, long before the Opposition or anyone else, when an election is going to be called. It is the Government and the Premier who decides on the Election date. It so happens this year that the Government have gone the five years. We all know that there will be an Election: between now and the end of November - there will be an Election. We all know that, we do not know when, but it could be June, July, August, September, October.

In the ordinary case, of course, there is no foreknowledge like that, an Election can be called two years, three years, four years or five years. And the Government party has an advantage over other parties because it can decide when an Election is going to be and the time to get ready for an Election. We already know that Mr. Martin Goldfarb, a great sociologist, has been advising the Premier now on Election strategy for some time, on the sociology of it all and psychology of it all; that he is getting ready to merchandise the hon. the Premier like a case of tomatoes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think that is a little off the beam.

MR. CROSBIE: All right, Mr. Chairman, we already know that the Government have a vast advantage, so why? The question is why the Government will not give, in this Province, the normal length of time the parties are given in other provinces to prepare for an Election?

No answer has been given either, Mr. Chairman, to the question of voters' lists. I asked a question before supper; when will the Government make available to the members of this House and of candidates who have been nominated to contest the coming Election, when will they make available the lists of voters? The Minister of Justice apparently says that the lists have been at the printers and that they are now printed, at least most of them are printed, well if that is the case, as soon as they are available to the Government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, they are at the printers.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, as they get printed, Mr. Chairman, the - pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the point is, Mr. Chairman, that I have asked whether or not the Government are going to make these available when the lists are printed? And before this item is passed that someone on the Government side should say what is going to be done with those lists of the electors, The last list was taking in 1965, before the 1966 Election. The only lists that are available to us are those that were done six years ago. And we would like some answer, as to when these are going to be made available. So it is fair to both sides, so just not the Government, and the Government candidates have the latest list of voters, but both sides of the House. So somebody should answer that before this vote is carried. As to the rest of the members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: After dissolution, there are no members of the House, right. They are just candidates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And all candidates should be treated equally. Candidates on the Government side are going to have these lists long before the candidates on this side or other parties are going to have them. The voters lists are available now to the Premier and the member on the other side. They will be made available long, and perused and in the possession of members on the other side who are going to run again in the Election, long before they are made available to the rest of the candidates in the Election. They will get them three weeks before the Election, once the Election call is made.

Now I object to that, Mr. Chairman, as being the wrong procedure. And we are asking the Government, are they going to take a different attitude for the coming Election and make these available to those interested, at the same time, the Government have them made available to them? Apparently they

MR. CROSBIE: are not, because the Premier has indicated that they are not. So that is a question I would like the hon. the Premier say what he proposed to do with these voters lists? Is he going to make them available to everyone at the same time they are avail to him?

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, before we pass, I just want to say something which is in a sense re-emphasizing what the last speaker said this afternoon, I must be careful how I speak about the hon. gentleman, this afternoon I referred to him in advertently, as my colleague. I suppose it is quite correct to refer to him as my previous colleague, and I would like to refer to him as my future colleague. I am quite sure we will have him as our future colleague. Certainly I would welcome him far more as a colleague himself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why, is the hon. gentleman going to be a Reform Liberal?

MR. EARLE: Probably ninety percent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe the other one is going Tory.

MR. CROSBIE: No sense in reforming the Liberal Party.

MR. EARLE: There is no chance. There is not one possible chance in this world that I will attach my name to the Liberal Party with the gentleman on the other side again. That is finished and done with, Thank Heavens, that is gone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But, it is true of the other hon. gentleman?

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. EARLE: My hon. former colleague and my future colleague who spoke this afternoon -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is becoming a Tory now? A loyal Tory.

MR. CROSBIE: After Saturday, I disassociated myself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A loyal Tory.

MR. CROSBIE: Gutted the Constitution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A loyal Tory.

MR. CROSBIE: Eliminated it.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor? Apart from this little exchange, Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to say is that I would like to refer to what the hon. gentleman mentioned this afternoon in connection with the redistribution of districts. District boundaries: The situation around Newfoundland is so ridiculous that it has gone past being funny. The resettlement programme has affected a great many districts, notably some of the districts on the south coast, my district in particular. Just to show how ridiculous the district boundaries are today, as they apply to the voters in my particular district; in order to get to one section of it I cross over the district of the hon. the member for Placentia West, also the district of the hon. the member for Burin, then I go away over to the other side of the bay and come pretty close to the hon. the member for Hermitage. Now the effect of that is that in that particular section of the coast, I have a number of small villages, but no large towns, there is not a very large settlement in my district, except Terrenceville, which is the largest. But on one end of Harbour Breton, and on the other end Grand Bank and Fortune, and the whole thing is completely out of whack, because I have a very small district, with a very small number of voters and it does not take in any large settlements on either end. But, at the same time, I had to cross over other members districts to get into part of mine.

Now in St. John's it is even worse, because when they did the last distribution some years ago, or a redistribution, apparently the fellows did not like the look of the streets, and said there were too many conservatives on that side, so we will cross over to this side. There are too many Liberals here, so we will cross over to this side. You have the district boundaries zig-zagging all over the place. The thing is patently ridiculous. So it is high time, in fact it is long past time that a close look is taken at the district boundaries right throughout the Province, and that they were divided up on a somewhat more equitable basis.

Today the problems of transportation are not as nearly as difficult as they were some years ago, as the hon. the Minister for Education mentioned.

MR. EARLE: These district boundaries could be shifted around to give more fairness in numbers of voters in each district without, at the same time, putting an undue burden on the candidate, because he can today get around much easier than he could a few years ago. There is not the same reason at all for having districts confined to certain areas, which maybe very well, when there was not the ease of transportation that there now is.

So, I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that the Electoral Office and, of course, the House who has the power could, before the coming Election, have a look at these boundaries and see if something cannot be done about it. I do not know how much notice that requires, but certainly it is long past due.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I would like to say in reply to points that have been made. What we are debating at the moment is the voters list to be taken for the general Election that is to be held later this year. Also, an amount of money, the total amount is \$175,000. This is to pay the balance of doing the Election list, and, also the cost of the general Election.

There has been some suggestion here from the other side that we ought to change the Law, the Election Law, to provide that there shall be more than twenty-one days between the date of the Proclamation by the Governor of an holding of an Election, and the date on which the Election itself is held. The Law for all of the present century, for seventy-odd years, the Law of Newfoundland has been that there had to be twenty-one days between those two dates. And every general Election that has been held in Newfoundland has been held under that Law, the Election of 1900 and 1904, and 1908 and 1909 and 1913, that is five, and 1919 and 1923, and 1924, and 1928, and 1932 that is ten; and the six Elections since Confederation, that is sixteen general Elections have been held under that Law that provides that there should be not fewer than twenty-one days between the Royal Proclamation, the Governor's Proclamation setting the date of the Election, and the date of the Election itself, not less than twenty-one days.

Now, Sir, the fact is that not once in the six general Elections that have been held in this Province, the Province of Newfoundland, that is six of them, not once has a mere twenty-one days been given. It has always

MR. SMALLWOOD: been more than twenty-one days, twenty-one days and three weeks; normally four and five weeks have been given, not three weeks, but four weeks and five weeks or something between three weeks and five weeks.

MR. CROSBIE: Which one was that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not remember the, I would not even be able to remember, as glorious as the victories were, we won all six of them. I dragged the hon. gentleman in by the coat tail, I got him elected here too. There were six elections and we won them all. But I do not remember exactly the dates of them. And I do not think it is material. Now that is point number one.

There is no reason now that anyone can imagine, no reason now for making it a longer period than there was in any of the sixteen elections that have been held in Newfoundland since the turn of the century. There is no reason now, there was reason then perhaps, but not now. Now, what have you got? You have got virtually, not every, but virtually every district in the Province that you can cover in a day or a day and a-half by car. When I ran for Bonavista North, in the first general Election after Confederation, I could not go from more than three settlements by road, from one settlement to the next to the next, three. I had to do the entire district by boat. Today, you can leave Confederation Building and you can be to the far end of Bonavista North four hours later, it is a little fast driving, call it five hours, from St. John's, Confederation Building, you can go to the far end of Bonavista North in five hours. I did Bonavista North by boat and it took days to do it.

Now the same is true of virtually all the districts in the Province. They are all now linked up by road. I said, virtually all, not all. You can go by car, it is a hop, skip and a jump, as distinct from the days when there were no roads. Remember, we built 7,000 miles of roads since Confederation. This Government, by the way, did that, 7,000 miles of road and 1400 miles of them paved. Now that makes a difference in campaigning, that makes a difference surely, does it not? Does it not make a difference in the ease of covering a constituency, in the ease and the time it requires to cover a district and campaign in it? Surely that makes a great difference today compared with the

May 3, 1971

Tape 441 (night)

PK - 8

MR. SMALLWOOD: day in all those previous elections, up to eight or ten years ago. Surely, there is a vast difference not requiring a longer period. but, if anything, a shorter period. If they could hold an Election in Newfoundland in 1900, with the road we had just built across the Island then, if they could hold an election and the Law said. there had to be twenty-one days

MR. SMALLWOOD: between the Proclamation and the election itself, if that was O.K. then, what has happened to make it necessary now to have a longer period in the Law? What is it that has happened? This is what no one has told me. I have not had a hint from anyone. It is easier to campaign today. The mails are more frequent, if you are thinking of sending literature out by mail. There is radio now and there was not then, there is television now and there was no television then, there are roads now, and there were no roads then. So what has happened suddenly to make twenty-one days less adequate than twenty-one days were, ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty years ago in Newfoundland?

Then there is the member or candidate who does not know the district. If he is a sitting member running for re-election and he has deserted his district and has not gone near, maybe it takes him longer to get acquainted with his district. But a man who knows his district, does not need that kind of time.

Then there is the point made this afternoon by the Minister of Education, there is no answer to that argument. There cannot be an answer. Until fairly recently, what did you have? You had all of Labrador, one district, one district, the entire Labrador Peninsula 110,000 square miles, that was represented by one man elected to this House. That man had the same twenty-one days as anyone else, the same number of days. You had the entire great White Bay. This vast Bay was represented in the House by one man, it was only one district, today of course it is two. You had the great Northwest Coast, from Deer Lake all the way down to the Strait of Belle Isle, that was one district that had to be canvassed by a candidate in that same period of time and by boat, every inch of it by boat. I did it, I canvassed that great Coast before Confederation. Go back a little and it was not even a motor boat, you did it by sailing boat and the law is the same today,

MR. SMALLWOOD: it has not been shortened, it is the same law, not less than twenty-one days. All Notre Dame Bay, the whole of Notre Dame Bay was one district. It used to elect, by the way, three men, that was the great Liberal district in which the Liberal team, led by the great Sir Robert Bond, the great Liberal Leader, and a name that must be very dear in the heart of the hon. member for St. John's West. The name of Bond must be beloved in his mind. The great Bond led the team of three candidates in Notre Dame Bay and it was so big, the Bay was so big, the district was so big, that no one man could cover it. What happened? They would divide it up. Bond would cover one part of the district and each of the other two candidates would cover a part and you had the whole district covered in that way.

It was the same in Bonavista Bay. Bonavista Bay was one district. One, the whole bay, and no road and everything by boat and that was so big that the three candidates, again you had a district that would elect three men to the House of Assembly and again you had a district where the three men, the Tory team or the Liberal team, three each, they would have to split up the Bay to do parts. There was a time when all Trinity Bay was one district, and so it goes, all Placentia Bay, that vast Bay of Placentia was one district, and the law then was the same as it is now.

What a difference today, what was the district of Placentia - St. Mary's is now three districts. Placentia East, Placentia West, and the district of St. Mary's and all of it connected by road. You can go to every last single, individual, settlement of St. Mary's district by car. The same with Placentia East and I do not know but you can now go to every one of Placentia West. Can you not, by car? Except maybe three islands. So what has happened to require the twenty-one days be made longer?

Now there is another point and it is this, that when the last Federal General Election was held in Canada, there was wide-spread agreement among the Parties that their period was too long. They had made their law providing for a period of time between (a) the taking of a voters list, (b) the Nomination and (c) the holding of the election. They had made that

MR. SMALLWOOD: law back nearly a hundred years ago and it is too long, it is too long. The people get weary of it, they get bored by it, they get fed up to the teeth. The politicians get fed up with it, they get weary of it and they get fed up to the teeth and the whole of Canada wishes the devil had the election, because it is too long. It is unnecessarily long. It was done at a time when there were no roads in Canada, no radio, no television, no ease of travel, with big constituencies, and they have not changed and the result is this; not only do the people get bored but the cost, the cost of conducting the election, it is for each individual political party, for the Liberal Party, for the Tory Party, for the NDP, for the Social Credit Party, for the Creditste, and any other Party that run, for them the cost is made a crushing burden, because it lasts so long. The shorter the campaign, the short and sweet, short and cheap, short and inexpensive, because Mr. Chairman, my own personal experience, and I have had a lot of experience in elections, I have won six in a row. The only man since John Cabot sailed in here that ever did do that, six elections in a row and shortly it will be seven. Six elections so I have had some experience! I have had some experience and my experience tells me that election campaigns do not win elections, the election that is coming this year is won now. It can be lost but it cannot be won. The election is won now and the campaign itself will not change two per cent of the votes.

All the roaring and bawling, all the television and radio, all the newspapers, all the printed literature, all the PA systems out on the street corners, all the public meetings, all the literature sent through the mail, will not change two votes per hundred. Because when the election is called, the peoples' minds are made up, they pay practically no attention to the propoganda, if the TV lasts more than a minute, you will lose votes, the Party that uses up TV that interrupts a popular show that the people have had for years and years and months and months and they are used to it and they want

MR. SMALLWOOD: to turn it on and, instead of their programme coming on, it is some cursed politician. This is true, this is so and everybody knows that it is so. So the shorter the campaign the better. Now if somebody had argued here, prior to the 1904 election, stood in this House and said, "Mr. Chairman, twenty-one days is not enough, it should be thirty-one days, it should be forty-one days because of the big districts, because of lack of roads, because we have got to cover it by boat, because there is no radio," they would not be even able to say that, because they did not even think of radio, they could not say "because there is no TV", because they did not even think of TV. If somebody had argued here in 1904, sixty-five years ago, it would have been a pretty good case but God in Heaven, 1971, arguing that what has served so well in six general elections, is all of a sudden become inadequate. That is just sheer obstruction, it is nothing else. Talk for the sake of talking. There is no reason in it, there is no rhyme in it, it is just a lot of foolish talk. That is all it is.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment or two and possibly a suggestion or two with regard to the voters' list. Many speakers have been talking about it this afternoon.

I do not see why we should have to wait for the list to go to the printers at all, because it is my understanding that all the revising Justices or whatever they were called, the people in the various districts, who get the count revise, made seven copies of the list, which means to me that certainly a copy could be made available to the sitting members, certainly a copy of each district could be made available to the various parties' headquarters, because no one knows, in a great many districts, who the candidates might be for either party.

It should also be borne in mind that monies which have been expended having the election list prepared was not spent by the Liberal Party, Mr. Chairman, but by the people of Newfoundland and I have a right, as representative of my district, to know the number of voters in my district.

MR. COLLINS: just as soon as that list is taken. There is no reason in the world why that list cannot be given to us and if it is not we can only assume that the Government are of the opinion that it is to their advantage to keep it from anyone in the Opposition.

Now Sir, there has been some comment also about the boundaries of the various districts. It is all very well for the Premier and the other members opposite to say what served us years ago, laws which served us well in the early 1900's, can serve us now, but, Sir, we are living in the 1970's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not tell, we are in the seventies now are we?

MR. COLLINS: 1970's in case the Premier did not know, possibly he might have found out a few other things about the seventies when he was in Gander over the weekend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am willing to learn. I am glad to hear that.

MR. COLLINS: You are living in the 1970's, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Seventies, heh!

MR. COLLINS: The Premier had his say, Mr. Chairman, is he going to be quiet now for a little while? Does he want to yak yak on, day and night?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a debater, what a debater, what an orator.

MR. COLLINS: This is 1970 and while the geography of Newfoundland did not change, the population has changed, in a great many cases because of Government policy through resettlement. In a great many cases because people have moved on their own initiative or whatever the reason, Sir, the various districts, the compositions of them have changed enormously.

The Premier really wants to do something about this and there is no reason why he should not. He really wants to do something to provide equal representation, equal opportunity of representation, let him appoint a neutral commission, as the Federal Government did, two or three years ago. Let him appoint a neutral commission, and come up with a reasonable and realistic distribution of seats. Certainly the time has come for that and long past. Previous speakers have also mentioned the need for

MR. COLLINS: advanced poles.

I remember in the elections which I ran in, I ran in a couple of them, where certainly a great number of voters, I do not know if they were Conservative, Liberal or NDP or I do not know if they would have voted or not, but certainly there are a great number of people who, had they any intention of voting, certainly were denied the right to vote because they were away on polling day, either in the woods or on the fishing grounds or wherever, Certainly there is a need for advanced polls and I would suggest that it be on the weekend prior to polling day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is already provided for.

MR. COLLINS: It is already provided for but it seems, Mr. Chairman, that it never happens. It is provided for in The Election Act, but it never happens.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does happen.

MR. COLLINS: I have never seen it happen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well maybe the hon. gentleman was asleep.

MR. COLLINS: I have not been asleep, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to get advanced polls myself, and I have gone to the Chief Electoral Officer and we could not get them. It was a violation of the Act, actually, because the provision is there, However it does not say it "shall be held" it says it "may be held".

MR. SMALLWOOD: How is it a violation?

MR. COLLINS: It is a denial of the people's rights

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a violation of the Act.

MR. COLLINS: It is a denial of the people's rights, raping of the people's rights, which I have mentioned in this House before.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, and the year before, in this hon. House, I mentioned the fact that servicemen of Gander, in the Town of Gander, we will have about four hundred of them, unless the election is called next week and, if it is, those people will not be around to vote and it is just as well because if they are around they are not allowed to vote. The only Province in Canada

MR. COLLINS: where servicemen cannot vote the same as other citizens.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Servicemen normally vote eighty per cent Liberal.

MR. COLLINS: Well that is all right. Let them exercise that right. I do not know, the Premier does not know, but servicemen in Gander find they cannot vote, and this is the only Province in Canada whereby they cannot vote. Their wives can, provided they are Newfoundland women, but if they come from the Mainland, even their wives cannot vote and, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we began to think

we are living in the seventies and make out rules adaptable to that age.

MR.CROSBIE: Before the item passes Mr. Speaker, the Premier just ended a few moments' remarks, he went back to 1900 the number of election - and all that - then had the gall to end up by saying that what somebody said on this side of the House was "obstruction."

The Premier, when he rose to make his remarks, made a broad, sweeping statement. The usual kind of broad sweeping statement he is used to making: That in the six elections held in Newfoundland since 1949, in every case, in every case he said more than twenty-one days notice had been given between the dates the Lieutenant Government made his Proclamation and the Election Day.

When the Hon. the Premier was asked to cite the dates, to give us the examples of those elections, those elections, all those elections were more than twenty-one days or twenty-two or twenty-three days, he cited none. Thinking that just his broad sweeping generalization is going to be accepted. Well, in 1966, the only one I am personally familiar with, because the exact time given was twenty-three days, I believe. It would have been twenty-one days, the Premier planned to call the election Sept. 6, but I suggested to him it was better to wait two days because Sept. 6, was after Labour Day and people would not have been back from the Labour Day weekend, or the notice would have been twenty-one. But in 1966 the notice given was twenty-three days and I would like to make a bet, not a large one, that the Hon. the Premier will get one of his 7000 civil servants to check since 1949, all six elections, and see how many days expired between the Proclamation by the Lieutenant Governor and Polling Day; that he will find not in one case was more than twenty-four or twenty-five days notice given at the maximum. I am going to be terribly surprised if in any case it was more than twenty-three days. So how about the Hon. the Premier putting one of the 7000 civil servants to work. We have not the time over here to check that out. We are here morning, afternoon and night and have not

the staff. Well, I offered that challenge, I offered the challenge to the Government side of the House; let us have research, the day of the Proclamation and each election since '49 and the day the voting was held, and let us see how many of them were over twenty-three days notice.

AN.HON.MEMBER: The same number of days as when you were in the Government.

MR.CROSBIE: What has that got to do with it.

AN.HON.MEMBER: If it is good enough for you it is good enough for us.

MR.SMALLWOOD: What the new Tory Leader, not good enough, he is the Tory Leader, he is the Leader, he is the Leader, he is the Tory Leader. He loves it too.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to linger on this item.

MR.SMALLWOOD: He is so proud to hear it you can see him purring all over.

MR.CROSBIE: You see, I hear the Premier calling me a purr, I had to retract this afternoon because I called the Hon. the Premier something that rhymed with purr. Now one other point Mr. Chairman; The Hon. the Premier said, "the election," the Hon. the Premier said; "is won now. not two per cent of the votes are going to be changed between now and election day." Have you ever heard such absolute tripe? It is the Hon. the Premier has retained Martin Goldfarb to advise him on how To market the tomatoes.

AN.HON.MEMBER: Who has the hon. member hired?

MR.CROSBIE: He has nobody hired, unfortunately. The Premier says, "the election is won now, it does not matter what happens during the three weeks of the campaign or from now on. People have made up their minds, not two per cent of the votes will change." What did the Hon. the Premier say two days ago in Gander? "Every inch of ground must be fought over," he told the Assembled troops at Gander. "It will be trench warfare," he said. Every one must be lifted to the polls.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order please! I am sure the hon. member does not really think that the -

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

MR. CROSBIE: I will obey.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The election count is hardly relevant to this particular -

MR. CROSBIE: All right Mr. Chairman, I always observe the Chairman's dictum. Before this session is over I will be sitting down every time the Premier says so. If the election is won now let us pack this all up now and go home and let us have an agreement within all parties there will no campaigning, no propaganda, we call an election -

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case the Tories would not elect one man.

MR. CROSBIE: Except getting on - and we allow the electorate of Newfoundland to go to the polls we will sit on our - we will sit down and everybody will agree to do nothing, and let us see what their verdict is, but we will not find that. All it is now, right, during the summer the tremendous announcements, the big announcements will come, the industries, there will be an industry in every district and in some there will be ten, at least there will be announcements. But still we are told tonight; nothing that can happen now makes any difference. It is not needed. It is funny it is needed in every other Province but there is no point debating the point Mr. Chairman, the Hon. the Premier is adamant, there will be no more than twenty-one days notice, or if the twenty-one happens to fall on Sunday we will get twenty-two days notice.

I can just see the Premier next fall in his usual magnanimity, giving us five weeks notice of the election. This is going to be a real surprise. Seven come eleven. If the Hon. the Premier is as cocky about the election as he pretends to be, let him agree to give us five weeks notice, he has nothing to worry about.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, just one point so that nobody goes away here under misapprehension. This is the point that I raised this afternoon. This is question of advanced polls. The law does not prescribe that there shall be advance polls in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We know that. We know that.

MR. HICKMAN: And the fact is there were not advanced polls in 1966 and the fact is that deep-sea fishermen of this Province, carpenters and other tradesmen, who have to move out of their district to vote, were robbed of their franchise and were not given the right to vote and -

AN. HON. MEMBER: And you were the Minister at the time.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right I had been Minister for a whole day. They resented it. I think they are entitled to precisely the same thing, protection the voters get in every other province of Canada, namely, that an advanced poll is mandatory, it is not in the discretion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Act should read, "there shall be, twelve days or fourteen days before election day, advanced polls will be held for one day or forty-eight hours in a place to be prescribed, or places, by the Returning Officer in that district." Very simple. These people want to vote and you cannot expect them to tie up all the draggers in Newfoundland so that they can stay in for a week or two weeks just to cast their vote. There is no logical or sensible reason in the world why they should not have the same right to vote as every other Newfoundlander. Just one other point, Mr. Speaker, we seem to be losing, when we talk about the shortness or otherwise of the election called, the argument and the answer that have been coming from the the side of the House is that it has been good enough since 1900, that communications has improved, that transportation is much better, you can now go around your district and get to your district much easier that you could years ago. That is so true. But, Mr. Chairman, is that the only reason for the dictates, the length of the election called, because, if it is, then instead of having a five week election - in Prince Edward Island you can walk across the place in a day, so they would have about a four day election - they still have their five weeks, so does Nova Scotia, New Brunswick. Surely the other issue is, and it is a very valid one, that what an election is all about, if you are

going to have the participatory democracy that the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation talked about so often, if you are going to ask the people to become involved, not only in campaigning but in making up their minds on the issues, then parties have to be prepared to defend these issues and to logically present their issues, present their platforms to the electorate. Have you ever heard of a political party making its platform known before the election is called? of course you have not. You generally hear it about two weeks before an election. If any political party has a good platform that is defensible, they will not mind having to defend that for three or four or five weeks. If they have a platform that is not defensible or if they have a platform that contains more fiction than truth, then obviously the sooner you can get the election over with the better, before people start asking discriminating questions.

The question; the ability to get around the district is only one criteria for electioneering and for the length of the election. Insofar as the electoral boundaries are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that a retrograde step was taken on the south coast in changing around or fixing the boundaries on the Peninsula of Burin. Up until a few years ago, until about seven or eight years ago, there was some logic and some sense in the way the boundaries ran. Garnish and Frenchman's Cove and Grand Beach and Winterland were very properly in the district of Burin. For some reason nobody has been able, it has been attributed to the fact that the shackle went down with the survey pole and stopped at some tavern and lost his way, because there is no other logical explanation for it. These three towns right in the middle of the District of Burin, right on the peninsula of Burin, for some reason are in Fortune Bay. Winterland, which again is south of the natural boundary, is in Placentia West. It just does not make any sense. Geographically it does not make any sense, population-wise it does not make sense, the interest of the people in that area are basically the same and, you know, nobody has ever offered any explanation. I cannot think of one, as I say,

other than the surveyor was, maybe he went to St. Pierre before he started the survey but, whatever he did, he sure made a mess of it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. member who just spoke knows it or not, but the next manifesto is going to be a copy of Ripley's Believe or Not.

Clauses 02-01, 02-02, 03 carried.

MR. MURPHY: On -02-02, \$500 for Office Expenses for the Electoral Office.

Who is asking the question, Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman ask the question? I was endeavouring to ask a question I think someone else-
02- Sir, with reference to office, \$500, is this enough to pay the office staff down at this electoral office.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not meant to pay the office staff, it is not meant.

MR. MURPHY: Just to pay for the office.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, -03, would the Premier tell us if there is going to be a redistribution Bill brought before the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean for St. John's East Extern? The hon. gentleman is surely interested in St. John's East Extern, they are going to dump him.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, that is about as much as I expected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has expected it for months.

MR. HICKEY: That is the kind of an answer I expected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh!

MR. NEARY: Do you deny it?

MR. HICKEY: Deny what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Being dumped.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, we heard a few rumbles, do not mind that. We do not mind that, Mr. Chairman, where I came from, Mr. Chairman, some 4000 people sent me here, not half a dozen who are rumbling these last few days. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, while we are on it, where I came from one man does not call the shot. But there are some 16,000 voters in my district, and I imagine they will have a say whether or not I am going to be dumped or not. At any rate I will say one thing; I am not the slightest bit

concerned. It does not bother me in the least. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can get back to the question I asked, is there going to be a Redistribution Bill brought before the House, during this session? Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Government might give some consideration to one. It might bring some sense into sorting out some of the districts, my own is a good example. St. John's East Extern, you start in Flatrock, Pouch Cove and Bauline go beyond it to the east, but they are not in it. It takes in all that area back to St. John's, you end up in here in the Baird - Duff Subdivision. Now, Mr. Chairman, whoever did the job of slicing that up should get a gold medal. I will say one thing, Sir, I would have to be on a ship, depending on them reading the compass, because they must have been drunk when they sliced it up. My concern is not one of worrying about myself because the most that can happen is my district be made smaller, there are close to 16,000 voters in there now. The most that can happen to mine is that they reduce the number. I would strongly urge, Mr. Chairman, that some consideration be given to this, not only this district. St. John's North is another example, and several others in the Province.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe, I am not sure and I would like to merely ask for information but I believe in 1966 in St. John's East Extern there were something like eight or ten thousand voters. Is the hon. member suggesting now there are 16,000 voters in his district?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I use it as an approximate figure. I am prepared to bet it was over 15,000. Quite a number of developments have

MR. HICKEY: taking place during those five years in the North-East Housing Division. In the Baird-Buff sub-division, the Kent's Pond area, the Torbay road area, all those apartment buildings, I would say Sir, there are at least between fifteen and sixteen thousand voters.

We are not only talking about St. John's East Extern, Mr. Chairman, this district came up as a matter of a joke with regards to some suggestion of dumping. Of course, then again I do not know if the Premier meant that he was speaking politically or not when he was talking about dumping, because we have a dump in our district that we are trying to get rid of.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): On this side of the House we are the hon. gentleman's friends. So he has some friends in the House here.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, with friends like those I sure do not need any enemies.

MR. MURPHY: Who wants enemies?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whether the hon. gentleman wants them or not, he has them and he knows it.

MR. HICKEY: I have friends on that side?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Friends here, and here probably only.

AN HON. MEMBER: And in his district.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in his district.

MR. HICKEY: Ah Mr. Chairman - "Live horse, and you will get grass."

MR. CHAIPMAN: Shall O3 carry?

MR. MARSHALL: Wait now Mr. Chairman, if I may before we get off this: We are on O3, the Election Act Expenses, and the question I would like to ask is whether or not a sufficient amount of monies or funds have been provided for the expenses that we know are going to have to be met this year? There is a difference only of \$64 thousand between the vote for this year and last year, and I would imagine certainly that the election is going to cost more than \$64 thousand. I would like to ask this question; it is going to cost the Liberal Government much more, but I wonder how much it is going to cost the Province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We think no more.

Motion, total subhead 02 (Election Act Expenses) carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, 303-01 is the Premier's Office, and I presume that this is the place in the estimates where we can discuss the Premier's activities, that is as Premier, not his other activities.

The Premier is no longer a minister of any department he got rid of the heavy burden in Economic Development which he has placed on the broad shoulders of...

AN HON. MEMBER: Municipal Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Acting Minister of Provincial Affairs.

On the broad shoulders of the hon.member for St. John's South. This is the only place in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, where we can discuss the Premier's activities. Mr. Chairman, there is a question tabled in the House, question no.(388) and the answer that I got to that question was most illuminating. The question was this; since March 1st, 1970, how many trips on Government business have been made by the Premier outside the Province of Newfoundland, showing the date of each such trip, the number of days taken on each trip, place visited on each such trip, the nature of the Government business involved in each such trip, and the cost to the Government of each such trip under the headings of transportation charges, hotel and meal expenses, and other expenses? That is a legitimate question for any member of this House or the public to know. How many trips have been made on Government business by the Premier since March 1, 1970? That is thirteem months ago. The date of the trips, the number of days taken, places visited, nature of Government business, the cost of each trip showing transportation charges, hotel and meal expenses and other expenses.

What is the answer given to this House and to the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman? Here is the answer; the following trips were at Government expense. The following; June 17, 1970 to Ottawa \$206.00. \$206.00 for a trip to Ottawa. It does not show how much is for the air

ticket. how much is for hotel and meals, how much other expenses, how many days were spent in Ottawa. That is the bare bones of that answer.

Between March 1, 1970 and June 17, 1970, the hon. the Premier left this Province on quite a few occasions. In fact, in the month of March 1970, the hon. the Premier and four or five members of his Cabinet adjourned the House three weeks while they went across the Atlantic to London, they went to Paris, then went to Amsterdam, they went to Switzerland, they went here they went there, dealing with John Shaheen and the rest of them on the Come by Chance deal, and the House was adjourned for three weeks. Apparently, according to this answer, either the answer is incorrect or that trip was not paid for by the Government, the Premier's trip and the trip of the rest of those ministers. If it was not paid for by the Government, who was it paid by? Who paid for it?

Apparently, between March, in those four months, the Premier took one trip out of this Province on Government business, at Government expense. Then the answer goes on, between June 17, 1970 and August 7, 1970, this is the next trip, London - Oslo; London - Montreal - Toronto \$1,077.00. The question asked what is the nature of the Government business involved in each trip? What is the cost under certain headings of this trip? London - Oslo; London - Montreal - Toronto \$1,077.00. That is not the answer to the question. Are we not entitled to know what was the nature of the Government Business on that trip? Then September 5, 1970, Ottawa, \$203.00. September 21, 1970, Montreal to London \$900.00, November 24, 1970, Tokyo \$1,547.00. Now Mr. Chairman, for the whole fourteen months, from March 1, 1970 to when that question was answered about a week or two ago, the hon. Premier says that there were five trips by the hon. the Premier outside this Province at Government expense.

We all know that there were dozens and dozens and dozens of trips by the Premier outside the Province during these months, all of them on Government business, according to what we hear on the radio, what happened to the trips to Romania? Does the House remember the trip to

Romania in February or early March, when the hon. the Premier went with the Minister of Economic Development to Bucharest, Romania and I do not know where else? They were gone for seven or eight days, but that is not listed in these trips. Who is paying for these trips? Is it right, that, when the Leader of the Government of Newfoundland goes abroad on trips like this, that some other private individual is paying for the trips? Who paid for the trip to Romania? If it is on public business for the public of Newfoundland, surely, the public of Newfoundland should pay and we should be told what the nature of the business was.

When we ask the question, what did it cost? We should be told what it cost. What is going on? What are all these private trips paid for by private individuals? In fourteen months, five trips by the Premier, according to this answer, at Government expense.

New York, there has been several trips to New York by the hon. the Premier within the recent four or five weeks, who pays for the trips to New York? Another piece of information supplied in answer to the same question asked in connection with trips taken out of the Province, or another question asked, about what planes were used. Then we discovered that the hon. the Premier uses planes of Brinco, Javelin, Shaheen Enterprises, Lundrigans, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Irving Oil, Bowaters, Home Oil, Price Newfoundland, and so on.

Lundrigans: How many trips were taken by the Hon. the Premier on Lundrigan's planes? Is it proper for the Premier of the Province to go jumping everywhere in Lundrigan's planes, not paid for by the people of the Province, but paid for by Lundrigans? The Premier went to Ottawa on Thursday, last week. According to reports he went to Ottawa on Lundrigan's plane. What connection has Lundrigan's plane with the hon. the Premier going to Ottawa? Is that not improper? People who have business relationships with the Government flying the Premier of the Province everywhere he wants to go and apparently at no charge. These are the kinds of things that are not permitted in other jurisdictions. They are not permitted at all, Mr. Chairman.

Here is a question, of all the travelling that the hon. the Premier has done since March 1, 1970, if this answer is correct, only five of those trips were Government business at Government expense. Every other one of those trips, and there were dozens are paid for by whom, how and why?

The trip to Romania, did the Romanian Government pay for it? Was there Government business involved? Well then, who paid for it? Are we entitled to have that information? There is something very wrong there, Mr. Chairman, either this answer is wrong or there is some explanation due this House. The fare of the return trip to Tokyo is \$2,200.00, yet this answer here shows that the hon. the Premier visited Tokyo November 24, 1970 and the cost of the whole trip, and I remember that the hon. the Premier was gone at least, ten, twelve days, two weeks, the cost of that trip was \$1,547.00. yet, a round trip from here to Tokyo is \$2,200.00. The Premier travels first class as he said, what happened the rest of the trip. What other stops were made on the trip? It was not only Tokyo that was visited.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only Tokyo on public business, the rest was private. On the way back we stopped at two or three places.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but the fare would be the same. How could the fare be \$1,547.00? There should be an explanation of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was the material for that coat, which cost me...

MR. NOLAN: Three dollars a yard.

MR. CROSBIE: That is very honourous yes, three dollars and all the rest of it. All we can do, Mr. Chairman, is ask the questions, we do not expect there will be any answers because it is not the habit of this Government to answer any questions like this.

The fact, that the Premier of the Province took dozens and dozens of trips last year outside the Province that are not reported as being on Government business at Government expense, probably will not be explained. If it is, it will be one of the first things explained here. The hon. the

Premier is also - Does the hon. the Minister of Economic Development have to continue making such a fool of himself? Apparently the Minister does have to continue.

MR. NOLAN: Will you permit a question?

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

MR. NOLAN: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, we are on the estimates, you will have a chance to speak. We can all speak, unlimited time on the estimates. We can bob up and down.

MR. NOLAN: All right then, the hon. member can proceed making a fool of himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier was asked a question, Mr. Chairman, a question tabled in this House that could not be of more importance. It involves ten to twenty million dollars, money of the people of this Province. He is asked, in connection with the construction contract entered into between Procon (Great Britain) Ltd., and the Crown Corporation Provincial Buildings Ltd., and the \$118 million worth of goods that are to be shipped to Come by Chance from England, he has been asked the question; is there any Federal Sales Tax or any Canadian Customs Duties to be paid on all that machinery and equipment? That is the question. We know from the contract that the Newfoundland Government has to find that money, Procon does not. We know that normally the duties are ten and twenty percent, that there could be ten or twenty million dollars involved in this expense, further expense to the people of Newfoundland for the enrichment of Mr. Shaheen and his friends at Come by Chance. The question is - this is the Premier's office, I am asking the Premier of the Province now, when we discuss the Premier's office will he answer the question and it only requires yes or no, Mr. Chairman. Is there customs duties payable on that equipment coming from England to the Come by Chance oil refinery? This is the only chance we are going to have

to ask the hon. the Premier.

The hon. the Premier can answer that simply with a "yes, there are duties" or "no, there are no duties." By the fact that he does not say, "no, there are no duties," we know that the people of Newfoundland are going to get the stab again in the pocket book for Mr. Shaheen and that oil refinery at Come by Chance. The hon. the Premier can answer now when we are discussing the Premier's office.

The Premier has been asked a dozen times about what happened to the \$5 million interim financing that was advanced to Mr. Shaheen. What happened to the auditors' statement that our auditors were supposed to get. They went to New York...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a Point of Order, I am willing to go along with the gag, he is half demented anyhow, but really, under the heading a vote to the Premier's office means that anything I have ever been connected with is now subject to debate? Is that right? Is that good Parliamentary practice?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): No, I think it is stated clearly that the item that is before the Committee now is the salaries for the Premier's office, and I really do not see how, and I am sure the hon. member for St. John's West does not see how the customs duties payable on equipment and other things have very much to do with that.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the crux of it is this, we are discussing the Premier's office...

MR. SMALLWOOD: So anything goes.

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to express my views on what the relevance of this is. We are now debating the Premier's office, that is the office of the Premier, and I am discussing questions that the Premier has refused to answer in the House. I am pointing out questions that he has given wrong information about in the House and that need further explanation. This is the only place in the estimates where the conduct of the Premier, as Premier, can be discussed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the relevant...

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not.

MR. CROSBIE: It is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not.

MR. CROSBIE: And it is not...

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not, it is anything but that.

MR. CROSBIE: For any one to try to find out what the Premier is doing or what he is hiding.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah, cracked.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not cracked.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You will be locked up before the year is over.

MR. CROSBIE: Another question the hon. the Premier - listen to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, half-crazed, half-crazed with hate.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Oh! Ho! Ho! , I am crazy with hate.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Would the hon. member please continue with his speech under the heading - Salaries. I think the hon. member is going too far afield in the remarks that he has just been making.

MR. CROSBIE: I am trying to continue with my speech, Mr. Chairman, not speech, but these remarks, and I am being constantly interrupted by the hon. the Premier. He is trying to create a disturbance so he can have the galleries cleared and put himself down in the annals again. There are two questions answered in the House, Mr. Chairman, to show what kind of accurate information the Premier gives the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the vote is as: Salaries and not of the Premier. Salaries of Civil Servants working in the Premier's office. Now is this to be the occasion of the debate about me or about those Civil Servants whose salaries are now before Your Honour? The argument that this is the only opportunity to debate me, in my conduct, is laughable. Is it not?

MR. CROSBIE: No!

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only chance the House has to debate my conduct is on the vote for salaries to the staff in my office. Who can accept that argument?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman where is the Premier's salary if it is not in Premier's Office? Where is it carried? Is it hidden somewhere else? Premier's office is where we can discuss the Premier. Now the Premier in answer to Question No. 24 in this House was asked a question about how much pulp wood was cut by Javelin up at Come-by-Chance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anything at all so long as he can tie it even one million miles away to the Premier. Anything now can be debated.

MR. CROSBIE: This is misinformation given by the Premier, in his office as Premier, to a question asked in the House. Question No. 24 asked: How many cords of pulp wood were cut by Javelin Forest Products..?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Is this in order?

MR. CROSBIE: At Lake Melville in 1970?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think in the Salary Estimates, the heading Premier's Office, does include the Premier's salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It includes the Premier's salary, Mr. Chairman, but does that mean that this - if there is any other opportunity in this session of the House (This is the Law of Parliament) if there is any other opportunity to discuss the Premier, surely it cannot be discussed now. How many times is it proper and Parliamentary to discuss it. The questions that are put on the Order Paper, the questions then of which notices are given, the answers that are given, is that the time to debate it or is it now? What I want to know is this: If any hon. member in this House can show any kind of a tenuous connection with the Premier, is there anything that cannot be so shown? Is there any topic under the sun that cannot be linked to the Premier? If it can be linked is it debatable? Surely that is not so. Surely it is obvious that that is not so, that anything in the wide world that can be linked to the Premier is now open for debate, because there is a vote for salaries. That is completely contrary to all Parliamentary practice and precedent.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a point of order. There is a vote of \$12,000 in here, Premier's Office, \$12,000. Now when we are voting a salary for a Cabinet minister or for the Premier that is when we discuss their activities. I am discussing the Premier's function as Premier, when he is asked to give information to this House and gives wrong information to the House or does not give information to the House, which is a most important function of the Office of Premier. It is quite relevant to this debate. There was an answer given, as I was saying, \$75,000..;

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Chair sees it this way, that the duties and the carrying out of duties of the Premier are relevant to this particular heading. But that does not permit an hon. member to then go off into all the angles of various economic development projects or trips and all this type of thing. It is the carrying out of the Premier's duties as Premier that is subject to debate, not all these odd things such as our customs' duties payable

Mr. Chairman

and things of that nature.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, is there any more important function of a Premier than to give the public information on public affairs and to answer properly questions asked in the House? What I am pointing out here is the Premier's refusal to give public information to the public. And the Premier's refusal to give complete information when a question is answered. I am asking for an explanation of why the Premier in between March 1, 1970 and now, according to his answer, has only taken five trips out of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is tedious repetition and on that he should be ruled out.

MR. CROSBIE: Should be ruled out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes ruled out. That is unparliamentary.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I am asking why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is contrary to the rules of debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I am asking why contradictory information is given in two answers to questions. In Question No. 24..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now here it is all over again.

MR. CROSBIE: I have not had a chance to get to it yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is tedious repetition.

MR. CROSBIE: Because of the constant interruptions of the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is tedious repetition.

MR. CROSBIE: Question No. 24.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is an insult to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: 75,000 cords of pulp wood cut at Lake Melville during 1970. That is the answer. Question No. 480 asked of the Premier: Since January 1, 1969, what volume (That is two years, not just one) of timber has been cut by Javelin ..?

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

Mr. Crosbie.

shipped from Labrador for export outside Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of Order.

MR. CROSBIE: 21,000 cords.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of Order.

MR. CROSBIE: Two different answers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down!

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to sit down.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, clown! Sit down, clown!

MR. CROSBIE: These stupid interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. My point of order,

Mr. Chairman is this: If it is in order now, under this heading of the estimates, to debate all the conduct of the Premier, will it also be in order to do the same thing all over again in the debate on the Budget Speech?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point which I have to consider is whether it is relevant now. My ruling is that the conduct of a minister is subject for comment on the occasion of the voting of his salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in the Address In Reply and in the debate on the Budget Speech..

MR. CROSBIE: This is not on the point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am still on the point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: The point of order is dealt with.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down! Sit down! Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: This is getting too tiring.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Chair cannot rule, as the Premier is well aware. The Chair cannot answer the question as to what may or may not be on another occasion. The ruling of the Chair now is that the duties

Mr. Chairman.

of the Premier as Premier are the subject for comment when the Premier's salary is being discussed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case, Mr. Chairman, so that we may have a ruling on it, because there is going to be a debate on the Budget Speech, I move that the committee rise. We refer the thing to Mr. Speaker and find out if it is in order, in both debates, to go over the same ground in the one session.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, that is complete and utter trash. If the Premier wants to appeal your ruling, he can appeal your ruling to the House. With his majority, he can over-rule you, but he cannot rise the committee to ask the Speaker anything. There is one recourse from your ruling and that is for the Premier to appeal to the House. Yes, the Premier with his majority can stop us asking any question, but he will have to do it by an appeal to the Speaker, not by this other ridiculous route he suggests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Chair wishes to declare that the Premier wished the committee raised.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a motion that the Chair rise. Could we have a vote on that, Mr. Chairman? That is not unanimous. The Premier has only made the motion.

MR. MURPHY: Is the motion before the Chair that the committee rise?

On motion that the committee rise, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker in the course of the Committee of Supply, a matter arose which could not be resolved and the Chairman rose the committee to report to Mr. Speaker. The matter which could not be resolved was under heading 303-01 - Salaries as to whether or not the question of the duties and the carrying out of the duties by the Premier were relevant to that item.

MR. CROSBIE: Clarify it first. Is this an appeal from the Chairman's ruling that is now..?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, as I was the one who raised the matter, perhaps I would be permitted to state why I asked for this procedure.

MR. CROSBIE: Is this an appeal from the Chairman's ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: We have three people standing. Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wish to ask a question ?

MR. MURPHY: I wanted to asked a question with reference to the report of the Chairman, Sir, where a matter could not be resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. May I have some clarification?

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman was not able to resolve the matter and in accordance with the rules of procedure, the Chairman simply raised the committee and called Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I was the one who moved that. The problem is as follows:

MR. CROSBIE: There is no problem except that the hon. Premier...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Would the hon. the Premier continue his statement without any interruption.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The problem, Your Honour, is as follows: We are in Committee of Supply. We are debating the estimates. We are at one particular item: Salaries in the Premier's Office. These salaries include the salary to the Premier. In the debate on this matter, is it in order - obviously there is no question that the Premier's duties, the duties of a Premier, his general conduct may be debated as may the conduct of any minister, when the estimates of that minister are before the committee, but, Your Honour, is it in order in that debate, in view of the fact that there has been a debate this session already, held and concluded on the Address in Reply, in which all the conduct of the Premier is open to debate and is debated and further there is on the Order Paper, at this moment, a debate coming up on the Budget Speech, which again is an extremely wide-ranging debate, practically as wide-ranging as the debate on the Address in Reply. In the light of the fact that there are those two sweepingly broad

Mr. Smallwood

opportunities given to the House to debate matters of the broadest possible importance, including the conduct of the Premier, and including the conduct of the administration in general and in view of the fact that opportunities provided the House to move motions of want of confidence, to indite the Government on almost anything that will occur to the minds of any hon. members of the House, in view of that, is it in order to do so again for the third time in the debate on the estimates and if so, will it then be in order for all the matters that are discussed about the Premier in this debate to be raised and debated all over again in the debate that is to come on the Budget Speech? Would that not violate one of the most basic principles of parliamentary procedure, that a matter is debated only once in a session? It may be debated again in the following session; that when an opportunity is provided and it is on the Order Paper and notice of it has been given and it is to come up for that wide-ranging kind of debate, is it in order to have that on Supply?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker I address myself to this and I presume it is a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the House was in Committee on Supply. The Office of the Premier was being discussed. There is a vote of \$12,000 in the estimates for the Office of the Premier. The Chairman ruled that I was relevant in addressing myself to the conduct of the Premier in his failure to give proper information to the House in reply to questions and otherwise. There was no appeal taken to the House from that ruling. I refer to Beauchesne Mr. Speaker, page 203: "The only motion allowed, when a Resolution is under consideration in Committee on Supply, is that the amount be reduced or that the Chairman leave the Chair either without making a report or to report progress on certain Resolutions." That has not been moved. There is no

MR. CROSBIE: No proper way under Parliamentary Procedure, where the hon. the Premier can come out of Committee and then ask the Speaker to answer some hypothetical fact, situation, when there has been no appeal from the Ruling of the Chairman of the Committee to the House in connection with the point involved. The Chairman has found the discussion relevant. The discussion is not before Your Honour for Your Honour to find it relevant or irrelevant. And with respect to the rest of the Premier's comments, we are not restricted, Mr. Chairman, to only speak on any subject once, during the term of the House. There is a general debate on the Address in Reply. There is a general debate on the Budget Speech, now we are on the estimates. And on the estimates we can ask questions and discuss the amounts opposite any office or position. We are now dealing with the Premier's office. If there is to be a ruling in this House that the Premier's conduct in the Office of the Premier cannot be questioned when the estimates are being discussed, and his salary is provided in those estimates, if there is a ruling that we cannot question how the Premier answers questions, or how he gives information, or what he does when his office is up before Your Honour in this House, then shut the House down, and put us out.

Page 201 of Beauchesne - "The whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way, when the Committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the estimates of that department. Which reads as follows: General Administration. This is the first item on the Premier's office. It is then relevant to criticize every phase of the department, totally or in detail, without evading Standing Order Number 59(2) " This is Beauchesne. There is nothing in my submission before Your Honour, for Your Honour to rule on. And we should go back to Committee of Supply. And if the hon. the Premier wants to shut off any question of him or his conduct, then appeal to the House and have his majority sustain him and we will have censure in that way in this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, again, on a point of order, and in reply to the hon. gentleman. It is not at all a matter of objecting or agreeing to being

MR. SMALLWOOD: questioned. It is not at all that.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have answered over three hundred question that have been put to us in this House, over three hundred in this present session. We have been asked more than that, but we have so far answered over three hundred questions. So it is not a matter at all of objecting to having questions asked, or objecting to answering them, that is not the point.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, what is the point?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The point is, the whole point is this; that whether or not because the Premier salary along with the salaries of all others in the Premier's office are now requested to be authorized by the Committee of Supply, whether because of that all the general, widespread and detailed, both widespread and detailed debate, may take place on the Premier. So that if any time through the session there was a question and an answer given, that may now be debated. If no answer was given, that now may be debated or any question that was not asked may now be asked and that may be debated. No matter what it concerns, pulp-wood cutting in Lake Melville, import duties on goods coming into Come-by-Chance, the spending of \$5 million advance bridge money to the Shaheen people, three years ago, Three years ago, of four years ago, whenever it was on the Oil Refinery. Anything in the wide world, Mr. Speaker, so long, as it can be linked to the Premier, becomes a matter of active debate. This is the point I am raising, whether the procedure -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This matter was raised before,

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

MR. CROSBIE: and dealt with by the Chairman. And only by an appeal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two cannot - two cannot-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Is the hon. member rising to a point of order? I think I can say this right now: I have listen to every single word that went on in the Committee. Some of it I wish I did not have to listen to. Secondly, the matter before the Chair - now I am in some doubt as to what is

MR. SPEAKER:

before the Chair. There has been no appeal from the Chairman's Ruling. If there had been an appeal against the Chairman's Ruling, I could not accept the appeal, as they do in the House of Commons, who changed their rules last year, and there is an appeal from the Chairman's Ruling to the Speaker himself.

Any appeal that is made is to the House and not to the Speaker. There is no appeal before me at the present time. This matter should have been resolved in the Committee. I would suggest that we go back to the Committee, because I cannot, the rules do not permit me to give an opinion or state the answer to a question posed as to what should happen, and in that sense it is a hypothetical case that is put before me.

But, as I have said, I have heard every word that has been said in the Committee. I have my own opinion about it, but the rules of this House do not permit me to give an opinion as to what course of action should have been followed or should have not been followed in the Committee.

I would suggest respectfully to all members of the House that we go back to the Committee and, if the Chairman rules one way or the other, then there may or may not be an appeal made, and that appeal will be to the House. But, my hands are tied as far as giving an opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To the House, Mr. Speaker, or to the Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The appeal is to the House, if there is an appeal taken against the Chairman's ruling. But there has been no appeal taken against his ruling. So I would respectfully suggest that we go back to the Committee and continue the work and in accordance with the Chairman's ruling. If the ruling does not suit any member of the House, then he has the right to move that his ruling be appealed to the House.

That is all I can say on this matter right now.

The Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall 303-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Not on your life, Mr. Chairman. We are only started with 303-01. that is the Premier's office. And it is the conduct of the Premier we are now here discussing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is as near as you will ever get to it in talking about it here tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: Is that right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Imagine that? Is that not a tragedy?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just imagine that.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a question and an answer given by the Premier, Mr. Chairman, 21,000 cords of wood cut in 1969-70, by Javelin at Melville, and exported from this Province. And an answer given to another question, 70,000 cords. They cannot both be right. Surely, it is the function of the Premier's office to see that when questions are answered in this House, actual, truthful, information is given them, which has not been done. And surely, when the Premier of the Province is asked questions on public matters, and public matters of vast importance, it is the function of the Premier to see that they are answered and the public are told.

It is the Premier of the Province, Mr. Chairman, that has to take responsibility for the fact that the mill at Stephenville, the Javelin Mill there has increased in cost \$16 million since last year. And it is the Premier of the Province that has to take responsibility for the fact that not one word of explanation has been given to this House of Assembly or the people of Newfoundland, as to why that happened. It is the Premier of the Province, Mr. Chairman, who must take responsibility for these liquor leases that we have been discussing in this House for some time, at Placentia, at Grand Bank, St. Lawrence -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a test for you.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no test.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That matter is now before the House under another heading, and the debate has been taking place. Mr. Chairman, may that now be debated?

MR. CROSBIE: Certainly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May it? It is already being debated by the House, and there is a motion before the Chair.

MR. CROSBIE: There are serious charges made, Mr. Chairman. We are now discussing the Office of the Premier. Serious charges involving the conduct of the Government, with public funds and three sweetheart contracts given.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the matter is already in-

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier -

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order. There is a motion before the House. Your Honour, you must be aware of that, it was debated here last Thursday, it is coming up again Wednesday. There is a motion on this very matter. A matter cannot be debated twice, it is on the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: We all know, Mr. Chairman, that there is a motion on the Order Paper. It may come up next Wednesday or it may not. And it may come up without the Premier saying one word about it, as the Premier has refused to do right through this session and refused to do last year. This scandal for which the Premier has to take responsibility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think you are reflecting - it seems to me that the hon. the member for St. John's West is off on two points, or two courses of argument. And it seems to me that the rule is that when a member asks a question, the minister responsible may or may not reply. If he does reply no debate is permitted.

Therefore, I think that in a Committee of the Whole House the fact that a minister may or may not reply to the question ought not to be commented on either. I think that if a minister gave an inaccurate reply to a question that, that could be commented on.

With regard to the question of these leases; that is, as I see it, out of order really on two accounts. The first thing is that it has been set for debate in the House and is actually on the Order Paper. And the other thing is that; perhaps an account is enough. Therefore, I do not think we should get into that aspect of this matter.

I think too that the question of the duties of the Premier or any other minister relates strictly to his particular duty. Also, I draw the attention of the hon. the member for St. John's West to the fact that he has been misquoting paragraph 23(9) from Beauchesne. Paragraph 23(9)

MR. CHAIRMAN: does not say what the hon. member has represented to the Chair to be said. It says; "the whole management of the department may be discussed in a general way. when the Committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the estimates of that department, which reads as follows; General Administration..."

We are now under the Heading; Executive Council, Premier's Office, and the debate should be limited strickly to that particular item which is the salary for the staff of that office, including the Premier's salary.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we are under Executive Council, which the first item was the Lieutenant Governor's Establishment. We are hardly going to discuss the Premier's office under the Lieutenant Governor's Establishment. This item is Premier's Office, that is the Premier's department, and we are discussing the Premier and what I quoted is what is in Paragraph 23(9) of Beauchesne on that point.

In connection with the Chairman's ruling and the rest of it, I will accept it. I will pass on. The Premier of the Province, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for the Laws of the Province. Surely, the Premier, as the head of the Government, is responsible for that. Yet, we have a situation in this House of Assembly, and I know hon. members have heard it before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair is not going to permit that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I should say right here now that the Chair is not going to permit debate on the whole wide range of Government policy under the Heading of Salaries. That is not the question at all. The question is the particular duties of the Premier. Somebody could stand up and say, for example, the Premier is responsible in fact that the price of fish was poor last year or was good last year. Now this is not the point, The point is that it must be limited to the particular and detailed duties of the Premier and not to the general policies of the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. the Chairman will get me finish my sentence, he will see the relevance ^{of} what I am discussing, Listen to poor old chatter box over there. Why does he not get up on his feet like a man and speak out his

MR. CROSBIE: mind. MR. Chairman, listen to it. Brilliant repartee across the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the point I was making, when the Chairman stood up, is that the Premier, as Premier, is responsible for the administration of the Laws.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Everything, everything is.....

MR. CROSBIE: For the administration of the Laws of this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: therefore, fish, mines, forest anything at all. So long as they can be connected with me. That is the argument.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, can I finish my sentence?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And its collation.

MR. CROSBIE: Can I now finish my sentence?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And its collation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I will stop and let them hackle for a while. Come on Premier! Shout again!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: All right, can I finish my sentence then, Mr. Chairman? Responsible for administering the Laws of this Province and is disobeying the Laws of the Province by failing to table in this House agreements that legislation of this House requires to be tabled. This is the time to ask the Premier to answer that: That the Premier of the Province is disobeying and having the Government disobey the Laws passed by this House. Why are not the ..

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

MR. CROSBIE: of Industrial Development Incentives Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we are being told by the hon. member that, any matter whatsoever, I, as Leader of the Government, now anything that the Minister of Fisheries, and the Attorney General, I am to carry out the laws, not the Attorney General. I am responsible for that. I am responsible for education, anything that happened he can debate, because I am the Leader of the Government. Anything on Health, that is again. Anything on Provincial Affairs. Anything on the Department of Health - anything, because I am the Leader of the

MR. SMALLWOOD: Government. This is the argument now, Your Honour, which means that the debate on the salaries for my department now gives the opportunity to any hon. member to debate anything under the sun, so long as you can connect it with the Premier. The Premier is responsible for carrying out the Laws of the Province, then anything that is by law he can be attacked on — on this vote.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: On this one vote.

MR. CROSBIE:

The Premier is only too delighted to take all the credit for what all his Ministers do and he must accept the responsibility -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: He must accept the responsibility -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not sitting down, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: If the Premier can speak to a point of order so can I. I will not sit down, not in this world will I ever sit down. I have a right to address the Chairman just as much as the Premier does and it is his responsibility to see -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Will the hon. Premier -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down you ignoramus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Oh, come on and be quiet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look he is defying you, Your Honour, absolutely defying you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Chairman can see very well who is defying and who is not. Now on this question, we have had it before, a member has a right to raise a point of order. No member has the right to speak to a point of order, a member may raise it but a member may not speak it. When a member raises it he shall state his point of order briefly and succinctly to enable the Chair to see what it is he is talking about and then the Chair will make a ruling. No member has the right to speak to a point of order unless he is invited to do so by the Chair. Members speak to points of order not to vent their own particular views but for the assistance of the Chair, which seems to

MR. CHAIRMAN:

be forgotten in this particular Committee. So no member has the right to speak to a point of order. The other thing is this, that when the Chairman stands all members should be seated.

On the particular point that we are talking about here, the ruling I am going to make on that is this, that the Premier is only responsible under this particular heading for his duties as Premier and he is not responsible, under this particular heading - I am not going to have any debate at all on whether some other Minister has complied with some other statute.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is the Chairman ruling that the Premier is not responsible for disobedience of the law by his Government, that he is not generally responsible for that? The Premier, in this particular instance, Mr. Chairman, the Premier was Minister of Economic Development for two years, while this statute was being disobeyed and only surrendered that portfolio three or four months ago, and it is still being disobeyed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! If I may just state the point again, as it seems I was not heard. In these estimates there are headings for every department of Government under which the duties of every Minister can be discussed. The way I see it - this particular heading here for the Premier's office relates particularly to the carrying out of that office by the Premier, as Premier, of this particular office, the office of Premier not the office of the Minister of Economic Development, not the office of Education and Youth, not the office of Provincial Affairs but the office of Premier. The Chair rules that this debate has to be limited particularly and relevantly to the carrying out by the Premier and other persons in his office of the duties of the office of Premier.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I, of course, will observe your rulings as I always do. How long will it be before the jumping-jack is up again when the next question is asked? Question 376, addressed to the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: Jittery-Joe, not jumping jack.

MR. CROSBIE: Jittery yes, jittery-jumping-Josephus. Question 376, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the office of the Premier, asked about the operations of the Holiday Inns in this Province. The question was answered by the hon. the Premier about three weeks ago anyway. The last part of that question was, "will the Government table the agreement or a copy of the agreement entered into between the Government or any agency of the Government and Atlific (Newfoundland) Limited covering the operation of the said Holiday Inn Hotels in Newfoundland?" Yes, said the hon. the Premier, the Government will table it. Three, four weeks later we are still waiting for the agreement between Atlantic (Newfoundland) Limited and the Government concerning the operation of Holiday Inns to be tabled. That is a function of the office of the Premier. The Premier said yes that agreement would be tabled in this House and it is not tabled yet. The hon. the Premier, of course, is hoping that we will forget that he said he would table the agreement. Well, it has not been forgotten.

So in the few short moments I have had to try to speak on the office of the Premier, incumbered with constant interruptions on points of order that are not points of order, constant heckling, I have shown, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier is not giving the facts when he is asked questions, he is refusing to answer other important questions, he is giving false and misleading answers in some cases and he is making commitments to the House he is not carrying out in others. That is how the Premier is operating insofar as this House is concerned. The Premier said, a few minutes ago, that three hundred questions have been answered in the House. Just look at some of the answers we have been given, the pitiful excuse for answers and look at the important questions that are not being answered and that the Premier will not answer, and the laws are being violated. Now, Mr. Chairman, since it has been made impossible in this discussion of the Premier's office to discuss the office of the Premier and what he should or should not do and whether his duties are being properly

MR. CROSBIE:

carried out or not I will cease discussing it because it is obvious that the Premier cannot stand to have his conduct in his office examined, with this constant interruptions and calling in the Speaker and all the rest of it that have gone on in this debate.

So I say vote the hon. the Premier the money, vote him twice as much, let him do what he like with it, let him conduct his office as he like, shut down the House of Assembly, shut our mouths all up and do away with the House altogether, if that is the way you are going to conduct it. That is my last word on this Premier's office.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, on this particular vote before we pass on. In spite of all the backchat and cross-fire across the House tonight there are one or two points which are very relevant to this vote which should be emphasized and repeated. There can be no question that I am discussing this particular vote which we are under in the estimates. The vote itself covers salaries, travelling and office expenses, and under travelling-

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the vote is just salaries.

MR. EARLE: Well, salaries under these various headings as we come to them, this is the block of the whole thing. Therefore under the Premier's conduct in this office, most certainly his travelling is an item which we can discuss.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we are not come to that yet. It is salaries. We will come to travelling, but so far it is only salaries.

MR. EARLE: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that under the general heading of the office we are given the liberity of discussing the whole office, which in this case also covers travelling and office expenses -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the hon. gentleman will not talk about travelling when we come to travelling. Are you going to talk twice about travelling?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just as you like. I do not intend to speak about it twice, I will speak about it once only. Under this heading the general conduct of the Premier's office comes and the fact that there is set aside

MR. EARLE:

here \$10,000. this year for travelling as against \$15,000. last year for travelling, both of which figures must be patently wrong, obviously wrong to anybody that follows the Premier's activities. Either he is taking, the hon. the Premier is taking trips which are being paid for by other people, these must be numerous, as my friend from St. John's West mentions, or this figure is completely wrong. Now we have to assume that there must invariably be trips paid for by other people. This in itself is patently wrong, distinctly wrong. The Premier of this Province or any Province accepts a very, very deep responsibility, as Premier he cannot be under obligations to people who are doing work for this Province. It is a conflict of interest and when he accepts plane trips or trips abroad or anything from contractors, financeers or anyone else that come to this Province looking for business, he automatically puts himself, in his office, under an obligation to these people. He should not accept such trips. It is much to be preferred that the country, the Province pay for all these trips and obviously that is not being done.

We see in this vote here that this year there will be \$1,000. transferred for the use of airplanes. We presume that the new Premier, when he gets into office, will stick strictly to the rules, he will not be allowed to use Lundrigan's jet, he has \$1,000. to hire other planes. This is as it should be, Mr. Chairman. It is entirely and completely wrong that a person in the high and honourable position of Premier of this Province will accept favours or gratuities of any kind from any contractor, financeer or anyone else, in the form of trips or free transportation or anything else. That is the one point which I wish to drive home, that it would be far better that this vote be for \$200,000. instead of \$10,000., but that the Province were paying for it and that the Province, as such, through its Premier, were not under obligation to these people who are looking for favours.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, before the vote carries I would like to say, in reply to my hon. friend who just sat down, that I gave the House, the House,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

not the Committee, and I am not sure that I am even in order to refer to what happened in the House earlier in the present session, but in answer to a question I gave a list of institutions and organizations and companies of one kind and another whose planes, on whose planes I have travelled as Premier of this Province. I do not recall the names of all of them but there were seventeen or eighteen different outfits. There was the Government of the United States, they provided planes for me to travel on, the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec and then I have travelled on planes of the Newfoundland Government itself, we own some planes. So that is four Governments on whose planes I have travelled. EPA have provided planes and I have travelled on their planes, Bowaters of Corner Brook, Price of Grand Falls, I think I travelled on a Buchans Mining Company plane, I certainly travelled on M.J. Boylen's plane, I have travelled many times on the Lundrigan plane, I travelled on the Javelin plane, when they had one, they do not have one at the moment, I have travelled on, I do not remember, something like eighteen different Governments and outfits on whose planes I have travelled.

MR. EARLE: I am not questioning Government planes, these are quite all right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, I am saying how, I am to the best of my recollection, I gave the list the other day and I had it written out and handed it in and I suppose it is in Hansard, I do not know, but now I am speaking from memory, I do not remember the names of all seventeen or eighteen of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Alcan

MR. SMALLWOOD: Aluminium Company of Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: When the hon. member for St. John's West -

MR. SMALLWOOD: In fact I think the hon. member for St. John's West travelled with me on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same plane.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the same plane, the same trip. Oh yes, he did.

MR. CROSBIE: Some plane, some trip.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some trip, Alcan, we were doing business with Alcan, the Government were negotiating at the time with Alcan. That was all right, he was on it, he was on the plane then, that was all right, that made it okay. That was a private corporation with whom we were negotiating, Mr. Chairman, and they were kind enough to send a plane here and they picked me and I took the Minister along with me, because at that time he was concerned with housing, in his Government department which included housing, and it was housing we were negotiating.

I have gone on Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, the Iron Ore Company of Canada, Wabush Mines, British-Newfoundland Corporation, on all of these and many others that I do not remember. I have travelled and never once, never once have I charged the Government one single nickle for any such flight I have ever had. They did not charge me I did not charge the Government. I passed on no bill to the Government and collected no money from the Government when I travelled free, as I frequently do. Now I can tell you, Your Honour, and I can tell the members of this Committee and the people of Newfoundland that when I travel on the plane of any company, corporation, Government or anyone else I am not bought, I am not bought that easily, I am not bought, I am not bribed, I am not browbeaten, I am not overawed. I deal with the biggest of men, I am able to do it and not be browbeaten and not be bought and not be bribed and I can deal with those corporations and deal with them independently, and I do.

If the Government of Newfoundland had its own planes to travel anywhere I would always travel in them. Wherever it is humanly possible to travel on a Newfoundland Government plane I do so, but Newfoundland Government planes only travel within our Province and wherever I go in this Province, if it is humanly possible, I travel on a Newfoundland Government plane, unless I am going on non-Government business. If I am going on purely political business I do not travel on the Government plane. I have done it once or twice but then I paid the bill, I asked the Department to give me a bill and I paid it when I

May 3rd, 1971

Tape 447(Night)

JM - 8

MR. SMALLWOOD:

travelled on business that was purely political or at least partly political and partly public. I took no chance, I paid for it if it had any political aspect whatsoever to it.

I am out of pocket, my own pocket, that I have paid out of my own pocket, out of my salary, I am out of pocket thousands of dollars travelling on Government business that I never billed the Government for -

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a matter of fact, I never do bill this Government anyhow. If some of my staff say to me, "have you put in a bill for that last trip?" I say, "well, that is right, no I have not." "Will you look after it?" That is all I know about it.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the trip to Romania?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I, first of all, I never buy an airplane ticket, the staff buy it and they hand it to me, or if a minister is going with me, if another minister is travelling with me, usually he looks after the travel arrangements. He looks after the fares, He gets the ticket. He makes the reservations. He looks after the hotel and pays it. I travel around the world without a nickle in my pocket sometimes. I leave it to the minister who is with me to pay, and the bills will be all in his name. Make the most of it, Mr. Chairman, anyone who wants to.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, make the most of it. There is not an answer to the question raised here, what public business did the Premier go to Romania on that is not charged off to the Government? Who pays for the trip to Romania? Why not give us some specific information? The hon. the Premier gets up and says, how he is out of pocket thousands of dollars travelling around the world. Bunkum! Bunkum! He is out of pocket thousands of dollars. Did the Premier go on a trip to Romania and pay his own expenses all the way over and all the way back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I did not.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, who paid those? According to the answer....

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government of Newfoundland paid my fare to Romania and back, and in Romania the Government of Romania paid every nickle of my expenses.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, did the Premier's office not give a proper answer to the question asked?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know.

MR. CROSBIE: Here is the answer given to this House, information that is suppose to be correct. The last trip of the Premier on Government business was November 24, 1970, at Government expense, Toyko. Not a word about a

MR. CROSBIE: trip to Romania at Government expense. The Premier now says, "he went to Romania and back on Government expense." It is not on the answer to this question. That is the burden of our complaint, Mr. Chairman. We are not getting correct answers, when we do get answers. We are getting part answers and misleading answers and incorrect answers, stupid answers. Who paid for all the recent trips to New York? None of them are mentioned on this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were no expenses on the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: The Premier says that they are using all these aircraft to go over, Yes, perhaps to a point it is all right, for some specific or particular purpose, for the general use of a private plane -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is recalling now, he is reminded, he was on one of them. But now it might be all right.

MR. NOLAN:...It was all right then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was okay, then. Maybe, up to a point, it is all right. To the point where he was on it.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! No! Imagine

MR. SMALLWOOD: Beyond that he is wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. In 1967 I went on the Alcan plane from St. John's to Montreal, with Alcan, to see a house that Alcan were producing. That is quite correct. Now, let us have an explanation, that was Government business, Alcan took the Premier and I up to Montreal to see their house and so on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Took the Premier and me.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the rest of these trips? Why is it,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the Premier and I.

MR. CROSBIE: Why did the Premier use a private plane last Thursday to whip up to Ottawa and back again? What connection did that plane have with the business on hand? Was that a plane of Lundrigan's to take the Premier off to see something that Lundrigan's had to show him to bring back? No, it was a public trip from Newfoundland to Ottawa on Government business, that

MR. CROSBIE: brought the Premier back to Gander and landed him there for a Liberal meeting. I have no hesitation about the trip on the Alcan plane, that can be explained. But, what we want to know, is what is the explanation for all these other trips? And the trip after trip with Lundrigan's and their plane? And what is the explanation for the incorrect information given? The Premier now after a debate of an hour and a-half will finally admit that his trip to Romania was paid for by the Government, over and back, and that the Romania Government paid for him while he was in Romania. Why did that have to take up an hour and a-half of the time of the House to find that out. If the Government would come clean and give us the information, it would be settled in five minutes, but no there has to be points of order and abuse and all the rest of it to try to beat us down. We cannot be beaten down. And the Premier still has not answered, still has not given information, still has not met the hon. the members for Fortune Bay's point of the impropriety going in planes owned by people looking for favours from the Government time after time, after time.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, we have been so long on this item. Because it takes an hour and a-half to find out that the Premier went to Romania and back again at Government expense, not listed in the answer to that question that I mentioned at the beginning of the night.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, Salaries on page 9 of the Salary Estimates. Would the Premier mind giving us the breakdown of these officials, who they are please?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Parliamentary Assistant, of course, is the hon. the member for Trinity South. The Liaison Officer is Mr. Herman Batten, former Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons. The Executive Assistants are as follows: Mr. Frank Colbourne in my Corner Brook office; Mr. Garry Brownrigg, part of whose duties are those of Executive Assistant to me, to the Premier, and part as Director of Transportation and part of his salary is attributable to one and part to the other. Mrs. Templeman and Mr. Robert Jenkins, the Director Grade III is Mr. John Whelan, and then the two directors Grade I, are Miss

MR. SMALLWOOD: Duff, I think, she is called by special private secretary, Miss Betty Duff and one of the positions is vacant. One officer Grade VI is Miss Moulton, and the two officers Grade V are Mr. F. Peckford, I do not know what the "F." is for -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fred, and Mr. E. Rowe. What is the "E" for?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eric.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Eric Rowe. And one officer Grade IV is Mr. Vincent.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Shall 02-01? Carried. 02?

MR. CROSBIE: 02, Mr. Chairman? Why is there only an allowance of \$100. for postage from the Premier's office. Surely, there is more mail goes from the Premier's office than \$100 worth of mail a year. What is the connection of \$100 there? That is transfers from other departments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I just do not know. I simply do not know the answer to that question. I know that the postage in my office is fifty times that or may be a guess, yes fifty times that, I think, Many times that anyway. I do not know. I do not understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not required to vote those.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We do not vote those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Report that Sub-head 303 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because those are found in other departments, they are paid for in other departments and it is in the other departments that the detail is given and the debating is done and the votes taken then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 304-01 carry?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on 304-01, we come to the item of salary and this is in the Executive Council Office, and this might be a good a time as any to bring up this particular matter. Included in the staff here is a legal council at a certain salary. That legal council is Mr. Cyril Greene, the former Deputy Minister of Justice. We all know that Mr. Greene resigned from his post as Deputy Minister of Justice shortly after his trip to England

MR. MARSHALL: and the Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery negotiations. And one question that needs to be answered with respect to this, it has not been answered, as yet, is whether or not the resignation of Mr. Greene had any direct question at all, either direct or indirect, with the contracts which were being signed in connection with the Refinery over in England at the time.

It seems very mysterious, the circumstances surrounding it seems rather mysterious to come back from England and then the resignation is there. We have seen with respect to these negotiations what there are many, many questions that have been brought up, that have not been answered, such as the hon. member for St. John's West question with respect to the customs duties etc. Many inept agreements were signed at that time. Much money of this Province was committed, as a result of these negotiations. Mr. Greene was one of the top individuals employed by the Government and taken over there for the purpose of giving legal advice. You just cannot announce a resignation and a transfer to another area without giving the reasons. And I would like to know now, what, if any, either direct or indirect connection, Mr. Greene's resignation may have had with respect to this Come-by-Chance agreement? Did it pertain particularly to any stand by him, as legal council of the Government, with respect to those documents?

No answer, as usual.

MR. MURPHY: Under this vote, two ministers without portfolio, have we only two ministers without portfolio now, I thought it was three, who would these ministers be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the ministers without portfolio, the hon. the senior member for the District of Harbour Main, and the hon. the member for the District of Labrador South. By the way are we at Executive Council Office?

AN HON. MEMBER: 304-01.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, 304-01. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the explanations are as follows: the President of the Council, of course, is well known, the hon. the Attorney General, the ministers without portfolio are those whose names I have

MR. SMALLWOOD: just given. The Clerk of the Executive Council, Mr. James G. Channing, Legal Council, Mr. Cyril J. Greene, the Officers Grade V are Mrs. Baird and one vacancy. The Deputy Clerk of Council is Mr. Herbert J. Coombs.

MR. MURPHY: There is no one there now. No allowance for him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is Mr. H. J. Coombs, he is the Deputy Clerk of the Council. The Deputy, Mr. Channing, and he takes the place of Mr. Channing occasionally. The Office Grade IV, is Mrs. H. White, Shorthand Typist is Miss Rees. The extra assistance of 39-93, includes \$2400, a total of \$2400 for secretarial assistance for the two hon. ministers without portfolio.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, since the hon. the Premier is giving the answer, whether he proposes to answer the other question proposed with respect to Mr. Cyril Greene, because his silence or his refusal to answer

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no intention in this world of doing it.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, this is no different than any. Thank you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no sense for the hon. member to ask me.

MR. MARSHALL: Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 304-01 carry? Carried.

On Motion Sub-head 304 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan.

On Motion carried.

Total Provision Salary adjustments?

On Motion carried.

Total: Executive Council.

On Motion carried.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to vote against this vote, Mr. Chairman, because of the Premier's refusal to give any information. We want a Standing Vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour please rise;

MR. SMALLWOOD: In favour of what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In favour of Total: Executive Council, please rise. (7)

Those against please stand. (5)

I declare the motion carried.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Item V - Provincial Affairs

501, Salaries, 502 General Administration Carried.

511 - Emergency Measures;

511-01 through 511-02-03 Carried

511-03-03-02 (Miscellaneous: Equipment Training)

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, on this one, (02) why is there such an increase this year? It is \$10 thousand as against \$3 thousand last year.

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the increase is due to a change in Federal policy, this is seventy-five per cent reimbursable and there is a Federal policy for training more people and we plan to take advantage of it. It is seventy-five per cent reimbursable.

511-03-03-02 Carried.

511-03-03-03

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what Heading I should ask the question under but it does not matter I suppose, as long as I ask the question, if the hon. minister does not mind.

Several communities across Newfoundland have been able to partake of Federal funds plus Provincial funds in the procurement of fire fighting equipment. I know Glovertown is one town which took advantage of it. There are several others.

I wonder would the minister be able to indicate to the House, how many communities have made representation for cost sharing under this Plan and what the prospects are for the continuance of this Plan?

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, if I get the hon. member's question correctly, there used to be a policy whereby the Federal Government would help EMO, that is through our Department, in obtaining fire equipment but that policy was abandoned, I think two years ago. We do get help with regards to the

MR. FRECKER: training, I think I mentioned above there, training of fire fighters, but we do not get this equipment anymore, to my knowledge.

511-03-03-03, Supplies Administrative, 511-03-03-04, Supplies Training, 511-03-03-05, Rent and Utility Service, 511-03-03-06, Uniforms, 511-03-03-08, St. John Ambulance, 511-03-03-09, Local Disaster. Carried

522-01 Consumer Affairs:

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, this could be a very important division of the Department, Consumer Affairs. I noticed that the Vote has been increased quite an amount this year, up to \$14 thousand in total as against \$3,900 last year. It still seems to me that it is far short of what might be required to do a proper job.

I suppose there is nothing of greater interest to the general public than what they consume, what they eat and what they pay for. While this is largely influenced by a similar Department in Ottawa under which Mr. Basford is the minister, there must be ample room locally for a very active division of the Department in this respect. Because I am quite sure the hon. Mr. Basford has no means of knowing what is going on in Newfoundland with regards to Consumer Affairs but a local division could have its fingers very, very closely on the pulse.

Now there are in a number of fields a lot of questions that could be asked on Consumer Affairs, it is not only the question of what is being paid for various services but what sort of service has been rendered. I do not suppose you can stop anybody in the City of St. John's today and ask them about general repair work and a lot of things of that nature. The impression, rightly or wrongly, by the public is that they are being taken to the cleaners. I am no different than anybody else, but I protested yesterday that I took my car in for servicing, the only time anything goes

MR. EARLE: wrong with my car is when I take it into the garage for servicing. It invariably comes out needing another job to be done. By the time you are finished with this sort of thing and you go back and back and back, the bill that you get is simply astronomical and I am sure that the public generally feel the same as I do in many, many services of this type.

We often hear that the food business is taking the people to the cleaners, this is so completely foolish compared to what is being charged in other fields in service industries. Somehow or other, because a person puts something in their stomach and they eat it, it appeals to them that they are being over-charged for it but competition, as we have noticed, particularly in the last year there was a great competition among supermarkets etc. That has kept the price of the ordinary consumable groceries at a pretty good level.

They are fighting for existence among themselves and they are keeping prices down to a reasonable, competitive level in that particular field. But I do not think the same situation applies in many other service industries and I think that the minister in this particular endeavour should have his Department strengthened considerably. To make some real enquiries as to what goes on, because he certainly cannot do it with a budget of \$14 thousand, that only pays a couple of salaries. He certainly cannot have any proper inspection division and I doubt very much if he can accumulate any facts or any statistics whatever with such a small budget.

Now this is a very, very wide-ranging matter. It affects everybody's cost of living in this Province, not only in the City of St. John's and its environs but all throughout the Province and if we were to be doing a proper job on this Consumer Affairs, the minister would need a staff of several dozen, to cover the Province properly and look into what is going on and I think it might be one of the most active, most serviceable aspects of this minister's Department, if he were empowered to do just this.

MR. EARLE: I am disappointed frankly, that in the current year, when the Federal Government are beginning at long last to take such an active interest in this, with the accelerating cost of living in Canada, that we in this Province are so far behind.

A Token Vote, you might almost call it of \$14 thousand for an endeavour of this kind is just ridiculous, and I am quite sure that the public would be very, very much behind the minister, if he were empowered in his Department to look after their interest. And my only criticism of this Vote is not that it is too high but actually that it is too low.

MR. MARSHALL: I agree with what the member for Fortune Bay has said but there is another aspect as well of this particular division that I would like to make a few observations upon.

This relates to Consumer Affairs. I do not know, I suspect that this division of Consumer Affairs is not very much, or very deeply engaged in the consumption of credit of consumer credit, as it ought to be, because in this Province, as in other Provinces, it is most necessary to adopt a very, very, watchful and careful eye over the operations of some of these Finance Companies that are operating in this Province.

There is one company in particular that occurs to me, and there are others besides, but one particularly which apparently delights in dunning people for the indebtedness that has been incurred and the Registries of the various Courts will bear this out to any investigation made by any of the hon. minister's staff.

And I think that it is very, very necessary that steps be taken to protect the general public from certain zealotry of some of these finance company people. Unfortunately, some of them have the world divided up into two or three categories, on the one hand are the creditors and on the other are the rest of the world and then the debtors and God help the debtors.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this has assumed serious proportions with some people and I can think, I have mentioned it before, and I can think specifically of debts that have been incurred from time to time by a man, who the rules of the finance company require his wife to sign the contract itself, and very often she signs it not knowing what the situation is and what the liabilities are involved with the signing of this contract. But she quickly finds out, if the husband defaults on the debt, and she has any assets which can be attached by the finance companies themselves.

I feel that certain provisions, certain steps ought to be taken by the Government. In one of the Provinces, I believe it is British Columbia, they are even considering legislation to prohibit the type of advertising that prevails and has prevailed particularly within the past five or six years, restricting somewhat the manner in which finance companies advertise for customers, and advertise their wares, because it is a type of advertising which, in some cases, can cause a great deal of harm and it can be false and it does not tell the true story.

So I think that the minister ought really to direct himself, in this division of Consumer Affairs, particularly, to see that the finance companies, in this Province, work on a proper basis and on a fair basis to protect the citizens of the Province. With respect to this business of endorsing notes, and endorsing contracts, I think that there ought to be a provision to assure that the endorser of the contract - I am not talking about the banks because the banks are usually on a different plane, but I am thinking of these consumer finance companies that seem to take a great delight in dunning people; that there ought to be some provision with respect to the endorsement of notes and the endorsement of contracts, that the endorser is informed of his or her rights and liabilities at the time of the endorsement, because very often the signature is procured, even though they have large block letters on the contract that the individual should read it over, the fact of life is that

MR. MARSHALL: they do not read it over and the Government should take some positive steps to protect these people. I would look forward and hope to see this particular aspect of Consumer Affairs dealt with in a much more vigorous nature.

MR. CROSBIE: Not yet, Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that it will carry.

Mr. Chairman, I think I said last year, and I will repeat this year, that the Vote here for Consumer Affairs and a Consumer Affairs division in the minister's Department is purely tokenism, tokenism.

\$28 thousand voted or suggested by the Government to be voted for Consumer Affairs in this Province, consumer protection. In a Budget of some five hundred odd millions of dollars, the hon. the Premier is so delighted to roll over in his mouth and express the \$500,000,000 Budget that we have got, the Government has got to provide \$28 million for Consumer Affairs.

Now what can the Consumer Affairs Division of the Department of Provincial Affairs do to help protect the consumers of Newfoundland, when they employ three or four people at the most, if that many, and they have a Budget of \$28 thousand. It is pure tokenism.

How the Government can say it is concerned about Consumer Affairs, there is not much concern. Why, for example, has the division of Consumer Affairs not investigated the prices charged for eggs by the Marketing Association? On the one hand the Government sets up a Marketing Association to keep the price of eggs up for the egg producers in this Province and on the other hand we have a division of Consumer Affairs, and that cost, by the way, that whole farm outfit, the chicken and the chips policy and the ham and eggs policy, costing the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars, to subsidize

producers and allow them to get a good price for their produce. In Consumer Affairs the Government has a token vote of \$28,000. What is the point of having a Consumer Affairs Branch at all and could the minister explain for us what the two or three people there are, in Consumer Affairs -three- what the three of them are going to be able to accomplish? Here we have on one hand a vast number of people employed by the Farm Marketing Board, employed down at Pepperrell, subsidization of the building, subsidization of wages, subsidization of equipment for egg producers and for the pork producers of the Province and for the broiler producers. This is a Government controlled by people interested in producing eggs and broilers and there are hundreds of thousands, I do not know what the total is, I would say, this year at least two to three million dollars being spent for the benefit of poultry, broiler and pig producers in this Province and a total of \$28,000 being spent for the protection of consumers. It is not hard to see where the interest of this Government lies. It does not lie with the consumer, it lies with the few producers that we have producing eggs and broilers and the rest of it. They are doing their best to stop inter-provincial movement of eggs and broilers, to discourage it, keep the prices up and then, when we come to the Consumer Affairs, \$28,000.

If there were not a private agency in this town, one that is operated by Gordon Bastow, the Better Business Bureau, where would a consumer with a complaint go in this province today? Or if you wanted to check on whether a firm is reputable or not reputable, can you go to the hon. Minister's department and ask him? No, they do not function like that.

MR. COLLINS: This department functions to keep prices up.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government functions to keep prices up. The Consumers Affairs division of the Minister's department I am afraid is only a joke. It is going against the whole trend of the Government, which is exactly

the opposite, keep prices up for poultry, keep prices up for broilers, keep prices up for pork. They are not so concerned about the vegetables and the consumer has a token vote of \$28,000. So I will be interested - and I think their job is just administer the few Acts that have been passed by the House requiring the registration of people who are going to extend credit. We take credit finance companies.

MR. COLLINS: The Gander Conference is being rehashed now.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, the Saturday morning conference is going on again. The war conference at Gander, every inch of ground is to be fought over, every trench to be manned, every chicken carried to the polls, there is going to be some queer eggs hatched at the polls this year, Mr. Chairman. So would the minister - We will know who will be clucking when the election is over and it will not be the Hon. the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will see, I have heard that before.

MR. CROSBIE: It will be the cock's last crow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have heard all that kind of stuff before, six times - I am hearing it now for the seventh.

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the hon. members of the Opposition for highlighting some of the points that we ourselves are very interested in. We have noted that there is a growing interest among Newfoundlanders generally for consumer protection, and God knows we do need it. But I should like to point out that the hon. member for St. John's East touched on a type of thing that our present division of Consumers Affairs is dealing with and in his last remarks so did the hon. member for St. John's West. Our consumer protection to date, from the legal point of view, concerns merely credit and a great deal can be done, Mr. Chairman, with regards to protecting the public in this matter of credit, as inferred by the hon. member for St. John's East.

First of all we have now a staff of six; director clerk, and a shorthand typist. They are engaged in seeing to it that every firm that extends credit in any kind or form in Newfoundland is properly

Registered. Now that may not seem important but that^{is} the first step towards being able to assist the public.

Secondly, we endeavour to inform the public concerning credit. The Act insists on those extending credit giving the fullest possible information, in the clearest possible way, so that people do not have to use magnifying glass to find out, in some hidden corner of a form, that if they do not do so-and-so they are like a fly on a fly pad, caught in a situation where they cannot extricate themselves.

Now there is another aspect of consumer protection which is being looked after on a national scale, namely through, I do not remember the exact name of the department but it is Ron. Basford's department and I think it is called Consumer Protection. Now, that department keeps in close liaison with our department. I. and my deputy are hoping to attend a conference coming up the twenty - fifth and twenty-sixth of May in Ottawa at which the experiences and the problems which have come up in the past year, in all the provinces, will be discussed and aired. The shared experience results in legislation across Canada that permits one Province to protect its citizens and wherever people are travelling they can be protected from^{one} province to the other. People who are blacklisted, say in Ontario, and come to Newfoundland and endeavour to carry on - you know crooked business - can be spotted right away because of the liaison that exists between my department and the comparable departments in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, and so on. It is a unification, bringing a greater uniformity in legislation to protect the public against under-handed and bad business practices.

Now, the questions brought up by the hon. member for Fortune, Mr. Chairman, are very, very important but they do not come under the department of Provincial Affairs. I believe that Ottawa, the Federal Government, is very busy with these very things and again through my department, if any Newfoundland firm or any Newfoundland citizen feels that he has a justifiable complaint, my department will investigate it

or put this person or that firm in touch with the proper authority, Federal or Provincial, in another Province if it happens to be somebody in another province that needs to be investigated. Generally speaking, the idea of having a division of Consumer Affairs in Newfoundland would be good if we only had one person, provided that one person was doing the job of seeing to it that there was a channel of communications between the Province and Ottawa, between the Government and the Better Business Bureau, between the Government here and the Government in the other provinces on matters affecting consumer protection.

We are just beginning to - the division is only just a year old - I do not believe our director is even yet a year old in his new position. He is a man who has had wide experience in the field of insurance and there again Newfoundland, by doing what I have been endeavouring to do this very session, by amending the laws to bring them, insurance laws, to bring them in conformity with the comparable insurance laws of other provinces, is insuring that what happens in another province and what happens in Newfoundland, for the protection of people who use insurance, will have a means of being aired and being investigated and of being controlled. I think I have said enough, Mr. Chairman, to give a general picture of what I might call the nation's Division of Consumer Affairs in the Province of Newfoundland. It does do a great job in enabling us to establish proper relationships with the Federal Government and with the other Provincial Governments and with the Better Business Bureau and will enable us to serve both companies and individual citizens.

Item 522-02 carried.

Item 531-01:

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just one or two questions on this and that is with regard to historic sites generally. I presume this covers Castle Hill and so on and so forth in Placentia. I have had some enquiries, Mr. Chairman, from people in the area

MR. MURPHY: whether they are valid or not, and possibly the hon. minister, being the member for the area, might have received the same request, as to employment possibly for some of the high school students from the Placentia area. Apparently, under the Northern Affairs, these jobs, as guides so on and so forth, are open only to University students. And I am just wondering, in view of the particular need in Placentia area, if we must stick to that, or is it in the minister's power to do something to provide employment for some of these high school students, Grade XI, whose parents have been through the closing of the Base there or the phasing down, and really in need of someone to work? I am just wondering, if the minister will give me some expression on it.

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is well taken. I have been in communication with Mr. Frank Stevens, who is the Federal representative for Historic Sites here, and this very question was discussed, about the possibility of hiring high school graduates in addition to university students.

I understand that some of the guides at Castle Hill have been brought in from other parts of Canada, whereas some of our own high school graduates are just very anxious to do the guides jobs. On the other hand, we may find that some Newfoundland students, University students, are getting similar jobs in other provinces of Canada. But, we are now investigating this point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. WORNELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. the minister if it is the intention of his department, under Historic Sites, to look into the preservation of, some work relating to the preservation of the Historic Site at Conne River? The Micmac Reservation. I think that came up last year, and the minister promised to do something about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which is that?

MR. WORNELL: That is at Conne River, the site of the Micmac Reservation at Bay d'Espoir.

MR. FRECKER: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have been looking

MR. FRECKER: into the situation with regard to the Micmac Indians in the Conne River district. We have had a number of pieces of research done, as a matter of fact, concerning that Micmac Historic Site. There is not just one historic site there, there is an area more I would say around the Conne River. Dr. Florence O'Neil was very interested in that at one time, and Mrs. Stoker at the University spend quite a period researching the Micmac culture for the Department of Provincial Affairs and for the University. I do not just know what progress really we have made with regards to the Micmac culture and, in answering the hon. the member who spoke, on our side, I do not know of any immediate plans, Mr. Chairman, for having an establishment of Historic Sites. We are studying the culture of the Micmacs and endeavouring to come up with something. We have not any definite plans at the moment. I think that is correct.

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just a few marks generally on Historic Sites. I suppose probably one of the best Historic Sites in Newfoundland is St. John's itself. The whole town actually, it has a background filled with history. History of all types. I am wondering, if the minister could advise the committee just what sort of liaison they have with the City of St. John's and the development of this City? Why I ask that question, is that while everyone is very, very pleased to see progress in a city, one of the main attraction which we have here for tourist, and which we are fast losing, is the neatness of the city of St. John's.

St. John's had an atmosphere of its own and an appearance of its own, and it looked something quite different from any other place in North America at one time. But now, in the name of progress, just about everything is torned down. We see St. John's developing into a counterpart of almost any other Canadian city, complete with all the electronics gadgets of noise, site, colour and so on. To some people's eye that may appear to be attractive, but I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that to the average tourist he is not going to bother to spend his hard-earned dollar to come down here to St.

MR. EARLE: John's to see something which he could see in Moncton or Fredrickton or other points west. We are fast losing the very attractive and individualistic items which at one time so earmarked St. John's as being something unusual, very different, and something worth seeing.

Now all of the New Cover Street area which has disappeared into the magnificent City Hall, of which I suppose the City is rightly proud but, to my mind, looks like a replica of the Maginot Line. This is a pity because there is not enough of it preserved in that area to give any of the earmarks or any distinction to the City of St. John's, as it used to be. Now by default, I am afraid our Government and our Department of Provincial Affairs are not being actively enough interested in preserving what we had.

In all towns all over the world there are continuous battles between those who want to preserve and those who want to rebuilt or destroy. Some towns have been particularly successful in combining one with the other. I remember seeing in one particular town in Great Britain, which had a population of approximately the same as St. John's, and that was a very attractive place indeed, because, I think it was, the London Bar, undertook to build a new town in that area, because the pressure within the City of London was so great from population explosion that they had to move people out. When they moved them out into the countryside and to this area, they did a very fine job, they preserved what was there and they built around it. They built a very, very attractive town indeed, and this has happened with a number of the new towns in Great Britain.

Now what we are doing in St. John's is unfortunately tearing down just about everything we have of historic significance, tearing down anything that has anything to do with the past and we are replacing on that same spot something which is modern, perhaps, very useful and very efficient and that sort of thing, but without any particular appeal to our visitors. Given a few more years, as I said earlier, St. John's will look like any other North American city. Perhaps, our younger people will say, that is fine. At least we can all that has past, but, perhaps. I am a bit more conservative

MR. EARLE: in more ways than one.

I would like to retain some of the things which speak to us of the past, because I believe that we have a past worth remembering. And I do not like to see everything just being sacrificed in the name of progress, particularly, to be quite realistic, if in so doing we also lose income. We lose income from the people coming in here, who will not come, as I said, if they are going to see exactly the same thing as they can see other places.

Now this is not shortsighted policy, it is longsighted. We should build so as to attract visitors, we should retain what we have and we should certainly try to remember the past and keep some evidence of it, so that people can see what has happened in Newfoundland in the past and not just be confronted with monuments of progress, as we see them today. Because many cities have learned, to their dismay, that these same monuments of progress create in time an environment in which people do not wish to live, and then they have to hurry out to the suburbs. How many towns in North America have done the same thing, as we are doing here on a smaller scale? That we build and rebuild in the centre; we find that we have a town which is congested, polluted and everything else.

I think there was a letter in the paper tonight ~~only~~, that the town is expanding, but what provision are we making for play space area for our children? The whole thing should be co-ordinated into preservation of our past and a good environment for our future. And while it maybe a job for this City, the Government cannot just shrug that off - this Government is altogether too fond of saying; that is a job for somebody else. In the schools they say it is the denominations. Anything that is at all touchy they say it is the Federal Government's responsibility, and now the Minister of Public Works tells me that what I am talking about is completely a city responsibility.

MR. CHALKER: No, I never said that.

MR. EARLE: He is right to a certain degree, but he is not right to the extent that this Government

MR. EARLE: Extent that this Government cannot take itself away from all of this responsibility. This Government, if it is a Government, should be setting the pace and should be setting an example. Of all places, our Capital City, where we have the greatest population in this Island and have so much to preserve, is one area in which they should be and that particular division should be paying very, very strict attention indeed. Not just confine it to a Signal Hill park or something, it is the whole area, because, people are not just going to be content to come here and go up on Signal Hill on a foggy day when they cannot see anything, they want to roam around our city and see our city and be charmed by it. I would commend to the minister that his division take my words to heart before it is too late to see if some further preservation cannot be done.

HON. DR. FRECKER (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, again I would say that the hon. member is but echoing our own sentiments. For instance, we have spent over \$100 thousand in the past few years on preserving one of the most historic buildings in Newfoundland, I refer to the Colonial Building, and the new archivist Mr. Burn Gill, is doing a magnificent job inside the building in bringing it up to date, where people will be proud to visit that building. I understand, for instance, that when the learned societies are here later this month or early in June, the archivists of Canada are to hold their meetings in our Colonial Building, and I would invite any hon. members of this House to pay a visit to the Colonial Building, which used to be so drab it would make one ashamed to go into it. It is now a building that we can be proud of both inside and outside. I feel that with the support of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, that work will continue and include the exterior grounds, the grounds of that building which could be a tremendous asset to this city. It could be, with that Grecian type of architecture represented in the building, if we had a mosaic floor in front of it, and had beautiful lawns and parterres of flowers, we could really have something that people would consider a joy to visit and to look at. That is one.

Number two, we have acquired, as is well known, the old St. Thomas' Rectory, at a terrific cost, with tremendous help, I might say, from the Federal Government, but still we had to take the initiative in this, and this is going to be a period museum. The building is at the present time being restored, and we hope to send our specialists in this particular field of old time furniture and so on overseas to get period furniture for it so that that museum will be very genuine. Again we have had all kinds of support from the Federal Government with regards to the restoration. They sent down their expert restoration architect last year, Mr. Dalibard, from France, practically the only such specialist in Canada at the present time. Then we have this Signal Hill Historic Park, which is a Federal project, but again it was a historic site in St. John's and it is being preserved and restored. Then the Quidi Vidi Battery, which was done with the help of the 59th. Regiment as a centennial project, is a place that was visited last year, Mr. Chairman, by more than thirty thousand people. That little battery down at Quidi Vidi, and I wager that some of the members of this House have not been down and seen that little battery. On a fine day it is a delight, a delight, even if it was not historical it would be a delight to see the skiffs going out through that little gut, standing on the parapet where the guns are, and are shot, you know, fired for the benefit of visitors when they go down there, it is really something worth doing.

There is a historic trust made up of citizens of St. John's, which is working on making the public conscious of the very thing that the hon. member from Fortune referred to, that St. John's has an atmosphere. St. John's is different, St. John's, how could I express it? The Lord knows an awful lot could be done to improve it both old and new because, there is so much dirt and filth and carelessness around. Nevertheless, behind all that there is a genuine historicity that all our citizens should take an interest in, and this Historic Trust Society is busily

engaged sizing up what buildings have merit, which buildings are older than one hundred years old and so on. They have already, with the help of Provincial Affairs, restored the little Chapel at Quidi Vidi, not completely, and they are negotiating I believe with the Public Libraries Board to see if it can become a suburban library attached to the library system, but at the same time be a preserved building.

There is a genuine movement on foot, Mr. Chairman, it is only beginning, but there is a genuine movement on foot among interested, alert citizens to preserve that quality that is St. John's that is so different from what there is on the mainland. Dr. George Stirling at the university deserves special mention here Mr. Chairman. He has taken a real, real interest in making a catalogue of the historic buildings in the city. We have been in touch with the Federal Government with regards to the National Heritage Foundation, which is making a national survey of buildings over a certain number of years of age with a view to preserving them.

Preserving a building does not necessarily mean, Mr. Chairman, that it has to be put in moth balls. It means that it has to be preserved from being destroyed and it can be leased for laudable purposes, for instance, for a lawyers office or a doctors office, and the architecture of it be preserved and even restored if necessary. We are aware of the problem. We are very deeply interested in it, and as time goes on I hope that we will be able to get more funds. The Federal Government is very interested in this as well as we are, so we have a good strong ally there.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we let this item carry, I would like to make a few suggestions to the minister. Perhaps he has thought of them already. With the rapid decline which is taking place in a lot of the smaller Newfoundland outport settlements, and the encouragement which this Government is giving many times to have people relocate, has the minister ever thought of selecting a settlement somewhere along the northeast coast and preserve it as it was fifty years ago, sixty years

ago, or at least what it is now.

Last year I had the opportunity and the great pleasure to visit Upper Canada Village. Certainly this is something which those people have every right to be proud of. I think we would be derelict in our duty to the history of Newfoundland, and the ingenuity of the people living in the outports if we did not select one of those settlements and preserve it for future generations. The old flakes and the sodded cellars, the garden rock fences and the two-holers if we want to, they are all supposed to have disappeared if we can believe all that emanates from that side of the House. Certainly these are the things that we should be looking at, and I would suggest to the minister that the time is now if it has not already passed. Certainly we cannot wait much longer to preserve one of those settlements and make sure that it is done right.

DR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to see the support that the Government is getting from the hon. members on the other side. About four years ago I believe the hon. Minister of Health and I, in company with the then Director of Historic Resources, Mr. David Webber, were travelling to L'Anse au Meadows to see that marvelous site and on our way back Mr. Webber pointed out to us a number of islands that he had his eye on even at that time to do exactly what the hon. member for Gander is mentioning there. Only yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I happened to be looking at a magazine that may make you smile, it is called "Mademoiselle." It is a very nice magazine, has some nice pictures in it, but it also has some good ideas in it.

MR. MURPHY: What is that, a female "Playboy" is it?

DR. FRECKER: No, no, not quite like "Playboy." In this magazine, there were advertisements and I would just like to mention it here, I am glad to get the opportunity. They were mentioning that in Finland, where you can rent an island for the summer. Say tourists come along and for thirty-five dollars a week a family can rent an island, and have enough

May 3, 1971, Tape 452, Page 5 -- apb

space in a cottage...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

DR. FRECKER: Maintained perhaps by the Government, I am not sure on
the details, where a whole family

MR. FRECKER: can spend a perfect, quite pleasant summer holiday. In other parts of Norway, I believe it is, they have whole sections of deserted villages which are being preserved and converted into summer tourist attraction places, where people can go and hire a cabin, and spend a very pleasant, quite vacation. Now, why not Newfoundland do something similar with some of the Islands that have been vacated? I think, they would make ideal places for people coming from the metropolitan areas, like New York and Toronto, Chicago, who do not want to come to St. John's, especially if St. John's gets too modern, or do not want to go to Halifax, but they would love going out in one of our bays and roughing it a bit.

Talking about the two-holder that the hon. the member referred to, even that was mentioned about the little cabins in Norway. They referred to them as, W.C. outdoors, and no running water, these were attractions. Now cleanliness and the ability to serve people, you know, to put things in ship-shape order, so that when they go there they have everything they need, but they still not having the type of life they have to live in the city. I think Newfoundland has it made to develop a thing like that, with some of the beautiful islands in our magnificent bays.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister's remarks have been very interesting, but he mentioned the Colonial Building. It would be a vast improvement, if that bathtub, that abomination, that last wreck of the fountain that used to spurt down there or squirt, was removed out of it. Now cannot the minister find a few dollars, the Minister of Public Works, this year and at least do the job of removing that over-sized bathtub, then it might be possible to get some people to go into Colonial Building to see what is in there. Because it is not widely known now that there is anything in there. It looks to be a deserted building behind a deserted swimming pool or former swimming pool. I would imagine the number of visitors to the Archives is not very great. So the first thing, if you want to increase the patronage of the Colonial Building, the first thing is to take away that monument to the Premier's foresight and initiative, which is that fountain that was put in front of the Colonial Building. I do not know

MR. CROSBIE: how many years ago now, but it was one of the Premier's brainwaves, ten, twelve or fourteen years ago. That has got to be removed this year, along with the removal of the Premier. The rust really gets somewhere in this Province, on the historic sites and otherwise.

Now, I do not think the minister, or at least I have not heard him say who the Director of Historic Sites is now. Who has replaced Mr. Webber.

MR.-FRECKER: Mr. Disher.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Fisher is it?

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Disher. D I S -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, yes, that is right. Oh, yes, I think, I have met him, Mr. Disher. Could the minister

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I do not think, so.

MR. FRECKER: He is a war vet.

MR. CROSBIE: In connection with this Historic Sites, could the minister tell us what is happening now at L'Anse-au-Meadows? Is L'Anse-au-Meadows now taken over - the Government of Canada announced, I believe, they were recognizing it is a National Historic Site, and also the area in Port au Choix. That was announced last year. What has actually happened since these announcements were made? And what has actually taken place at L'Anse-a-Meadows? The last time I was there -

MR. SMALLWOOD: L'Anse-au-Meadows.

MR. CROSBIE: I call it Lanse-a-Meadows. That name will do me. The last time I was there, it was about two years ago, at that time there was some kind of a queer looking building over the excavation there, there was no watch man around, so I could not get in. I did not see too much of it.

MR. ROBERTS: I had it fixed before that.

MR. CROSBIE: I have the hon. minister fixed, all the delegates from St. Anthony, deserted the hon. minister that particular time. And they are still deserting him, so if the hon. the minister will tell us what is happening in L'Anse-au-Meadows, and Port au Choix. It is inexplicable, it is just about eleven o'clock, so I will finish up by saying, yes, I will accept that

MR. CROSBIE: invitation. If I could run in more than one district at once I would gladly do it.

Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing to me that the Federal Government is so insensitivity to the needs and the requirements of the people of Placentia, that the Historic Sites Branch, the Castle Hill Park, are actually employing guides for the summer down at Castle Hill who are not even from the Placentia area. I think that is the matter the minister referred to. And I am sure that the minister must be going all out in his representations to the Federal Government to change that. I mean it is the idea of bringing in people from the mainland to go to Castle Hill to act as guides for the summer, when there are a few, some hundred, unemployed in Placentia - it is just so ludicrous, as almost to make one weep. I am sure that the minister, when he heard the news, just about lost his teeth from gnashing them, or I would assume that he did.

I am sure the House would be interested when it finds out just what is happening. To my mind they should be taken and ridden out on a rail, if anyone appeared on the Castle Hill to act as a guide who is not from the Placentia area.

It is eleven o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall I carry?

MR. CROSBIE: No, not yet, I asked the minister for some certain information.

MR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I could -

MR. CROSBIE: It is eleven o'clock, and this item can wait over until tomorrow, so we can hear this information properly. It is eleven o'clock.

MR. FRECKER: Well, I am at your service, Mr. Chairman.

On Motion, that the Committee rise report having passed Heading III - Executive Council, all items, Heading V - Provincial Affairs, items 501 to 522.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

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

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns it will adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 11:00 A.M.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, that motion to adjourn I would like to move an amendment that in view of the heavy work schedule on us people, we have put it forward many, many times that when the House does adjourn it will adjourn until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow afternoon. I make that as an amendment to the Motion, proposed by the hon. Leader of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question on the Amendment?

MR. CROSBIE: A question on the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the Amendment. It is unreasonable for the House to meet three sessions a day. We met today from 11:00 to 11:00, and then to be asked again to meet again tomorrow at 11:00 A.M. through to 11:00 P.M. tomorrow night, and for members on this side to be able to carry out their duties. Mr. Speaker-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! These debates on the adjournment, there can be questions asked but motions for the adjournment are not debatable. I would also point out too that the hon. the member for St. John's West has already had a motion today, that the House meet at 11:00 A.M. Is the House ready for the question?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Speaker, out of the blue, takes the opportunity to say what the hon. the Speaker knows full well, that was rather than meeting tonight from 8:00 to 11:00. What is the relevancy of the Speaker's comment? There is no relevance.

MR. SPEAKER: The relevance is this, that the House had already decided that they would not meet. If we want to get technical, there was a motion at 6:00 P.M. that this House would not meet at 11:00 A.M. tomorrow.

On Motion Amendment lost.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, 1971, at 11:00 A.M.