



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 40

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Member for St. John's East.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, today I do not think that this occasion should pass without the House noting its sorrow and passing an expression of sympathy. I know all honourable members would wish to do so, on the recent passing of Archdeacon Norman, who was Archdeacon of Newfoundland and a very distinguished personage in the Anglican Church, who served throughout many of the parishes in Newfoundland. He had been very active for many years in the affairs of the church. He had been retired for a little while, and recently passed away. His interment took place today at Coley's Point.

Normally motions of this kind are placed before the House before this. We had intended to do so yesterday but I know the honourable members of this House would not like the time to go by without recording their sympathy to the family of Archdeacon Norman, not only to the family but to the Diocese of Newfoundland on its very sad loss.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, we would like to support the government in this message of sympathy to Mrs. Hierlihy and her relatives. Archdeacon Norman I believe was one of Newfoundland's most outstanding sons, especially in the Anglican Church. He served many missions throughout the Diocese of Newfoundland. He had been for some fifteen or sixteen years a very close and personal friend of mine and a very close and personal friend of my father for a much longer period.

The honourable Member for Harbour Grace and myself attended the funeral of the late Archdeacon Norman. We would indeed support this motion. I believe Newfoundland and indeed the Anglican Church have lost an outstanding son.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. H. A. COLLINS: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the honourable members in paying tribute to Archdeacon Norman. He was well known all over Newfoundland and during the past

number of years he has travelled extensively to the various parishes and missions. His most recent charge was in Bishop's Falls which is part of my district. He had a lot of relatives at Gander and in Conception Bay. I would certainly want to be associated with those who have extended sympathy to the family over the passing of a very fine Newfoundlander.

MR. SPEAKER: It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries today from the Municipality of Lumsden, Mayor Parsons, Councillor Dr. Manning and Town Clerk, Mr. Gray. On behalf of all the honourable members I would like to welcome these gentlemen to the House of Assembly and to the galleries.

PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Tilting, on Fogo Island. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is not a duplicate but it is certainly the second or third petition that I have presented on behalf of the good people of Tilting.

The prayer of the petition is that the road from the Central High School on Fogo Island, all the way to Tilting, be upgraded and paved. Now, Sir, this time of the year, like all other gravel roads in Fogo District, along the straight shore are in deplorable condition. This may be brought on through the mild winter and the melting of snow.

However the people of Tilting have a just cause in having their request made to have their particular road upgraded and paved. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the best anniversary that the government can help celebrate, if they will agree to upgrade this road and have it paved as well as all other gravel roads in Fogo District.

I am sure the people will be delighted and they will surely have something to celebrate if they can get those roads upgraded and paved. I beg to have the petition laid on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker,

with leave of the House: After the expressions of sympathy on the passing of the archdeacon, the honourable gentleman was up with his petition.

I would like to make a brief announcement with respect to senior appointments, in a sense, really promotions in the Department of Education.

(1) The appointment of Mr. Aaron Van Kesteran as Director of Vocational Education for the Province. He replaces Mr. W.J. May who some months ago was promoted within the government service and now holds the position of Assistant Deputy-Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Mr. Van Kesteran is a graduate in Mechanical Engineering from the Technical College of The Hague in Holland and is a registered member of the Institute of Professional Engineers. He came to Newfoundland in 1947, worked for seventeen years as Aircraft Maintenance Supervisor with KLM and with Allied Aviation in Gander. In 1963 he was appointed Principal of the Gander Vocational School, a position which he held until January, 1970 when he became Assistant Director of Vocational Education with the Department of Education. He is married, now resides in St. John's and has three children. I imagine he is pretty well known to a fair number of members of the House.

The other is the appointment of Mr. Allan Guy who also has been with the Government in the Department of Education for a number of years, as Director of newly created Division of Research, Planning and Information, in the Department of Education. Mr. Guy is a native of Twillingate where he received his early education and did under-graduate work at Memorial, Carlton and Queens from which he got his bachelor's degree. He got his masters in Educational Planning from the University of Toronto. He has completed two years of additional work, working on his doctoral thesis in his spare time, his free time or his own time.

Mr. Guy as well, I would imagine, would be well known to quite a number of honourable members. He was a high school teacher in Twillingate some years ago and as I mentioned is a native of that area. He also taught in Botwood and Grand Falls. He was a Provincial school supervisor in the Green Bay - White Bay areas and was supervising principal of the Twillingate Regional High School System and also was on the faculty of

the College of Fisheries for a while. He worked for some time as a planning officer with a Board of Education in Ontario and for the past three and one-half years he has been in charge of educational planning of the Department of Education. In his new job he is responsible for co-ordinating the department's efforts in research, accumulating, compiling statistical data and educational planning and he also provides for the consolidative service to school boards and to denominational offices with respect to educational planning in their areas of jurisdiction. He is married and they have three children. I table this in case any honourable members wish to peruse it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from St. Barbe North.

MR. FRED ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House I would like to congratulate Mr. Van Kesteran on his appointment as Director of Vocational Education. Mr. Van Kestern, although I do not know him all that too well, was a neighbor of mine for a very short period of time and he seems to be a very sincere and hard-working Newfoundlander and it is nice to see a gentleman who has decided to become a Newfoundlander being appointed to this high office.

I would also, Sir, on behalf of my colleagues, like to congratulate Mr. Allan Guy as Director of the Division of Research and Planning, if I got it correct, the Director of Research and Planning in the Department of Education. Mr. Guy, of course, is a native Newfoundlander. I went to university with Mr. Guy and he has had a distinguished career in the field of education and I am sure that he will contribute greatly to the Department of Education. I would like to wish both of these gentlemen all the best in their new appointments and sincerely hope that these two divisions will really get moving. I hope to see a great deal come out of the Division of Research and Planning, in particular, Sir, because I have been wondering over the past couple of years just what has been going on in that particular area of the Department of Education. Once again, I would just like to congratulate them and wish them all the best.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Twillingate.

MR. H.W.C. GILLETTE: I would very much like to add my congratulations to these two gentlemen. The former is a stranger to me both by name and by person. The latter Mr. Guy is not only a native of Twillingate but he is actually a



relative of mine, his mother having been a cousin of mine. So, naturally, Mr. Speaker, I have a great sense of pride in the fact that Mr. Guy has risen to this position with the Government of Newfoundland. He has been very, very close to education in Newfoundland since graduating from high school.

Just as a matter of a story of by the way, he made a trip with me when we covered some 700 miles, in my small cabin cruiser, when I was doing the North East Coast on a selling trip. He has some pictures and also he has a sketch and drawing of the cemetery in Croque which is a very unique cemetery in this province. He was very much interested in all of the aspects of the North East Coast, particularly for his own educational purposes. I believe he made a sketch at that time of every tombstone in the cemetery and the inscriptions on each and every one of them.

It is a cemetery which holds the seamen from the French and the British navies. I just mentioned that by the way, Mr. Speaker, but I want to repeat my congratulations to these two gentlemen, particularly to Mr. Guy. I feel, as the member for St. Barbe North, that both these gentlemen will add considerably to the educational programme of the government, any government of this province.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

HON. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the debate of yesterday, I want to give notice of motion of a resolution which should be of interest to all parties including the opposition. I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will on tomorrow move that the Standing Orders of this honourable House of Assembly be amended, in the following manner:

(1) To amend Standing Order 49 which will read as follows:

"49. (a) No member except the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition or a Minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such Minister or a member making a motion of "No Confidence" in the government and a Minister

replying thereto shall speak for more than forty-five minutes at a time in any debate.

Paragraph (b) The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition shall not be entitled to speak for more than ninety minutes at any time in any debate except where the Premier moves a government order or is replying to a motion of "No Confidence" in the government or where the Leader of the Opposition speaks in reply immediately after a Minister has moved a government order or makes a motion of "No Confidence" in the government."

(2) This is also of interest. To amend the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly by adopting a new Standing Order bearing number 116 as follows:

"116. (a) The proceedings of the Committee of Supply shall be limited to not more than Seventy five (75) hours to be reduced in accordance with the following provisions of this Standing Order.

"(b) There may be appointed at each Session immediately following presentation of the motion to move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means at least one Committee of the House which shall be charged with responsibility of considering and reporting upon any estimates referred to it, each such Committee to consist of not less than seven nor more than fifteen members of which fifty per cent of the complement of such Committee shall form a quorum.

"(c) The Estimates of ten departments may be referred to a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order in which case three (3) hours shall be deducted for each department so referred from the total of Seventy five (75) hours of the Committee of Supply.

"(d) All Estimates which are to be referred to a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order must be referred within ten sessional days from the date of the motion to move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means and the Committee to which such Estimates have been referred must report to the House within twenty five sessional days from the date of



said motion; but in any case, a Committee to which any Departments estimates have been referred must report to the House as soon as it has concluded its

consideration of that department. Paragraph (e) "Each report of the committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order of the House shall be placed on the Order Paper for debate at a subsequent sitting provided that such debate shall be confined to not more than three hours. Debates upon such reports shall be in the House with Mr. Speaker in the Chair and shall be subject to the normal Standing Orders respecting debates in the House provided always that at the expiration of three hours all such questions as must be decided in order to conclude the debate on the report before the House shall be decided forthwith."

Number (f): "Any estimates not referred to a committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order shall be considered in Committee of the Whole on Supply and it shall be the duty of the Chairman to record the time spent in consideration of estimates in each department."

Paragraph (g): "At the conclusion of seventy-five hours provided by paragraph (a) of this Standing Order or such lesser number as remain by reason of operation of paragraph (c) of this Standing Order, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Supply shall put all questions necessary to carry every vote and item of each estimate not referred to a committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order and such questions are not debatable.

I have a copy, Mr. Speaker, for the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill: A Bill, "An Act Respecting A Provincial Court.

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill: "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Teachers' Association."

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo.

MR. E.W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before we get into Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries.

The Minister of Fisheries made a statement on one of the radio stations this morning, I am not sure which one.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: CJON.

MR. WINSOR: CJON, was it? To the effect that refrigerated warehouses in the United States are now blocked with Newfoundland or fresh fish blocks. Can the minister tell us if the case now is that the supply is greater than demand for Newfoundland frozen fish blocks on the American market?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that is a little bit involved but I will try and answer the question in as concise form as I can.

Reports which we are getting from the United States, they are fairly accurate, we believe, indicate that most of the suppliers in the States do have a fairly high inventory of fish. It is higher than normal. I discussed the matter with the federal minister last Saturday and the Federal Government is well aware of the situation as we are and as the industry in Newfoundland is also aware of it. They have discussed it with them.

The best intelligence which we can get would indicate that one of the reasons for this is the introduction of minced fish into the United States from Korea and Japan, pollock and whiting. But then again the best information from the Federal Government at this time is that it might be a temporary thing. We are looking forward to the position improving as the summer comes on.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, is what the minister saying now that we have reached the stage where the Newfoundland frozen blocks have reached the saturation point? If this is so, does the minister think that this will have any effect on the price of fresh fish to our fishermen?

MR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, we are not anticipating any difference in price to the fishermen. The price at the stage at the moment is fairly stable. Prices have dropped back a little from the high of last summer and last fall. There is every indication that the price which will be offered for salt fish this year will be even better than last

year. So, in the event that the fresh fish market does not continue to improve, certainly from a Newfoundland fisherman's point of view, we look at the salt fish market. That market is really buoyant. So, we do not anticipate too much difficulty.

It has been said that one of the reasons for the high inventory in the States or the slow movement of fish has been due to the fact that consumption in Lent was down this year compared with last year. Of course, the major problem is again the minced fish which has been brought in by Japan and Korea

All told we are keeping in touch with the authorities in Ottawa, with the industry and we are all optimistic that it is a temporary thing and by the time summer rolls around and inventories start to build up again that the position would have improved.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: I undertook yesterday to get some information with respect to a question from the honourable member for Bell Island and this was regarding the government's new policy effective this month, April this fiscal year, of payments twice a month to recipients of social assistance. The payments will be made the middle and end, the fifteenth and last day of each month and will in fact be two equal installments of the total amount.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable Minister of Health. Could the minister indicate whether or not there is a shortage of supply of nurses to the International Grenfell Association at the present time and what steps his department is taking to ensure that areas such as Labrador, St. Barbe North and White Bay North that are under the jurisdiction of the International Grenfell Association will not suffer adversely from this shortage of nurses?

DR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of nurses in the International Grenfell Association as well as other areas. I think the main concern with the International Grenfell Association is finding nurses for some of their more isolated outposts and they are carrying on their campaign of advertising in the United Kingdom. A recent statement from Dr. Thomas indicates to me that the replies to advertisements in the United Kingdom for nurses have dwindled down to what he calls a trickle, in other words there are relatively few United Kingdom nurses now applying to come out to work with the

International Grenfell Association.

Another point was that some of the nurses have been put off from coming out here because of certain psychiatric requirements. These have now been deleted by the Nurses Association. People are given a year in which to work without a psychiatric exam. The essential point is that there are not sufficient nurses in the United Kingdom applying to come to the International Grenfell Association where traditionally they had been receiving most of their nursing supply from, and advertisements are now being placed in the Canadian and American journals as well.

We are very aware of the situation and are taking the necessary steps through advertising to encourage people to come.

MR. F. ROWE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has the minister given any consideration to expanding the facilities of the various nursing schools in the province for the purpose of getting additional nurses trained within the province itself, because we know that they are overcrowded at the present time and cannot accept all the applicants that they receive each year?

DR. A. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just before the class ended in September of last year we were informed that there was likely to be a shortage developing in the next year or two and we asked each school of nursing in the province to increase to a maximum their intake of students. In addition to which we have increased the numbers of training for nursing assistants. The other point I could mention is that the Miller Nursing Commission on nursing has now been received, it is at the printers. I have no doubt that when this is received back from the printers there will be certain recommendations there regarding the future nursing situation.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, another question of the Minister of Health. Has the minister's department, have any of his officials looked into the situation at the cafeteria at the university? Now I am not concerned about whether the food is a little cooler or not



April 3, 1974

Tape No. 1039

NM - 3

but on a television programme yesterday there was some pretty despicable evidence of dirty dishes and this sort of thing at the university, so I was wondering if the minister has had officials of his department

look into the hygenic situation of the cafeteria at the university.

DR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not see the particular statement nor was it brought to my attention. The last problem we had with the university was the question of the poisoning episode following which the public health inspectors made several visits and followed up on conditions there.

I will take notice of what he has mentioned today and bring it to the attention of the chief of the health inspectors.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the Minister of Fisheries on this very serious matter that was raised by my colleague the member here for Fogo. Would the minister indicate if because of the crisis that seems to be developing in the fresh fish industry - it is a crisis, Mr. Speaker - if the government are taking any steps to encourage more fishermen in the province to get into salting their fish because there is a great demand in the salt fish market? The price is good but it looks -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The price is going up.

MR. NEARY: The price is going up. The chairman of the Salt Fish Corporation announced a couple of days ago that there would be an increase in price. So, would it not seem logical then and make a lot of common sense to switch from fresh to salt? Does the minister have any programme in his department to encourage fishermen to do this?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is really no crisis has developed yet. As far as we can see, there is no crisis developing. As I mentioned, I discussed this with the federal minister last week and we were thinking in terms of what the federal government could do under the Prices Support Board in the event that some fish had to be withheld in Canada for a time until the market levelled off, until the supply was disposed of in the States. With everybody on top of it now, we do not envisage any problem.

With regard to my statement concerning the fact that the salt fish market is really buoyant and prices should be higher than last year, we have had meetings with the Salt Fish Corporation, with Mr. Maloney and with the new chairman of the corporation, Mr. Bradbury. We have also had meetings

with the people who normally produce salt fish. In other words, they buy the fish fresh from the fishermen and salt it. So, I have been assured that there will be adequate supplies of salt in the province for the summer. Also, I think that the industry and the fishermen and the government are ready for whatever might happen.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the minister is right. I wonder if I could direct another question to the minister and put my mind at ease concerning a rumour that I have heard that Fishery Products will be using two foreign draggers this year to supply fish to one of their fish plants here on the Avalon, I think in Trepassey it is, if this be true and if so why? Did they get permission from the Government of Canada and from this government here? Is it a fact? Can the minister confirm or deny whether this is true or false? If it be true, why? Why must they bring in foreign draggers? Manned by foreign crews I am told.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the announcement has been made. Fishery Products have entered into an agreement with the federal government whereby they have been permitted to bring in two Spanish trawlers, purely for demonstration purposes.

One of the reasons for this, Mr. Speaker, is that last year we caught only about seven - in fact it was exactly 7.6 per cent of the cod quota in the ICNAF areas of 2J3, 3K and 3O. Fishery Products are trying to prove that the Spanish method can be applied to Newfoundland. They have chartered two pair trawlers. The crews are coming with them but it is purely on a demonstration basis to see how effective that type of fishing can be carried out. They will have Newfoundlanders I am told on the boat for picking up the experience and training and so on and so forth but it is purely a matter between the federal government and Fishery Products and on a demonstration basis, experimental work if you want to.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is quite a shocker. Could the minister inform the House, Sir, if it is being done with the blessing and approval of the provincial government? Because I am sure if there were

any objection from the province, the federal government certainly would not give Fishery Products permission to bring these two draggers in, manned by foreign crews, to supply our local fish plants, and we with the record unemployment in this province. Is it done with the blessing of the provincial government?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of with or without the blessing of the provincial government. It is entirely an arrangement between the Fishery Products and the federal government. It is on a demonstration basis only, for experimental purposes. It is to try and improve our position in terms of being able to catch our quota of cod.

We are looking at an ICNAF meeting coming up in Halifax this year when it is going to be embarrassing to Newfoundland, to Canada in fact, because we are going to be seeking higher quotas, increased quotas and there is a real good chance that the foreigners

will look us straight into the eye and say; "Well, last year you only took about eight per cent of your quota, so how can you demonstrate to us that you can do better? I suppose the federal minister is taking the position it is a very worthwhile experiment. It is not something which is going to last forever. Certainly they need the cod fish. They are catching cod fish not flounder or red tail or yellow tail or red fish, It is strictly geared up to cod because for some reason and maybe the honourable member will be able to tell us more than we know ourselves because we have not been around here that long yet, for some reason down through the years we never in this province proved to ourselves or to the world, for that matter, certainly we have not proved to ourselves that we are capable of going out there and catching fish. I mean the fisheries of the Spaniards and the Portuguese have been coming over for some time.

I would suspect that the federal minister got this in mind. He is trying to find ways and means to improve our capabilities in that field. The information which is gained will be available to the province and certainly we hope it will be useful to us in formulating our long term plans.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister would inform the House if the minister or his government, if there were any prior consultation by the federal Minister of Fisheries or the Government of Canada before this decision was taken? Sir, are there any consultations? Did the minister object? Did his government object to this nonsensical move? Was there any objection on the part of the province?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we were advised of the fact after it was consummated. As I said, there is no reason why the federal minister should get in touch with us because this falls completely within the jurisdiction of the federal government. We were told about it on Saturday after the deal has been consummated.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the minister intend to protest this move? Or what is the policy of his government on it? Are they allowing these foreign dragnets to

come in here to supply our local fish plants with the blessing of the federal government? Are they going to protest it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is the minister going to protest this?

AN HON. MEMBER: Speech! Speech!

MR. NEARY: Will there be a protest?

MR. COLLINS: Time will tell.

MR. NEARY: Time will tell. Go ahead.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question following the question by my colleague regarding the foreign draggers. Last year I believe Fishery Products brought over a trawler the "Boston York" or a similar name to experiment upon the Hamilton Banks. I believe the charter of that vessel was jointly shared by the provincial and federal.

My question to the minister is: Has there been any report from that experiment? Was the experiment successful? What did they find?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there was an experiment carried out using the "Boston York". The cost was shared by the federal fish, provincial fish and Fishery Products. Some fishing was done on the Hamilton Banks. I think one of the things which was proven is that it is not a very economic area to fish in.

However before one can draw any firm conclusions they must take into account the fact that maybe the ship was not the right type ship. It is difficult to say if it were a success or if it were not a success because there are so many imponderables. Depending upon where you might go to the Hamilton Banks, it might determine what you catch is going to depend upon the ice so on and so forth.

The information which was gathered was useful. It might be noteworthy to mention the fact that Fishery Products did not undertake a similar operation this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: So it was not successful.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Hon. the Premier? In view of the information that has come out in the House this afternoon, will the Premier tell us what has happened to his famous trawler fleet, twenty trawlers that they were going to build to supply the fish plants around this province?



AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Six being built now at Marystown. Have there been any more contracts let?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is not it. Well would the Premier give us some up to date information on this?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon? What is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not to you, he says.

MR. NEARY: Well to the House - would the Premier give the House some information on it? Well, do not sit there like a dummy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MOORES: I will gladly answer that question.

It is typical of the Member for Bell Island. He knows more about personal innuendo to another person than he does about the fishery certainly because the record of the previous administration in the fishery was not that great. Regarding the trawler programme, the government have awarded the first six tenders to Marystown. It is as we have said earlier the intention of the government to become involved with further development in this regard. These boats are expensive and the financing, the orderly introduction for them into the catching capacity of the province, must be done in an orderly manner in conjunction with the trade and the union and so on. It is the intention of this government to pay some attention to the fishery as opposed to that mecca of information from Bell Island who would not know a cod from a sculpin.

MR. NEARY: That is really, really smart, Mr. Speaker. It is really funny. I know the difference between a man and a politician.

Mr. Speaker, there is another question for the Hon. Premier: (He is in such a sensitive mood today) Would the Premier inform the House if the government have made any representations to the National Harbours Board, re the freight delivery services down here on the St. John's Waterfront, which could possibly bring down the cost of living in this province if the improvements were made?

MR. MOORES: Continuously, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: We are really getting the information today.

Sir, I wonder if the Premier, in view of the things that have been said about the second oil refinery, Sir, and people expecting to get employment there this summer, would indicate to the House the actual start up date of the second oil refinery? When will people be able to find employment on the second oil refinery?

MR. MOORES: I would assume, Mr. Speaker, as soon as it starts.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate to the House the starting date? Is there a target date for starting the second oil refinery?

MR. MOORES: The contract has been let, Mr. Speaker, and as I understand the engineering plans have been drawn up. The company who is building

the refinery have this information. The company appointed by the government, representing the government's position - I have to look at these plans. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, above all else, it will be started as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate to the House how long it will take this French firm to draw up the plans for the refinery? Will it be six months? A year? Two years? How long will it take?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable gentleman that it will not be anything that he could not put on the Order Paper and get an answer to because it will be at least that long.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Will the second oil refinery start this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

This issue of the second oil refinery and questions thereto have become a debate between the Hon. Member for Bell Island and the Hon. Premier. I am sure that the honourable members are aware that this is not really the purpose of the oral question period, to get involved in a debate. It is the feeling of the Chair that we should continue with either other questions or Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Health. In view of the reports that 2,000 employess in the hospitals in St. John's are threatening to go on strike because of lost time or unsatisfactory arrangements for the emergency that was declared during the recent storm in St. John's, what steps has the minister taken to try to offset this confrontation which seems to be brewing between the hospital boards and the government and the employees in the hospitals?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health is caught in the middle of this because it is between the Newfoundland Hospital Association and the Treasury Board. We have spoken to both parties. We are not involved in the immediate negotiations.

MR. NEARY: Treasury Board is an arm of the government, is it not? Could not the minister consult with his colleague, the Minister of Finance?

DR. ROWE: I have said that I consulted with them.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister give the House the information?

What was the result of the -

DR. ROWE: I will not speak on behalf of Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well would the minister undertake to get the information?

This seems to be developing into a very serious matter.

DR. ROWE: I will undertake to speak to my colleague the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

MR. NEARY: Give the information to the House?

DR. ROWE: That would be up to my colleague.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the rebellion that is just about to take place on the outer regions of St. John's where the minister has imposed a land freeze, although he does not like to refer to it as a land freeze, would the minister indicate to the House if the government intends to revise its land freeze?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any rebellion that is taking place with regard to the so-called

land freeze which is not a land freeze. Then again, it is pointless to try to get that across, I suppose. We have said on numerous occasions and I have said here in this House before that we will do a complete reassessment of the land development controls in the St. John's area in the spring, but there is no way we can do it before the spring comes; when the snow is off the ground.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name would smell just as sweet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, a supplementary question: Would the minister indicate if the Government have any plans to purchase the land? I know the inventory is going to take some time. The land is frozen at the moment. Does the Government have any plans to purchase the land from the owners or are they just going to proceed with half a programme, half a policy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MAYNARD: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a question that could be put on the Order Paper. It is not one certainly of immediate urgency. We are dealing with the farming community in the area of St. John's and whether or not we might have a policy or formulate a policy to purchase land or do otherwise with it will come at a later date. I am not going to answer the question now.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from St. Barbe North.

MR. F.D. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the honourable Minister of Education: Is the minister aware of the fact that the President of the University feels that enrolment will still be down again next year at the university and hundreds of young Newfoundlanders will be turned away from the University?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I am aware of that. Yes. It was reported, I believe, in this morning's Daily News.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education: What do the minister and his Government plan to do in order to get back the student enrolment at the university to some degree of normality, similar to what it was a couple of years ago?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly in the kind of economy we live in, we do not direct and require people to go to this institution or that institution. So, I really do not know what one could answer there. I presume the honourable gentleman is referring to the Student Aid Programme. I presume that he is referring to the Student Aid Programme and asking or wishing to have answered rather, the question with respect to the Government's Student Aid Programme for next year which I, of course, am not at liberty to reveal until the estimates of expenditure are tabled in the Legislature, until after the budget speech.

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day, we will continue with motion number (7), I think, on the Order Paper. I think the debate, last Private Members' Day when this was discussed, was adjourned by the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I find it kind of difficult to get back to a speech that I started over a month ago relating to the amendment to the Private Members' Resolution put by the member for St. John's North. The amendment, of course, was put by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I believe during the course of his remarks relating to the motion.

Sir, at that time when I was speaking, just over a month ago, I expressed the feeling that I did not know whether or not I should commend or condemn the honourable the member for St. John's North for bringing this particular motion into the House.

Sir, I commend the gentleman for his intentions of bringing the motion into the House but Sir, I really have to criticize him and condemn him for not bringing in any substantial motion, a motion with some teeth in it in order to govern election expenses and what have you. Sir, there are simply no teeth in the member's resolution and this is



why the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was forced to bring in this particular amendment.

Sir, the other question that I asked at the time and wondered out loud at the time was, why would it be necessary for a government backbencher to bring in such a resolution or a private members' bill calling for legislation with respect to the conduct of elections and election expenditures and donations and this sort of a thing?

Sir, I express the feeling that if this government, this present government were indeed a team, which have been suggested from time to time, that they certainly must have been able to have a caucus, bring this particular matter of election expenses and donations and what have you up in caucus and make a recommendation to the cabinet and it would be considered at the cabinet level, legislation would be drafted and it would be brought in as a government bill. Sir, this is something that I find very, very difficult to understand indeed, why in fact legislation has not been brought in by the present administration. Instead, we have a private members' bill coming from of all places the backbenches of the present administration.

Now, Sir, since this motion has been put, we have heard from the Hon. Minister of Finance, we have heard from the honourable Member for St. John's East and the Member for Bonavista South on the government side. Sir, in the course of my remarks over a month ago I suggested that nothing has come from the government side of this House on the debate on the amendment so ably put by the Leader of the Opposition, nothing has come from the opposite side of the House except an attempt to cloud the main principle of the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, there have been a twisting of words, a convolution of words, great red herrings have been dragged across the floor of the House of Assembly in an attempt to confuse the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition. There have been a steady rash, Sir, of criticism from in particular the Hon. the Minister of Finance and to a certain degree from the Member for St. John's East and from the Member for Bonavista South, criticism of the Opposition, the present

Opposition in this House of Assembly, of the previous administration, criticism of the federal government, criticism of school boards and the churches with respect to anything having to do with election donations, expenses or the conduct of these elections, Sir, which I interpret as nothing more than to cloud the issue or the main point of the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Sir, I was out of the House at the time that the Hon. the Minister of Finance was speaking. However, I did read through the verbatim reports. We just get a series of words such as; mischievous, pernicious, political quackery, obnoxious, trashy, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota. Sir, an outpouring of adjectives and adverbs simply to confuse the main point or the main principle of the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir, the Minister of Finance attacked the previous administration for not bringing in such legislation during their twenty-three years of governing this particular province.

Sir, over a month ago when I was speaking I made certain charges or I attack the points made by the Minister of Finance and by the Member for St. John's East but I did not substantiate the charges at that

time and this is what I intend to do today, Sir.

Sir, the honourable the Minister of Finance on February 13 said, and quoting from the Minister of Finance: "I introduced a resolution before the House while I sitting here as a Liberal backbencher. Like my honourable friend, the member for St. John's North, when I introduced a resolution before the House requesting action similar to that requested by the honourable the member for St. John's North in his recent resolution, I spoke on it and I was scorned by the government of the day about it, by the Leader of the Government I was treated with contempt." This is the kind of thing the honourable the Minister of Finance gets on with, Sir.

"In any event, the resolution was not accepted by the House," the Minister of Finance goes on to say, "The Premier of the day piled three or four reports on the table and said that this was trashy and the House should not consider it. It was obnoxious. It was redundant. It was pernicious, it was everything under the sun, that the member who moved the motion was the same way. Nobody on the Liberal side of the House, and four of the honourable gentlemen opposite were in the House then, supported it whatsoever. For the previous twenty-three years of our existence not one jot, tittle or iota was done to reform electoral law in Newfoundland except to bring bills before the House gerrymandering the various districts. This is all the previous Liberal Government ever did in this direction."

Now, Sir, I would suggest that it would have been a much higher ground for the honourable the Minister of Finance to take if he simply, if he could tear himself away from the past, forget that the previous administration is not in power, forget that J.R.S. is not on this opposite side of the House, forget that the leadership campaign is over, that the election of October, 1971 is over and deal with the present and not the past. This is precisely, Sir, what the honourable minister has been doing consistently on every occasion in this House, attempting to criticize, not attempting to criticize, criticizing the previous administration on every occasion no matter what the topic is at hand.

Now, Sir, usually the Minister of Finance attacks the Opposition for disagreeing or being negative, disagreeing with the Government or being negative in its approach towards the Government. Sir, the Minister of Finance did the exact opposite, a complete turnaround in the course of his remarks at a later point in his speech when he attacks and criticizes the Opposition for agreeing.

Quoting from again Sir, the Verbatim Report of February 13, "Why is the Liberal Opposition of this House now coming on to say how much they are in favour of these changes?" Presumably he was referring to the fact that we were in favour of something along the lines of the motion put by the member from St. John's North and in favour of the Federal bill C 203, I believe it is, governing election expenses. "Why is the Liberal Opposition of this House now coming on to say how much they are in favour of these changes?"

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think this a shocking state of affairs when honourable members on this side of the House have to consistently call for a quorum.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One day we are going to out-vote them. Does he know that?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Minister of Finance asks why the Liberal Opposition in this House is now coming on to say how much they are in favour of these changes. "Because they are out of power," he suggests, Sir, "because they are finding it more difficult to get money than the party that is in power."

Sir, the minister is completely inconsistent throughout his attack on the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister of Finance attacks the Leader of the Opposition for a speech that he made a few months ago. I cannot remember exactly where it was. I think it was either in Corner Brook or Stephenville, but,

Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance attacks the Leader of the Opposition for his speech that he made regarding election expenses. The Leader of the Opposition made a speech a few months ago in which he was in favour of this and he gets up in the House with his amendment. He suggests that it is all hypocrisy. "It is just hypocrisy." He may believe it also but the real reason why they are now so for it when before they would not consider it, was that before they thought they had the advantage over the Progressive Conservatives, if they did something like this the P.C.'s would be able to battle them on equal terms.

Sir, this is another example of simply attacking for the sake of attacking, dragging a red herring across the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition, which attempts to put a little bit of meat into the private members' resolution moved by the Member for St. John's North.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition is not being hypocritical whatsoever. Over the years, Sir, people do think, even members on this honourable side of this House, they have a change of mind, they have a change of philosophy and of ideas. God help us, Sir, in this House if everybody ceased to think or change their minds! We still can have a change of philosophy on items that are brought up in this House. Surely, Sir, it is the right of the Opposition to have a change of mind based on their experience. Sir, What is wrong with that? It seems to be wrong, Sir, for the Leader of the Opposition to change his mind but it is quite all right for the Minister of Finance to take his stand, different at this point in time from that which he took in 1968 and 1969 when he was the so-called defender of justice at this time.

Sir, another example of a red herring that can be found in the Hon. the Minister of Finance's speech is when - Mr. Speaker, I insist on calling a quorum again.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Would the Clerk count the House, please? There is a quorum.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Speaker, it is the government's responsible to maintain a quorum in this honourable House.



MR. NEARY: Get a new Whip, I would suggest.

MR. ROWE, F. B. The Whip is not doing his job, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Speak from their own seats please.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance in his debate attempted to drag another red herring across the amendment.

The honourable gentleman opposite, the minister says,

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Member for St. Barbe North for the last three or four minutes has been talking about -

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

MR. PECKFORD: the resolution that is on the floor as if the Minister of Finance had a resolution dealing with red herring. Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the resolution that was brought in by the Member for St. John's North -

MR. ROWE, F. B. What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker? Will the member state his point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: I am in the process of stating it, Mr. Speaker. Then the amendment brought in by the Leader of the Opposition had to do with election expenses. The amendment explicitly says that the Leader of the Opposition or the Opposition want the government to bring in some legislation within thirty days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Member for St. Barbe North all he is doing is discussing the speech by the Minister of Finance and trying to contend that red herring were brought across the floor of the House and hence he is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, it is a matter of opinion between two members of this honourable House. I am debating the issue at hand, I am not criticizing the Hon. Minister of Finance personally. I am debating what it is that the Hon. Minister of Finance said in his debate and I assume that this is the purpose of this House of Assembly. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the point of



order is not a point of order, it is merely a difference between two members.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Yes, I am inclined to agree with the honourable Member for St. Barbe North that while he may wander far afield at times, he is generally speaking within the realms of relevancy. While it is good at times for honourable members to bring up points of order in which they give their opinions, the rules are

being traversed. However, I do feel at this time that the honourable member is within the rules.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance said, Sir, that the honourable gentlemen opposite are going to force us to introduce legislation within thirty days, going to force us. I heard somebody mention arrogance a few minutes ago. What could be more arrogant than the House of Assembly passing a resolution like that? They are not only going to introduce legislation Mr. Speaker, the members of the House tell us they are not only going to introduce legislation they are going to do it within thirty days.

Now, Sir, this is another example of much to do about nothing. Honourable members on this side of the House are not strong on this particular point and I am prepared to move an amendment to delete that particular section from the amendment put by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was simply emphasizing the fact that this is something that had to be dealt with as quickly as possible. It should not be allowed to drag and die out during this particular session of the House of Assembly.

Sir, another example of distraction mentioned by the Minister of Finance was when he said, "Mr. Speaker, we are now supposed to meekly follow the House of Commons of Canada." Or tomorrow will they bring in a resolution to this honourable House, some other act passed by the Parliament of Canada. Will we be asked to pass our own Family Allowance Act? Will we be asked to pass the National Defence Act? Will we be asked to pass a LIP Act? We do not need it, we have lots of lip across the House.

Sir, what kind of argument and what kind of statements are these put by the honourable the Minister of Finance whom I understand, Sir, is a lawyer, and we would expect some greater degree of logic in the honourable Minister of Finance's debate and argument than that which we find in this inconsistent and convoluted speech that

he presented with respect to this particular amendment.

Sir, another example of distraction, deliberate distraction I submit, Sir, to distract from the main point of the amendment put by the member for White Bay North, It may very well be that some or all or many of the provisions in the present federal legislation will be suitable to be introduced into our legislation. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest seriously that within thirty days the government introduce into this House a law on this subject similar to that passed by the House of Commons in Bill C-203 is the height of ludicrousness. He is asking the House to do something so ludicrous and so unheard of that it boggles the imagination. "I would say that this amendment must have been drafted by the member for Bell Island. It certainly was not drafted by anybody who was fair thinking. It was drafted by the honourable member for Bell Island; well it is certainly mixed up enough to be."

Now, Sir, I am flabbergasted, my mind is when I hear an honourable Minister of the Crown coming on with such garbage and such foolishness in those quotations that I related to this afternoon, Sir.

Sir, another point the Minister of Finance brings up is this; He says that we cannot pass legislation directing radio and television stations to make free time broadcasting available to political parties in Newfoundland. There is no way even if we were so inclined, Mr. Speaker, that we could plainly adopt the legislation passed by the House of Commons. The honourable Leader of the Opposition is barefoot of ideas.

Now, Sir, is the Minister of Finance suggesting that we cannot negotiate with the federal government or federal agencies or federal departments pertaining to such matters? I submit, Sir, that we can. As a matter of fact when this administration took over, Mr. Speaker, there was a great trooping of members opposite to Ottawa with a film crew to show a great buddy buddy relationship existed between the federal administration in Ottawa and the provincial

administration which was supposed to be contrary to that which existed previous to the March election. Sir, I am suggesting that there should be no trouble whatsoever in negotiating with the federal authorities or CRTC or the federal government or any federal agency if there is a simple matter of a question of whether free radio and television time can be made available to political parties.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Leader of the Opposition just last week managed to get fifteen minutes of free television times I believe.

MR. WM. ROWE: And radio.

MR. F. ROWE: And radio time.

MR. ROBERTS: Except CBC.

MR. F. ROWE: Except the CBC, and this did not require months of negotiations or anything else with the federal government.

Sir, the Minister of Finance, I submit, was not only shallow in his arguments and inconsistent in his arguments, lacking in logic in his arguments with respect to the amendment put by the member for White Bay North but, Sir, I submit that the Minister of Finance was indeed hypocritical with his stand on certain points and I, Sir, refer to his stand on patronage when it comes to elections and events following elections.

"Newfoundland, Sir," he says, the honourable Minister of Finance, "is no different in this respect than any of the other nine provinces nor is it different from the Government of Canada. Patronage, Sir, is the system in all ten provinces and the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the fuss," and this is quoting the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, "when I think of the fuss that was made last year about one George McLean who got several small advertising contracts from the Newfoundland Government and compare it with the situation to Ottawa where tens of millions of dollars are paid out yearly to advertising companies that run the Liberal Party's advertising and political campaigns nationally, it just makes me

wonder. Patronage of the sort that McLean got in Newfoundland is small potatoes compared to patronage being handed out."

Now, Sir, he does not substantiate these charges. They have been substantiated in this province.

An honourable member asks, Sir, "Are you admitting that McLean got patronage?" Mr. Crosbie -

MR. BARRY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member going to read back to us the Minister of Finance's speech. It is all very well to relate in passing to some of the irrelevant or unsupportable arguments used by the Minister of Finance, if there are any and I doubt there are, but do we have to listen to the entire speech of the Minister of Finance again? If the honourable member cannot get his own speech for presentation to this House, then I suggest he sit down and give somebody else a chance.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy would not want to hear the honourable Minister of Finance's speech once again because it was lacking in logic. Sir, the point is that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member may make his point.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Mines and Energy does not have a point of order. As I understand it, Sir, this Assembly is established for the purpose of debate and I can be no more relevant than to refer to and rebut some of the statements made by the Minister of Finance, and if it hurts the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, that is his problem.

MR. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, we might make the point that if he is going to quote the Minister of Finance he should at least read what he said forwards rather than read it backwards.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Could I speak to the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member has already spoken to the point of order, has he not?

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): He spoke to the same point of order. If the honourable member might resume his place. Is the honourable member seated? The point raised by the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy is certainly a point of which I think the honourable member for St. Barbe North should take note. He is reading quite extensively from a speech by another honourable member and one of the standing rules of debate in the House is that honourable members should compose their own speeches and they should not read either speeches prepared by themselves or by other people. However, the honourable member is, generally speaking, using it for reference, but I do think that he is reading from it somewhat more extensively than necessary.



MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that for ratification of all honourable members and Your Honour that if I did refer to remarks made by the honourable Minister of Finance strictly by memory, that through human error itself I would probably end up misquoting the honourable the Minister of Finance. On that point I will be ruled on a point of order. The only way that I can accurately quote the honourable the Minister of Finance is to quote from the verbatim report, Sir, from which I will continue to do so.

Sir, I can assure the honourable member for St. John's North that I am reading from the front to the back. If he hears from the back to the front, that is his problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making is that the honourable the Minister of Finance has taken an extremely hypocritical stand on this whole business of patronage because, Sir, when the honourable minister -  
MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable member's word 'hypocritical' is a form of the word hypocrite which in Beausheue is abusive and insulting language. Maybe the honourable member might in continuing his speech make his point using other words.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may we have the citation on that?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Yes, section 155, 4, Beausheue.

MR. F. ROWE: For my own -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Did he wish to speak to a point of order?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will continue and I will say that the honourable the Minister of Finance's stand with respect to patronage if not hypocritical is certainly completely inconsistent with statements that the honourable Minister of Finance made during the 1969 leadership campaign and statements made during the two provincial elections.

When the minister was asked in this honourable House if he were admitting that McLean got patronage, the honourable Minister of Finance said, "I certainly admit it. What else do you think he got? I mean

we are not fools here." Sir, the Minister of Finance asks us what all the fuss was about over McLean. I ask the honourable Minister of Finance what all the fuss was about in the declining years of the Liberal Administration when the word patronage was brought up on a number of occasions by the honourable Minister of Finance in this House, on open line shows, on public stages and during the election campaigns? Sir, I can assure you if that is not hypocritical, the least it is is that it is inconsistent.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are not allowed to do it by the backdoor.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy will have all kinds of opportunity to get up and make his speech. Unfortunately, Sir, the poor old Minister of Finance usually has to bear the brunt of the criticism from this side of the House because the honourable the Minister of Finance is practically the only person that does any speaking on the other side of the House and is the only leader on the other side of the House.

If some other honourable members said something, we should be able to debate what they had said.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: God help the other side then!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They need a leader.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, the minister -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Is this in order, Mr. Speaker? Arrogance! A quorum call please, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A quorum, Mr. Speaker, a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Would the clerk count the House, please?

We have a quorum.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Finance in his debate suggests that there is no need for public financing of elections. Well, Sir - just one second now, where did it go? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said that if we provide in effect a disclosure law you will see contributions of political parties dry up immediately because the people

who donate large amounts of money are not going to want their names disclosed when they do it.

Now, Sir, I suggest that we have to pay the price of democracy in this province or any other part of the Western World. I would suggest that it would be less expensive in the long run if we did have public financing of election expenses because somebody pays for election campaigns in the final analysis. I would submit, Sir, that in the final analysis and indirectly the people of this province pay for every leadership campaign, every election campaign. It cost more, Sir, than it would through proper controls and if it were done through public financing.

So, Sir, I would like to make a point that if we are to have democracy in this province or any other part of Canada that the province and the people of the province should be prepared to pay for it and it would cost less in the long run to do it through public financing than through this system where you get large corporations and what have you donating to political parties. They expect something in return for it. Obviously they are not written contracts. This has been a part of our history, Sir. It has been a part of the history of Canadian politics and I submit that in this day and age that we should be reaching the point where we say let us pay at a cheaper price, at a less expensive price for our democracy.

Sir, if you carry this argument to its logical conclusion, why the members of the House of Assembly, their salaries are paid by the public chest. Why not the election campaign itself? Sir, the Minister of Finance in his attempt to

attack, as well as attacking the Opposition and the Federal Government, lashes out, Sir, at the CRTC, at radio stations and at T.V. stations and Sir, I refer honourable members to page 720 of the Verbatim Report. I will not read that particular section, Sir; it is there for everybody to read.

Sir, on page 730 the Minister of Finance makes an astounding admission, an astounding admission indeed. "Finally a blow was struck for democracy and we had an election," the Minister of Finance says, "because all that the resignation did of Mr. Saunders from the House of Assembly was to result in an election. Mr. Saunders resignation permitted that there would be an election. That is all it did, permitted there be an election."

Now, Sir, I do not know if I am misinterpreting or misreading what the honourable Minister of Finance was suggesting at this point in the game but surely the Minister of Finance is not suggesting that any means justify the end. Surely he is not suggesting that cheating, bribing, do anything, to have an election call or to win an election.

Sir, these are the things that I feel duty bound to bring up with respect to some of the points that the honourable Minister of Finance made. The honourable Minister of Finance suggested, Sir, that this resolution calls for something that the Government is already considering or already doing. Mr. Speaker, I ask you this question. If the Minister of Finance is saying that this resolution calls for something that the Government are already doing, what are we doing debating this resolution? Why was it brought into the House to start off with? Why was it not brought in in the form of legislation? Was it discussed in caucus on the other side of the House?

Sir, I submit that the Minister of Finance was attempting to distort and distract and confuse and pull red herrings across the floor of the House using confrontation tactics to cloud the point of the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, the principle of the amendment was lost completely as a result of the honourable Minister of Finance's vicious attack on everything in sight, including CRTC,

radio, T.V., Federal Government and the Provincial Opposition.

Now, Sir, the honourable the member for St. John's East if he can tear himself from the Rules of the House, insulted, if I might say, his own colleague, insulted his own colleague, the member for St. John's North. Sir, the honourable member for St. John's East said -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: ... Mr. Speaker, I have to insist on calling a quorum. I think this is a despicable display of attendance in this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: Despicable listeners.

MR. NEARY: Adjourn the House.

HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Being no quorum, Sir, I move the House adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Quorum.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, without a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum. A quorum.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum, if any honourable member should wish to speak.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, we have no quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. ROWE: I am sorry! I was not in my seat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I assumed that the honourable gentleman yielded the floor.

MR. ROWE: For what purpose, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: On two occasions I indicated there was a quorum and no member took his place, so I recognized the Hon. Minister of Justice.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROWE: The Hon. Minister of Justice is now recognized as the speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I accept (Blocked out by applause).

I would like to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that I was not in my seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. ROWE: That is justice, Mr. Speaker! That is justice! I hope that the Minister of Justice is capable of explaining an attempt, Mr. Speaker,



to stifle debate in this House, when you have five or six members from that honourable side of the House, Sir, out strolling around the corridors.

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I very briefly refer to the resolution that is before the House in particular the amendment as moved by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

It does appear to me that in debating the principle of this bill or this resolution we seem to have lost sight of the main reason, I assume, why the honourable the member for St. John's North brought this resolution before the House. That was namely to give honourable members an opportunity to present to the House and to Government and to this Government that must share the, indeed must not share but must carry the responsibility of bringing legislation policies before the House. But is very commendable, most commendable that the honourable the member for St. John's North seized upon this opportunity and stayed within the rules of the House to give Government benches the opportunity to hear the resolutions, the recommendations of the members of this Assembly.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the main object of controlling the election of expenditures by political parties and candidates is the reduction of excesses of expenditure, the elimination of possible tyranny which, as I am told, used to transpire many years ago in democratic societies over contributors and on contributors to the government of the day.

What is equally important, Mr. Speaker, is to eliminate in the minds of the public any concept they may have of waste and corruption within political parties exemplified by their extravagance at the time of an election.

Mr. Speaker, long before I was fortunate or unfortunate enough to find myself in public life, if there were one thing as a taxpayer and as a voter that I resented very much indeed particularly in federal elections, having to be subjected to six weeks of some of the most frightful propaganda that one could imagine. Day after day the candidates droned on, insulted the intelligence of the electorate by suggesting that they had



to repeat it every day so that everyone would fully remember the rather mixed up, on occasions, platforms and programmes that were presented to the voting public.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the voters and taxpayers of Newfoundland would hesitate for a long, long time before they would say to their elected representatives, "Take some of my tax money and help pay for some of the half-witted propaganda that we have to listen to, whether we like it or not, during election campaigns."

Mr. Speaker, any candidate for election, any political party has an obligation to clearly and definitively state to the electorate what his platform is, what his ideas are, what the party that he represents intends to implement should that party be called upon to form an administration.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, can be done very cheaply, very effectively without having to call upon the taxpayers of Newfoundland to dig further into their pockets and pay for it. I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, that if the people in Calvert were asked whether they would like to have their potholes filled or whether they would rather contribute towards the election expenses of candidates for offices that with very little reluctance they would choose the former.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a way to continue, to assure the perservation of democracy without asking the taxpayers of Newfoundland to pay for elections. Mr. Speaker, it can be done very simply and with a reasonable degree of effectiveness. I am not bold enough to suggest that it will be done with total effectiveness and that is by way of legislative limitation on the amount of money to be spent by candidates and by political parties.

The government of this province have done a fair amount of work. Last year when I, under the restructuring bills, was given the responsibility to administer the Election Act or at least as the minister referred to in the Election Act have been doing some work in (1) trying to ascertain the effectiveness of the legislative machinery that is presently enforce. The consensus of opinion amongst those who have written on the subject in Canada and those who appeared before the

Barbeau Committee set up on election expenses which filed their report with the Government of Canada in 1966 is that by far the way for the most progressive and best legislation in Canada is not the bill C203 before the House of Commons but rather the act which was introduced and passed in the Legislature of Quebec a number of years ago.

It would not be proper for me to comment on the practices that at one time had been followed allegedly in the Province of Quebec but there have been several books written concerning regimes of former prime ministers of Quebec which indicated that sometimes their rules left a great deal to be desired.

One piece of legislative restriction or requirement in a Canadian province which may be of interest to honourable members and which in my opinion is relevant to the debate is in Manitoba. In the Province of Manitoba it is provided that candidates are not permitted to spend more than forty cents a voter. Quebec is more generous. Quebec allows fifty cents per voter up to the first 10,000 voters, fifty cents for the next 10,000 voters and forty cents thereafter. British Columbia does not set any limitation at all.

Bill C 203 limits candidates expenditures to one dollar per voter for the first 15,000, fifty cents for the next and twenty-five cents thereafter. That certainly would be one provision that would be probably a little bit rich for our blood. Nova Scotia sets a limit of one dollar per voter up to the first 5,000 and eighty-five cents for the next and seventy-five cents for the next.

I have to confess that I was in Halifax one day last week where there was an election campaign being waged and despite these limitations and assuming that all political parties stayed within these limitations the three parties contesting that election and the candidates for these parties did not seem to be lacking for sufficient funds to conduct the election campaign and get their platforms across to the voters of that province.

Some provinces, Quebec does provide a modest reimbursement to candidates who received a certain percentage of the vote cast in an

election.

We have found that in our studies to make sure that when we come before this House - There is a lot of time yet, Mr. Speaker, this administration have just completed two years of office and the Election Act provides for five years that when a bill is brought before this House that it will be realistic and a bill that is capable of effective control and effective implementation. This will require, Mr. Speaker, for instance; maybe some great Democrats in the Province of Newfoundland will violently oppose even the principle we are talking about now because this would require for instance the registration of political parties, to be effective, to guarantee the effective enforcement of legislation. If legislation cannot be effectively enforced, Mr. Speaker, then I submit we should not bring it in and there is no reason why it would receive or should receive the endorsement and approbation of

honourable members in this House or any other Legislature. To be effectively implemented, you first would have the registration of political parties. Who is going to make that learned, fair and equitable decision as to what constitutes a political party? There will be no difficulty for the chief electoral officer recognizing the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, the New Democratic Party of Newfoundland and maybe even the Social Credit Party. He could possibly find but he might have some difficulty in recognizing the New Labrador Party. His problem there would be that that party, I believe, has stated in its constitution or certainly in the number of candidates that it has been running in elections, that it is primarily a party centred in one part of the Province of Newfoundland; namely, the three electoral districts of Labrador.

We may some day find ourselves with all kinds of unusual parties and groups who would get together and say that they are going to contest two or three districts and we are going to - well if we recall in the federal election, all kinds of parties break loose across Canada in certain areas. They never get very far. It costs the electorate a lot of money and that sort of thing in getting ready for them, preparing for them. But who makes the decisions? Are we going to define it? What kind of definitive description are you going to have insofar as registered political parties are concerned?

On the other side of the coin what would be the reaction of this House, for instance, if a political party dedicated to the overthrow, not the government - any party that is in opposition is dedicated to the overthrow of the government - is dedicated to the overthrow of our democratic institutions? If the late Tim Buck were still alive today, what would the chief electoral officer do if that gentleman came along and said, "I want to be financed by the people of Newfoundland in the forthcoming election and if I am elected, it is my stated policy that the House of Assembly will forthwith be dissolved and never again will we have elected representatives." What would they do with that?

Mr. Speaker, these are the questions that any conscientious informed government must direct its attention to before making a final decision as to the kind of legislation that should be brought in. It has been suggested by some people who have done a great deal of research in the field of election expenses, of election costs, that these things can be worked out on a voluntary basis between parties. This has been tried. It was tried in Finland, Sweden, and in West Germany, Mr. Speaker. The successes were very limited indeed and they were not long lasting. The result is, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKMAN: There are fourteen.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. HICKMAN: There was a quorum when it was called, Mr. Speaker.

May I note that that there were fourteen. I commend the Hon. Member for Fogo for staying in his seat, keeping the quorum.

Mr. Speaker, the result is that the Canadian Provinces, those who have brought in legislation, have felt; to be effective there has to be legislative provisions.

Mr. Speaker, in the United Kingdom, the Mother of Parliament, whose traditions we very properly follow to a large extent in this House, the Mother of Parliament has been woefully unsuccessful in the legislation that they introduced insofar as the controlling of election expenditures are concerned. In the United Kingdom, they control by legislation the expenditures of candidates but do not control the expenses of registered political parties. The result has been, Mr. Speaker, that all candidates for Parliament assiduously stay within the confines of the legislation and the limitations thereof and whack it to her out of the party treasury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia, who have brought in legislation, still find that they have had their problems and they are still encountering problems

in trying to adequately enforce it, to try and keep the lid on and at the same time allow candidates the opportunity to discharge their responsibility in getting their philosophies across to the voters.

The Government of Canada in its wisdom, sometime in the 1960's, set up the Barbeau Committee on election expenses. That committee after substantial hearings and a great deal of research, a committee that was composed of very competent people and research staff, presented their report in 1966. One would have thought that the federal government would immediately seize that report of the commission and say this is what we want, get the legislation before the House. The government



of the late Mr. Pearson and the government of the present Prime Minister, very properly and they could be commended for it, said that before we take this step it will require a great deal of study by the ministers and the members of the cabinet and the minister responsible for the administration of the act. It took them seven years, almost eight years, before the Government of Canada felt that it had now come up with an act which met some of the recommendations of the Barbeau Committee and then brought it before the House.

There have been all sorts of innuendos and suggestions and I have heard them during this debate, that the New Democratic Party should take credit for the final bringing of that bill before the House. I do not think that was the case at all, Mr. Speaker. I think it was the case that ordinary prudence dictated that there be a great deal of study into that committee's report before bringing the legislation before the House which as I say, Mr. Speaker, the authorities, writers say is not as effective, not as progressive, not as good as the Quebec legislation.

So, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government is very fortunate, should be eternally grateful to the member for St. John's North for having the wisdom to provide the Progressive Conservative Government in Newfoundland

the opportunity to hear from all members of the House on their divergent views as to the type of legislation required.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, we are not alone in our belief that there should be some control on election expenses. We believe - I certainly believe that we can preserve all the trappings of democracy and all the rights of democrats by limiting the amount of expenditure that is necessary. Even the limitation of expenditures, Mr. Speaker, has created outcries in some jurisdictions within Canada because, on the limitation of expenditures, in some legislation, there have been exclusions. For instance some of the provinces exclude publications in newspapers and editorials and news reports that are published in a somewhat different manner than under the guise of an advertisement.

Radio and television stations have complained that they have had

great difficulty and will experience great difficulty under the federal act in trying to decide what constitutes election broadcasting and what constitutes politicking by members under the guise of press releases during election campaigns. Other jurisdictions have excluded the reasonable cost incurred by a candidate and his agent for food and lodging and travel but have never been able to put a definition on what reasonable cost is.

So that, Mr. Speaker, anyone who subscribes to the view that a bill should be brought in within thirty days or sixty days in a parliament that still has a life expectancy and a legislative life of and a statutory life of another three years, in my opinion is not being realistic and is quite unaware of the kind of problems that have to be -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Would the clerk count the House, please?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Adjourn the House, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Anybody who speaks in the House has to be counted, Mr. Speaker, I submit.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. EVANS: They do not count even when they are in here.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, again before this debate closes, I would like to hear from honourable members. I have not yet heard from honourable members in this House who participated in the debate. Honourable members opposite, many of them spoke for an hour and a-half and it is their right. I would like to hear them submit their views as to the qualifications for official agents, the kind of auditing system that will have to be imposed in so far as candidates expenses are concerned, the limitation on the returns by all candidates to the chief electoral officer.

There is no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, that for any legislation to be effective we must have competent, independent auditors to audit the accounts of the registered political parties and to audit the accounts as they relate to the election of candidates. Who is going to pay for that? Should the taxpayers assume that cost? Or should you simply say to a

political party that that is your cost, that if you want to retain a  
a chartered accountant, and it would have to be a chartered accountant  
I would submit, to do this kind of work, it is going to cost many thousands  
of dollars. But, the political party says, I am not going to do that.

Alternatively are we going to use the taxpayers money and take  
an already overworked auditor general's department and suggest that they  
throw down their work on the accounts for three to six months and do  
that auditing?

The audit must take place in any jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, where they have control on election expenses and the returns filed at a maximum of six months from the date, from polling date.

Some jurisdictions require that every election voucher over fifty cents or one dollar must form part of the record which is transmitted to the chief electoral officer and must form also part of the audit of an approved auditor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is why I say that the amendment that is before this House is not realistic, indeed it is quite unrealistic. This is why government will continue, I hope, to make absolutely certain that before a bill is brought before this House that we have to attempt to find the answers to these questions.

Should we make a difference, for instance, in the expenditures allowed candidates in certain parts of Newfoundland, in that part of Newfoundland comprising of the three electoral districts of Labrador? Should they be allowed a higher expenditure? There are places along the south coast where the cost of conducting an election, because of geographical reasons, is considerably higher than St. John's Centre.

You would find for instance, Mr. Speaker, that both of the major parties in this province, I suspect for financial reasons, have been forced to lean very heavily upon provincial broadcasting and provincial television programmes. Yet many of us campaign, some of us at least, in areas where we have our own local radio stations or local television stations, where the candidates themselves cannot rely upon the provincial broadcasting, the provincial propaganda that has been emanating from their party headquarters. This means that candidates in that area are faced with expenses far, far in excess, I mean their own personal expenses, than those who can avail of the coverage and surely of the propaganda that is issued by their own parties.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I can say that as a minister in the last few months, having resumed responsibility for this bill, that we have been giving a great deal of study. Look at the recommendations, representations made, for instance, by the New Brunswick Federation of

Labour, where they too asked for a limitation on expenditures but then point out the real problems in trying to enforce the act and hoping and suggesting to their government that when they do bring it in they find the formula and it will be a far more efficient one than the one that is indicated in Bill C 203 to enforce their act.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of comments made, a lot of issues raised. Some are irrelevant I guess in the general context but relevant in the sense that it is only within the past few years in Canada and in the United Kingdom that people have felt it necessary to ask their legislators to impose some form of restriction on election expenses. They have done it, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, because the voting public is becoming more and more critical of its elected representatives. This is a great pity.

I like to believe, rightly or wrongly, that any member who seeks election to public office does it out of a desire, sometimes a burning desire, to serve his province or his country or his municipality. He does it in the sure and certain knowledge that if he does not perform competently that he will be and should be subjected to constructive criticism. When he enters that kind of life he is prepared for it. He has no right to assume nor no right to believe that the criticism of that member will go beyond his competency.

In the last few years, Mr. Speaker, and in particularly in the second general election of this administration, the one of 1972, and I say this not at all in a way to disparage those who have gone and served before us but I would say on both sides of this House that both parties attracted into the political field the most competent group of men who sought elected office since we attained the right of self-government over a century ago.

There are many honourable members in this House today who are making a pretty severe financial sacrifice to sit in this House, many members -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: There are members in this House and they are on both sides of this House, There is the honourable gentleman for White Bay North who is a professor -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Barbe North.

MR. HICKMAN: St. Barbe North, whose income I am quite certain was far greater than it is now and his expenditure was about one-third. There is the honourable Member for Carbonear whose income I am quite certain was far in excess. I can go on and take I would say every honourable member of this House and it would be hard to find one who today is not in a far less affluent position than he was before the voters sent him to this province.

But I would like to believe that the honourable members were willing to take that chance.



I would like to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable members in this House and candidates who were not successful entered the political profession in the belief that it was an honourable profession. I believe that when any of us see statements outside this House, generalized statements - these are the worse statements of the lot - generalized statements as to the integrity, in particular the integrity of elected representatives, that we should not take any great delight because at that particular time it may be aimed at some other honourable individual and honourable member of this House.

I do not believe, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that the political history of Newfoundland is such that we, as I believe some speaker said, above all else, above any other legislature must bring in legislation of this kind that is now being debated under this resolution. If one is a student of Newfoundland political history regrettably one has come across two or three episodes in the political life of Newfoundland of which we should not be very proud. I do not think anybody will point with pride to the findings of the Hollis Walker Enquiry.

It would be quite wrong to generalize and say all members who were in the Parliament of Newfoundland at that time were something less than honest because that is not what the Hollis Walker Enquiry found. It is regrettable that from time to time you may find one or two individuals in the days of Responsible or Representative Government who behaved not in accord with the best rules of honesty.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that for every Newfoundland politician from the time Representative Government was first granted and then Responsible Government and until we lost our democratic rights with the advent of Commission of Government, that for every one who had been found to have profited, to have become wealthy, you will find twenty-five who died in a far worse position financially than they were when they first were elected to office.

If in time the government of this province bring before this House and the House approve legislation controlling election expenditures, if and because it is felt necessary to improve the image of the political

people in our province, then so be it, it will have to be done. I cannot think of any other reason why it should be done. If we can satisfy the people of Newfoundland that you do not have to make contributions to political parties in order to get the same fair treatment from the government of the day, as a person does not, then obviously we should not concern ourselves about political expenditures at all.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is in that light and in that light only that a responsive government should and is looking at the type of legislation that will in time come before this Legislature.

The amendment to the resolution, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not acceptable, not acceptable in the sense, Mr. Speaker, that it does not take into account the various considerations that any responsible government must examine before bringing the legislation before the House. I would ask this House to take some comfort in the fact that this type of study that I am referring to has been going on within the confines of government for several months.

I believe that we will certainly be in a position. I think it is fair to say that there will be another federal election long before there is an election in this province. It will be very interesting to see if there will be any noticeable change in the six weeks of expensive propaganda that is spilled out over the airways and through the media -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They only do it for twenty-nine days.

MR. HICKMAN: Or whatever the limitation is or if there will be any reduction in the traveling expenses during the sixty days of the candidates. I would be bold enough to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we will not see any reduction. If we should not, then it shall be obvious that some of the fears that have been expressed by those who have examined the federal act and compared it with the Quebec act are not important.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I commend the honourable the member for St. John's North for his tremendous foresight, his tremendous concern as a great democrat to allow this resolution to be conjured up in his mind and then brought before the House and then permit all honourable members to participate in what has been a good debate.

One honourable gentleman got up and said -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: All honourable members or one?

MR. HICKMAN: One honourable gentleman got up and he spoke at one point when I noticed there was far less than a quorum here. He was on the opposite side and he spoke on and on and that was fine. There was nobody called a quorum. He started out by saying that he thought the debate was much too long and sat down at the end of his ninety minutes. There is nothing wrong with that because what he was saying and the wide-ranging debate we had on it was very worth-while.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, as I say I commend and thank the member for giving us the opportunity to debate it. I will not vote for

the amendment that we are now presently debating.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Harbour Main.

HON. W. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr.

Speaker, first of all I would also like to congratulate the Member for St. John's North on moving this resolution. He did a marvelous job of presenting it to the House. I will take issue with the words from the honourable Member for Bell Island when he stated that Mr. Smallwood was the first person to raise this issue. He was not, as we all know, because the Hon. Minister of Finance raised it quite some time ago, a few years ago.

At that time Joe Smallwood said it was silly. He did not expound very much on it. Of course, following in his footsteps the honourable Member for Bell Island got up and he also said it was silly. He said, Mr. Speaker, "The whole thing is silly. It is uncontrollable." But all of a sudden, when he spoke on the resolution this time he stated "It does not go far enough."

The honourable Member for St. John's North, if nothing else, has at least caused a very beneficial discourse on the subject of public financing, of election campaigns. It is indeed, Mr. Speaker, most interesting for any of us who have been involved in election campaigns during the past number of years to review the happenings during these years, the manipulations, the intrigues which at that time went on by the various candidates and the political parties. I am sure if it were written in book form, Sir, it would be a most interesting subject to read.

I have been involved in elections and political life for quite some time. I have on three occasions gone to the electorate, myself looking for support. I first became involved in politics when the former member, I forget which district - it was Bill Browne, he was sitting here in the House and a federal election came along, so he resigned his seat and tried for the Federal District of St. John's East.

But indeed it was a most unique experience. It was an experience of a lifetime. I do hope that some form of legislation will be introduced

in this House, whether it will be the resolution as proposed but amended, but I believe that there should indeed be some control on election expenses. I do not really agree that the election expenses should come from the public treasury, because I do not believe that our people should be taxed for this purpose. I certainly feel, however, that there should be controls.

In years gone by, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party found itself in desperate straits financially. They found themselves no doubt in the same position as the Liberals find themselves today. We had very little to fight a campaign on. Our candidates had to find funds as best they could, through their own personal means and efforts. If they did not get enough funds, they had to just go out door to door, campaigning and meeting people in the streets and just hoping for the best.

I have seen the day, when helping to fight campaigns and even fighting one myself, when we had no money for cars or helpers, posters, television, radio. We had no money for anything at all, Sir, while our opponents were splashing it all over the place. The various businesses throughout the province were not so much inclined to support the Progressive Conservative Party financially. A lot of it was because out of mere fear, because of fear of reprisals by the former administration. We had no hope at all expecting a donation from anybody. To have a donation from anybody who had a liquor licence, that was certainly out of the question.

On one occasion I heard that businesses around the province, particularly the large ones who depended on government patronage, were instructed that they were not to contribute more than \$5,000 to the Tory campaign. These instructions went out quite specifically and, of course, we felt the results of it, while the Liberal Party of course had unlimited funds, no problem; with Doyle and all the liquor licences around the province, there was just no limit. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps even up in the millions, to fight an election campaign. Every lounge in the province was expected to contribute, it was either that or they might be closed down for a period of time.

I know one tavern owner, Mr. Speaker, who discussed this matter with me one day shortly prior to the October election in 1971. He was not a supporter of the administration as many were. He was amazed, there was no such thing as a request for funds, it was a demand. No such thing as; "What are you prepared to give us?" They came along with a specific amount. It depended on how good your business was, the amount of booze you sold a year and the amount of money that they thought that you should be making as a result.



Just let a tavern-owner back in those days show outwardly that he supported a Tory Candidate, he would be closed down solid, like the Furey's in Harbour Main.

The Liberal Party, Sir, had unlimited funds. One did not have to be a financial wizard to understand why. There were great proliferations of posters, four by eight, radio advertisements and television advertisements. Sir, who will ever forget the 3-D coloured pictures in October, 1971, of Joe Smallwood, and little mirrors that said, "Will the lady on the other side please vote Liberal." There were larger pictures, postcard size. These costs hundreds of thousands of dollars. I understand that it cost \$60,000 just to fly them in.

I recall the period of the campaign when the Liberal Candidates in my district, two of them, had no posters. They had nothing to give out. They were all running around in a tizzy wondering what they were going to do about it. Finally out of the blue came this big jet with a full belly load of these 3-D pictures, mirrors, little gimmicks and so on. That load cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$60,000 just for air freight alone. Can we imagine at all, Sir, is it imaginable, what the overall expenditure must have been for this type of campaign, for this election? It must have cost at least \$1 million in 1971 - it had to.

Then, of course, just prior to the election in October, 1971, we had certain ministers coming out on television, advertising parks, advertising safety on the highroads, etc. This was a government programme, it supposedly was not political. They had the Minister of Economic Development on every now and again telling us how beneficial it is to have these parks around the province and what he was going to do to establish more parks and so on. Then we had the former Minister of Highways getting on showing us how to be safe on the highways, what we should do and what we should not do. These were paid by the government, right out of the government's coffers. Of course, as soon as the election was over these advertisements disappeared. We might note also, Sir, that these advertisements were made up by the then publicity firm which

was employed by the Liberal Government, much the same as McLean's by this administration. I think they were called McClarens, if I am not mistaken. They were the ones who were doing all the public relations work for the government. They did it for the election campaigns as well. They were paid handsomely for it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are indeed in favour of public financing of election campaigns. This is something they have always been accustomed to. They had twenty-three years of it.

When Joe Smallwood first took over the administration of this province, Mr. Speaker, he went further than just using public funds, - the public chest as he referred to it in one incident, in order to frighten the people, to coerce them, to bribe them, to use it as a threat, to force them to vote for his candidates.

Mr. Speaker, just let me cite one incident which happened and which is recorded in the "Sunday Herald" dated June 19, 1949. Here is an example of how he used the threat of public funds to get his candidates elected. It is all recorded here. This was a political rally which they had down on the Southern Shore. Greg Power was running. Smallwood got on the stage and he said: "If you do not vote for Greg Power," he warned. Ferryland voters at all meetings, "not one cent will you get from the government during the next forty years. Mark it down, I mean every word of it." I am just quoting from the paper itself. "You have turned me down three times," he declared at meetings in Renewa, Fermeuse, Admiral's Cove and other places along the shore. "Ferryland has voted against me in two referendums and in the provincial election but I won in spite of you. Now I do not need you. I have been elected." He warned, "You need me. I am sitting right on top of the public chest. Not one red cent will come out of it for the Ferryland District unless Greg Power is elected." That is marvelous stuff for a Premier of a province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DAWE: Yes, the Liberals want to get back to it, they want to use the public funds again to finance their campaigns.

He went on, "Unless you vote for my man, you will be out in the cold for the next four years, one year for every time you turn me down." That is Hilterism. He reminded all his audiences, "I will know this time exactly how you voted. The votes are being counted in the polling stations and on the night of the election I will know what settlements were for me and what ones were against me. Any settlement which supports me by voting for Greg Power will be helped by my government. Those settlements which vote against Greg Power will get nothing, absolutely nothing." He went on then, of course, to degrade

Major Peter Cashin who was running against Greg Power and so on. It is all outlined here. That is the kind of tactics we had to put up with in the past.

I would be frightened, Mr. Speaker, I think to know that any administration, whether it is this one or any other one, would have control directly by providing the funds to a certain candidate to run in an election. What a threat! What a whip! What a club to hold over any person! Can you not imagine if some person like Joe Smallwood were to take charge of the administration, I can imagine now exactly what would happen. There would be no need for an election because all the members opposing would be threatened off by the non-availability of funds. But in those days they had unlimited funds. They could lay their hands on any amount of cash. They could splash where they felt like it. They had money to buy cars, to hire persons, unlimited cars.

I have seen in the District of Harbour Main on several different occasions where there were as high as eighty cars hired by the Liberal candidates, supposedly to transport persons to the poles but in actual fact it meant that they were buying votes. Not only did they hire a car, they hired a person to go along in the car along with the driver. That meant one extra vote or at least they thought it did.

On polling day alone we saw an expenditure often well in excess of \$4,500 for cars only. Now if we were to use that sort of thing as a guideline, as a yardstick, and if we were to introduce legislation and pass it to the effect that candidates will be financed, where do you draw the line? How much do you give them? What do we recommend? Would the Liberals who have been so used to campaigning in this fashion, would they settle for a paltry \$2,000 to go out and fight a campaign? I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, especially in view of the fact that they already owe \$500,000. Of course this is not to mention the four by eight (I must mention again) coloured posters which were in every nook and cranny in the district during the election, expensive posters, four by eight with

colour pictures. Each one cost perhaps \$50 or \$60, and it might be even a conservative estimate then. We were never so fortunate as to know or have the opportunity to know what such posters cost, Mr. Speaker, because every time I ran and every time I supported anybody who did run we had to be contented with the printed posters, the Tory blue on white.

MR. NEARY: Who got the member to resign?

MR. DAWE: I did not resign yet.

MR. NEARY: No, but Saunders did. Who bribed Saunders?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: We are not debating Saunders.

MR. DAWE: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I know one Liberal candidate who splashed around quite a sum of money during the October 1971 election campaign. I know one candidate, Sir, who having been approached by a constituent in an effort to have something done with a local road which actually did not go anywhere except to perhaps his potato garden, he was asked by this particular candidate how much it would cost and he said; "Well, I do not know, a couple of hundred dollars I suppose," whereupon the candidate puts his hand in his pocket and hauled out a magnificent sum of money and passed him over \$250 and told him to get it done himself. That is a prize example of paying for your votes.

MR. NEARY: Who paid Saunders?

AN HON. MEMBER: None of your business.

MR. DAWE: This is only an example, Sir, of the sort of spendthrift bunch who were on this side of the House before us and who had no concern whatsoever for money, contributed funds or government funds or whatever. These are the people who now want the public of this province to pay their way the next time. But now, Sir, that their resources are gone, that their pot is dried up, now that they are in the hole \$500,000, they are all for a motion which a few years ago they turned down flat.

The taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stand for this Legislature to institute legislation which will ultimately cause an increase in taxation just so that we can perhaps even pay off, as they no doubt expect, the \$500,000 which they owe.

MR. NEARY: Where did the \$2,500 come from for the stadium?

MR. DAWE: I am sure they would be happy if the Minister of Finance were foolish enough to go down to his office and have his staff type out a cheque for the \$500,000 to pay their debts. That would be lovely, would it not?

MR. NEARY: Where did the \$2,500 come from?

MR. DAWE: I do not think they have a fool on a hook though. They are just going to have to pay it off the best way they can.

MR. NEARY: That is speculation.

MR. DAWE: Of course no doubt a goodly sum of that \$500,000 was as a result of election campaign expenses in the last by-election down in Hermitage. They are not above spending huge sums of money either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the bridge in Manuels.



The bridge in Manuels has been taken care of.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DAWE: You would love to know, would you not.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in favour of the principle of the motion before the House. I cannot agree with the amendment to it because we have already been, well, practically discussing this now for a good part of thirty days. I do not see how we could possibly bring in legislation which would go through this House, not this type of legislation where every member wishes to express his opinion on it.- thirty days certainly is not realistic whatsoever. But I agree with the resolution, the principle. I would support it wholeheartedly if it were amended to the effect that there would be controls and not necessarily public financing.

I like the idea of regulatory legislation. I do not think it is fair to the people of this Province to have two parties going out during a campaign and splashing unlimited funds around with no concern for anybody only themselves. Really, Mr. Speaker, when the election is over, having spent such huge funds, is it really the consensus of the people that the party who actually won was their real choice or in such circumstances would it be a matter of just being bought? I would go to the electorate at any time, Mr. Speaker, with no more than \$2,000.00 and at the present time we have a fair sized district. It stretches for about twenty-five or thirty miles, somewhere in the vicinity now of 11,000 voters. We do not have to be extravagant. All we have to do is get out and meet the people - give them our programme and what we would propose to do for them. We do not have to buy them, Mr. Speaker, and we have not yet.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DAWE: We talk of and defend democracy, Mr. Speaker, but is it really democracy if you go out hoping to buy your way, which is not, surely is not the way in which it works. There is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that people are critical of elected representatives. They have seen a tremendous display, over the past twenty-three years prior to this administration, of spendthrift and waste and buying and coercion. We

cannot blame them really for being suspicious.

Perhaps it would be worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, if we considered setting up a committee to look into this situation, to bring forth recommendations, study it. Perhaps a committee could be set up, give them a period of time, let them bring back their recommendations. Perhaps we will get something concrete out of it, something worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with the amendment to this resolution. I think it is completely ludicrous. I cannot fully go along with the resolution itself because as I have stated I do not believe that our people should be paying my way to a seat in this House. If anybody should pay perhaps it should be the members themselves. Therefore,

Mr. Speaker, shall vote against the amendment. I feel compelled to also vote against the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Green Bay.

MR. A. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the motion and the amendment that was put by the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: There is the expert on rules again, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: The whole problem with the amendment on this resolution is one that I referred to in a previous speech in this House. It is simply this; that some time ago the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture introduced a bill in this House to rationalize the forest industry, to bring some sense of stability to it, to reorganize it. The Forestry Bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to ever come before any House of Assembly in the last ten or fifteen years.

This bill the Opposition would prefer to have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: I am trying to make a comparison, Mr. Speaker, between that and the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. Now the Leader of the Opposition wants this present election expenses thing to be discussed and for legislation to be brought to the House within thirty days.

There is no election in sight for a year, a year and a-half, two years, perhaps longer, Mr. Speaker. We have plenty of time, as honourable members, for all of us to discuss this matter thoroughly, to perhaps incorporate parts of Bill C 203 from the federal government and to take the more welcomed aspects of that that can be applied to the province. We can discuss it and give government more suggestions on how we should proceed on it.

But the Opposition want full scale legislation on election expenses within thirty days, on an issue which has no major significance until the next election is called. Sir, we have a year or two years in which the

government can prepare proper legislation to be put before the House because I think all honourable members agree that some kind of regulation of election expenses should be brought in. So we have a fair amount of time in which to debate and cogitate and to look over the bills of other provinces or the bill at the House of Commons in Ottawa, lots of time.

But on the forestry legislation, something which is of major significance to the province, to people, to helping them to supply a decent living in rural Newfoundland, the opposition want it delayed. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that alone indicates their priority when it comes to major things that have to be discussed by this House.

So it is strange to me, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand that they want thirty days in which to bring in legislation on election expenses which we can discuss for the next year for that matter, Mr. Speaker, without it having any real effect on anything in the province. They want that done in thirty days yet with something as important, as significant as the forest policy which will allow for more jobs in the province, which will bring the companies and so on into line regarding our forest resource, they want it delayed - something that has been studied beyond belief over the last ten or fifteen years and that everybody is fairly familiar with.

On the amendment itself, Mr. Speaker, on the thirty day thing, obviously from what I just said, I cannot vote for the amendment because it is unnecessary, totally unnecessary. I think the whole purpose for the motion being put in the beginning is to give all honourable members a chance to debate fully, to give their suggestions to the government so that government in its wisdom and with all of these suggestions can compile good legislation to be put before the House before the next election to regulate election expenses. That is the whole point of it. If we do nothing else but provide suggestions to the government for this purpose, I think the whole debate has been worthwhile and important.

There are three or four points

related to election expenses that we were adhered to by the honourable member for St. John's South, I think, which are worth repeating.

The first thing is simply, Mr. Speaker, that we have to be careful when we are talking about regulating contributions to political parties. There are the small individual contributions which are of no great consequence. They might be ten dollars. They might be fifty dollars. They might be one hundred dollars, anything below one hundred anyway or in that denomination which individuals give because they believe in the cause of that party at that particular time or they believe in the candidate who is wearing the label of that party at that particular time and who really do not expect any favour in return. There are hundreds and hundreds of people around the Province in every election, in every district, who contribute in a small way, like I say, ten or twenty dollars to the candidate because that individual, that citizen believes that that candidate will make the best representative for that district in the four years hence. I do not see anything wrong, I do not see anything wrong with that continuing. I do not think government or we should put regulations in there to inhibit individuals from contributing to the party of their choice or the candidate of their choice in an election.

When it comes to corporations or large companies where they have a vested interest in the Province, where they are trying to expand their operations or they are trying to expand their facility then that is a different matter, Mr. Speaker. I think here is where we are going to need some regulations, there is no question in my mind. Manitoba prohibits corporations from contributing.

So here perhaps we need and perhaps the way around this, where you have large corporations who and everybody knows it, who will contribute a sizeable amount of money, whether it be \$10,000 or \$100,000 to the party that they think has the best chance to get into power at that time, for a particular reason. They want a favour. Let us face it. They want a favour to be able to get to, to see those people who have the power, who are in the high echelons of government

to assist them in expanding their facility or in building a new plant somewhere or whatever the case may be. Here is where the real guts of the issue is, Mr. Speaker, I contend really is, when we are dealing with large companies or large corporations who through the great money they have at their disposal can give sizeable sums of money up to \$100,000 and in many cases, nationally, I suppose \$500,000 or \$1,000,000. Of course, we have seen this kind of thing happening in the United States. No doubt it has happened in Canada for decades. There is no question about that. The difference right now is that the United States situation is more before the public, which is not to say that a similar parallel situation has not happened in Canada in the last few decades and I am pretty sure in saying that it did happen.

So, the point to be made, Mr. Speaker, that in disclosure, in regulating for disclosure and election expenses the main onus here should be on the corporations. If it be disclosed, if a regulation be brought in where there must be disclosure of who gives what to what party and everybody can see that this corporation gave \$50,000 or \$60,000 or more to the party that forms the government and six months after that party gets the government you see that corporation suddenly springing up a new plant on land that was previously held by somebody else or whatever, got land that nobody else could get to put its plant there, well then it can be deduced by the electorate, by the people of the province, that there is a connection between that \$50,000 or \$60,000 and the fact that that corporation was able to establish that plant at that time.

So, I think here is where the great abuse to this whole situation rests. It would seem to me that disclosure is a very important point that must be kept in mind by government when they are considering bringing in legislation to regulate election expenses.

As pointed out by the member for St. John's South, you must be very careful when you do that because you must say explicitly in the regulations or in the legislation that that one hundred dollars, if you



say that you must disclose everything over one hundred dollars it must be for one year because if you just leave it at one hundred dollars, well, some corporation could give one hundred dollars every week for the fifty-two weeks of the year which would amount to a lot of money but all they would be disclosing would be one hundred dollars. It must be written into the regulations or into the legislation to disclose one hundred dollars or more for the year rather than to just say disclose one hundred dollars.

So, I think the individual verses the corporation is very important, that we could still allow and it should be allowed, it even should be encouraged to get more people involved in the process.

A big point that must be made is that the corporations and the large companies must be made to disclose their contribution to various political parties.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further to the other points, the whole point of this, I think, some honourable members have alluded to it and others have not but I think all honourable members who speak on it should know that the popular conception, the popular attitude that the majority of people in this Province as well as other provinces have of politicians is not a very healthy one. I can recite, as other honourable members can, I am sure, instances of talking to their constituents in their district and one of the major points always made is that because you are now in government (take my own situation) and not now teaching, that you now have it made, that there is an unlimited supply of cash at your disposal from some source unknown, so that now it is no problem for you, money is no consequence, you can get it whenever you want it. This is a sad commentary on the political process and on the system in general that this kind of attitude so strongly permeates much of the thinking of people in the Province. I doubt whether this kind of regulation or legislation or even something like bill C203, that the honourable member for White Bay South went into at some length, whether this would actually cure that kind of an attitude that is prevalent. I think it is extremely

unfortunate that it does exist and it is difficult to know how one can overcome it considering especially when you have so many other pressures from the Press about other countries and so on being involved illegally in such operations.

I think it is something that people in public life should be very aware of and I think that politicians have a responsibility to their constituents and to people when they are talking to them to try to make the point always, every day, of their own honesty in the business and to try to prove that to people by action and by example.

Besides disclosure, Mr. Speaker, I especially say of one hundred or two hundred dollars per year as it applies especially to corporations, the second point I would like to make is that there must also be some kind of limitation on the amount that an individual candidate can spend in a given district on a campaign. The point should be made, has been made before, I believe it sincerely, that if there were a good individual, a good man who was running for public office, that if he were truly a good man and were really eager to get into that position that he can do a fair amount without too many dollars and be elected, that it is not necessary to have an unlimited supply of money. It is not necessary to have even two or three thousand dollars in this Province to get elected if you are ambitious and if you have the desire to attain that office.

I do not have to go back very far, only to the last election where there was quite a bit of money thrown around in my district, from the other side. Needless to say, I did not have any and I think it is just a matter of hard work by the candidates concerned. I think very often we overplay the media and that people become saturated almost with the publicity and that it is a lot better for candidates very often to almost, not altogether ignore but to really play down the media and it is much better to meet a man in his kitchen or in his living room, to see you face to face and talk to you, rather than hear some public announcement over the radio of what you are going to do or how much you dislike the other person,

but I think there must be some kind of limitation on how much should be spent on election expenses in a given district. Perhaps it might vary, I do not know, between an urban district versus a rural district. Perhaps there might be something that can be said for spending more in the rural parts of the province as opposed to those in the urban parts.

There are districts here in St. John's - I suppose St. John's Centre is the most notable example where it does not take the honourable Member for St. John's Centre very long to travel throughout his district. The number of halls that he would have to hire and whatever are quite less than would be the case when you are talking about a district like mine where you have to travel ninety, one hundred and one hundred and twenty-five miles sometimes to go from one side of the district to the other, all of it by the way, just about all of it on gravel road.

So when you talk about the limitation, which is necessary, limitation of election expenses, one should keep in mind that limitation should not be just a blanket limitation which would apply equally to all districts in the province, that there might be something to be said for doing it on some sort of a formula basis where a district that has quite a few roads, a rural district where you have a sparsely populated communities and you might have twenty-five or thirty communities, that that candidate should be entitled to more election expenses than some other candidate in a more urbanized riding.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we have to do something regarding disclosure, to help cut down on the abuses that corporations might make of the power that they have because of how much they have contributed, that there must be some limitation put on how much is to be spent in a given campaign in a district.

Then, of course, as mentioned in the resolution, the business of public financing: Well I would like to associate myself with the views of the Member for St. John's South in saying that it would seem to me that in the interim, for say in the next election, it would be a fair idea to try and implement the disclosure

feature and the limitation feature and to try it out for an election and see how it operates and to work from there towards perhaps public financing of election expenses, totally.

But I do not think it is fair or it is right to just swallow those parts of the bill C 203 in Ottawa that apply to the province and to incorporate it into provincial legislation just for the sake that they have done it in Ottawa. There are many reasons why that bill was brought in at that time, politically and otherwise. We should not just mimic the kinds of regulations that Ottawa sees fit to bring in.

So I think we should give the disclosure and limitation thing a try and to see how it works. Then, of course, there is nothing to stop the legislature from incorporating various aspects of the public financing part of it at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, another point that I was trying to make was simply that this business of election expenses, in general I think not only the province but nationally in the Western World today away too much is spent on election campaigns. I do not know what kind of a debate would ensue when we get into the actual public financing, I can see it starting at a fairly reasonable level whereby the legislature dictates through legislation that "X" number of dollars will be spent and so on, but I can see it escalating very quickly.

Of course, the other thing here is that you are not going to, no matter how many rules you can concoct, no matter how many regulations you put into legislation, if somebody be dishonest, well he is dishonest. There are going to be ways and means to get around any rule or regulation that is incorporated in the legislation; you are just not going to do it. If a politician be dishonest, he is dishonest. There are all kinds of ways to get around it. So you would say that such and such has to be disclosed. How many contributions can be accepted without disclosure taking place? I am sure quite a few.

So, it is going to be difficult to eliminate completely. When you have dishonesty, you have it and it can be very difficult to rid yourself of it. Perhaps through such measures we will cut down on the number of abuses that are presently prevalent not only in this province but in other provinces and countries as well.

On the business of spending too much: Take, Mr. Speaker, just about now in this province we are getting into bands and the buttons and the posters and all the rest of it to such an extent that, you know, there is no question in my mind that there is an awful lot wasted and we could do a lot more to cut down on it. There is absolutely no need for it. In most cases, if you are talking about a rural district, most of the people in the district, unless some candidate is thrown in from outside, are pretty well aware of the qualities of the candidates. They know the individuals pretty well and they have got their minds pretty well set. All the buttons and what have you, I think, is just a waste of money and it should be restricted, there is no need of it at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A few streakers.

MR. PECKFORD: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Get a few streakers.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, a few streakers. That will be the next thing. If that fad should be still prevalent in two or three years time, with another election we may

MR. W. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, right.

So, I think the amendment, Mr. Speaker, as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, was not meant in the best interests of this whole issue; that he should not have brought it in at this time. The Leader of the Opposition should have allowed full debate on the question and passed the bill as it was, the motion as it was, and leave it then to government to contemplate on the various ideas that were brought up and then if it happened that by the time the next House sitting rolled around, next spring, no action, no concrete action were taken by the administration



to implement any proposals that were brought up the year before, then is the time to start putting in your thirty day thing. The whole -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I have not seen it. So, the whole strategy by the opposition is wrong. I think they realize it is wrong. It was a little trick, one of those parliamentary tricks that you play to try to embarrass the administration. It is a job - well, I do not know about embarrassed - but it is a job that the opposition has to do. I think in this one instance that they failed, that the whole trick of it backfired because I do not think that anybody in his right mind would expect an administration to within thirty days bring in legislation on a matter which in comparison or contrast to other issues that are important today, you know, ranks well down the list, seeing we do not have an election coming within the next six or eight months or whatever.

So, that the hurry is not there. We should debate it, get all the ideas we could and then, of course, we can take some action on the entire legislation. At the same time as they want immediate action on this Election Expenses Bill, they are willing to delay a Forest Policy which is of ten times the significance that this bill is.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, they were when it was going through second reading and the different comments on it indicated -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, right.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are all the things that I have to say on this amendment and on the motion as put by the member for St. John's North. I think before the honourable member for St. Barbe North sat down or left the House - he was speaking before he left the House and it is unfortunate that he saw fit to leave the House right in the midst of the speech. The least he could do if he is speaking is to stay in his place and speak but not to hide away out behind in the corridor or somewhere to try to escape it.



MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member is not being relevant.

MR. PECKFORD: He did mention before he left the chamber that if government were already doing something, why was the motion brought in? I think this was his point. He mentioned that there: The whole point of the motion -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order. I did not leave the chamber and I would like for that to go on the record.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, is it?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): A singular point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: He did leave the chamber.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member has made his point.

MR. PECKFORD: So, the honourable member for St. Barbe North asks that if the government are already doing something, why was the motion brought in? This was all explained to the honourable member for St. Barbe North

a couple of weeks ago. The whole point of the motion was simply to get as many ideas from the Member for St. Barbe North when he spoke, to enlighten us as to what he thinks is the best way to handle this very perplexing problem, to get all the ideas from the Hon. Member for Bell Island who has all kinds of them on election expenses, to get all the ideas we could. We have a whole whack of great information from the Hon. Member for White Bay South. He told us all about Bill C-203 and how it is going to be implemented by the federal government; it is just wonderful stuff. With all of this information then, this is why the motion was put so that it would give all honourable members a chance to stand up and express their views concerning this matter. With all the information then, this administration will get down and get to work and seeing which one's ideas were valuable and incorporate them into legislation. For the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North to try to make this very, very weak point about why bring the motion in, this is the whole point of bringing the motion in, which is to give everybody a chance to discuss it; to give all the views which they have on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: He had a real good chance to do so and, of course, he boggled that opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, we need something to regulate corporations, the large sums of money that they give to political parties, both in the province as well as nationally. We need, therefore, to regulate, some kind of disclosure regulation so that everybody will be aware of how much money "x" corporation gave to a government. Then, of course, the public would be able then in their wisdom to see whether anything came out of that for that corporation. We need to limit the amount to be spent on elections in various districts throughout the province. Here again there are dangers in that. We need something there and it should be limitation based on a formula, depending upon the districts, whether they be rural or urban. As far as public financing goes, it could be a good thing.

My own view is that we should go with disclosure and limitation and give it a try and then we can decide whether public financing need take place. I think this is the way we should proceed. Seeing that there is no great urgency in the matter, it is not a motion that is going to cripple the economy or not going to cripple the economy, whatever the case may be, if it be passed or defeated. It is something that can be fully debated by everybody, all the ideas assembled and then the government can bring in appropriate legislation based on those ideas in the next session of the House perhaps, seeing that an election is not right around the corner. It would be perhaps worth our while for other such motions to be put for the Wednesday with a view not to try to get government to do something in ten days or thirty days but to give all honourable members a chance to express their views on it, as almost like a committee rather than just a House, everybody getting a chance to express their views on a fairly important matter.

Now as it happens in forestry or social assistance or something, where a definite policy has been determined, one would not necessarily get into that until it was seen how it operated for a while. In other sectors of the economy, in other spheres, I think it would be worthwhile to go through this exercise again on another topic of importance.

Mr. Speaker, we should not swallow Bill C-203 or those aspects of Bill C-203 which are applicable to the province. We should look at them, look at all the views that we have from the honourable members present and then on the basis of those, given time, the administration has a chance to bring in some valuable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it now being near six o'clock, could I adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: On motion debate adjourned.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Thursday at 3:00 P.M. April 4, 1974.