



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 11

VERBATIM REPORT

Thursday, February 22, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

February 22, 1973

Tape no. 269

Page 1 - MRW

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Recording System breakdown.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have now learned one or two facts about this particular lady. We are told by the (Acting) Premier that she was hired in November.

MR. HICKMAN: On or about November 1.

MR. NEARY: What was that again? I did not get that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: On or about November 1.

MR. NEARY: On or about November 1, the hon. (Acting) Premier tells us that this particular lady was hired. He also told us that she is receiving \$8,000 a year. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. (Acting) Premier if he would tell us just what it is, exactly what it is this lady does for her \$8,000 a year? What kind of a job does she have?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: As I suggested before the short interruption, the honourable lady had been seconded from the Premier's Office to my office right now, in the sense that she is on the payroll of the Office of the Premier. She will be on my department's payroll in the coming fiscal year. She is presently doing research. She is presently doing an inventory for me of the physically handicapped. She is going to provide a liaison with the volunteer organizations and agencies, charitable and noncharitable organizations. We are hoping that she will be able to provide some contact with regard to placement of physically handicapped people and help out in that area and she will also be doing some work with regard to a study we are doing in the Division of Recreation with regard to recreation for the mentally handicapped children.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The lady to whom we are referring, Mr. Chairman

perhaps the honourable minister could indicate whether this lady, who I do not know from Eve, but is she qualified in child welfare or does she have qualifications in the field of dealing with retarded children, i.e., or handicapped children of any kind? Also what is she called? What is her job? The minister might also be able to tell us what she is going to be classified as once his department comes on stream? Why does not the payment for her salary come out of the honourable minister's division, which is a division which previously existed and which now exists? Why do they not pay her out of that, all this kind of a thing, Mr. Chairman, just to try to clear up

the relative strangeness of the whole episode. Also is she on a fee for service basis, for example? She is being paid \$8,000 a year, is this a one year contract?

MR. ROBERTS: Have we any assurance it is not going to be negotiated retroactively?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Right. Well, that question would seem to apply with just about everybody who has been taken on in the past six months or a year. This type of a question, I mean does she have tenure? Is she an established civil servant as it used to be understood? Does she have pension rights? How does she fit into the public service of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Her classification right now is generally a research analyst in my department. She is on a contractual basis with the government. She is not a civil service employee. She is not paid, to the best of my knowledge, a fee for service and her total salary is her salary of \$8,000.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Chairman, another question. Is there a contract between the government and this lady or is she there at sufferance? Can she be flicked out by the government tomorrow, say? I mean any civil servant theoretically can get that fate although it does not very often happen but is she in an even more tenuous position than your ordinary civil servant? Was there a public competition held for her position? Perhaps the minister would like to deal with those questions.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As I suggested to the hon. member for White Bay South, she is on a contractual basis and as many times as the hon. member asks that question he is going to get the same answer because that is the situation.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Does she have a contract?

MR. ROUSSEAU: She has a verbal contract with government.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): A verbal contract. A contract normally has an amount stated and we have heard that but it usually has a term as well. Is there a term to this particular contract? Does it end at the end of this fiscal year? Is it indefinite? Is it open-ended? What are the terms of the contract? Perhaps the hon. minister would like, well he says it is verbal, is there any memorandum of the contract and if so would he care to table it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would think that her -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Table a memorandum of the verbal contract, Now Mr. Chairman, let us not have legal advice from the member for Bonavista South.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would think that a verbal contract for one year would be much similar to those other people who have one year contracts.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): One year, is it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: One year, I would think.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Is the minister responsible for his department, Mr. Chairman, or not? Who answers for the employee he is talking about?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay, one year.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Well, she maybe surprised to hear that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But anyway, -

MR. ROBERTS: The minister maybe surprised when the hon. Premier hears it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman,

You know, I am quite willing to answer any sensible question posed by the opposition, quite willing but let us not start playing the games tonight and try and ruin a persons name like he did this afternoon. Okay.

There are points to be raised. I accept these points. They are well taken and I am ready to stand up here and answer every question that I can answer, as accurately as I can

MR. NEARY: Could I ask the honourable minister another sensible question if that is what he is looking for, Mr. Chairman. On December 15th, 1972, from a press release from the honourable the Premier, department of the office of the Premier, dated issued December 15th, 1972. Release time and date immediate.

"A news story broadcasted this morning stated that a new assistant, Mrs. Terry Neary, was recently hired by Premier Moores at a salary of \$15,000 a year. This is an incorrect statement and the Premier said that she was hired at secretarial pay to do research work for the government on handicapped people and rehabilitation. It is intended that she will work in the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation, under the honourable Joseph Rousseau, as soon as his new department is set up." The Premier said that she was hired at secretarial pay. Will the honourable minister tell us how many secretaries in his department are getting \$8,000 a year or is this to be the new salary for secretaries in the honourable minister's department?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There are at least fifteen or twenty in the civil service.

MR. ROBERTS: Name two. Name two. Would the honourable gentleman name two? What does the minister's private secretary get?

MR NEARY: \$6612.

MR ROBERTS: Come on, name them. Identify.

a half dozen in the whole civil service. The lady who is the Premier's secretary would get \$8,160.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The lady who is my secretary but is not the same person who was my secretary when the last estimates came out has resigned from the civil service.

MR. ROBERTS: Miss Betty Duff, she was the former private secretary to the Premier of this province and presumably the administration carry on her on...

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Her salary is identical, which is the usual case.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, agreed, and a gentlemanly and a decent thing it is to do and I commend it. She is a very fine secretary indeed, a very fine secretary, a very fine lady. Name some others now or identify...

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, I am not at liberty to do that

MR. ROBERTS: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that no secretaries are paid \$8,000 a year, this is straight political patronage.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is one...

MR. ROBERTS: One! There is one now and may I ask the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you saying that there is a limit on the salaries to be paid to secretaries?

MR. ROBERTS: Of course not: With this crowd there is no limit on anything. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would indicate, he is obviously not going to deal with the secretaries question and the gentleman from St. Mary's did not know what he was talking about, but could the minister give us his assurance please, as the minister to whom this lady it to be responsible, Mrs. Neary, that she will not get a retroactive adjustment in pay in the course - and I am going to ask that question, Mr. Chairman, on every position in the estimates. If there are 20,000 positions, I am prepared to ask it every time unless the government will give me an assurance that there will be no more of this retroactive - and I know much more than I can say, I wish I could say it, I wish I could say.

Will the minister give us the assurance please, with respect

to Mrs. Neary?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the honourable gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to the lady's qualifications.

The honourable Premier said in a press release that she was hired at a secretarial salary. Will the honourable minister tell us if the lady can type, if she can take shorthand, if she has any background for research on physically handicapped, mentally retarded children. What her experience is, what qualifications the lady has for this particular job. Is there anybody in the minister's department presently on the payroll qualified to do that kind of work that would like to get a promotion?

MR. ROBERTS: Were there public calls for applications?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The answer to your question is yes.

MR. NEARY: The answer to what is yes?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The questions you asked.

MR. NEARY: I asked the...

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes she can type, yes she can take shorthand.

MR. NEARY: I asked the minister to inform this committee if the lady could type -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes she can type.

MR. NEARY: Can she take shorthand?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. NEARY: What is her background for doing research on physically handicapped and mentally retarded children?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The lady is working with people who are doing research

MR. ROUSSEAU: She is co-ordinating, gathering information. She is gathering information from different sources for my office.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister expand on that a little please, Mr. Chairman. If she is no longer a research assistant, as we were first - it is like the Minister of Justice, as we get deeper into it, its gets "curiouser and curiouser," as the Mad Hatter said. Would the gentleman please expand on it? What research is she co-ordinating? She is no longer research assistant, it turns out. Now she is a co-ordinator of research assistants. Would the gentleman expand please?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not say that. I say she was co-ordinating research, that does not make research co-ordinator.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh I see. Excuse me. Well would the honourable gentleman dilate upon her duties please?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have already told you and I will tell you again what her present duties are -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a Point of Order, I got tripped up on this the other day, and if I am going to get tripped up, let the gentleman from Labrador play the game too. He cannot call us "you", we have to be "honourable gentlemen". I stretches myself to think of some of them, but anyway it is okay.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Far be it from me to infer the honourable gentlemen are not honourable.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, whatever the honourable gentleman wants.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable gentleman's words, we will let the people of this province judge that.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Anytime the administration want, and no Bill Saunders this year. Anytime. The Premier will get a dissolution anytime he asks for it. He will not have to ask three times this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well George McLean is obviously going to be available.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Presently the lady is co-ordinating research, to me that does not connote the term research co-ordinator.

MR. ROBERTS: Plays football but is not a football player.

MR. MARSHALL: On a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition cannot abide by good plain manners he can abide by the rules of this House and allow the honourable minister to speak in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. The honourable member has the right to be heard in silence and provocative remarks from either side of the House tend to disrupt the good order of the House -

MR. ROBERTS: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not finished speaking. If honourable members wish to speak and interject remarks, they would do so but rising in their place to a Point of Order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. I accept the ruling humbly. I assume that Your Honour will make sure that it applies to all members without the attention being drawn from now on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The impartiality of the Chair has not been challenged before and indubitably the Chair will be impartial.

MR. NEARY: Maybe I am not making myself clear to the honourable minister, but would he please tell the Committee what qualifications this lady has for this particular type of work? Did she work at it before? What experience does she have?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I appreciate the honourable member's deep and personal concern. The lady has been involved in a number of voluntary organizations. She has worked with very many of these organizations. Formally she has

no training, if you want to put it that way. But I think the honourable member will accept the fact, I do not know whether he agrees with it or not, but I do not always think that a person with a lot of normal formal training necessarily can do a job. This is a department that was created with a special emphasis on the physically handicapped and the mentally handicapped of this province and the need for a person who can appreciate the needs of these people was apparent. In my estimation this lady has an appreciation of the needs of these people and that makes her qualified.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable minister would name the organizations that this lady was associated with that makes her qualified for this position.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable minister does -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Has the honourable gentleman the right to be heard in silence, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we have been listening for the last two or three hours to repetition upon repetition and Mrs. Neary in my view has now been discussed quite enough. The honourable minister does not have to give the list, the voluntary organizations that she belong to or did not belong to. This government have seen fit to appoint Mrs. Neary to a post of research assistant, particular responsibility in rehabilitation. She will do far more in that job than the honourable gentleman's, some of his appointments did when he was Minister of Welfare, including his friend Al Green, whom the honourable minister had as his executive assistant, getting \$5,000 a year while he was also employed in a full-time civil service job. Now you know anyone's patience can crack under this constant repetition. We believe Mrs. Neary to be capable of doing the piece of work that she has been given to do. If she turns out not being capable of doing it, her contract will not be

renewed. She is a far finer appointment than many of the honourable gentleman had made.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I really do not give a hoot for the honourable gentleman's opinion that Mrs. Neary has been discussed long enough. I know the honourable gentleman arrogantly thinks that if he says something is okay, it is okay. But we have as much right to be in this House as any honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would you please ask the honourable gentleman opposite to hear me in silence? Mr. Chairman, do the rules protect all members equally?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rules do protect all members equally and of course the Leader of the Opposition has the right to be heard in silence. The fact of the matter is that this matter has been debated at length and repetitions of arguments are going to result in indignation from either side of the House then. If the honourable members would abide by the suggestion, it is getting close to the time to move on to other matters.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect, Sir. It is not repetition. My colleague asked a question, it was

February 22, 1973

Tape no. 275

Page 1 - MRW

Mr. Roberts.

the first time that that question had been asked. The question grew out of remarks made by the honourable minister. Now if the honourable gentleman, Sir, does not wish to answer the question, of course, that is his right. We cannot make him answer a question. We may then make some comments on his refusal to answer a question. That is surely within the rules, Sir. As I understand committee, the rules of the committee are that the committee may debate. Am I correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister may refuse to answer questions -

MR. ROBERTS: Of course! If the minister does not want to say even one or two of the voluntary organizations in which Mrs. Neary has been, even the Progressive Conservative Party, a voluntary organization in which she has been active -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If an honourable minister decides that an answer is not warranted, then that is not commented upon by the person who asked the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that is the first time in my life - I have been in this House now seven years, Sir, and I sat in those galleries three or four years more -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is talking about questions on Orders of the Day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Come on, Your Honour may be speaking of questions on the Order Paper or a minister's refusal but not in committee, Sir. Committee is this government or any government coming before the House -

MR. CROSBIE: You are giving the ruling now, are you?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not! Does the Chair want us to wait while the committee adjourn while Your Honour gives the ruling?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Carry on!

MR. ROBERTS: I will carry on, if the Chairman will keep people quiet. The hon. gentleman from St. John's West, is he going to obey the rules or are the rules only against this side? Is that what they want, Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLLINS: We have been sitting here for four hours.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman from Gander can sit there for forty-four hours, he might learn something.

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: You can learn how loathsome -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable gentleman calling any of us lonesome?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention of all honourable members that we are discussing head of expenditure, III, Executive Council, and we have now digressed into an academic discussion on the rules of order which is not the order of business we are supposed to be discussing.

MR. ROBERTS: Has Your Honour ruled that we cannot comment upon the refusal of the minister to answer a question? I am not sure if that is the ruling of the Chair or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a hypothetical question.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not hypothetical, Sir. I wish to comment upon the honourable gentleman's refusal to answer the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable minister has not refused to answer the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, then I will put the question again at the risk of repetition. Would the honourable gentleman, the member for Labrador West, the minister designate (I am not sure what portfolio he holds) recreation and rehabilitation -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Rehabilitation and recreation.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry - rehabilitation and recreation. I humbly

Mr. Roberts.

beg the honourable gentleman's pardon.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Do not be so sarcastic.

MR. ROBERTS: Me be sarcastic? Not after the honourable gentleman's performance tonight, Mr. Chairman. I would not dream of being sarcastic.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, the hon. gentleman from Burgeo always has something to add, it is too bad he does not act. I wonder if the honourable minister, Sir, would indicate some of the organizations to which the lady in question belongs and for whom she has worked on a voluntary basis? The importance of the question, it goes without saying, is that the honourable gentleman has brought it forth as part of the justification for his decision or the administration's decision to appoint this lady to a position.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable gentleman does not have the list of organizations. The honourable gentleman will certainly get the list and you may have the information at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the honourable gentleman undertake to table the list in the House, please, Sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, the honourable gentleman will table a list in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: That is ... decent of him, Sir. I am grateful. I wonder if the Minister of Justice has yet the information he agreed to table this afternoon, relevant to Dr. Peters?

MR. HICKMAN: What did I agree to table this afternoon?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman agreed to table the Order-in-Council of October 12.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman agreed.

MR. HICKMAN: On the contrary.

MR. ROBERTS: On the contrary, the honourable gentleman did.

He may have changed his mind.

MR. HICKMAN: On the contrary.

MR. ROBERTS: Let the Hansard be sent for.

MR. HICKMAN: Let the Hansard be sent for?

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman also undertood -

MR. HICKMAN: Let the Hansard be sent for?

MR. ROBERTS: Right! Let it be sent for. The honourable gentleman also - do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKMAN: You will have -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman also undertook to table the contract of employment between Dr. Peters and Her Majesty's Administration. Now he did undertake to do that, Sir. If the honourable gentleman doubts it - now he may have changed his mind, that is fair enough. Maybe the big meeting that was held in this building after 6:00 P.M., maybe he changed his mind but if so, let him say so. Has he the information which he undertook to table, Sir?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I read the Order-in-Council or the Minute-in-Council of October 12, 1972. I have no intention of tabling the Order-in-Council. I have no intention of tabling any contract. I have given

the information at my disposal and all the information that is available and that is all I have.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. This afternoon he undertook -

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman has not changed his mind at all.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. He did undertake this afternoon to table certain documents and if he does not wish to table them now that is fine, let it be judged. Obviously again, Sir, there is something to hide. When people will not table information, Mr. Chairman, there is something to hide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will please be reminded we are discussing Head of Expenditure 111 - Executive Council and Head of Expenditure 11 - Legislative was passed this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would Your Honour please expound on the ruling? I was referring to remarks on Head 111 this afternoon. What did I say that led to an out of order ruling? I mean was I out of order, Your Honour? I was referring to remarks made on Head 111 this afternoon by the hon. gentleman. Could Your Honour please tell me where I went wrong?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can get back to the hon. member for Labrador West down there or the hon. acting Premier. I do not care who answers the questions. We are told by the ministers that this lady was hired on or about November 1 and the minister admitted that he was not sworn in until sometime in December -

MR. ROBERTS: December 1.

MR. NEARY: December 1, so obviously the minister knew nothing at all about the hiring of this particular lady and what the terms of her contract were. He will not admit it but obviously he did not know anything about it. But what I would like to ask the minister is what

this lady did in between the time she was hired and the time she was transferred to the minister's department? Where was her office located and what did she do during that time?

MR. ROUSSEAU: In reply to your question, she was doing at that time the same things that she is doing now.

MR. NEARY: For whom was she doing it, Mr. Chairman, because there was no minister at that particular time?

MR. ROUSSEAU: For the same person then as she is doing it for now, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, in which the rehabilitation unit is contained.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister answer the second part of my question and inform the committee where the office of this particular lady was located.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think the hon. member knows quite well where the office of the lady was located.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not know where it was located. I want the hon. minister to tell the committee.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman. I would like to offer some explanation. I have sat and listened to this silly, stupid kind of questioning. This innuendo and inference of all kinds of things that appear to the hon. gentleman from Bell Island to be wrong, it gets to the point where one cannot take any more of it, Sir. Maybe we should tell him some things which he knows but which he will not admit because he has a way of knowing a whole lot of things, that is in relation to the Department of Social Services.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Now if you want the information shut up and listen. Are you going to shut your mouth and listen until you get it?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: May I have a ruling, Your Honour?

MR. ROWE(W.N.): To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman knows that he is out of order and that he cannot say that sort of thing. He should be asked by the Chair to withdraw, number one and number two, Sir. Your Honour has already ruled against irrelevancy during this debate this afternoon and tonight. May we have the same ruling against the hon. gentleman as he is warbling on there about something that has no relation to Head 111.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman -

MR. HICKEY: I offered some information as the former Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, my hon. friend across the way might have forgotten but I did not. I was minister when this lady was hired and I am offering to give some information as to why she was hired,

where her office is and the purpose for which she was hired and the work she is going to do. Now, does the member for Bell Island want that information? Can he contain himself? Can he just be quite till we give it? Shoot, I would not take a chance on that because my aim might be too good.

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Neary was hired, according to my information, my discussions with the Premier, because the Premier is particularly interested in the people and the children who are retarded throughout this province, people who are disabled in this province, none of whom we have a register or record on today. If this lady does nothing else but bring to this government an accurate record and registry of every retarded person in this province, disabled person in this province, then she will have darn well earned her salary, something which the former minister did nothing about while he was minister for three years but now all of the sudden he finds so much wrong with this appointment. As I understand it, this is some of the work that this lady is to do apart from the co-ordination of the voluntary organizations in an effort to make life a little more tolerable and pleasant and to bring as many retarded children who are in care of the government at this time and who will be coming into care and to place them in a home setting.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the opposition would find so much fault in this kind of an appointment. Is there anyone in this province who needs more attention, who are deserving of more attention than the disabled and the retarded? Is the member for Bell Island, is the Leader of the Opposition or in fact all the members on the other side against this kind of new approach to the disabled, the retarded? Is that it?

Maybe Mrs. Neary, when she is finished with the rest of the people in the province, might look in the opposition to complete that registry.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable minister for the information but I am afraid that the honourable minister must have misunderstood what this is all about. We are in committee of the whole Sir, to discuss certain headings under Supplementary Supply and to get information. I do not recall anybody on this side of the House criticizing the appointment. We are only trying to find out what it is all about.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is what I told you.

MR. NEARY: Then the honourable minister launches into an attack on the opposition for being against retarded children. Well, Sir, I want to say to the honourable minister and the honourable Minister of Rehabilitation that there are any number of employees in the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation and Social Services, any number of employees who have many years of experience in dealing with child welfare and retarded children and physically handicapped children who would be very happy, Sir, to take that particular position for \$8,000 a year and are a lot more qualified than this particular lady. They did not get the chance, Sir.

This is the kind of appointment that demoralizes the department.

MR. HICKEY: It is hard to listen to this kind of garbage. Why did the honourable minister not take some action when he was minister for three years?

MR. NEARY: I have the floor.

MR. HICKEY: Put up or shut up. Get off with this nonsense.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, obviously the minister is making a fool of himself, as he usually does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When honourable members rise on points of order, they should rise on points of order rather than on points of debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was looking for information. We want to find out why this particular lady was selected for this job, what her qualifications were, how the Premier or the minister arrived at her salary. That is all we want to know, Sir. We are not against retarded children.

The former administration did more for mentally retarded children in this province than that crowd over there will do.

MR. NEARY: What about Exon House? What about Halfway House? We will come to Exon House later, Sir. We will find out how the staff over there were demoralized for the very same reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member keep it in mind that we are discussing Heading III - The Executive Council. It is getting pretty close to being probably irrelevant at the present time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister was allowed to make his statements and the honourable Minister of Finance was allowed to make his, so I have a right to comment on what they said. The honourable minister who just took his seat was going to tell me but he did not tell me where Mrs. Neary's office was located? Now I am going to ask the honourable minister again. Where was the office located?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry, I did not mean to be sarcastic, if I sounded that way because if I recall last week in the House the honourable member for Bell Island indeed said where the lady's office was. So I thought you knew it. In case you did not, it is the eighth floor.

MR. NEARY: The eighth floor.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You mentioned last week in this House.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, all I said last week was that I saw this particular lady two weeks ago use a key to the Premier's private elevator to get up to a floor, I do not know what floor the lady went to. Now the honourable minister tells us the eighth floor. Now will the honourable minister tell us if anybody else occupied that particular office?

MR. ROUSSEAU: That question is beyond my competence to answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let the Acting Premier answer it, if the honourable minister does not know because this is before his time. Did anybody else occupy this particular office on the eighth floor?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh! the honourable Leader of the Opposition occupied it with a great deal of distinction for a couple of years, Mr. Chairman, there were all sorts of gentlemen. There was one gentleman there who worked for a whole year preparing membership cards for the Liberal Party.

Then when he finished, well I am not competent to comment on who occupied it for the next two years. The office, since this administration took over the office was occupied first by - what was her name?

AN HON. MEMBER: Miss Feaver.

MR. HICKMAN: Miss Feaver, was it? Is that her name?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: When she vacated the office my recollection is that Mrs. Neary moved in, when Mrs. Neary vacated the office, Mr. Gerry Korbai moved in, he is there all by himself sitting behind that small little desk.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, now would the honourable Acting Premier tell us when Miss Feaver vacated the office?

MR. ROBERTS: To further that, Mr. Chairman, is Miss Feaver still on the payroll of the public treasury of this province? If so, what does she do and may I ask where she does it? This is Head III, she was on Head III.

MR. HICKMAN: She is not on the payroll under Head III of that I can assure you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well has she left the government service?

MR. HICKMAN: I think so. But you will have to address that question to some of the other ministers because it is not in my department.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Chairman, I will address it, if the honourable minister will tell me to whom I should address it. But she was paid out of this head, the list tabled last year by the Premier. By the way another question, is the Premier, you know, if he is still Premier what has happened? Is he going to be around? Is he gone away?

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable Premier is gone away, he left this evening, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition has heard, by the press, to meet with Premier Bourassa.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not hear it by the press. The only thing that

I know about the Premier, as I was coming out of Elizabeth Towers his driver was sitting there -

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: - saying he was going to take the Lord and Master to the airport.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. He has now gone.

MR. ROBERTS: He was waiting for him to come home at seven o'clock.

MR. HICKMAN: He has gone to Quebec to meet with Premier Bourassa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the honourable Acting Premier will inform the committee if they keep attendance records on the eighth floor?

MR. HICKMAN: No, I have not the foggiest idea.

MR. NEARY: Well could the honourable Acting Premier find out? Because I have a very good reason for asking that question.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and further would the honourable Acting Premier while he is at it find out when Miss Feaver left the payroll, if she is left? When she left? And what her duties were? Again we have reasons for asking.

MR. HICKMAN: I am sure you have all kinds of reasons, with great sinister thoughts. Mr. Chairman, Miss Feaver, my understanding was that she was the secretary on the staff of the Premier and was responsible primarily for looking after district mail and doing the typing for whomever, I presume then it was the honourable Minister of Tourism, was then his secretary. She was primarily the secretary to the then parliamentary assistant to the Premier.

Other than that, I did not check on her.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable acting Premier...

MR. HICKMAN: I have not seen her around this building, Mr. Chairman since October or...

MR. ROBERTS: Not seeing her around the building does not mean that she was not on the payroll, that is the point of it.

MR. HICKMAN: She is not on the payroll now.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask when she left? We have not seen her around the building either, Mr. Chairman, that is the point of asking.

MR. HICKMAN: I will undertake and this is a firm undertaking, I will find out for the Leader of the Opposition the date that Miss Feaver went off the payroll.

MR. NEARY: Could we get that information, Mr. Chairman, before we pass over this subject?

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask what department she has been transferred to.

AN HON. MEMBER: I understand it is the Department of Tourism.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the gentleman of tourism, the Minister of Tourism designate, tell us if she has been transferred to his department?

MR. DOYLE: Yes, that is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Are we talking about tourism now, Your Honour?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no tourism.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no head for tourism, there is no head under which the honourable gentleman is being paid - I do not know where he is being paid.

MR. DOYLE: I stand corrected and I will say that she has been transferred to the Department of Economic Development.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! Well, we will come to that head in due course.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have another minister in on the act, all trying to cover up for the honourable the Premier. Fools rush in where...

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order! I have been sitting here all day listening to this nonsense, covering for this one - we are

not suggesting the House is being misled because we cannot suggest that. The implications are there and I am sure that the honourable the member for Labrador South will agree with me when I say that this type of imputation, this consistent and persistent attack on persons like Mrs. Neary, is the sort of thing that I suspect the Leader of the New Labrador Party, the honourable the member for Labrador South was referring to in his outstanding speech the other day.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, (a), that is no point of order and secondly, who does the honourable the Minister of Justice think he is? No attack was made on anybody. We have been trying for an hour, less whatever time the committee rose because of the microphone business, to get some information that is all. As for this afternoon, there was no - I had an agitated call, indirectly, from Dr. Peters. Ah ha! What was he told? Ah ha! He is being attacked. I do not know what the honourable gentleman - if he told him anything.

MR. HICKMAN: I have not seen him.

MR. ROBERTS: There was no imputation made. If the honourable gentleman thinks there were some charges, let him state it. I could make a charge but I will not. I could make a charge about that interesting contract, that \$28,000 that was negotiated retroactively.

AN HON. MEMBER: Innuendo again.

MR. ROBERTS: Not innuendo. I said I could make a charge and I said that I would not.

MR. HICKMAN: Why do you not? Kiddy stuff.

MR. ROBERTS: Kiddy stuff? Will the honourable gentleman set up a select committee and hear witnesses under oath? I will make the charges then if they will hear witnesses under oath. Let us see, Let us see.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable Minister for Tourism tell us when that particular lady joins his staff? At what date Miss Feaver joins his staff?

MR. DOYLE: I do not believe that is relevant to the present discussion.

MR. NEARY: It is relevant to it.

MR. DOYLE: It is not, it is not -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that up to the past week this lady was paid from the subhead Executive Council and that is why I want to confirm the date that she was transferred from the Premier's office to the Department of Economic Development. The honourable minister knows. Why does he not tell the committee.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the honourable gentleman wants that information he can put a question on the Order Paper and get it. We do not have the information here tonight to say when somebody was appointed or on what date somebody was transferred and it is not the function here on supplementary supply to have at hand every detail of information like that.

If a question is put on the Order Paper, we can get the information. We do not know when Miss Feaver was transferred, whether it was one week ago, two weeks ago or two months or what exact date. How can we?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, the honourable the Minister of Finance may not know, but surely the Minister Designate of Tourism knows.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister does not, how can he?

MR. ROBERTS: The lady is apparently working for him.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order. The point of issue here is that the Executive Council is seeking supplementary supply. The honourable the Acting Premier has indicated the various heads concerned for which we are seeking supplementary supply. We are not seeking supplementary supply with respect to the provision of any salary for the lady in question, Miss Feaver. We are not trying to hide anything. As the honourable the Minister of Finance said, these questions are readily ascertainable by placing the questions on the Order Paper.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the inquiry extraneous to

what we are seeking monies for now are irrelevant and it is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the honourable the Acting Premier earlier if there was a record of attendance for the employees on the eight floor and the honourable Acting Premier indicated that there probably was. Sir, I wonder if the honourable the Acting Premier would send to the eight floor now and have that record of attendance brought here before the committee.

MR. HICKMAN: No I will not.

MR. CROSBIE: Who is down there now to get it?

MR. NEARY: Get the janitor to get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we have been all afternoon trying to get some sensible debate on this bill before the House. I agree with the honourable gentleman from St. John's East that perhaps we are straying just a little bit off course. I am very much interested in the kind of questions that my colleagues here are raising and I am sure that there are ways of getting the answers to these questions.

I see no reason why we should have to sit here all night debating points which could be brought up in a much more orderly fashion. I believe that there is a way of getting on with the debate in this House without resorting to obstruction.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, as we were saying about Head III, the item or the Head under debate, let me first of all ask whether any money is to be paid out of this Head to Mr. Robert Nutbeem Esquire of Harbour Grace?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask then out of what Head it is to be paid, please?

MR. CROSBIE: It is not paid to him here, it is paid when next year's estimates are given.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Finance - it has been

announced that Mr. Nutbeem is now on staff, on salary, from where is he being paid in this fiscal year, please? It may not be Head III but I just want to know where we can debate it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Robert Nutbeem has no connection whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, with the Executive Council. None, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota, not a feather, no connection whatsoever. There is no money in executive council for Mr. Robert Nutbeem and therefore the question is quite irrelevant at this stage.

If the honourable gentleman wants to put it on the order paper, he will find out if he is being paid for this year and from what vote. He is not being paid from executive council, it has no connection with it and it quite irrelevant here.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if the honourable gentleman is so arrogant as to even refuse to indicate what department the Premier's brother-in-law is paid out of, we will ask upon each Head.

MR. CROSBIE: Good.

MR. ROBERTS: And we will get a no or yes answer.

MR. CROSBIE: Proper thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Right! Right! Right on! How they have changed.

Let us ask about Mr. George Hutchings of Corner Brook.

MR. CROSBIE: What about him?

MR. ROBERTS: What about him, that is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, what about him?

MR. ROBERTS: Let us have perhaps the Acting Premier or (I suppose it is Acting Premier if the Premier is out of the Province) what ever title - the Minister of Justice, the President of the Council, when was Mr. Hutchings appointed? Obviously he is being paid out of this subhead. Was his predecessor, Mr. Ed Kearsy, a gentleman known to the gentleman from Labrador South, what was Mr. Ed Kearsy paid and is Mr. Hutchings paid the same salary? May I also ask whether the job Mr. Hutchings has was advertised or whether, I am not saying it should have been, I am asking whether it was and perhaps the Acting Premier could also tell me

whether Mrs. Neary's job was advertised or whether she was 'plucked out of the blue' as it were, Sir? That should do on Mr. Hutchings to start with.

MR. HICKMAN: Mrs. Neary's job was not advertised. Mr. Hutchings' job was that of executive assistant to the Premier in the Corner Brook office or whatever title it carries out there. It was not advertised. Mr. Jerry Korbai's job was not advertised and Mr. Hutchings was engaged in either September or October. His salary is \$15,000 a year. I do not know what Mr. Kearsey's salary was, but I feel reasonably certain it was not more than \$15,000 a year.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is quite aware that executive assistants, obviously those are not jobs that you advertise.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, one can or cannot advertise and I am not saying one should advertise, I am merely trying to find out if one did. Can somebody, perhaps the member from Ferryland, who was parliamentary assistant to the Premier until his move into the cabinet as a minister, could he tell us please - I am looking through the salary estimates and I do not see - I see an executive assistant listed at \$19,000 a year. I do not know if that was Mr. Kearsey or not, but again, Mr. Chairman, it is paid out of Head III. The honourable gentlemen are asking for more supply for Head III so it is a relevant question.

MR. HICKMAN: The \$19,000 in the estimates for the executive assistant I think at the time it was paid, I think the first executive assistant the Premier had is now the honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. ROBERTS: It could have been.

MR. HICKMAN: That salary as I understand it was voted for the office in St. John's. I do not know...

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, at the time this was

MR. ROBERTS: voted the honourable gentleman -

MR. HICKMAN: Who was a member of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: A member of the House, yes. It is for expenditure from the 1st. of April -

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, might I clarify that situation for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Not for me you cannot.

MR. EARLE: You asked a question and I will answer it.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not ask the honourable member for Fortune Bay.

MR. EARLE: I think it would stand clarification. In the October election, as all members know, I was defeated as the member for Fortune Bay. The Premier asked me, because of my experience in politics, to join his staff, which I did for a period of three or four months, up until the next election. I was paid during those three or four months at the rate of \$19,000 a year. I imagine that is where the vote came in. I might say that on the 1st. of March, when the next election was announced, I resigned and I worked in the Premier's Office as his assistant for four and a-half months at no salary whatever, not one cent.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the honourable gentleman. There was no reference made by anybody on this side to him. He worked for four and a-half months with no pay. As a matter of interest: When? From what period?

MR. EARLE: From the period from the 1st. of March until I was appointed to the cabinet.

MR. ROBERTS: I see. I see. My compliments to the gentleman then. Of course he drew his sessional pay, but that is fine. However, I have no reference made to the honourable gentleman at all. I am aware of the fact that he resigned on the 1st. of March and that was perfectly proper, just as it is perfectly proper for him to go back to Fortune Bay and stand for election. In March he was elected.

Now, as I was saying, Mr. Hutchings is being paid \$15,000 a year, Could the Acting Premier, the member from Burin, tell us please

MR. ROBERTS: what his predecessor - what I am trying to see is whether it is a raise or the same. There is no information in the estimates to indicate that at all.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot answer, Mr. Chairman. I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the honourable gentleman for Ferryland answer please? Would one of the honourable gentlemen undertake to get the information? Fine. How would it be transmitted to us?

MR. HICKMAN: I will table it on tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the honourable gentleman - Will the honourable gentleman tell me please, the estimate, he said this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, on this subhead, that among the positions for which supply was being requested was communications clerk. Would the honourable gentleman please tell me, he named the gentleman, I have forgotten the gentleman's name or the lady's name as the case may be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. J. Ridgley.

MR. ROBERTS: How long has Mr. Ridgley been employed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. I asked because, is he the second clerk down there?

MR. HICKMAN: I will have to get that information for you.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, you know, the ministry come before the committee and I mean, can they send for an official? Can they have somebody on hand? These are not unreasonable questions to anticipate. I ask, Mr. Chairman, because the estimates already provide for a communications clerk and I want to know if this is the second one. There is a communications clerk position provided, it can be found on page nine of the salary estimates for the current fiscal year. These are not unreasonable questions to anticipate.

MR. HICKMAN: No. No. I will get them for you. I undertake to table whether, the answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, whether Mr. J. Ridgley is the second communications clerk, when he was hired, the name of the first communications clerk, if there are two and the salary of both.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, I know what the estimates are. I do not know what they are getting. We know what the estimates said for Dr. Peters, we did not know what he was getting. Now, let us come around to Mr. Dicks. Does he not work for the Executive Council? It was announced by Information Newfoundland that he is an executive assistant to the Premier for Central Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Dicks is not under the Executive Council Vote for which we are asking for Supplementary Supply, Mr. Chairman. I was advised by the honourable the member for Grand Falls that he was paid under Community and Social Development subhead. Anyway we are not asking for any money for him now.

MR. DOYLE: He is serving on a one year contract.

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable the Minister of Tourism who used to be in the Premier's Office informed me that Mr. Dicks was hired for a period of one year and presumably when that year is up then his status will have to be determined if he is going to stay on.

MR. ROBERTS: I ask on this subhead, Mr. Chairman, because it has been announced by Information Newfoundland, that Mr. Dicks is now an executive assistant for the Premier in Central Newfoundland. Are we to understand that his contract terminates, because he was hired on the 20th. or 21st. of January in 1972? The year has come and the year has gone, Sir, now perhaps the Acting Premier could indicate to us the terms of employment of this gentleman, please?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Dicks was hired as an executive assistant and my understanding and the advice I get is that he was hired for one year and it was a one year contract. Obviously any of the executive assistants' contracts can be renewed, and hopefully will be renewed from year to year.

MR. ROBERTS: The year has come and gone, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: No. I did not realize the year had come and gone for Mr. Dicks. He was on Community and Social Development until January 31. Mr. Chairman we are not seeking any supply, certainly

MR. HICKMAN: under the Head of Executive Council for Mr. Dicks.

MR. ROBERTS: What I mean is, is he being paid now or have we another charity? Who is paying him? It has been announced that he is working for the Premier but where is he being paid?

MR. HICKMAN: It looks so far as if he has not been paid at all as yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that is a little broad.

MR. HICKMAN: We are not asking for the money and if we do not ask for the money -

MR. ROBERTS: Well then all I want to know is, Information Newfoundland sent out a broad sheet saying he is working for the Premier. Fine, fair enough, no argument, more power to the guy but now we are told he is not being paid out of the Premier's Office Vote. I accept that. I do not argue with that. Where is he being paid?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fort Knox.

MR. ROBERTS: That is probably the same as the Premier's Office Vote.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that Mr. Dicks, who has now, according to the announcement, been transferred to the Office of the Premier to serve him in Grand Falls, which is a very desirable thing, will heretofore will be paid out of the Premier's Vote. But the significant thing is that in the monies that are now being asked under Head II of \$70,300, there is no money in for Mr. Dicks.

MR. ROBERTS: Notice, Mr. Chairman, that is a pernicious doctrine and cannot be accepted. The request is for an additional estimate for subhead 303-01 which is salaries for the Premier's Office and there is no right, constitutional or anywhere else, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to say that that dollar is designated for that. The truth is that \$221,000 is not adequate, the ministry wish to raise it by \$30,000 to \$251,000 and any person who has been paid out of subhead 303-01 has a share of that \$30,000. He has three twenty-fifths of it and I submit that anything, and this is an important

MR. ROBERTS: point, Mr. Chairman, it is nonsense for the honourable minister to say that these people have been hired on and they have been paid out of the \$221,000. If there is not enough money to pay them for the rest of the year, fair enough, so they need \$30,000 more. Everybody who works on the staff of the Premier's Office, including I may add the Premier himself, who is paid from that vote, is getting three twenty-fifths of that \$30,000 or three twenty-fifths of his salary will come from that \$30,000 item.

It is a pernicious doctrine and I am surprised the minister would advance it. It is a serious argument. He knows better. He should know better. All right then, Mr. Dicks is apparently working for free, Well we will put that on the Order Paper too. We may be asking a particular thing. 304-01 Salaries Executive Council goes from \$104,000 up to \$120,000, an addition of \$16,000, would the honourable gentleman indicate please to whom that increase - who has been taken on down there at what rate of pay and so forth.

MR. HICKMAN: I think I indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, there are two men who have been taken on, one is Mr. H. Clarke, I think his name is Hubert Clarke but I am not sure. He has been taken on in the planning and priorities committee at a salary of \$21,000. Mr. R. Oliverio, who was I understand on the treasury board, has been transferred from the treasury board to the planning and priorities committee and his salary is \$21,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Now that is \$42,000 the hon. gentleman -

MR. HICKMAN: There are eight new staff to be recruited, hopefully between now and the end of this fiscal year.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman indicate how eight new people -

MR. HICKMAN: Well, these will be clerical, planners -

MR. ROBERTS: But the vote goes from \$104,000, Mr. Chairman, to \$120,000.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, there is an increase of \$16,000.

MR. ROBERTS: \$16,000 - Now these gentlemen have been on at \$1,500 a month. They have been on for two or three months and we only have a month and bit left in the fiscal year. Were there any countervailing savings in this subhead? Were there any people not recruited out of the 304(01) vote as it was passed by the House?

MR. HICKMAN: There appears to be no indication to me there is any countervailing savings. The indications are, Mr. Chairman, that eight additional persons will be recruited before hopefully this month. There is also a note here, I did not realize and the hon. Minister of Finance can correct me on this, that additional treasury board staff are required but I thought treasury board came under the Department of Finance but -

MR. ROBERTS: It should come under the Finance Department.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, I realize that but I thought it came under the finance vote and I do not think that is very relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Surely it does come under the finance vote.

MR. HICKMAN: I thought it did.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, now I am more confused than ever. It is not a good day for the minister and myself in communications. Maybe we need a communications clerk at \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year to help us. By the way I am informed that Mr. Samuel Dicks was hired on February 1, 1972 for a contractual period of one year at \$12,000 per annum subject to review at the end of that period.

MR. HICKMAN: That is good. I got away with providing that information to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: What I want to know is what he did after February 1, 1973. twenty-one days ago? Has he been extended?

MR. HICKMAN: He was hired on February 1.

MR. ROBERTS: No, his original employment was for a period of one year. It began on February 1, 1972 for one year from the date of appointment, reference M.C. 17872.

MR. HICKMAN: Since February this year he has been on the staff of the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I only know what we are told publicly and that may or may not be the truth and I am trying to find out. He has been but he is not being paid from this vote, apparently and I find that very odd. Mr. Dicks maybe a very charitable gentleman who maybe working for free instead of for \$1,000 a month, each month, every month.

Now what I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate to us please, there are more people in this restructuring business than Mr. Clarke and Mr. Oliverio. A great number of public servants have been transferred and I am going again by the announcements to the various incrustations which are being put about. From where are they being paid if not the executive council vote, please? I mean, are they being paid out of this vote? Mr. David Mercer springs to mind, he is

the only one springs to mind and he maybe the only one.

MR. HICKMAN: I am guessing at this now but I would assume Mr. David Mercer is still being paid under the Community and Social Development vote because that was the vote that his salary was voted under last year, was it not?

MR. ROBERTS: Now that is where he was being paid, is he -

MR. HICKMAN: I would assume that. Look these questions I have no, I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes but you cannot expect us not to ask because you do not know.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not suggesting you should not ask them but I am giving you an undertaking that I will find out how many have been transferred to the Planning and Priority and from what vote they are being paid.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes and perhaps the minister could just table the names of the ladies and gentlemen involved or gentleman as the case may be and from where they are now being paid because I am sure they are being paid, I am willing to bet a modest amount, twenty-five cents perhaps, Sir, that Mr. Dicks is not working for charity.

MR. HICKMAN: He should not be but -

MR. ROBERTS: He should not be but it is a most unusual experience for the minister to come and ask for supply and not have any information. Let me add that I appreciate the position in which the minister finds himself. What does surprise me is that in the Premier's absence his parliamentary assistant does not handle them. I think that would be the gentleman who is full-time with the Premier's staff, his personal staff should be reasonably au fait with these facts. I do not think we asked anything that is very unusual but I may add we got some unusual answers.

On motion, Head 111 - Executive Council, carried.

Head IV - Finance - \$463,300:

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now. Is the minister going to come in or is he -
Oh, the minister is so arrogant now he is not even going to come in.
Oh. hold on now he is putting out his cigarette, I take it back.
Would the minister perhaps - Most of these look fairly straightforward,
Mr. Chairman. His own office is up by \$8,500 and perhaps he could
indicate what that is for.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, I doubt if the minister is doing that. I think he
has enough money of his own. There maybe some of his colleagues who
would try that but I do not think he would.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them?

MR. ROBERTS: Name what? His colleagues. He has eighteen colleagues.

AN HON. MEMBER: The ones who would take the extra salaries.

MR. ROBERTS: I said there maybe some. The hon. gentleman would know
and if he says name them, then he knows and let him name them.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, I thought you knew something that I did not know.

MR. ROBERTS: I know much the hon. gentleman does not know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I am sure of that as you were in there long
enough.

MR. ROBERTS: Right and not only that I expect I will know much more
when I get back. Would the minister please also indicate -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Ex gratia payments, Mr. Chairman, of \$43,000, what that
covers please? There is an item here entertainment, \$30,000 and there
is an item of "other," I am not sure if that is the same as the general
contingence vote but an item of just "other, \$25,000." That is a lot of
"other." "Other" is up from \$75,000 to \$100,000 now and also, what is the \$125,000
on royal commissions - There was \$75,000 in the estimates as adopted

by the House, Sir, and it is now to become \$200,000. Perhaps the minister could indicate where that extra money is to go.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, it is a very tall order, Mr. Chairman, because this is supplementary supply we are asking for. These are not the estimates and we do not have available with us information on every single item as we would have -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. gentleman does not mind me speaking. I have been listening since 3:30 this afternoon, to Dr. Peters and Mrs. Neary, and I am tired of that now and I am getting a chance to say a few words. Now we do not have all the details here. This is not the estimates. They will be coming up and when the estimates come up we will have all the details and our officials here and every niggling little question the gentleman wants to ask we hope we will have the answer for him. Now as far as the questions he is asking tonight, I will give him what information I have and I hope that will satisfy him.

Salaries in the minister's office \$85,000. Provision was not made in the original estimates for the general salary increase in the various salary subdivisions. There was an increase in salaries during the year of five per cent plus another four per cent and that applies to this vote as it does to most of the others. Now that would include the extra \$2,000 for executive assistants who now get -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, it was \$12,000 in the original estimates. Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right Mr. Cole was getting \$12,000. He was a very valuable -

MR. ROBERTS: Worth every cent of it.

MR. CROSBIE: He was a special assistant.

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly was, very special.

MR. CROSBIE: He is a very good appointment and he is a man that I am

proud and delighted that this government made chief electoral officer.

MR. ROBERTS: Relevancy, old relevancy Crosbie.

MR. CROSBIE: Very, very proud of it. Very, very, very proud. He is a good appointment. He shines over thousands that were made by the previous administration. Some I could mention, on the Workman's Compensation Board for example, who were a blot upon the escutcheon of the province.

Number two were salaries, general administration, that is the general salary increase that was not provided for. Travelling

\$2,500, that is due to an increase in travelling, an increase in the number of staff of the Audit and Compliance Division and the Gasoline Tax Division.

Equipment Rentals: That is due to increased use of the Xerox copier. There is a lot more work being done now. We need a lot more copies. We forgot to put in a rental of a cheque writer and signer. The cheques are going out now on time, copies are being made, information is flowing freely to anyone who asks for it.

Computer Services: Anticipated savings did not occur and transfers had to be made to computer services.

Postage: There has been such a tremendous increase in the work done by this government in every sphere of activity that our postage charges went up by \$10,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Why are you asking for \$50,000 anyway?

MR. CROSBIE: Or \$50,000, it is five times as good as -

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot even read.

MR. CROSBIE: It is a fantastic increase in answering our mail. We answer the mail. Contrary to the allegations made by honourable gentlemen opposite, we are answering our mail in ever increasing hoards. There is \$50,000 extra for postage.

Civil Service Commission Salaries: We are still paying their salaries, the Civil Service Commission, despite the fact all three of them are all liberal political appointments. We continue to pay their salaries and there is still increase there in the Civil Service Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: Who are they?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Robinson, Mr. Fewer and Eric Jones. The honourable gentlemen opposite get up in this House and downgrade and attack men like Harvey Cole and call them flunkies, when here is the Civil Service

Mr. Crosbie.

Commission, and we have never attacked gentlemen like that personally.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Nor would we say they are flunkies. But they are certainly political appointments.

MR. ROBERTS: Harvey Cole is a flunkie.

MR. CROSBIE: He is not a flunkie and never was. He is twice the man the Leader of the Opposition is and always has been and always will be.

MR. ROBERTS: A paid political -

MR. CROSBIE: A tremendous appointment. The province is lucky to have him.

MR. ROBERTS: The province cannot afford it.

MR. CROSBIE: The province cannot afford the honourable gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then - (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: That is why in the next election he is gone with the wind. In White Bay North they are gone beserker. They cannot wait to get at the honourable gentleman in the next election.

MR. ROBERTS: Put Ambrose Peddle down there.

MR. CROSBIE: What a competition! We got ten potential candidates already willing to go up. Let us see now, what was my next question? There was underestimation in the original estimates for amounts to be provided under exgratia payments.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the \$42,000 extra?

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, ha! Oh, ho!

MR. ROBERTS: Oh!

MR. CROSBIE: Better hide that.

MR. NEARY: Are you sure that that was tobacco you were smoking out there in the corridor.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not have all the items. You do not expect me to have all the list.

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly do.

MR. CROSBIE: You do?

MR. ROBERTS: Paragon of virtues, the honourable gentleman!

MR. CROSBIE: Oh my Heavens! I will tell you this that it is a lot less than it was last year, because last year there was \$153,000 when you crowd got through with it, the exgratia payments. They were really great here last year.

MR. ROBERTS: This year it is -

MR. CROSBIE: The crowd who were getting the great share last year are "x" this year. These are pension payments, Mr. Chairman, and I do not have them all here. During the year at various times you find, for one just reason or another, somebody is entitled to an increase in pension or pension for years that they are not strictly entitled to under the act, i.e., Mrs. Muriel Templeman. There is an exgratia payment to her in connection with her pension. She was the past Premier's secretary for twenty-three years.

MR. ROBERTS: Mrs. Templeman is entitled to a pension by act of this House.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but she is also getting an exgratia component.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not begrudge her a cent.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not have all the reasonable - perhaps there was not service.

MR. ROBERTS: She gave noble service. We will do the same for Mrs. Nugent.

MR. CROSBIE: It may have been something to do with that she was retiring before she was sixty or whatever the right age is.

Chief of Police Pittman, an exgratia payment and there are a number of others. If the honourable gentleman tables the question or when the estimates come up, I will give him the details of them all but that is just a few examples. There is nothing sinister in any of them. If he wants to ask me specifically about somebody that he suspects got an exgratia payment -

MR. ROBERTS: No! No! I am just generally interested to know why the government are lashing out \$43,000.

MR. CROSBIE: Well it is only a third of what was whacked out last year.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Now entertainment -

MR. ROBERTS: That makes it okay, does it?

MR. CROSBIE: I can tell him that these are all legitimate payments.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not doubt they were legitimate.

MR. CROSBIE: Now entertainment \$30,000, what is that for?

MR. ROBERTS: That makes it higher than the year before.

MR. CROSBIE: That is for dinners, banquets, luncheons, for this group and that group. The precedent was started by the honourable gentleman's government. For example, if it is an association having their first national meeting in St. John's, we pay for a dinner for them and there were more of these than we anticipated at the start of the year. Some of it is for entertainment by the government itself or by ministers. That would not be very high. Anyway it was underestimated last year and if I can do anything about it, I would certainly like to cut it down. The trouble is that once the precedent is started, it is very difficult to get out of it, with all these groups. They are all worthy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lubrication.

MR. CROSBIE: No lubrication, strictly -

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing but water and milk.

MR. CROSBIE: Other, \$25,000, that has me a bit puzzled. There must have been a lot of other this year, but I think that is the general contingencies vote to which things get charged if there is no specific provision for them. Now for some reason, they did not give me the breakdown of 'other'. I will have to undertake to get that for the honourable gentlemen.

Royal Commissions, \$125,000. The breakdown there is that these were not anticipated. We underestimated the Blackhead Road Urban Renewal Scheme, it is \$23,000 additional.

MR. ROBERTS: That is Mr. Kostaszek.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Kostaszek. The family law study, we had to pay the final bills for that.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the total?

MR. CROSBIE: I would have to get that for the honourable gentleman. We paid \$24,000.

MR. ROBERTS: My Lord!

MR. CROSBIE: The total is up. I think it was about \$100,000.

However, that was a study undertaken by the last administration.

MR. ROBERTS: It was undertaken by the present Minister of Justice.

MR. CROSBIE: - and the present Minister of Justice, very interested in family life, family law. Municipal Government: That is \$18,000, the royal commission that is started on municipal government. Here is an interesting one. This is a jim dandy. The honourable gentlemen are going to be delighted with this one. Bell Island, \$10,000.

MR. ROBERTS: What is it gone for?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know what it is gone for but they are having

Mr. Crosbie.

hearing and we do not know -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: It is a very valuable investigation and we will get a report in due course. The Royal Commission on Labrador, \$50,000. These have to cover, of course, up to the end of March. It is not all money spent.

MR. ROBERTS: How much is the royal commission?

MR. CROSBIE: The Royal Commission on Labrador, \$50,000 is the estimate up to the end of March. That is \$125,000. Now I do not have here the information of what they cost altogether. The O'Dea Commission, that cost altogether now (I am giving an approximation. If I can remember tomorrow, I will give him the exact cost) between \$40,000 and \$50,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does that include Mr. Robinette?

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, Mr. Robinette is not included. He is probably under "other". I will have to check that.

MR. ROBERTS: Under entertainment.

MR. CROSBIE: That is all I can tell the honourable gentleman. I will have to get him the amount on "other".

MR. ROBERTS: I am most surprised. I thought that the minister,

being a paragon, to hear him speak at least, of virtues, would have had the information. I am wonder if he would try to get some. As he pointed out, these royal commissions are between now and the end of the year or between whenever they start and the end of the year. Would he undertake to get the information and table it in the committee tomorrow, please, or whenever the committee next meets? Bell Island, \$10,000 for this fiscal year. Mr. Justice Mifflin, the commissioner, of course, would be paid by the Government of Canada. I assume his salary continues, as the government do not have to absorb that. Where the \$10,000 is going -

Mr. Roberts.

I mean what is it to go for, how much? - I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Legal fees. There are a lot of legal fees, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is getting legal-aid so is the gentleman from St. John's East (Extern). They are both getting legal-aid.

Normally these bills are not submitted until the work is done.

If the honourable gentleman would attempt or undertake to find out - all right, the Labrador one \$50,000. Mr. Snowden is he under salary for this or is the university paying him? He is full-time, so reasonably he would be paid a salary.

AN HON. MEMBER: I believe he is being paid -

MR. ROBERTS: How much is that please? We are paying it, the people of this province are paying it, how much is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: The information will be made available.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, that is all I ask.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the chairman again?

MR. ROBERTS: The Royal Commission on Labrador, Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Goodyear is a magistrate, presumably, he is paid as a magistrate.

The other two commissioners, what are they being paid, please? I should imagine that there would be heavy travel bills for that commission as well. Trips to Norway, Yukon - the honourable gentleman is not going - he is not in the house .

MR. CROSBIE: Has the honourable gentleman read the "White Eskimo?"

MR. ROBERTS: Yes I have. As a matter of fact, I had dinner in Goose Bay the other night with the gentleman, Frank Mercer, the commissioner for - I am not sure what his title is, but I think he is

Mr. Roberts.

commissioner for Labrador Affairs - paid for it - we did.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We will have him bring the honourable minister's body over the Gaff Topsails.

MR. WOODWARD: The commission are paying the National Film Board to film the hearings in Labrador.

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps the minister could find that out for us, whether the -

MR. CROSBIE: I think the federal government are paying for that, at the urgency of Mr. Rompkey.

MR. WOODWARD: No, it is a public spectacle anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister find out whether or not

MR. ROBERTS: the government of this province are standing that particular thought. The same with the Whelan Commission, is Professor Whelan, he was working full-time with the administration, he was an adviser in the Premier's office. I am not sure as of when, but he was restructured or restructuring or something. Perhaps the minister could find out. I am surprised the minister does not have it. He is such a fount of information, but he develops a gap about the 18th. of January 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is in the breakdown because the other will now be \$100,000, even in the lush years, as the minister would say, of the former administration, it was only \$93,700 actual. The government are estimating \$100,000 this year. So there are more "other" than we were "other". Perhaps the minister could undertake to find out. I am fascinated by this entertainment, it was \$55,000 in the 1971 - 1972 revised estimates, Mr. Chairman. It has risen now to \$87,000, estimated for this year. I wonder if the minister will undertake to table a list of the functions because I am quite candidly of the impression that there have not been as many functions as there might have been or should have been or would have been or sometimes were. Would he also. I am particularly intrigued with the references to ministerial entertainment because I have been hearing the most interesting stories of ministers. I am not saying they are all true or not, one hears stories. But the minister mentioned that ministerial entertainment was up, or is in this, \$30,000 is a lot of dinners at Woodstock, Colonial Inn or wherever these dinners are being held. Perhaps the honourable gentleman could let us know on that.

Now he mentioned a cheque-writing machine, that is an interesting device to have, especially if there are 20,000 less cheques this year since the mothers got the axe from the honourable gentleman and his colleagues. Would the minister tell us whether the government are up to date on all their bills or whether they have accounts outstanding as of, you know, current date 1st. of February? Were there accounts

outstanding? Or are the government paying in the normal, whatever it is, thirty days after the accounts are rendered?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, to deal with the last question first, I have not had any outraged creditors of the government after me to have their bills paid, so I assume that we are paying on time and I have no reason to doubt that bills are being paid in the normal course. There may be some outstanding more than thirty days for one reason or the other. But you can certainly take it that bills are being paid as promptly as they always have been.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am sorry, the minister is wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: Well if I am wrong and somebody sends me the information as to some bill or other that has not been paid promptly, I will certainly look into it. I did come across a bill for \$46.19 the other day, but there had been some foul up in it, the creditor wrote me and it was immediately paid the next day. We were able to stand it. We had enough to cover it. But is there any specific case that the honourable gentleman is worried about, we will certainly check into it. Bills are being paid as promptly as usual.

I will table a list of the royal commissions and the breakdown for the honourable gentleman. But these questions are the kinds of questions that should be on the Order Paper and can be properly answered. We are now dealing with supplementary supply. These questions can be asked properly and the answers tabled properly that is the way for it to be done not this kind of process that is going on here tonight. This is a derogation from the whole concept of supplementary supply.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no,

MR. CROSBIE: It is criminal.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

MR. CROSBIE: Criminal in its intent, puerilismous, mischievous, vexacious, irritating, irresponsible, and there must be something else there.

AN HON. MEMBER: arrogant.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you drunk, Sir. Are you fueled up.

MR. CROSBIE: I have never been drunk in my life.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you fueled up?

MR. CROSBIE: I remember another gentleman who use to stand here and he would wave his glass, that was really good water.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you fueled up tonight?

MR. CROSBIE: But I have had more than water, but not tonight.

Now let me see, where was I? Oh, yes, I will get this thing on the royal commissions for you, and the entertainment, if I think it looks all right I will give you that too.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister is becoming something like all of his predecessors now. But you know he is wrong. Very wrong when he says on supplementary supply one may not ask questions. He can have all the theatricals he wants. He is very good at them. I give him full marks.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not get much chance these days.

MR. ROBERTS: He is very good at them.

MR. CROSBIE: Not like the old days.

MR. ROBERTS: He is very good, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Come on over, you can have more fun over here.

MR. CROSBIE: No way.

MR. ROBERTS: He may be here, one never knows.

MR. NEARY: You are being invited.

MR. ROBERTS: You will never see the "John Crosbie" sailing down the waves of Newcastle.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, actually she is 350,000 tons that one.

MR. ROBERTS: Built to carry George McLean, is she?

MR. CROSBIE: No comment.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, as we were saying before we were so rudely re-routed, the honourable gentleman can play all the theatricals he wants but that does not take away from the fact that his questions are perfectly

MR. CROSBIE: Well all right, all right if you want the entertainment I will get that too. All right.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is very entertaining on his own. And we only pay him \$11,000.

MR. CROSBIE: All right. No, I will get it for you. I cannot take it. I just cannot take it.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to come back please to the minister's office. These questions can go on the Order Paper. But the minister is here seeking supply, supplementary supply, perfectly in order to ask a question. If he choose not to answer that is up to him.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, I have the answer on that.

MR. ROBERTS: All right there is an extra person in there, who is it please?

MR. CROSBIE: This is what happened, my secretary, Mrs. Martin, a very, very dear soul.

MR. ROBERTS: The lady who has been with you all along ah?

MR. CROSBIE: Who has been with me through thick and thin, very efficient. She was under the office of Economic Development, when I gave up that portfolio her salary had to be transferred to the Department of Finance. That I believe is why, well that is part of the reason for the \$8,500, the rest is the general increase.

MR. ROBERTS: Then the minister is being a little franker than he was, a little fuller because it was obvious - but then who is being paid out of the \$6,000 allocated for the secretary of the minister? Does the minister have two secretaries? I know he is very busy. Do you have two?

MR. CROSBIE: Well the previous minister's secretary, Dr. Rowe -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Jones' secretary.

MR. CROSBIE: Dr. Rowe or Mr. Jones' was being paid there. She is transferred now to Treasury Board or Collective Bargaining.

MR. ROBERTS: So there is now only one person being paid out of 401-01 under a heading of a secretary to the minister, but for a while there were

two, is that what happened?

MR. CROSBIE: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: That makes sense.

Gosh I think the minister is underwhelming me with his answers or his promises to try - the gentleman for Green Bay, has he something to say.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not say anything for God's sake, he is almost through.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has finally - if the minister would give some information, we do not see the performance of the Minister of Justice or one like it. He seems to go really much quicker. A little information is all your humble opposition wants. The minister has given us what he had and has undertaken to get the rest. That is reasonable. Now he puts on his usual - We are use to that. Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman was allowed to wander on, am I not to be allowed to answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No? Oh that is typical arrogance of the young gentleman for Placentia West.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, that is a gross insult. I do not have to put up with that.

MR. ROBERTS: I withdraw the insult part that the honourable member is arrogant. If he does not feel that he is a gentleman, that is his problem.

Now as I was saying -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, can you maintain order?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. Could you maintain order here, Mr. Chairman? The honourable gentleman is asking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have made several attempts to maintain order, but the honourable members persist in being disorderly, it becomes very difficult.

MR. ROBERTS: An admirable job under extreme provocation from all sides of the House, or the chamber, the committee or whatever. Your Honour is cursed with having followed a bad precedent, a whole series of bad precedents

last year. Your Honour can hold out hope. If Your Honour is good in the Chair, Your Honour may not get promoted to the cabinet. So there you are.

Now as I was saying, Mr. Harvey Cole came into the debate, dragged in by the scruff of his neck by the honourable the Minister of Finance. Will there be more debate on Mr. Cole? Not now, not tonight. I shall content myself with a few observations upon that gentleman's ability to perform not a political appointment. I could not care less about political appointments. The previous government made them. Made all sorts of them, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lots of them.

MR. ROBERTS: Lots of them.

right, lots of them, any number of them. The present administration makes lots of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable members keep in mind that we are dealing with item IV - Finance

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the remarks of the honourable the Minister of Finance under item IV. Surely, that is in order on the debate. If the honourable minister can make the remarks, surely I am to be allowed to deal with the same subject as he is. Is that not correct? I notice the clerk is advising Your Honour, a much better point of law, or the other clerk is shaking his head. Thank you, Your Honour. Thank you.

As I was saying, my complaint is not with the fact that Mr. Harvey Cole was given a job. I think Mr. Harvey Cole deserves a job from the Torv Party. He has stood by them, like the lady the minister referred to, through thick and thin.

MR. W. ROWE: He was not given the knife, like the ex-minister.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he was not. That is right. He certainly was not. He has stood by them and in the days when there were not a lot of gentlemen of that political persuasion in this province, he was one. All marks, all power to him. He sometimes gets a little heated with my colleague at midday repasts, at private parties. He gets a little carried away.

The offense of Mr. Cole, Mr. Chairman, and we will be back on it I will only mention it now but since the honourable Minister of Finance mentioned it, surely I can. The offense is the particular job in which he is placed. It is a little like giving an alcoholic a credit card at the Board of Liquor Control to put Harvey Cole in as chief electoral officer. That is the offense. I have nothing against - the honourable gentleman needs the job and I think he deserves well of the party that now forms the administration in this province. I would be the last to begrudge him a job and I can say that when we come back into office,

as we will be it four years or twenty-four years, the wheel will turn, that the Harvey Coles in the appropriate jobs will not be disturbed unless the Liberal - I am sorry, pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He will be retired by that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh God, Harvey Cole never retires, boy. He just hangs on by his fingernails. He will be 107 years old. The point that I am making - and I will be hauled down probably for that but let me make it anyway - is that political patronage is a perfectly normal and proper thing and this administration will doubtless indulge in it. I do not see anything wrong with that. To their credit let it be said, they have not disturbed, to my knowledge, any of the political appointments of the previous administration. They may do it. That is fine. Once that business starts, it is hard to know where it ends.

The offense of Mr. Harvey Cole - and why, I think he is a paid political hack in a most offensive position is that he is chief electoral officer. Having said that we will, you know, we will have a great deal more to say on the gentleman and I wish we could discuss these things without referring to an individual but we cannot, Your Honour, one cannot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would permit and he is at the present time conducting an answer to a point of debate made by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance at the time in his remarks concerning Mr. Cole, may have been out of order and the honourable Leader of the Opposition may in turn be out of order. The fact that the Minister of Finance was successful in getting his remarks made is no reason to assume that the Leader of the Opposition is going to be able to persist in making remarks that can in turn be out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour and two wrongs do not make a right but I have said what I had to say about Mr. Cole on this point and I thank Your Honour for extending the same latitude to this side

as to the other side. Otherwise, you know, we will have a constant harassment back and forth of points of order. We are quite as capable. My colleagues and I, I think, know as much about points of order as the gentlemen on the other side. We are quite as capable of raising them. The honourable Minister of Finance to his credit has not complained. He can take it. He is about the only one over there who can. He does not always take it. He gets irritated and vexed. He does not look at all tense. He looks sort of sloppy.

MR. CROSBIE: Carry on, my son, carry on.

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway, I think the minister has either bamboozled us or satisfied us. He would say bamboozled. He will go home feeling that way. I think he has made, for him, an honest effort, compared to his normal performances, to answer. We shall await the other answers. Normally I would not give him - all right, that is enough on this one.

On motion, Item IV, Finance, carried:

Education and Youth, Item VI, \$2,500,000:

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this entire amount of Supplementary Supply is under and involved with teachers' salaries. I realize that it is a large amount. I think a look at the Supplementary Supply estimates in the past few years will show that there has usually been a fairly significant underestimation here.

The reasons are basically as follows: There are certain areas obviously where it is very difficult to estimate with accuracy. I am not convinced that it should not be possible to estimate with more accuracy than has been done in the past. I make that point.

There is the area of teacher upgrading.

(1) for courses on campus, I am not thinking of summer school but teachers who take courses on campus during the course of the year.

(2) they take them off campus in a number of centers throughout the province and there are of course these

(3) the several hundred teachers at Memorial University Summer School.

Of course, as honourable gentlemen know, Mr. Speaker, the estimates are usually prepared early in the year, the calendar year, for the financial year of April 1. These off-campus courses go on more or less all year long and of course the summer school is somewhere in the period of July.

Now, the number of people who were upgraded, the number of teachers who were upgraded in this three areas of upgrading; the off-campus courses in areas throughout the province, the on-campus courses, usually in the afternoon or evening during the course of the year, and the summer school courses in July or August, for a period from April, 1972, the beginning of the fiscal year, to February 15, which is the latest - well obviously there would not be much change between now and then - to February 15, 1973, was 3,250 teachers upgraded in one of these three ways.

Obviously it is impossible for the Department of Education to know, let us say, or to have known two months ago or a month ago or even now when estimates are being prepared, how many students are actually going to be taking upgrading at the university. The numbers, one can make an approximation of but only. They differ as well. We have no way of knowing whether those who are going in to be upgraders are going to be upgraded from one to two or from two to three or five to six nor is there any way possible to know how many will in fact pass and be successful.

In those areas of upgrading, in the period in question (April, 1972 to February 15, 1973) three thousand two hundred and fifty teachers were upgraded. Now, the other large, important factor in this - right.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, does he know how much of the two and a-half million dollars mentioned is attributable to that reason, the upgrading

of teachers?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not. I could undertake to have it -

MR. ROWE: For the estimates.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right, for the estimates. Yes, right.

Now, the other area, apart from ungrading, the other area is of course the teacher supply today. Whereas, not only years ago but one or two years ago, we had a large number of licensed teachers or a certain number Grade I, Grade II. We now have, of course, many Grade III, IV, V to VI to Grade VIII. This is in fact a good thing from the point of view of the professional academic qualifications of the teacher. This should and I think in most cases does become translated into better instruction. It certainly should but obviously one has to agree that the more highly qualified the teacher the better the system

MR. OTTENHEIMER: should be and the better the education should be.

It would appear, and I do not have the comparative breakdown of the chart that I am going to give now, going back the last five or six years, but I think that that would show that in this period there was a really significant jump in these qualifications and therefore of course the certification and the salary of teachers. Of course the Department of Education has no control over what teachers are going to be hired by a school board. The school is looking for five teachers, as long as they work within the money allocated to them - there could be five grade V, or two Grade I, and three grade III, type of thing.

Making a comparison in the teachers supply situation, between November 1971 and November 1972, licenced teachers - November 1971, 298; November 1972, 73; a decrease and these of course are teachers very low on us, a decrease of 225; grade III, I did not get I and II, I just want to show the tendency and not obviously to analyze each and every one. Grade III, November 1971, 684; November 1972, 778; an increase of 94; grade IV teachers, whereas in November 1971, 1,316, an increase of 101 November 1972; grade V November 1971, 961 and an increase of 232; grade VI, from 600 to 711, an increase of 111; and grade VII from 124 to 207, an increase of 82.

But just taking the grade V which emphasizes, I think dramatically underlines the type of thing.

MR. WM. ROWE: Grade V - two degrees.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. WM. ROWE: Or five years.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Or five years, right.

In grade V where there was an increase of 232, to show the difference, and of course all of those names on it come from grade IV, they put us entered right into the grade V.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But the difference in pay between a grade IV and a grade V is \$1100 per year, there you have an increase of \$232. These are the reasons, because of the upgrading, the fact that there were 3,250 teachers upgraded during that period, and also the change in the resource or pool, the teachers supply, these account for the additional expenditure of \$2.5 million for which Supplementary Supply is being sought.

MR. WM. ROWE: Just before it carries, there seems to be something wrong with the Department of Education, in some way or other, I do not know what it is. Every year that I was in the government, the minister around this time, you know about a few months before the financial year ended, it was always scurrying up to Cabinet looking for \$3 million or \$4 million. It happens every year.

It seems to me that with computerization and everything that by now we should be able to get some read-outs on what is likely to happen in these fields, is that not so? I understand what the honourable minister is saying, it is impossible to say how many people are going to go from one grade to another and all this sort of thing, but we do have a finite number of teachers. We do have tendencies and trends over the past number of years that can be fed into the computer, to come back here and ask for what amounts to well \$2 million, \$2.5 million, I do not know whether that is a five or six per cent increase. A fairly large increase compared to the average increase of 1.3 per cent and I am sure that there are some imponderables or some departments here with as many imponderables in them as the salaries of teachers, you know.

So I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, are there any moves being taken by the Department of Education to try to rectify this situation to try to get better information from computers and try to have a better information on input into the estimates of the Department

MR. WM. ROWE: of Education?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I basically agree with the honourable gentleman there and in fact I discussed this with officials of the department. I pointed out what I thought was a very large amount, they then of course pointed out to me that this had been a continuing thing. They did not really know if it were possible to get a more accurate estimate and my answer then was obviously, "you know more about it than I do, but I suggest you check with, and perhaps discuss the whole matter with officials of Treasury Board who are experts in Finance." I certainly hope that it will be possible to not have to come back and look for such a large amount of Supplementary Supply. The honourable member for Bell Island asked me if it were all for teachers and I said yes. That is true, only I think the actual heading is, Teachers and Superintendents, superintendents will be a very small percentage of them. I do not know what percentage it is, but it is a very small percentage.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is nothing in there for George McLean.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is nothing in there for anybody but teaches and there could be a few superintendents. There could be and there may not be but the heading includes superintendents.
Head VII - Justice - \$267,900

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this I can deal with very briefly. There are four subheads - subhead 714-01 Salaries magistrates, \$12,000 was required to pay the salary for part of the year for two additional magistrates, upon the approval of Treasury Board. Subhead 719-01 Service rental contract, R.C.M.P., \$156,400, the shortage in the R.C.M.P. general contract occurred because the R.C.M.P. underestimated the actual cost per man and also took on nine additional men during the present fiscal year for which we had not provided. Subhead 719-02-01 Corner Brook R.C.M.P., \$2,500, the shortage under this subhead occurred because the R.C.M.P.

MR. HICKMAN: underestimated the actual cost per man. Subhead 721-02, Salaries Fire Department, \$85,000, the shortage under this subhead occurred because of an increase of firemen's salaries under the collective bargaining agreement and because it will be necessary to hire in addition, and this is the real cost, an additional eighteen men on March 1 to put the forty-eight hour week into effect in the fire department on April 1, 1973. The forty-two hour week was provided under the collective bargaining agreement and it comes into force on April 1, but the advice I received from the Fire Chief was that in order for these men, the additional eighteen men, to be functioning as firemen, they need at least one month or two months preferably of training before they are taken on.

MR. WM. ROWE: I only have one question, Mr. Chairman. Does the honourable minister know or have any idea when the Steele Commission, the Royal Commission on Magistrates is likely to be received by him and tabled in the House thereafter.

MR. HICKMAN: I spoke to Commissioner Steele, Mr. Chairman, a couple of days ago. He is in the process of writing his report. I hope that it will be in my hands and in the hands of government while the House is still in session and it will be tabled forthwith, if you will give me a day to read it first.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what about these special police at Gander Airport, are they paid out of this vote?

MR. HICKMAN: No, federal.

Head IX - Department of Public Works, \$137,000

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the committee a detailed breakdown of every item here, but it is very easy to explain. By some over expenditures which could not possibly be anticipated when the estimates were drawn down, this has to do particularly the severe winter which we have experienced and a resulting increase

MR. EARLE: in the cost of snow clearing for the public buildings. When we read of Corner Brook, snow costing \$1,000 an inch to remove, and you take into consideration that my department has something over three hundred buildings to look after in all parts of Newfoundland, a particularly severe winter can wreck havoc in the cost of snow clearing. This was a very substantially increased item

during the present year. This also caused, severe winter conditions caused unexpected freeze ups in water services in some buildings and a certain amount of damage was caused which had to be repaired. Then on top of that there was an increase in labour costs in respect of tradesmen who were employed by contractors and firms engaged in doing maintenance work for the department. This was known generally to everybody that during the year there was a general increase in all labour costs and of course this also applied to the work done by my department. Also there was an increase in the cost of materials. Anybody who has the experience in any building or repairs during the past year knows that building materials have advanced very substantially and this affected the cost of our repairs and upkeep of the buildings also.

There was also an increase in the wages paid to hourly paid workers, on the open vote employees, as authorized by the government. The government authorized an increase in the open vote payment to employees who were paid on an hourly rate and this also affected our cost to this open vote hourly paid employees amount. Finally there was an increase cost of implementing public works carpenters to a pay plan because of the additional four per cent wage increase authorized for open vote employees. There was a four per cent increase to these open vote employees and this of course had to be implemented to our public works carpenters and others and this affected the cost there. The total increase for the whole department for the year was \$137,000.

As I said in my opening remarks this covers a tremendous number of incidental expenses and covering some three hundred odd buildings throughout the province. That was the reason, Mr. Chairman, for a general increase all around.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he could inform the committee if all the contracts that were let for snow clearing and maintenance work were awarded by public tender and if they

went to the lowest bidder?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to report that in spite of some public comment to the contrary that all tenders for snow clearing were by public tender. They were opened publicly and the tenders were awarded to the lowest tenderer, in fact some people felt that we were being more than fair in that respect. Taking into consideration the equipment offered, the ability to do the job which is also a consideration, the awards were given to the lowest tenderers. There was I believe one case where there was some dispute over the equipment which the contractors had. It was not judged by our department to be capable of doing the work and although he was slightly lower than the next lowest bidder, it was given to the next lowest bidder because he had better equipment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would explain to the committee just what control his department has over the number of hours that are worked actually at snow clearing from the time the machines start say in the morning until they finish in the evening or until they have all the snow cleared? Would the hon. minister tell the committee what control his department has?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, it is a very difficult field to police because snow storms unfortunately do not pick the time that they are going to come, at four o'clock in the morning or they may come in the middle of the day, and there is equipment rushed out at all hours of the night and day to do jobs. But generally speaking the staff of my department who carry out inspection and periodic checks on this keep a very careful eye on the operations of all of these contractors. Over many years of experience, most of these men have been associated with this work for a long time, they are very adept at catching any over-charges where they think that a contractor may be trying to pad his bills. The control is really based on the experience of the people who are inspecting

the jobs and controlling the jobs. I think in a case like this you can only rely on the efficiency of the inspection staff that you have.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what the minister is saying then; that it is more or less up to the honesty of the contractors.

MR. EARLE: No, not really. This is checked on.

MR. NEARY: It is checked. Would the minister tell us how it is checked?

MR. EARLE: We maintain in our department down there, I am only repeating myself, a staff of highly qualified people who go out and inspect jobs.

MR. NEARY: Yes but do they know when they start, because they are paid by the hour? Do they know when they start and when they finish?

MR. EARLE: Of course. Do you think we just let them go ahead. They are checked on as to when they start and when they finish. It is the same system. Incidentally most of the same men who were doing it for the former government and many of these men have been in the department for many years and are entirely reliable and they are quite capable of making adequate checks which they carry on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to follow the hon. minister. What the hon. minister is saying is that these men in his department, and I have no doubt at all but they are experienced in this particular kind of work, that they just go out and they look at the amount of snow that was cleared and they say to the minister, "Well, it would take about ten hours to clear this much snow," and so they just rubber stamp the invoice that comes in. Is this what the minister is saying or does the contractor have to check in when he comes on the job and check out when the snow clearing is finished?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Hold on now I am trying to find out from the hon. minister. The hon. minister has a new system.

MR. EARLE: The minister has not a new system. He has been following the same system, Mr. Chairman, that has been followed for years and

actually I can only go back to the statement that the people who have experience in this game can take an invoice and know if a man is overcharging too many hours for any particular job because they go out and see what kind of a job has to be done and they know how many hours that should take and invariably they go out at times while storms are on and see what is being done. They spot check. You cannot expect any staff of people to be out all night and all hours of the day checking on somebody who has a contract but there is sufficient check to be sure that there is no serious overcharging.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. minister has confirmed what I said, Mr. Chairman, that this is all guesswork.

MR. EARLE: No, it is not at all guesswork.

MR. NEARY: It is guesswork. The officials of the department just say, "Well yes it probably took ten, twenty, fifty hours to clear that much snow." There is no check on the time that the contractor came on the job and when he left the job. Can the minister answer that question? Is there a check? Does he have to check in because he is paid by the hour for his equipment? Does he have to check in when he comes on the job and check out when he is finished?

MR. EARLE: No, Mr. Chairman, there is not that kind of a check. If the hon. member is not satisfied that the staff is competent to do a good job then I would suggest that the same people who were doing this job for many, many years were equally incompetent. But they are based on their experience and their long years of service and many of them grew up from people who operated this sort of equipment. They know what is going on. It is not a reasonable request, having different storm conditions created at all times, that you are going to go out at a moments notice and check the hour. If a machine goes out at four o'clock in the morning and comes back at 4:30 P.M. and all this as they are all over the place, in all parts of the country I might say.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, these contractors are paid by the hour and their time should be checked on. I have the greatest amount of faith in the officials of the minister's department but they are being paid, Sir, the taxpayers money by the hour. I would submit to the hon. minister that his department, the hon. minister awarded contracts this past winter at such a low rate, Sir, such a low rate that the contractor could not possibly fulfill his obligation for the rate he was paid. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Whom are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: That is all right. I know whom I am talking about. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the minister's attention that he awarded a contract for snow clearing for \$10.50 an hour, I think it was, -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was last summer.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not last summer. And that very same gentleman, Sir, did not have equipment to fulfill his contract and he went to another contractor, I checked on this and it is not a bit funny as it is the taxpayers' money the hon. minister is flinging out. The hon. junior member for Harbour Main may think it is funny. He will find out how funny it is in the next election.

MR. DAWE: It was not your friends on Bell Island, was it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this particular contractor was awarded a contract for \$10.50 an hour for his equipment and he rented equipment, Sir, for \$24.00 an hour. Now I would like the hon. minister to explain to me how that happened. I would say that particular contractor should get the citizen of the year award, Sir. He is working, clearing snow for \$14.00 less than he is receiving from the minister's department. Now, Sir, I would like to have an explanation for that.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think any explanation I could give will satisfy the hon. member but I will try. As I stated at the outset

of my remarks the tenders were awarded,I think with one exception, to the lowest tenderer. The prices ranged all the way from \$9.50 an hour up to \$64.00 an hour for clearing snow. The \$64.00 an hour was in a place where there was only one snow-clearing piece of equipment available and much as we thought we were being taken to the cleaners by that,it had to be done in the place and there was only one person who could do it as it was in a very remote place. The \$9.50 an hour people who tendered,in our estimation were tendering for low cost. I agree with the hon. member that they probably could not do it for that but

I gave instructions to my inspector whom the honourable member is questioning - I said; "If any of these gentlemen and check on them very carefully, please, these contractors, if they are using faulty equipment or are falling down on the job, they have twenty-four hours notice and they are fired." So far this winter they have performed in spite of their prices. If they go bust on that contract, that is their business. but we have to protect the public money. We give it to the lowest tender and this government is always being accused of not behaving in a proper way, but this is one instance where the lowest tender won regardless of the results. At nine dollars and fifty cents an hour I do not believe that they can do it, If they go bust on that, it is their own fault. Next year they will not be back somebody else will be tendering at a higher price.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could the honourable minister tell us why tenders were called and then were withdrawn and called again for snow clearing in the early part of the winter?

MR. EARLE: Yes, without any hesitation, Mr. Chairman. The reason for that was that when some of the original tenders were opened, they did not have the required deposit, the cheque. Some of these protested and asked that they be called again and they be given a chance. The tenders were reopened in the hope that we would get lower bids. They were recalled again.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable gentleman is correct in his statement, that is when they got the lower bids and then the contracts were awarded, Sir, for snow clearing.

In this particular case that I am thinking about, the contractor was paid ten dollars and fifty cents an hour for his equipment. He rented equipment from another contractor in St. John's for twenty-four dollars an hour. I am not satisfied that the minister is giving me the explanation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not go to the contractor and ask him about

it?

MR. NEARY: I know how he is doing it, I know how he is doing it,
Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How? Tell us. Prove it, prove it, come on. I
wish I knew how.

MR. NEARY: I am dealing with the honourable Minister of Public Works.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are all here, we are all the same.

MR. NEARY: I already asked the Minister of Public Works, Sir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could you keep these "crackies" quiet please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. NEARY: They have had too much wine tonight, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, what I am asking the honourable minister is -
is not the system of controlling the time, is it not wide open for
abuse? Is it possible for a contractor to put in more time than he
actually worked? Is this possible under the present system?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, would you please keep the honourable the
junior member for Harbour Main quiet or I will nail him.

Will the honourable minister tell us if the present system
is wide open for abuse, that it is possible for a contractor to claim
more time than he actually worked? If it is so, then what steps is
the minister taking to rectify this situation?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think in the orders of debate, you are
not supposed to repeat yourself, but I have to repeat myself because
the honourable member from Bell Island is asking the same question.
There is a possibility a remote possibility that somebody could try to
overcharge, but I am satisfied that with the inspection by my department
officials, he would not get away with it for any length of time.

This is the reason we are checking up on these fellows. We
are giving them the contracts at prices which they cannot possibly do
the work for, but as I said in my earlier remarks, they probably will

not be back next year because they are being kept to the job this year. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that we are put in this job to save public money and to accept the lowest tenders we can, all things being equal. This is what has been done in this case and if the contractor goes broke, as I said before, that is his fault. If he tries anything crooked, he will not last. If you want to put in an army of inspectors to inspect all these jobs all over the country and to follow every move of a tractor or a snowplow or anything else and time them and see that they are taking so many shovels full of snow and all of this kind of stuff, it would cost this government far more to try to do that kind of check than anything they could possibly save.

MR. NEARY: I think the honourable minister is being penny-wise and pound-foolish, because it is possible to put a control on the amount of time that these contractors work.

Let us take for instance, Sir, Confederation Building. You have a garage here on the back that is open all night long. You have watchmen in Confederation Building all night long, twenty-four hours, right around the clock, Is it not possible, Sir, for the contractor who is clearing snow here at Confederation Building to sign in when he comes on the job and sign out when all the snow is cleared? Is that not possible? Down at Exon House, the same way, Sir, over here at Hoyles Home, the same way, down at the Sanatorium, the same way, at the Mental Hospital, the same way, Is it not possible? It is a very simple matter for the minister to put in a system whereby these contractors have to sign in and sign out. Is that not possible. Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: They have been doing that for the last fifteen years.

MR. NEARY: In this day and age when we are sending men to the moon is it not possible to get a very simple ...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Keep quiet "Teddy Bear."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please!

MR. NEARY: The minister has admitted, Sir, that there is a possibility, although he qualified by saying, "a remote possibility" for abuse. Well, Sir, as remote as it is it is still the taxpayers' money and the minister is being penny-wise and pound-foolish, because he is awarding the contract to the lowest tenderer and then they are making it up in the number of hours they claim for, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about it.

MR. NEARY: I am telling you all about it, I do not have to write a book, do I? If the honourable minister had not been at the wine tonight he would be able to understand what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the minister's explanation and I want to know what steps the honourable minister is going to take to rectify this?

AN HON. MEMBER: I wonder if the honourable member could tell us - -

MR. NEARY: Aw! keep quiet! I am talking to the honourable minister.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what steps the honourable minister is going to take to remedy this situation?

AN HON. MEMBER: The same control you had when you were minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause (9) carry?

MR. NEARY: No, not yet, Mr. Chairman. The honourable minister is refusing to answer the question?

MR. CROSBIE: He answered it already.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister has not answered it.

MR. CROSBIE: He will take you out and...

MR. NEARY: There he is, coming in again, coming to the rescue, honest John to the rescue.

AN HON. MEMBER: At nine dollars an hour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, you talk about arrogance. Anybody who is sitting in the galleries tonight will see who is arrogant. Arrogance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, I also want to - the minister refuses to answer that question, obviously he has something to hide. Now I would like to ask the honourable minister, Sir, if - there is a rule in the Department of Public Works that when you tender on a job you have to make a deposit. Is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are making one now.

MR. NEARY: I would like to make one right in the honourable minister's opening in his face, Sir, anytime. Mr. Chairman, I have the right to be heard in this House, Sir, and I have the right to be heard in silence. I would suggest that the honourable minister when he is going to speak, he go back to his own seat. That is one of the rules of this House, Sir. I will not carry on the debate until the honourable minister is ordered to go back to his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member need not sit in his own seat if he is...

MR. NEARY: The honourable member has to sit in his own seat to speak in this House, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not appreciate being interrupted when making a ruling. The honourable member does not have to sit in his own seat in the House. If he rises to speak in the debate he must rise from his own seat.

MR. NEARY: If he opens his yap at all, Sir, it has to be from his own seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause (9) carry?

MR. NEARY: No, not yet, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it is getting kind of late, if you want to carry on until eleven O'clock I am quite prepared, but, Sir, I would suggest that you keep the "crackies" quiet. I am dealing with the Minister of Public Works. I am asking the honourable minister if it is a rule in his department that when you tender on a contract you have to make a deposit? If so, is this rule followed in all cases?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that that is a rule of the department. I gave the exception and where it was done in the snow clearing contracts. Because of some confusion which came about over that, the contractors were recalled. I might say for the honourable member it is not unusual at all for a government department, if it feel that tenders are not what they should be, to recall them. For instance, I can give another one right now on the pressure of local operators, the contract for operating our aircraft, which was due on the 28th. of December, was postponed until the 27th. of January. Other contracts that I know since I have been in the department have been recalled for various numbers of good reasons. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we will continue to do so because there is very often a very good and valid reason for recalling contracts.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was not particularly referring to snow-clearing when I asked the honourable minister that question. Could the honourable minister say if the same principle applies to contractor who apply for maintenance work?

MR. EVANS: We do not clear rain.

MR. EARLE: The honourable member may not know, but for maintenance contracts, that is small jobs up to a cost of I think it was \$5,000 or \$6,000, particularly for jobs on buildings which have to be done at a moment's notice, there is a limit within government where no contract need be called. The practice there is to share this work up among a number of contractors in the area, to give everybody a chance providing in the experience of our department they can do qualified work, do proper work, and the experience we have with them is good. The work is shared around. But on emergency contracts such as plumbing and electrical jobs and so on, where a comparatively small amount is involved, jobs need to be done at a moment's notice, you cannot wait over a weekend, for instance if there is

a boiler goes down in some building, it has to be done right away. This type of job and this maintenance job is done without contracts being called. That has been the practice for a long time and still is the practice. As far as I can see it works very well and it will continue to be the practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Item IX - Public Works carry?

On motion Item IX - Public Works carried.

HEADING XII - NEWFOUNDLAND LIQUOR COMMISSION

MR. CROSBIE: We have a lot to hide in this one, Mr. Chairman. You would need \$65,000 worth to put up with what we are going through here tonight. But anyway, the vote is for \$65,000 or the special warrant was. Additional funds needed because they did not make provision in the original estimates for the general salary increase for the warehouse and retail store personnel. That is the increase of five per cent plus four per cent, nine per cent.

On motion Heading XII - Newfoundland Liquor Commission, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading XIII - Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if the House Leader would agree we would like to do Economic Development, because the minister is not going to be here. do Economic Development next. The minister will not be here tomorrow.

HEADING XV - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

MR. DOODY: There is \$100 in here which is the smallest and simplest part of it. Unfortunately it is also the saddest part of it because it relates to the steel mill which was recently ordered closed in Donovan's. That is a new subhead that had to be opened, so that money could be transferred to it to pay for the errors, mistakes and excesses. Unfortunately this is so and that accounts for the \$100.

The \$1 million is one that undoubtedly will be debated when the agreement comes before the House, and that covers part of the \$1,750,000 for the Newfoundland Forest Products Agreement,

the Hawkes Bay Mill. These monies were transferred from subheads in the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission. Head IV, subhead (14) which is Industrial Incentives. There was a saving of some \$2.2 million under that subhead and so these funds were transferred to cover the necessities of Economic Development.

MR. ROBERTS: I am delighted to know that the subsidies subhead, the Industrial Incentives Act subhead, that is the one under which ERCO were paid and also the Power Commission's operating losses. As I recall their cash flows, they will have an operating loss for the next few years. Then at some point (I forget) 1987, 1988, some point in the graph the two lines will cross and they will build up a healthy profit, and hopefully pay off this money. We used to have long arguments with the officials of the Treasury Board, whether it should be shown under capital expenditure or whether the Province should take security of some sort.

I am delighted to know it is down by \$2.2 million. That brings it down to a mere \$5 million, which is still a great deal of money.

Why is it down?

MR DOODY: : It is down mainly because there were unexpected increases in revenues under that sub-head. Strangely enough, this is a rare occasion which I suppose kind of denies this dirty rumor about Tory times being hard times. The simple truth of the matter is that the Newfoundland Power Commission picked up extra revenue which offset what they had anticipated they would have to spend. There was also a decrease in the cost of crude oil, I think, which also helped.

MR ROBERTS: This is most interesting. Crude oil, gone down? I am sure Woodworths have not put their crude oil down.

MR DOODY : Their cost under the contract that they had. I do not mean that crude oil is down. I know the price of crude oil generally is away up

MR ROBERTS: Yes. I do not understand. Could the minister -

MR DOODY: I do not understand either.

MP CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I was the minister responsible. There are several reasons for this fading. One was that the steam plant at Holyrood was not used as much as they anticipated it would be used. That probably has some connection with the crude oil, the saving in crude oil, because they did not have to use so much crude oil, they had it there at a lower price. Because of the pulp and paper, improvement in the pulp and paper business - last year, for example that vote was up considerably because the two pulp and paper companies did not use as much power. I think these are the two main items, plus the fact that economic conditions were generally good in the year. So it was over-estimated by \$2 million.

MP ROBERTS: We know it was a good year, mainly because of Ottawa's liberal "UIC" payments. We will come back on that another time. I really am intrigued because what this amount is -

MR CROSBIE: ERCO did not use as much.

MR ROBERTS: Okay. Because the difference between what it costs the Power Commission to run, and they are tied in by a deed of trust, what it costs them to run and what they bring in. Now if the improvement in the pulp and paper industry, which was of the order of what? Seventy per cent performance to about ninety-five per cent? Speaking of capacity. It was about that, was it? If the fact that ERCO had some down time, my understanding of the ERCO contract is that we lost

MP CROSBIE: Diddled.

MR ROBERTS: Diddled is a good word. There is a demand.

MP ROWE: Take or Pay, you know.

MR ROBERTS: Yes, Take or Pay. ERCO pay "X" dollars whether they use any power or a lot of power. Using a lot of power, it costs more the more they use, sort of thing. What I am after though is whether or not we could expect any decrease in that in the future. I know when we sat on Treasury Board, in would trot the officials and in and out would trot with them five or six or seven million dollars, you know, a great wack of cash - gone. Gone! Is there any prospect that that is going to decrease this coming year

or what can we hope on it?

MR DOODY: Well, we have a different president of the Treasury Board.

MR CROSBIE: Well, this is not going to increase. I do not know what the forecast for the estimate is this year but it should not increase because we are not entering into any more contracts where they are going to get power at less than, therefore it should not get any worse. The forecast, I think I was explaining to the House last year - Well, you know about the ERCO one which is \$4 million a year

MR ROBERTS: I do not think anybody is very happy about that, maybe not even ERCO.

MR CROSBIE: So I would say that the vote under that heading is not going to increase. It may not be down this year, again.

MR ROBERTS: Will, for example, the linerboard mill coming on stream -

MR CROSBIE: They are paying cost.

MR ROBERTS: That is the whole point, they are, I know. A number of us refused to enter into the contract - The point is, we had Grand Falls and Corner Brook go from say seventy per cent to say ninety-five per cent. It was of that order. I do not remember the precise figures. Now the linerboard mill comes on it will use, I should think, a great deal of power, for which it is paying a commercial rate. I remember a number of us refusing to sign it or countenance a contract at less than commercial rate, if the honourable gentleman wishes to check the record. Will the linerboard mill coming on stream, again result in a decrease in this vote? Because this vote is literally uncontrollable. The Power Commission costs so much, and they cost so much when the power is used enough. Most of their operating charges, I should assume, are the cost of servicing their debt, we paying the principal and they paying the interest. What are the Power Commission now, a quarter of a billion dollars?

MR CROSBIE: For what?

MR ROBERTS: A quarter of a billion dollars? The Power Commission.

MR CROSBIE: About that, yes.

MR ROBERTS: It is a very large chunk of the provincial debt, when you take

in Bay D'Esnoir. take the Holyrood Plant and take in the REA and take in all the things that are in it. What I am wondering is will this go down or will the revenues be going up from the Power Commission that is coming up?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, it is not a - I think it is correct to say we have not the details here tonight because as a matter of fact the estimates from the Power Commission

have not been up before the Treasury Board yet. But when the estimates come up there will be a full explanation on it. I could not tell you and this honourable minister here is not responsible for the Power Commission. It is the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy. But we will have the details on that when the estimates come up, we just could not tell you tonight. The requirement is down this year.

MR. DOODY: I think it might be fair to say in lieu of the fact that this administration has made it quite clear that there will not be power subsidies to the extent of power subsidies, period, as it has been in the past, that this will control that particular vote.

The only incentive grants possibly, but certainly not that type of -
MR. ROBERTS: Well one can adopt a philosophy of making direct grants as opposed to subsidies.

MR. DOODY: Well at least you know where you stand.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that philosophy has a lot to recommend it instead of for example waving the sales tax.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: One will say we pay you - you know, take the DREE approach, so much a job or so much a dollar invested whatever one wants. It makes good sense.

MR. DOODY: To that extent you are right, the vote can be controlled.

MR. ROBERTS: At least it can be controlled, if not increasing. I do not know how many industrial incentives there may be. All the agreements have been tabled because the act requires them to be tabled. The one that counts because it has got the money - the cost of the money, is ERCO. ERCO, the last figure I remember was \$3 million, \$4 millions or \$5 millions a year. As a matter of fact, it might also benefit the province to close ERCO. Their \$15 million second mortgage that was the principal amount, some of it has been reduced I think by now. But it might pay the province to pay off that \$15 millions, which is only three years worth, and let the ERCO plant close.

MR. DOODY: There are 400 people working there.

MR. ROBERTS: That is precisely the point, there are 400 or 500 people working out there.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Finally the honourable gentleman is thinking our way.

MR. DOODY: I am speaking from experience.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is thinking our way. There is a story behind how the ERCO contract was signed, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am sure there is.

MR. ROBERTS: There really is. I was not in the cabinet my knowledge of it is second hand. But I should think -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Justice should know all about it.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice, I guess he was in the cabinet, the ERCO contract.

MR. HICKMAN: The ERCO contract was signed before I was in the cabinet.

MR. ROBERTS: Before the Minister of Justice then.

MR. CROSBIE: If he had been in the cabinet we probably would not have known about it anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that may be. One can lead a horse to water, Mr. Chairman, but he cannot make him drink.

MR. DOODY: There is no need to backfire, there is no point getting into history.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The point I am making - listen to what is talking.

ALL HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague, the other day, Mr. Chairman, in the House was accused of being responsible for something which happened when he was eight years old. I know he was a prodigy. He was a prodigy in his childhood and he is a prodigy today. I mean, good heavens, to be running the province -

MR. ROWE, W.N. My brilliant future is behind me now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thank God!

MR. ROBERTS: But the point I was making is that there is a story behind the ERCO contract and I will put in a plug for the forthcoming memoirs. Whether they are in fact to be called "Godfather" or not, I do not know but I am sure that it will be in there. There is quite a story. Does that take care of everything on that.

MR. DOODY: Oh, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well I have a question on the subhead

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Yes. All right then would the honourable minister care to make a statement on Mr. Nutbeem?

MR. DOODY: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does Tourist Development come under Economic Development?

MR. DOODY: Oh, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, would the honourable minister care to make a statement on Mr. Nutbeem.

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the committee want to go on with it now, I am quite game. We will not finish it tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: He is not being paid anything yet. Well the minister who knows, I think is the Minister of Tourism. I am quoting him now, he says Mr. Nutbeem is not being paid anything yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Well would the minister make a statement. I am under the impression from Information Newfoundland, that found wisdom to which Moses, coming down with the tablets, is a piker, I believe, quoting the honourable gentleman, I do not have the release here but could the honourable gentleman tell us what exactly is the position with Mr. Nutbeem, please?

MR. DOYLE: The question is, do you want to know what his salary is?

MR. ROBERTS: No, his salary is \$20,000 that is until it is renegotiated, retroactively. But has he started work?

MR. DOYLE: He started work but he has not been paid yet.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Is he going to work without being paid?

MR. DOYLE: I would hope not, he is well worth -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sure he hopes he will be paid, not merely -
no matter how much the minister hopes. Now from where, from whence
is he going to be paid? Will he paid this fiscal year anything?

MR. DOYLE: No he will not.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, charity. From whence

MR. ROBERTS: will he be paid when he is to be paid?

MR. DOYLE: Tourism. When and if this good House sees fit to pass the Tourism Bill, he will be paid out of that.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sure the House, probably unanimously, but I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman will be paid, so he is now on charity.

MR. DOYLE: And has been for about six months.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, is his pay to be retroactive for six months, to what point is his pay to be retroactive.

MR. DOYLE: February 19, Monday of this week.

MR. ROBERTS: I find this very interesting because he was on for six months without pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: On charity.

MR. ROBERTS: On charity, well he has been on charity all his life in that sense.

Would the honourable gentlemen like to bring the gentleman before a select committee and I will query him about his past employment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Select committeeitis.

MR. ROBERTS: I caught it from the Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: No, you did not catch it from me.

MR. WM. ROWE: He has royal commissionitis.

MR. ROBERTS: He has got royal commissionitis.

MR. CROSBIE: There is an open book over here.

MR. ROBERTS: Comic book.

MR. CROSBIE: It is going to be comic in another few minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Every man to his own taste.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank God one has taste.

MR. CROSBIE: Try and be relevant now, please.

MR. ROBERTS: I had not realized that Mr. Nutbeem was some sort of saint in human form. Would the Minister of Tourism to be, or the

MR. ROBERTS: minister designated or puisne minister, whatever he is, sort of tell us then, Mr. Nutbeem has been working six months, this is February what is six months back? August, tell us about it.

MR. DOYLE: As is known publicly, Mr. Nutbeem has been a member of the tourism subcommittee of the planning task force since July or August of last year, since that committee was set up. In addition to that, he and I, for about the last two or three months had been trying to get some initial ideas on paper and in our own minds as regards to celebrations next year of the anniversary.

MR. ROBERTS: As of February 19, two or three days past, his salaried engagement began.

MR. DOYLE: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: At \$20,000 per annum?

MR. DOYLE: That is correct?

MR. ROBERTS: What term of contract?

MR. DOYLE: Two years initially because it is figured that - I am talking two fiscal years, because the setup -

MR. ROBERTS: You mean part of this fiscal year, six weeks -

MR. DOYLE: No, I am talking April 1 hence, a month's time.

MR. ROBERTS: So he will be on for parts of three fiscal years, because he was on for six weeks of this fiscal year.

MR. DOYLE: Six weeks of this fiscal year.

The major celebrations for the silver anniversary will come not in the coming fiscal year.

MR. ROBERTS: Which after all is not the twenty-fifth anniversary.

MR. DOYLE: That is right, not until midnight of March of next year. So he will be on for this fiscal year and the following fiscal year. What happens thereafter we will then see.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, we will wait and see.

Mr. Roberts.

Will the minister give us an assurance that Mr. Nutbeem's salary of \$20,000 will not be renegotiated retroactively? I think that that is the salary being renegotiated from a current date, that the \$20,000 is fixed and will not be renegotiated retroactively.

MR. DOYLE: As far as I am concerned, it will not be.

MR. ROBERTS: Do I have the minister's assurance on that?

All the minister can do is speak for himself.

MR. DOYLE: I just did that, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, I want to be sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will all back him up one hundred per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: I keep my back to the wall -

AN HON. MEMBER: We are right with him.

MR. ROBERTS: You are right with him, are you? The honourable gentleman whose loyalty has not been bought - I am sorry, that is not the honourable - whose loyalty has not been bought. The honourable gentleman who is not here is the gentleman whose loyalty has not been bought. We are going to have the pleasure of Mr. Nutbeem's company. Is there a secretary?

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition a question. Were you referring to me when you said that I had been bought?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I was not.

MR. PECKFORD: All right.

MR. ROBERTS: I referred to nobody. I will repeat the full statement. I said the honourable gentleman whose loyalty has not been bought - I mistook the hon. gentleman from Green Bay for the hon. gentleman from Trinity North. The hon. member for Trinity North went on the television and said, "my loyalty has not been bought." I was not aware anybody had

Mr. Roberts.

said his loyalty had been bought.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have suffered through now since 3:30 A.M. of these irrelevancies. The money in this vote is not for tourism at all. It is irrelevant to this vote. We are not objecting to the Leader of the Opposition asking about Mr. Nutbeem. If he has another specific question, he should ask it and let us get on with it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not need an excerpt from the hon. gentleman from St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: It should not be asked here. It is irrelevant here.

MR. ROBERTS: The Chair will enforce the rules of this committee.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Who cares for his opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We are discussing Item XV, Economic Development. The questions that have been proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition have been answered. If there are no other questions, we will move on.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman - I have never had any doubt of accepting the Chairman's rulings.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. ROBERTS: What do you mean, sit down? Of all the arrogance, sit down! Listen to it! Sit down! Listen to it! This is the same honourable gentleman -

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I submit that there are only two things that can be discussed on the vote here for economic development. We are asking for a vote for Newfoundland Steel, 1968

Mr. Crosbie.

Company Limited and a vote for Newfoundland Forest Products Limited.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir!

MR. CROSBIE: These are the only items mentioned in this request for Supplementary Supply. The estimates were passed last year. The estimates for next year will be before the House in a few weeks time. I, therefore, submit that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is out of order in discussing any further anything except those items.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order? The bill -

MR. CROSBIE: And that came and there was precedent after precedent in the last statements of the House.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): What is wrong, Mr. Chairman. Does the hon. member want to take the chair, Mr. Chairman? Is that what he wants?

MR. ROBERTS: He would if he could. He would take anything he would.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Chairman, we were confronted with a bill, Bill No. 45, "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums." there is a schedule attached to the bill, head of expenditure and the one we are on now is XV - Economic Development \$1 million, \$1,100,000. We have already dealt with the \$100.00.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): No, no that is the steel mill. The point is. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Head XV of the expenditures of the estimates of this House of Assembly and the specious arguments given out by the Minister of Finance have no weight whatsoever I would submit, Your Honour, and we are permitted in accordance with the argument given by the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier today we are permitted to talk about economic development under this head of expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two items under discussion. Item XV - Economic Development and members are requested to confine their remarks to these two items. Of course, we have voluntarily allowed wide-ranging debate on many items, however -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, the bill before the committee has no items in it except Head XV - Economic Development \$100,100. Mr. Chairman, I have been comparing this with special warrants tabled earlier by the hon. the Minister of Finance but that is not what this bill is about, Sir. This bill is a request by the government for authority to spend

\$1,100,000 on Head XV - Economic Development. If the bill came in as an amendment to the estimates that is fine but, Mr. Chairman, this is an act for granting, as the clerk so sonorously read, at Your Honour's command earlier, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of the Public Service For the Financial Year Ending the 31st day of March etc. etc., that is the same heading that is on the main appropriation bill, the main supply bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair the word "certain" which appears in the resolution is of particular significance and those items have been put forth and mathematically they add up to \$1,100,000 and therefore the discussions should center around these items.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with all respect, Sir, I hope Your Honour will hear argument on this because this is not an academic point and it is not raised in any gamesmanship. The wording on the front of Bill 45, most of which I just read, is precisely

the same except for the change in the fiscal year as the - no precisely the same as the heading on the main Supply Bill, Sir, which totaled three hundred and sixty-six million, eight hundred and one thousand and one hundred, Sir, precisely the same. What is before this committee, Sir, is this bill. Actually, the resolution but by agreement we debate the bill at resolution stage and then when the committee rises it goes to all three readings at once, without further debate. If not the million and one hundred dollars to which the honourable gentleman refers is merely his estimation, but that is not the bill, Mr. Chairman.

The bill is, the resolution is to be submitted to the House, a request for \$7, 686, 120. The wording on the front of this bill is exactly the same, Sir, as that on the main Appropriation Act, not a different wording. The title of this bill, Sir, is the same as the bill to spend \$366 million, the bill which gave the government authority to spend money.

I would ask Your Honour to reconsider the ruling. Sir, I think it is a very important one.

MR. CROSSIE: Mr. Chairman, there are many precedents in the four or five years in this House in connection with the Supplementary Supply Bill. The estimates and supply were dealt with last year and gave this government authority to spend money on tourism and the rest of it. There will be estimates presented to this House later in this session for next year, when the full debate can take place on every item, all that happened this year and what we are projecting to happen next year and why we want the money. This is a supplementary supply bill which asks for the House to approve \$7,686,000 we spent, authorized by special warrants, for certain purposes. The only things that can properly be discussed on this supply bill are the details given as to why this additional money was necessary. If that is not the case, then, Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that you do not only have estimates once a year, you have estimates three times a year.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a suggestion. It is a very important point. No one in this House wants to see a bad precedent set about this. May I suggest, Your Honour, that Your Honour take it under advisement, since it is a bit late, and if there is a ruling, a ruling be handed down on tomorrow.

MR AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would just say this: I think this committee should not be permitted to degenerate to this stage. The Chairman of the Committee, rightly or wrongly, if he makes a ruling, which I understand Your Honour just made, then he has made the ruling. Now the Leader of the Opposition asks him to reconsider. This can happen every time. If this House is to conduct its business, I respectfully submit that once the Chair makes a ruling, then that ruling stands unless it is appealed to the Speaker.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think you made a ruling on this and my own view is such a ruling is proper. Just a moment now. No matter how green he is, this House here elected this gentleman to be the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

MR NEARY: Give him a chance to function.

MR AYLWARD: He does not want a chance. He does not want a chance, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman of Committees has made his ruling. Surely the opposition must accept that. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to a point of order.

MR ROBERTS: Make your point of order.

MR AYLWARD: The point of order is this, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman of Committees has made a ruling. You find the ruling objectionable, so you ask the Chairman of Committees: "Will you please reconsider it." Now I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is improper procedure for you. You have made your ruling. If that ruling is not acceptable to the opposition, and perhaps it is a big point and I am not trying to - regardless of whether we question the wisdom of the ruling or not, the point is the Chairman

has made a ruling. If that ruling is unacceptable to the opposition the proper procedure is to have the Chairman's ruling appealed to the Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the point of order. I am astounded at what the hon. gentleman says. I really had expected better from him. I am surprised. Well I did. Maybe I should not have but I did.

Mr. Chairman, as I heard Your Honour made a quick ruling. It is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Quick ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am not arguing that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. gentleman had the floor I sat down, and let him sit down. I do not think Your Honour for one minute as conscious as Your Honour is of the traditions and the rules of this House would want to make a ruling which may be incorrect, that is all I am saying. I do not want to appeal the ruling. I do not like that. Normally I have given way, the Chairman has cracked me at least as often as he has cracked anybody else and so he should have. I have no complaint there. All I am saying in view of the points made by the gentleman from St. John's West, as my colleague has put it, this is a major point. Apparently it has been discussed in this House before. I do not remember the precedence but what I suggest to Your Honour is if perhaps Your Honour may wish to do as the Speaker is doing in Ottawa and as our Speaker has done on occasion after occasion, consult with the officials.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will permit. This debate has gone on for some time now and whether or not the Chair has made a ruling, the Chair did in fact make a ruling that we are discussing Item XV - Economic Development and that the discussion of that head, the matter should be relevant to the explanations given by the minister or ministers and the Chair rules that other items are irrelevant. That is the ruling of the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: Very well, Sir, then very reluctantly I must ask that we appeal the ruling. This means, Your Honour - Is Your Honour familiar with the procedure for appealing? Okay. I only mean it is new, it is the first time it has happened to him. I do not know if he knows it. If he knows it, fine. I suppose we can do it before eleven o'clock if not, but we wish to speak to the point of order. When Your Honour reports to Mr. Speaker, we are then entitled to speak to that.

MR. AYLWARD: I think at this time the procedure is as the Leader of the Opposition knows we do not debate it now, we go direct to the Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I said. I do not know what has gotten into the gentleman for Placentia East, Mr. Chairman. I said I wish to appeal the ruling, reluctantly.

MR. F. R. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, In the Committee of Supply , I ruled that on debate on The Supplementary Supply Bill, debate should be relevant to the specific items stated by the minister for which (I cannot read my writing, Mr. Speaker) monies are required.

MR. ROBERTS: It being 11:00 P.M., Your Honour should leave the Chair I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: I give the floor to the honourable the Chairman of Debates.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I will begin again. Mr. Speaker. in the Committee of Supply I rule that on debate on the Supplementary Supply Bill, discussions should be relevant to specific items stated by the minister for which monies are required and should not extend over the whole department. My ruling was appealed.

MR. SPEAKER: I will not permit any debate on this. The question is that the ruling made by the Chairman of Committees be sustained and those in favour "aye," those against "nay." In my opinion the "nays" have it. Motion carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit that under Standing Order (8), Your Honour must now leave the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 11:00 P.M., I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow, Friday.

1

2

3

4

5

6

