



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 19

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today fourteen girls from the Girls' Home and Training School here in St. John's, from Grade VII to Grade X, with their teachers, Mrs. Barnes and Mrs. Belbin. I would also like to welcome to the galleries, Mayor George Saunders, Deputy Mayor Donald Boone and Town Manager, Mr. Hancock, from the Town of Bishops Falls.

I indeed welcome you all here on behalf of all the honourable members and trust that your visit is most interesting.

PETITIONS:

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of approximately 460 residents of Branch, St. Mary's Bay and that is just about the entire adult population. The prayer of the petition is that the road through the community be paved.

Mr. Speaker, this like so many other petitions is one which all honourable members are certainly very pleased to present. There is no doubt that residents in communities where the main road through the community is not paved have a great deal, depending on the weather, depending on the time of the year, etc., of discomfort from dust in the summer and from road conditions at various times of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the petition and wish now to have it tabled and to have it referred to the department to which it relates, the Department of Communication and Transportation.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to support the petition that was put forward by the Member for St. Mary's for the paving and upgrading of the road through the Community of Branch that is represented by 460 voters in that community. Branch, as a number of other communities throughout the province and more especially

the communities in Labrador do not have roads and have been crying for roads, not necessarily paved roads, for a number of years and they were ignored. I would like to think in terms of the Minister of Finance making available in his budget this year sufficient funds to look after the paving of the road through the Community of Branch.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present what amounts, Sir, to a supplement to the petition that I presented on Monday on behalf of 550 fishermen in twenty-two communities in St. Barbe North. Just today I received an additional fifty names from the fishermen in Bartlett's Harbour in the District of St. Barbe North. They expressed the same concern, Sir, as the other 550 fishermen with respect to the herring seiner fishery operation in the district. On Monday I went to some length to describe the problem so I do not think I will go through that again.

Sir, I will simply ask that this supplement to that petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. DR. G. ROWE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question posed yesterday by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. His question was, as I took it at the time: "What arrangements are being made to examine all miners at Buchans for silicosis?" I am not quite sure exactly of the intent of the question. There are certain other diseases apart from silicosis which are to be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that the routine miners' examination is carried out annually on every worker except for employees with the company before 1959 who have the choice or option of taking an X-Ray. The answer is that an annual X-Ray is taken for each of the Buchans' miners.

MR. NEARY: In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the minister has not received a request from the Steel Workers' Union in Buchans for an examination of all the men presently on the payroll for silicosis.

DR. G. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that is a different question but the answer to that is that we are evolving with the Federation of Labour a central registry

to which every miner in the province his x-ray will be referred so we will have a continuous permanent record.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

DR. ROWE: Not specifically but for the whole question of all miners of which Buchans is a very important part. Buchans is certainly included.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hands, Sir, a 1974 Confederation Celebration calendar and I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism, Sir, if this has been distributed by Horizons Communications as an act of public charity or are they being paid to do this work?

HON. T. DOYLE, Minister of Tourism: I would like some clarification on the question, Mr. Speaker, distributed to whom or where, when?

MR. NEARY: Distributed to the media, members of the House of Assembly, and various other organizations and institutions in Newfoundland but I am thinking especially about the news media.

MR. DOYLE: I am not aware of how they were distributed to the news media, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that they went out from the Confederation Celebration Committee I believe yesterday afternoon or this morning to the news media. As far as the forty-two in the House are concerned, they were distributed I believe through your courtesy Mr. Speaker, by representatives of your staff, just prior to lunch time today. That answers the question.

MR. NEARY: Well would the minister, Mr. Speaker, inform the House if Horizons Communications would actually deliver these calendars to the news media are being paid? Are they part of the \$2 million that is going to be spent on the Silver Anniversary Celebration? Are they being paid or are they just doing this work voluntary? Is it charity or what? What is it? What is the story, Horizons Communications?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member is entering into debate and at best asking questions that are argumentative in nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The question raised by the honourable member for Bell Island, I think in essence the same question was asked on a couple of previous occasions and at that time I directed him to put it on the Order Paper. This in essence is the same question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day we shall continue with the Private Members' Bill. I think the honourable member for Bell Island adjourned the debate last day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all assure the House that the note on which we ended up with yesterday afternoon, that we ended yesterday afternoon's sitting with is not the reason for the Leader of the Opposition not being in his seat today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the honourable member sure?

MR. NEARY: The Leader of the Opposition, Sir, took that matter in the spirit in which it was given. Sir, if I could only get this thing anchored here. What is wrong with this?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one good feature about Private Members' Day, Sir, is that it only occurs once a week so you have almost a week in between to prepare some background material for the subject under discussion and I was glad to have the opportunity, Sir. I only got a few minutes last week as you know, to speak on this very important amendment that is being moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I only had a few minutes in which to speak in this debate, Sir, so I was glad to have the few days in between Private Members' Day to give me a chance to research this material because I feel, Sir, it is a very serious matter, a matter of utmost importance to members on either side of this honourable House.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, when I started my few remarks I complimented the member for St. John's North for bringing this resolution before the House of Assembly and I intimated at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it was not an original idea. The Government of Canada had already taken some steps to implement measures to control the spending of campaign funds during elections. Mr. Smallwood, the former

Premier of this Province, a few months ago had stated publicly that he ever returned to politics in Newfoundland that it would be only for the purpose of implementing two or three reforms - election expenses was one of the planks in his platform.

Then the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, out on the West Coast a few weeks ago when he spoke to Rotary, I think it was in Stephenville, stated the position of Her Majesty's Opposition in the House of Assembly on this very, very serious matter of election expenses, Sir. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for St. John's North has performed a singular service to this House and to the people of this province in introducing a resolution, Sir, that will at least focus our attention on the need to complement the nominal political Democracy we have in this province with a measure of economic Democracy without which, Mr. Speaker, political Democracy is nothing but plutocracy, the rule of the wealthy and the puppets and the front men for vested interests.

Maybe harsh words, Mr. Speaker, but they are true words, Sir. In my opinion, Sir, one fringe benefit that could result from this type of legislation if it were ever introduced in this honourable House is that, Mr. Speaker, it would enable men and women who are reluctant at the present time to become involved in political life in this province, it would no longer mean, Mr. Speaker, that you would have to be wealthy or well-heeled or well off to seek a seat in the House of Assembly here in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it annoys me to no end when I realize, Sir, that since responsible government came to Newfoundland that the lives and destiny, Sir, of our people have been decided by a minority group, the upper class, Sir, or what we commonly call the élite. For some mysterious reason in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, the thinking of a large number of our people towards individuals is based chiefly on their bank accounts, based largely, Sir, on their bank accounts. How well off are you? What kind of a car do you drive?

A lot of our people still look at men and women in this province, Sir, and in public life still look at them in terms of how much money do they

have. Then they judge a man's success by his bank account. This to me, Sir, is a foolish notion. I am happy to say that the young people of this province are gradually changing from this thinking, Sir, and the young people today, in my opinion, could not care less about a person's bank account or how much wealth he has accumulated or how much property he owns. What they form their opinion on people in public life, Sir, the basis on which they form their opinion is what contribution, what sacrifice the individual is willing to make towards society and mankind as a whole. This to me, Sir, is a very refreshing change indeed.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all look forward to the day in this honourable House when the members here in this House largely will be made up of ordinary common sense Newfoundlanders, Sir, Newfoundlanders who will truly represent all the people of this province and not just minority groups, Sir.

Just so I will not be just misunderstood in this matter, Sir, I do not want to be accused of again singling out the lawyers but, Sir, I think we have something like twelve, thirteen or fourteen lawyers in this House. Would this not be the

number of lawyers, Sir? What it actually means is that 150,000 Newfoundlanders should be lawyers. There are ten or fifteen lawyers, in a forty-two member House, Sir, we have ten or fifteen lawyers. That means that at least one-fifth of the population should be lawyers and by the same token, Sir, when you look at, and this is not a criticism of any individual member of the House, Sir, but when you look at the makeup of the House, you would think that the average income of people in Newfoundland would be around \$35,000 a year because that is what the average income, I would think, Sir, if you take all the business men, the professional people, the lawyers, the academics, put them all together, it would average about \$35,000 a year. So, Sir, it would immediately come to your mind that the average income of the ordinary Newfoundlander would be about \$35,000 a year where in actual facts this is not so. We have the lowest per capita income, personal income in Canada.

So, Sir, I think it is about time that the people of Newfoundland changed their views, changed their thinking about how they assess the success of an individual. Is it his brains? Is it his outlook? Is it what he can do for mankind or is it based on his bank account, the amount of property he owns, the connections he has, the number of banks that he is the director of? Is this how you gage a man success, Sir? I say no, Mr. Speaker and I am glad to note, Sir, that this is changing and I hope in future elections in this Province, Sir, if the government in its wisdom will bring legislation before this honourable House, not wishy-washy legislation but bring legislation before this House that will pay one hundred per cent of the cost of election expenses, not subsidize the millionaires and the well-to-do, the well-heeled lawyers we have in this House. That is not what we want, Sir. If we follow the line of reasoning of the Minister without Portfolio, the member for St. John's East, if we followed his reasoning, Sir, what the taxpayers of this Province would be called upon to do would be to subsidize election expenses, subsidize election expenses. That is what the minister suggested, Sir. He said Newfoundland, poor, old, little Newfoundland could not afford to finance elections out of the public treasury. I say balderdash to that.

What the minister really meant, Sir, was that he wanted the public treasury to subsidize the well-to-do lawyers and the well-heeled businessmen

and the professional people of this House because they could still dig down into their own pockets, Sir, or they would still be permitted to go to their friends, their well-heeled friends and say, "Give us a few dollars for the election." Then they come back and ask the public treasury to subsidize that as well. Sir, that does not make sense. If we are going to have legislation in this Province, let us go all the way, Sir, no half way measures at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, from Frances Bacon down to Watergate in the United States of America and the Saunders affair right here in our own midst, the odour of corruption, Sir, or apparent corruption is turning our people off. In a recent survey, Mr. Speaker, in that great Republican Bastion of Democracy south of us, Sir, a survey was carried out some time ago to find out what people thought of men and women in public life and I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, beyond belief. I do not know if any of my other colleagues in the House saw the results of that survey or not but, Sir, over a score of avocations and vocations were canvassed and it showed, Mr. Speaker, that the

politician was ranked down at the bottom of the line, the person that people least trusted. Down in the United States, that great Republic, that great bastion of democracy, it showed that the politician was the least trusted, Sir. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the politician was a full four paces below the convicted thief. That is something to laugh at.

Mr. Speaker, while legislation will never make honest men out of dishonest men it can in my opinion, through limiting the rewards of dishonesty in politics and by imposing weighty penalties on those convicted of misusing the trust placed in them by the people, at least convince many, Sir, that honesty is the best policy. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps if this were done it may commence the restoration of ethics to the proper position in public life which seems to me to be usurped by jurisprudence. The Lawyer's Guide, Sir, as my honourable friend from St. John's South knows, the Lawyer's Guide is based not on what is right and what is wrong but on what you can likely get away with.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I forgot that, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things the honourable members were taught in law school. It is not what is right or wrong, Sir, jurisprudence does not mean that, it is what you can get away with. The weakness of permitting jurisprudence to substitute for ethics is shown by the general outcry in the United States against the tactics of platoons of lawyers with whom Richard Nixon himself, who is a lawyer, was so misguided as to surround himself with lawyers much to the detriment of his administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the boys surrounding the honourable gentleman?

MR. R. WELLS: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. NEARY: Sure I would permit a question.

MR. WELLS: Perhaps the honourable member will give us his text so that we can read also what he quotes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is entitled to speak in this honourable House the same as I am. I sit here and listen to him, hanging on to every word he says. Sometimes he is using notes and sometimes he is not but if the honourable member wants me to send him over a copy I would be glad to, he may learn something. I will keep on reading -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious matter. A very serious matter. I took the time, Sir, since last Wednesday, Private Members' Day, to put together a few notes so that I could at least make what I consider to be a major contribution to this debate. I hope that honourable members on the government benches have done the same thing, have done their homework, because they will be called upon to vote on this resolution. Will they be ready, Mr. Speaker, or will they be wishy-washy or will they back away as they have done on other major important issues that have come before this honourable House?

Mr. Speaker, the resolution presently before the House, in my opinion, and the amendment merely create a topic for political dishonesty in this province. It will be debated at some length, legislation we hope will be introduced, after the amendment is passed - legislation will be introduced within thirty days. Sir, I have a word of advice for the government. The Minister of Finance when he spoke for the government really did not make it clear if we were going to have legislation this session or not. He said that we may get legislation sometime. Well, Sir, that is too late as far as I am concerned. We need legislation in this session of the House but I would not like to see legislation brought in that only goes half-way. If the government are going to bring in legislation, Mr. Speaker, I hope

that they will bring in comprehensive legislation with teeth in it so that if any member of this honourable House or any man or woman who has political ambitions in this province, who wishes to enter political life, Sir, would not dare break the law, that they would be scared, Sir, to break the law.

Mr. Speaker, it took man untold centuries to produce the code traditionally known as the Ten Commandments. It took psychologists Sir, and psychiatrists, aided and abetted by the philosophy of materialism, just a couple of decades, Mr. Speaker, to persuade us all that there is no place for objective standards and the traditional taboos and that each man is a law unto himself in our Western sub-culture, Sir, that the Ten Commandments and the Seven Deadly Sins are outmoded and ridiculous, that the convicted criminal, Mr. Speaker, is much more worthy an object of public concern than his dead or injured victim.

Mr. Speaker, it may be an uphill battle for us to restore honesty and honour to our political world but surely, Mr. Speaker, we here in the province of Newfoundland could find no better way of celebrating our twenty-fifth anniversary with Canada than by at least combining the efforts of every member on both sides of this honourable House of Assembly in the attempt to frame legislation, as I said a few moments ago, that will cause a weak member to think twice before assuming obligations to hidden backers and impose severe penalties, Mr. Speaker, to make it against the law to buy off a politician. Then corporations and well-heeled individuals will think twice before they do anything of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, today Democracy as an ideal is being aborted in jurisdiction after jurisdiction because of the increasingly great cost of buying support in election campaigns. Leading politicians, Mr. Speaker, particularly on the North American Continent, are faced with such mountainous costs in carrying their platforms to the electorate that they must either start as extremely wealthy men or obligate themselves

to wealthy men or corporations if they are going to make a show at all on election day. This to me, Sir, downgrades Democracy. It reduces Democracy, as I said in my opening remarks, to plutocracy and leaves hanging on the ropes, Mr. Speaker, of hopelessness and cynicism the ordinary people and their needs and wants. I do not think that we need any better example, Sir, than of the present Tory Government of this province, to see what I mean. It is a rich man's government, Sir, made up of well-to-do, well-heeled, wealthy people.

What do we see debated in this House, Sir? Silver anniversary celebrations, bridge tournaments, unneeded flags, silver coins -

MR. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Bell Island would turn his table around it would be level. It is one of those tables with two short legs and two long legs. If he turns it around, he will find it will be quite level and his notes will not keep slipping off.

MR. NEARY: If the honourable member would come over, Sir, I would lay it right down on the back of his skull it is so level. Flat headed, he could use it for a speaker's bench. That is about the best use he could put it to, Sir. The honourable member has not put it to any use in this House yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is tragic indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is very tragic indeed when we look at the real problems and the true needs of the people of this province today and we find a government made up of a group of

well-to-do, rich, well-heeled people who are not concerned about unemployment, not concerned about the high cost of living, not concerned about inadequate housing but more concerned, Sir, about silver coins, booze parties, beauty pageants, unneeded flags. That is the crowd who talked about priorities in this province, Mr. Speaker. The real reason or the root of the trouble, Mr. Speaker, started because the ordinary person in Newfoundland who wanted to run for public life did not have the do ra me, did not have the greenback, did not have the dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few of us in this House, Sir, who broke the sound barrier. I am one of them, Sir. I came from a very poor family myself. There are two or three others who came up the hard way. But generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, we have a group of men, no women unfortunately in this honourable House, who cannot appreciate the real needs of the people of this province. That has been proven over the last two years, Sir. I would not include the Hon. Member for St. John's South in that group because I know a little about the honourable member's background. He did come up the hard way. He is not one of these well-heeled - well he may be well-heeled now but he was not always well-heeled. I am sure the honourable member will never forget from whence he came. I am sure he will never forget that, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: He tried to go back in the October election.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe he did try to go back in the October election, but he was not accepted. He looks too much now like a graduate of Cambridge.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oxford!

MR. NEARY: Oxford.

It would be far better if the honourable member ever goes out to Bonavista North again that he put on a pair of jeans, a pair of overalls, to meet the people. Do not go out with a starched shirt, a stiff necktie and a mid-Atlantic accent. Sometimes I wonder if the honourable member has not forgotten from whence he

came, Sir, but here is one here who has not forgotten. I remember, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: So there are a few people, Mr. Speaker. The point here is this, that if we as elected representatives of the people in this House of Assembly in our wisdom see fit, Sir, to pay one hundred per cent of the election expenses out of the public treasury then, Sir, the day of buying votes, the day of those with the money having the upper hand, will be ended forever. I say 'Glory Halleluiah!' to that. We have had too much of it, Sir. We have had too much of it.

Mr. Speaker, to rescue our people and their political representatives from this dreadful mire that I have been talking about and if we do pass legislation in this honourable House that it will be total and drastic, not wishy-washy, Sir. We have had too much of that. I hope that it will be decisive legislation, no loopholes like we saw in the conflict of interest legislation which my colleague, the Member for White Bay South, said that you could drive fifteen or twenty ton trucks through the legislation on conflict of interest.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Twenty, fifteen ton trucks, Sir. Well, Sir, I would say that you could string them out and push them through it sideways because there are so many loopholes in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the driver? Wee Willy?

MR. NEARY: No, I would not want to see the Member for St John's East driving these trucks. God only knows, he knows enough about loopholes now. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the financing of all election campaigns should be out of the public treasury and there should be definite limits set, Sir, on the amounts that each candidate can spend in an election and that this amount be spent in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, this paying for election expenses out of the public treasury must be made law. I would suggest, Sir, that this honourable crowd

on the other side of the House have the courage to make it law. If they have the courage, Sir, and we have heard them at this sort of thing before, talking about great reforms. They all get on the television and radio shouting, ranting and raving about the great reforms they are going to bring into this honourable House. Then they bring them in, Sir, and they leave enough loopholes in the legislation so that they and their friends can find ways to get around the legislation. We saw that happen on two or three occasions in the last couple of years.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we do have the courage in this honourable House - we do over here, Sir, I can tell you that right now, - that if that honourable crowd over there do not bring in the legislation, a year or two from now when we find ourselves occupying the government benches that we will bring it in, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will be a long day.

MR. NEARY: It will be a long day, how are you! Not according to the reports that have been coming out of Bonavista South these days. That if we do bring it in, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be a strict audit placed on the campaign expenses of each candidate immediately following the election, Mr. Speaker. This audit, Sir, could be done by the Auditor General. The Auditor General who is completely impartial, nonpartisan servant of this honourable House.

What I am suggesting, Sir, is after each election the Auditor General - that is how strong I feel about this matter, Sir. It is not a laughable matter as far as I am concerned. It is a very serious matter that the Auditor General be asked to audit the campaign expenses of each candidate, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I am also going to suggest that anybody, any candidate who did anything improper be impeached. That is the word that we are hearing quite a bit about lately, Sir. Any candidate who is found to be guilty of an improper act should be impeached and dismissed. The next candidate who poll the highest number of votes the honest way, the next honest candidate be actually declared elected, Sir, even though he did

not poll the highest number of votes on the day of the election.

As I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, to do otherwise, to have the public treasury provide funds for election expenses then permit parties and individuals and candidates to go out and blackmail their friends and individuals and corporations into campaign donations is merely an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to secure public financial support for the present unhappy state of affairs that we have. It would only have a tendency, Mr. Speaker, to perpetuate the suspicious mysteries of Watergate and Saunders.

All we would get, Mr. Speaker, if we did not go all of the way - you talk about, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the question asked in the last couple of years; "What is the difference between Liberalism and Toryism?" I heard it asked of members on this honourable side of the House and members on that honourable side of the House. Much to my dismay, Sir, some of the members were unable to answer the question. They said they did not know. Did not know the difference between Liberalism and Toryism? I could spend the next week in this honourable House, Sir, telling the House the difference between Liberalism and Toryism.

I will tell the House now the difference between Liberalism and Toryism on this resolution. The Minister without Portfolio, the Member for St. John's East, expressed the Tory viewpoint last week when he spoke in this debate, Sir. He said that Newfoundland could not afford to pay for election expenses.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well perhaps the honourable minister will dig down in his pocket. He seems to have made a bundle, in the last couple of years, renting equipment to the Department of Highways, Rural Development.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Old "Conflict of Interest."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member for Bell Island is not being relevant to the amendment.

MR. NEARY: When I am interrupted, Mr. Speaker, by "Conflict of Interest" I could not help but be otherwise, Sir.

MR. REID: Jealousy will get you nowhere.

MR. NEARY: That is not jealousy, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Commission of guilt.

MR. NEARY: We will get around to the honourable gentleman later on in this session of the House. Well, Sir, there is the difference, we say go all the way and put a candidate in jail, impeach him, dismiss him, throw him out if he breaks the law. That is not what they are doing, Sir. It is not what they are doing. All they are doing, Sir, is if we follow the Tory thinking, the Tory philosophy, the Tory position laid down by the member for St. John's East, all we would do is perpetuate the present mysterious situation that we have. That is all that would happen, Mr. Speaker, and the only thing we would do is, the honourable minister could go in before the election, ask for his handout from the public treasury, then go down in his little office down in the Royal Trust Building, pick up his phone, call around to a number of his well-heeled friends and say; "I need a few dollars for my campaign." So all the public treasury would be doing would be subsidizing the minister who does not need any subsidy I can assure this honourable House.

So, Sir, all we would be doing is just adding to the rip-off of funds by political candidates, we would be adding to that rip-off by giving another rip-off of public funds.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Four against what?

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am all for it. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member could

not have been listening to me.

MR. REID: It is pretty hard.

MR. NEARY: I know it is very hard for the honourable minister, he can only think about James Reid and Sons, all he can think about, Sir. Wait until we get around to the Country Road over there.

This is another thing, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it should be discontinued. As far as I am concerned, Sir, no government in power should be allowed to spend one penny, not a cent after the election is called. Once the proclamation of the election, Sir, is made, there should be none of this going down and paving roads, scraping the snow off roads and laying down paving and filling up pot holes with paving and promising fish plants and provincial parks and promising all sorts of other things, Sir.

Why over on Bell Island, Sir, we used to call the paving machines over there the voting machines. Every time the paving machine would arrive, the people would say; "There must be an election on because the voting machine is back again." Not me, that happened before my time, Sir. I was probably the author of it, I do not know.

But Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference who did it or who did not do it, I am saying here and now, Sir, and I think that I am probably the first in Canada to say this, that once the election is called not one penny out of the public treasury should be spent for electioneering. It is just a waste of money, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this honourable crowd over there did not even have sense enough to change the technique that Mr. Smallwood used to use. He used to send the paving machines all over Newfoundland. Sir, they are so hopeless they have not come up with an original idea of their own since they have been over there. They even had to copy him down in Hermitage.

But, Sir, this is something that we should give very serious consideration to in the future. I am all for it. It gives

both sides an even chance. No more buying votes. No more squandering the taxpayers' money because, Mr. Speaker, nine chances out of ten, money that is spent during the twenty-one day campaign, which is the normal amount of time for campaigning in this province, the money that is spent in that twenty-one days

to a large degree, I would suggest in this honourable House is a waste of money. The roads down in Hermitage are probably gone now. We have drill holes, artesian wells all over this Province and it is a wonder the Province has not sunk, there are so many artesian wells around, ninety per cent of them not being used. We were not the only ones to put down artesian wells.

So, Sir, this is something that is worth considering. I am all for it. I do not think the member for St. John's East is all for it but that is the difference between Liberalism and Torism, Sir, we do not believe in half way measures. We do not believe in wishy-washy legislation. We do not believe in legislation that is full of loopholes. If you are going to do something, do it, put some teeth into it.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this moment I can offer no amendment to the amendment that was moved by the member for White Bay North, the Leader of the Opposition, on the private members' resolution that was introduced by the member for St. John's North. I do not think it would be in accordance with the procedure of this House for me to do that, Sir. I could probably word an amendment, a subamendment. I may be able to get away with it and then we would have another debate but, Sir, I have no intention of prolonging the debate in this House by obstructing the progress in this House but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest this in all sincerity that we not continue with this debate on the honourable member's resolution, that we table the resolution in this honourable House and let the House set up a select committee. Let the House, Mr. Speaker, set up a select committee to develop legislation that will be truly, Mr. Speaker, a bulwark of the political intergrity of our political elections and that such a select committee, Sir, be appointed immediately and be given instructions to report to this honourable House, Sir, with its recommendation not later than Wednesday, March 27, 1974.

AN HONORUABLE MEMBER: Is that an amendment?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not an amendment, it is merely a suggestion.

HON. W. MARSHALL (St. John's East): Tell us about the \$500,000 and its -
(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the \$500,000 owing by the Liberal Party is a private matter, the same as the money owing by the Tory Party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You want it to be a public one.

MR. NEARY: The money they owe to the Newfoundland Power Commission, they will not pay it. It is a private matter, Sir, it is a matter that will be resolved by the Liberal Party of this Province. It has nothing at all to do with the members resolution, absolutely nothing, Sir, and even if we did pass legislation in this honourable House, and the honourable minister knows this, if we did pass legislation to pay for election expenses out of the public treasury, it would have no bearing at all on that \$500,000, none whatsoever. It is a red herring, Sir, it is a whale that the member for St. John's East tried to draw across the path of the real issue and the real issue, Sir, is: Does that honourable crowd sitting on the government benches have the intestinal fortitude and the courage to take a step, Sir, which would be, in my opinion, one of the major reforms ever to come before this honourable House? Only time will tell, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they have the courage to do it.

I do, Sir. I am afraid of nothing. Put the legislation to the test in the House, have the members stand up and be counted, see who is for or against, see who wants this corruption, this bribery and corruption removed forever from politics in this Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is the Saunders case he is talking about, the bribe.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we had a public enquiry, a

commission of enquiry we would soon find out about this Saunders' scandal. As I said earlier in my remarks, it has all the appearances of bribery and corruption. It has all the appearances and I am amazed at some of the honourable members on that side of the House who can sit there day in and day out knowing that a constitutional fraud was inflicted on the people of this province that cost the taxpayers a half million dollars. A one hour session of the House, the most expensive and the most criticized session of the House of Assembly ever held. One hour! A half million dollars!

I heard, Mr. Speaker, and I have to take the honourable member for St. John's South to task on this, unfortunately my television is not working and I have not been able to find a few paltry dollars to get it fixed. The sound is working but the picture is not working so I could only hear the honourable gentleman I could not see him. I like looking at his beautiful physiog on television because he has that angelic look but I never saw a man who could slide out from under the issues, side-step the issues like the honourable member. Do you know what he said when the people who were interviewing him asked him: "What about the Saunders affair?" "I was not around then let the people who were there explain it, let them accept the responsibility for it."

Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member know that he has a seat in this honourable House? The way he wormed his way into this honourable House - he could not make it down in Bonavista North because of the Saunders' affair. Does the member know that? Does that clear his conscience? If I were sitting on that honourable side of the House it would not make any difference if it were October or March that I came into this honourable House I would want to know how I got there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Does it make any difference? Does it make any difference if it were October or March? The honourable member knows how he got

here.

AN HON. MEMBER: He got 79.9 per cent of the votes.

MR. NEARY: The opportunity, Sir, for the honourable member to get 79.9 per cent of the votes was given to him through the resignation of one William P. Saunders. His percentage will not be quite that much the next time if he does not clear up this matter of the Saunders' scandal.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that out of all the honourable crowd on that side of the House there are only one or two over there, only one or two that I would say would welcome a commission of enquiry to clear the air and I would have to say that I consider the honourable gentleman to be one honourable, decent, respectable man, Sir, a learned gentleman of this honourable House. I will be very surprised when the test comes that we will find the honourable member glued on to his seat, afraid to stand up to be counted. The test is going to come, Sir, and I would consider the honourable member for St. John's North to be another one. One thing I will say about both honourable gentlemen, Sir, is that they have asserted their independence since they have sat on that side of the House much to the chagrin of the Premier and his ministers. I understand the member for St. John's North was taken out in the back room and severely lashed, got a tongue lashing for bringing this resolution into the House. The member for St. John's South got hauled over the coals for bringing another resolution in on a house for a house.

I do not know if it is true or not -

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to interrupt the honourable member for Bell Island to advise him that he has about three or four minutes left to speak.

MR. NEARY: Only three or four minutes? Could I have another hour?

So, Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that we not proceed further with this debate, that we table the resolution, have a select committee of the House appointed to bring in

a report and make recommendations not later than Wednesday, March 27, 1974. This strikes me, Mr. Speaker, as being a reasonable proposition and I hope that members on either side of the House will go for it.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, although there are probably some other members who would like to speak on this amendment, I feel that it might be helpful if I were to review some of the points that have been made and to make some comments about the amendment itself. After listening to the member for Bell Island, I realize the truth of the old adage that suggests that just because there is snow on the roof does not mean that the fire in the furnace has gone out. I would say that there is still some fire in the honourable gentleman yet and perhaps he has another few months of usefulness left.

Perhaps I should begin with the honourable Leader of the Opposition who proposed the amendment in the first place. Here I will mention some of the points that he made leading up to introducing the amendment. He suggested that the present system of politics invites abuse and that he was intending to put in an amendment to see that this resolution could be implemented as quickly as possible. He suggested that thirty days seemed reasonable. Well, I would like to point out at this time that thirty days would hardly give us time to catalogue all the enormities of the previous administration. Just to merely write out the abuses and to look at them would take far more than thirty days. So, even a whole month would hardly be sufficient time.

At some point in his discussion - I do not know if it were he or the honourable member for White Bay South who very kindly offered me a seat on their side of the House. I must say I take it in the spirit in which it was offered but I was rather disappointed that it was offered by such a low ranking member. Your know, if for instance the doorman of a public building offers you rental space, you do not really take him seriously. If somebody cleaning

up a barn suggests that he can give you a piece of the action, it is not really and you cannot view it as a serious offer. However, I thank the honourable gentleman.

Then the Leader of the Opposition went on to talk about collectors and bagmen and the various evils attendant upon that particular system. He suggested that because of the cost of elections that the system itself may be about to break down. Certainly some of his points were well taken. He pointed to the vast increase in the cost of television and radio. He suggested that the costs of the recent by-election in Hermitage were very high, and made some estimates. I do not think I need to go into those but I think he made his point, that the cost of electioneering is high and is perhaps disproportionately high. Certainly for those of us who have had any contact with politicians in the states who have had to run, there because of the structure of their parties it costs them almost as much, if not more, to get nominated as to run, and the cost there, partly because of the larger districts I suppose, can run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. All of these are on quite legitimate expenses.

So, I think he was trying to develop, the Leader of the Opposition was trying to develop the theme that the implementation of a motion as is now before this House is really a logical development of the recompense first paid to members some fifty or sixty years ago and the gradual greater and greater involvement of government in the cost of electioneering itself, that is setting up the machinery for voting whereas perhaps a hundred years ago people voted in public by a show of hands. Now fairly elaborate machinery, quite properly chargeable to the

public treasury is set up for people to register their vote. I think he was trying to develop the suggestion that it would be only logical to go all of the way and pay all of the expenses of election. Well be that as it may he then introduced his amendment.

I feel the wording itself is somewhat vexatious and perhaps even mischievous by suggesting that this House urges and requests the government to implement its oft repeated promises to the public. I am surprised the amendment was allowed in that form. However, I realize the extreme latitude with which the Speaker treats the opposition in this House. therefore, I can understand why such a sloppy, loosely phrased amendment was permitted.

However, I must say that I cannot support it. However, I do feel that - I appreciate the spirit in which the amendment was made. I feel that the more discussion there is around this motion the better.

Now the Minister of Finance I think replied, according to my notes, the Minister of Finance then replied to the Leader of the Opposition. He made a great many points, all of them very well taken. He suggested that this was probably one of the most important matters to have been brought into the House, Here I would certainly concur.

He then recalled the failure of the previous administration to support any election reform whatsoever. In fact if you could talk about election deformities, I think that would be probably more accurately describing the case. I think in introducing the motion itself I outlined some of the grosser enormities that I had witnessed in the past twenty years.

He suggested that the thirty days part of the amendment was obnoxious in that it would tie the legislative draftsmen and tie the House down to a timetable which might result in sloppy legislation getting through.

Then he raised the philosophical point that corporations and large businesses are not, although they are entities they are not persons. Therefore, although they can have influence they cannot have awareness or personalty and cannot really have opinions; all they can have is a sort

of influence in the way that a machine can have an influence. He felt that the acceptance or the seeking of large donations from large impersonal corporations probably could lead to a great deal of abuse.

Myself I feel that the control, and I throw this out as just a taking point to the House, I feel that perhaps the way to get around is to set some strict limit on the size of the contribution from such a corporation. I am fully aware of the very great cost of elections and the fact that future elections are going to cost more. I will come to that later on.

The Minister of Finance suggested that the cost to run an election in Newfoundland could possibly cost as much as \$500,000 to \$750,000 taking all costs into consideration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Well it is an expensive business - take forty-two members multiply that by the amount of money that - well you are really taking eighty-four members that is assuming you have two parties contesting -

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe one hundred.

MR. CARTER: Maybe one hundred, yes. It can mount up there is no doubt about that. I do not think we need to seriously disagree about the actual amount of money, we know it is considerable.

He suggested that this situation is much larger on the federal scene where you have 265 members and a possibility of 700 or 800 candidates altogether because of the four parties. He also suggested that the party in power can more easily get money than the opposition. Now that may or may not be true. I think with the federal system that you have in Canada, it may well be that the party in opposition, if that party happens to be the same as the federal party in power, may be in a better position than the provincial party but that is again something that - I could not come to any firm decision about that. I will just throw that out.

So that this motion, he suggested, the unamended motion, he was speaking against the amendment. He intends to equalize opportunity. This was part of my purpose in moving this motion.

MR. WOODWARD: Would you ask the honourable member to speak up, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CARTER: I am sorry, cannot the honourable member hear me? I am sorry, I did not realize the honourable member was afflicted with poor hearing.

MR. WOODWARD: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: No not at all, in fact if the honourable member should fall asleep I will send the page over to wake him up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Now he also suggested, should funds be both controlled and contributed towards from the public treasury. You see, this motion has several aspects, one is control and the other is contribution. I myself have yet to make up my mind which is the more important. This is why I am so interested in the progress of this debate. I have kept careful notes on all of the debate so far. I am trying to make up my own mind should the legislation that I hope will be eventually proposed,

concentrate on disclosure of contributions? Should it limit contributions? Or should it concentrate on persuading the government to pay part or all or some percentage of election expenses? There are really three aspects to this motion.

Then, of course, the Minister of Finance pointed out one particularly obnoxious outrage that occurred in the last administration and this was, "Conversations With The Premier," that particular programme that I think we all found so offensive. Fortunately the radio stations involved were gradually persuaded to give some time and certainly on the open-line programmes to the opposing viewpoint. It was a disgrace to the people of Newfoundland to turn on your radio every morning at 10:15 A.M. and find yourself badgered with these raucous sounds, the raucous, unintelligible sounds, consisting chiefly of insults and of very little intellectual content and mostly used to abuse someone who may have dared to offer some criticism to the Premier the day before. The whole thing was a disgrace. Those were some of the points, only some of the points made by the Minister of Finance.

Then the Member for White Bay South rose, still speaking on the amendment, and gave a speech that was again more remarkable for its lack of content than for any particular points, although he did make some points. Again his approach was rhetorical and while I think that may be useful out on a public platform, I would have much preferred that he used more argument and more facts. Let me go over what he did say. Mostly he described the Minister of Finance's speech as full of hypocrisy and weasel words. Now these, I suggest, were an opinion rather than fact. He suggested that the requested resolution will never be brought in unless it is passed with that amendment. Now again I would take issue there. If the unamended motion is passed, I have every confidence that the government will take action on it. I would be very, very surprised if the government fail to act. In fact they would fail to act at their peril.

He suggested that the idea of his amendment was that the motion allows too much leeway and that it permits the government to put it off and put it off for a year, possibly even two years. He also suggested that the present government might hesitate to give away its present advantage that is assuming that the government in power have an advantage and are looking for political funds, and that the present system is bad, that any one who gives a donation to a political party is looking for friends at court. Now I take issue very strongly with that attitude. During the October 1971 campaign, I can assure all honourable members that I would have given all that I had to have defeated the previous administration. In fact it became such an obsession with me -

MR. EVANS: The honourable member does not believe in our two-party system?

MR. CARTER: I do. I do indeed. I believe that government should change at least every twenty years. It was in that belief that I put all possible effort into it. I do not think that people who wish to contribute should be discouraged. I was prepared to be a very big contributor if I had to.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quarter of a million dollars.

MR. CARTER: Well not a quarter of a million.

Then, of course, the Member for White Bay South went over the Federal Act, and I intend to go through that very briefly. I will leave it at that for the moment, except to say that I believe the Federal Act is a sea lawyer's nightmare. I think it is complex, convoluted and unworkable in our situation. Then followed (my notes here read) a tirade against the Minister of Finance. He closed by saying that the legislation should be brought in long before another election. I think all that took an hour and one-half. Then he was replied to by the House Leader, Mr. Marshall; who criticized the criticism of the Minister of Finance (and did it very well) by the Member for White Bay South.

Mr. Speaker, he pointed out that in his view (I think I concur with that) that the purpose of this motion was to stimulate debate. I think it has done that. The debate seems to have been stimulating. I can see honourable members across the way scribbling away, Whether they are making notes to contribute towards this debate or whether they are just practicing their handwriting, I have no way of knowing. He did point out (again this is the House Leader) that too much money appears to be spent on campaigns; that the Progressive Conservative victories in October 1971, March 1972, were largely due to volunteers and certainly that was true. Never before in the history of Newfoundland was so much done by so many. It was a magnificent outpouring of faith and confidence in our party and I must say that I look back on those times.

He discussed both the Liberal and Progressive Conservative Leadership Conventions and certainly it is very hard to draw a comparison

whereas one was an orgy of debauchery, the other was a fairly sensible, straightforward campaign. One convention was much smaller but if the stories that one heard and the sights that one saw were correct, then the Liberal Leadership Campaign went far overboard. I hope it will never be repeated. I think that there should be another Liberal leadership campaign and convention. Perhaps there are several contestants from that side of the House that might care to put their names forward. I seem to sense in the member for White Bay South a possible longing for the mantle of leadership. However, that is up to himself.

Again Mr. Marshall felt that the expenses of a political party should perhaps be limited. Now there are a number of ways this can be done. I think the Federal Government, prior to its latest bit of legislation, attempted to limit by disclosure what could be spent. Now whereas this is not putting an absolute limit still it does put an effective brake upon uncontrolled spending. So, whether you "limit" - and I use the word limit in quotation marks there - whether you should "limit" by disclosure or whether you should limit absolutely by legislation or regulation, I leave it to the honourable members to consider.

Again Mr. Marshall disagreed with the government contribution towards election expenses. Here his point was well taken. He felt that it could get out of control if government paid all the election expenses. What with legitimate election expenses mounting rapidly, it could get out of control. Well, I agree with him. It could get out of control but I never did feel or at least in moving this motion, I never did feel that government should try to pay all the expenses of campaigning. I felt it should perhaps pay some. The amount again I think would come out in this debate.

The suggestion was made from this side of the House that perhaps the opposition favoured this motion because they see that they may be able to bail themselves out of their monstrous debt reputed to be \$500,000 or whatever it is. Well, certainly it is no intention of mine that any

effect of this motion would be retroactive. I do not think that anyone here seriously feels that it would be.

Then the member for Bonavista South had a few points to make. His points were largely that the Federal Act could not fit the provincial scene. Of course, he pointed out to the slush funds that had been administered by the assistant to the former Premier. We were told that a fair amount of money was earmarked for expenditures in the various districts, in the various sensitive districts. I think it is hypocritical of the member for Bell Island to suggest now that this ought not to be done especially since he was a member of a party that did actively engage in seeking to what has been described as buying the people with their own money.

Admittedly we know that government must go on even at an election time and how much government should go on is a matter of perhaps conjecture and perhaps can never be regulated. We do know that in the past election of October, 1971 and certainly in the election of 1966 with which I was quite familiar, government activity during the time of the election reached a crescendo that abated very quickly. There was a very quick diminuendo the next morning. The cold light of dawn saw the paving machines rolled away.

Anyway, I think probably the most telling point was made by the member for Labrador South who in a very short speech said that the Leader of the Opposition was wasting the time of the House by a contentious amendment and is therefore perhaps against the resolution itself. There is probably some merit in that. Certainly there does seem to be - each member seems to be taking up his full hour-and-a-half. I do not object to any member speaking as long as he is allowed to on any motion but I do feel that surely one can say what one has to say and then sit down. One does not need to pad ones speech so as to take up every last minute of the time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: I intend to. Once I have finished what I have to say I intend to sit down. I may say what I am going to say and then say that I have said it but having said it, I will sit down.

So, I suppose it is too much to hope that the opposition will vote against their own amendment. After all, they have made the amendment, they may as well vote for it. However, it is a suggestion that I throw for their consideration. Or if they wish to withdraw the amendment, that might be another possibility. I am not afraid that if this House does pass the motion that the original motion with some possible slight amendment - I am quite sure that the government would act upon the instructions of this House. I have no fears in that regard.

Now, a very brief word about the Federal legislation. As I was saying earlier it is a sea lawyer's nightmare. It is a forest of regulations and it would require a great staff to carry it out. They talk about

a dollar per name on the preliminary lists of up to 15,000 voters plus fifty cents a name on preliminary lists for the next 10,000 voters plus twenty-five cents per name on the preliminary list for the balance.

During an election campaign each party will be limited to spending a total of thirty cents per vote on the preliminary lists in all ridings where it is running a candidate.

You know, it all points to a tremendous gathering of facts and a tremendous amount of calculation and a tremendous amount of verification and I feel, quite honestly, there must be some simpler way to do it. Then we talk about reimbursement of expenses, sixteen cents per name on the preliminary lists up to 25,000 voters plus fourteen cents per name on the preliminary list for balance plus \$250, etc., etc., etc. Parties would be reimbursed fifty per cent of the cost of the radio and television time they use from their portion of the six-and-a-half hours that each station and channel must provide during prime time.

This Act utterly forgets or fails to deal with a situation that I outlined earlier. What about the situation where some friends of the candidate decide to get together and promote his candidacy? The candidate may not necessarily know anything about it or may know very little about it. Very often it has happened in the past in Newfoundland, it even happened to me; some people got together and decided to promote my political welfare and did bring voters to a poll and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: They may indeed. I would suggest that anyone who performed the same deed for the honourable member opposite sincerely regret their efforts because it is a disastrous failure. But the question is, Sir, how do you protect, how do you regulate this kind of thing? It is not possible to regulate it.

Then it comes to the tax credit, seventy-five per cent of the

amount donated up to \$100 plus fifty per cent of the amount donated from \$100 to \$550, plus thirty-three and one-third per cent the amount donated from \$550 to \$1,150 and amounts over \$1,150 receive no tax credit. A sliding scale - I do not know, the whole thing seems to me to be a mass of figures and then there are talks about official agents, auditors.

You know something much simpler surely can be devised. Of course again we have no control over the CBC or the CITC and therefore we cannot make provisions for radio and television times. It is beyond the power of this House to regulate that. However, I do not object to using it as a guide. Perhaps in some cases a guide of what to do and in other cases as a guide of what not to do but I do feel that to base any election law on this federal law, in Newfoundland, would be putting more difficulties in one's way than are necessary.

Again I want to defend, quite honestly to defend collecting money for a political party. There are people who will volunteer time and there are people who will volunteer their money. Under our capitalistic system, some people are wealthier than others. Our system rewards initiative. There are people with greater initiative and they get greater returns. I see nothing wrong with that and there are people therefore with greater discretionary incomes or great discretionary balances. They are prepared, if their feelings get worked up sufficiently they are prepared to donate large sums to the political party of their choice - or they may in their wisdom give to both political parties, feeling that they approve not necessarily of one party or another but of the political process in general.

We have a lot to be thankful for in our present political process in North America. We have open politics or relatively open politics. At least we are not restricted in the way that some Eastern European Countries are. We have a great heritage of freedom and it may well be

that certain individuals wish to promote this, the political process that they see around them and therefore, without any special preference, may give equally to both parties. I see nothing wrong with that, nothing wrong at all. But it can be wrong. It can be wrong if the person who contributes is looking for special favours or is trying to bribe or buy off or otherwise influence the normal course of government.

So I repeat again; to defeat the previous administration, I think I would have given all that I had. I would say this, that only the restraints of a Christian society prevented the most hideous nightmare that lunatic vindictiveness could contrive. To even describe the enormities that Mr. Smallwood et al, take that how you like, attempted, taxes the very capabilities of language itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: No, there is a bit more, a bit more.

So in conclusion I would say, by the way, that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not as bad as his predecessor, not as bad as the previous Leader of the Opposition whom I presume was Mr. Smallwood for a brief period until there was a leadership campaign.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is in St. John's but it is not in Gambo.

MR. CARTER: This is a fiction that I would like to explode right here and now. The former Premier might have been born in Gambo but he was brought up in St. John's and for him to try and pose as the great outporter was a fiction indeed. He was just as much a member of St. John's as if he had been born here. He came to St. John's at a very early age. I do not know what date but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it in his book.

MR. CARTER: Read it into the record. So for him to pretend that he was the defender of the outports, he was just as much a corner boy

as the present Leader of the Opposition. Yes.

So, there it is. I would like to leave these thoughts with honourable gentlemen and if they have any suggestion or contributions to make to the debate I will be more than happy to comment upon them at a later time. Thank you.

MR. ROBERT WELLS (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, we seem, in this debate this afternoon, to have caught the House in a very calm mood, very quiet and relaxed mood, I must say.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sleepy mood.

MR. WELLS: Sleepy mood. I will do something, I hope, to wake it up slightly.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: I will do something, I hope, to wake it up a bit, Mr. Speaker.

Before discussing the amendment and making some comments on the principle of election financing and the way I feel it ought to be done, I have to refer to the remarks made earlier by the member from Bell Island. I do not know where he is. I saw him down at the back and I saw him up here by the windows. I hope he has not jumped out after what he has said but he will appear now in a moment I think.

He was talking about the difference between the Liberal and the Tories and he made a great speech and a very funny speech and a very entertaining speech about the shortcomings of us on this side of the House and how we can say one thing and do another and all of our faults and shortcomings. It was very entertaining, Mr. Speaker, very pleasant, I enjoyed it.

This is not the first time this subject came before this House of Assembly. Back before there was a change of government, the member for St. John's West, as he is now and was then, made a motion dealing with election finances, and where were the stirring quotations of the member for Bell Island then? They were not heard. They were not heard, Mr. Speaker, because they were not said and because he, at the time, for all his funnies now and for all his great quotations, did not have the courage to say then

what we on this side of the House have the courage to say now. He did not say if he believed in control of electioneering and election expenses. He did not have the courage to say it then and that is the difference, I think, in a large measure, between the Tory Party, I am proud to be called a Tory, the Tory Party and the Liberal Party.

I have been in here in this House before, before I sat here as a member, Mr. Speaker and I have seen Mr. Smallwood when he was Premier incline his head and he simply had to incline his head and a member on his own side who was saying something that was unacceptable -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: No. No, but sometimes, sometimes something has to be said and the honourable member for Bell Island -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: No. No. The honourable member for Bell Island made some good points this afternoon but one has to consider the question of credibility, Mr. Speaker. Now, to leave that and go on to the subject matter of this resolution and the amendment which has been proposed.

It seems to me that before legislation is brought into a House of Assembly, before anything is done surely we have to examine the situation to see if there is something that has to be corrected. Now, in order to do that, I think we have to look at the present system under which elections are financed in this Province and I may say, Mr. Speaker, before going further, that all of us in this House should be grateful to the member for St. John's North for proposing this resolution. It is something that ought to be discussed and I am glad it is being discussed because I feel the time has come to examine the situation and hopefully to correct what I think are abuses or the possibilities of abuses in the system.

Now, political parties are financed in Newfoundland, as in all provinces of Canada, by donations of one sort or another. Certain political parties, chiefly, the NDP I understand is financed by donations from unions which means in effect donations from individual members, collected

by the union and then sent eventually to party headquarters. I think the Labour Party in England is financed in the same way. The two major political parties in Canada, the Liberal Party and the Progressive Party, are financed by gifts from individuals and corporations.

Now I think that in our consideration of this matter we have to draw distinction between gifts by individuals and gifts by corporations. I do not think that any individual who can afford a five dollar bill or twenty-five dollars or donates a car on polling day or something of that sort or if he is wealthy enough, affluent enough, can give five hundred dollars or one hundred dollars, I do not think that such an individual is attempting in any sense to buy anything or to subvert the system or to exercise an influence on a member of this House or any House that would be improper. I do not think so. I do not think that, for instance, if a corporation, a large corporation or even a medium sized corporation gives a thousand dollars or five thousand dollars, I do not think then, that that corporation is seeking in an improper manner to influence members of this House or a government in this House or an opposition or anybody at all involved in the process of government. I do not think so.

What occurs to me as being a dangerous thing and having all the implications of danger is when a large corporation or a medium sized corporation gives perhaps \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$100,000 or \$200,000, then I believe we are encountering the situation that we have to watch.

Now you might say to me and anybody might say to me, "How do you know that such sums are given?" The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not. I only know what we all hear from time to time that large sums are donated to political parties in Newfoundland by people doing business here. Then I think we have to draw another distinction. There is a distinction which has to be drawn between a

company such as a supermarket operator or a clothing store or somebody like that who have very little to gain from possible government patronage. The large companies, the national companies which have branches in Newfoundland and branches in every Province of Canada seem to me from the nature of the services that they provide might have more to gain, especially financial institutions, in dealing with the province.

There is something else that is very significant about our system and the very fact that I am going to say that I do not know something and that perhaps all members or most members in this House do not know something, I think is more significant than anything else that I could say. I think that I as a member of the public, I as a member of this House and I think this applies to most of the members sitting around here, we do not know who contributes to the political parties in Newfoundland. We can guess but we do not know who contributes. We do not know how much they contribute and except within broad limits, we do not know where or how the money is spent. We know that it goes for elections, of course, we know that it goes for party expenses but we do not know with any detail.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental point and it is a point that can lead to abuse. What or how much abuse it has led to in the past I do not know. How much abuse it is leading to in the present I do not know but I have to say that it is a system that leads to abuse. Nobody can tell me and I think nobody should be naive enough to think that if a businessman, if a large corporation contributes, for example, \$50 thousand or \$100 thousand to a political party in Newfoundland, nobody can tell me that they do not want something in return. I suspect that what they want in return is not simply the maintenance of the two party system. They do not just want to see good government, they may want to see that too, but they want various other things. They want a right of audience with people in government and they want, I believe,

they want business of some kind or another from government which will give them back that contribution plus more. That is what I feel that the large contributors are looking for. God knows! I may be wrong but I think that is what they are looking for and I believe looked at historically, Newfoundland, without knocking one party or another, I believe from time to time they have gotten just that.

I believe then that when the situation arises, when governments in Canada or any Province of Canada deal with large companies on a special sort of basis, because they have contributed monies, if that happens and I think under the present system it can happen, then I think government is ceasing to serve the people that elected it.

Corporations do not have votes and yet the people who make up corporations have in our system in Canada today, very often, great influence. I believe we owe it to ourselves as legislators, we owe in to our country and to our province to do something about that. You might say to me quite legitimately; "How do you know that?" "Does this take place?" The answer, I think, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

The United States of America, a very great country and a country that I admire myself very, very much, yet this Watergate thing has shown that the root of evil in politics has to do with party contributions. I think it was Jesse Unruh, in California who said; "Money is the mother's milk of politics." He was not far wrong. I think what he meant was that money contributed to politicians and to parties is what makes the wheels go around and he was not thinking of the actual process of governing he was thinking of the underlying porcesses, the things we do not hear often about.

When we look at the record of Watergate in the United States, always running through it like a golden thread are these large political contributions that were in the hands of lawyers, that were in the hands of fund raisers, that were in the hands of

politicians. Sometimes they were too hot to handle, sometimes they stayed in safes for years but they were there. They were the mother's milk all right, they are what made the plumbers groups possible, they are what made the actual Watergate burglary possible, they financed a whole degree, a whole gambit of wrong doing and wrong things.

It is interesting also and the question must be asked, if the money was spent in this fashion and we know from that that large amounts were contributed, what was given to the people who contributed in return? Nobody and no company gives large amounts of money like that without wanting something. This I think is why we are thinking about this today. It is no good to say that this applies in the United States only, it does not apply in Canada nor it does not apply in Canadian Provinces. I do not accept that Mr. Speaker, I think it does.

Proof we do not have. I do not suppose any member of this legislature has proof but we hear enough and we know enough just as citizens and as politicians living in this country to know that in Canada this kind of thing goes on. I would say something else about Canada and about Canadian Provinces and about Newfoundland as compared with the United States and compared with England also, for that matter, that in the United States they have a very great capacity with all the ills they have, with all the trouble, with all the fighting, with all the crime and with all the political skulduggery they have the capacity to turn it all inside out and to turn the cards face up and say; "This is what we have and this is what we should do about it." That process is going on in the states right now and that process is what tells me that that country is still strong.

The President of the United States may be impeached or he may not, he may go or he may stay but because that process can go on that is going on there now, that country is strong and that country has kick and life left in it. I feel in Newfoundland where

we have a history of corruption, a history going back before Commission of Government, anybody who is interested in this topic, anybody who is speaking in the House, any member of the public who is thinking about it ought to read Professor Knowles book, "Politics In Newfoundland." The bulk of that book deals not with the last twenty-three, twenty-four or twenty-five years even but with the period before Commission. It is a sad thing to say and a hard thing to say but we have a tradition of wrongdoing in politics in Newfoundland.

Please God! Now that we have come to 1974, that we have come in to this time and this place, I hope and I pray that we of this House will be able to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the change in thinking has come. I recall various speakers and I have been one of them myself, talking around this province in the past three or four years, from time to time, to groups of individuals, to services clubs or what you like, bringing up this point. Gradually the thinking has come round to what would have been unspeakable ten years ago. If anyone proposed that there would be a debate on this subject in this House ten years ago he would have been laughed out of the House. It would be a joke, It would be a piece of nonsense.

Political parties have always been financed that way and always will but today. I think everyone in this House and every one in

the country that is listening to us debate knows that this is a serious subject, knows instinctively with a gut feeling that something has to be done to control this sort of thing.

I was delighted myself, Mr. Speaker, back on the 7th. of June there was a programme on CBC called "Encounter" and the Hon. Robert Stanfield, whom I believe is a great man, was on that programme. They asked him about financing of political parties and disclosure of campaign contributions. Mr. Stanfield said that in the past he had never thought that it was necessary. "I accepted it. I went along with it but now," he said, "granting the state of political consciousness in Canada," he said, "I feel that the Canadian public, lest they think that something might be wrong, have the right to know where the money comes from. Therefore," he said, "when the legislation comes before Parliament I will support it." It did come before Parliament and he did support it and the Liberal Government in Ottawa supported it, in fact I think both major parties, I think the NDP supported it as well. It became law.

Now I am not interested, Mr. Speaker, in comparing what was done in Ottawa directly with what we need in the Province of Newfoundland. We need something based on the same principle. Obviously, we cannot control television. We cannot control radio or that sort of thing. These are purely within the jurisdiction of the federal government but the principle that was adopted in Ottawa with the unanimous consent and approval of both parties must I feel be brought to Newfoundland.

The principle is this: That first and foremost that there must be disclosure. Now you can say, all right so you disclose it. What does it mean? The person who gives or the corporation who gives \$100,000 is still going to give \$100,000. So what does it do? I will tell you what it does, in my view, Mr. Speaker. It means that if a corporation wants to give \$100,000 okay, fine, it can give it but it will be published and everybody knows that the X Y Z company gave that party \$100,000 or gave the other party \$50,000 or \$100,000 or \$75,000.

Therefore whatever party forms the government and whatever party forms the opposition when they deal with that company as government particularly, everybody will be able to say and know; "Ah! that is the

company that gave the \$100,000 or the \$50,000 or the \$20,000. We will therefore watch their dealings, we will watch them carefully. We will make sure that if the company or we will want to know if that company gets a contract, if it gets business that it is on the up and up, cards faced up on the table."

I have no objection as a member of a party to the parties being contributed to but I do not like it said that when the party for which I am a member forms government that something illicit is going on, something is given which ought not to be given and the reason is that there is to close a connection between the party and the given company. That I do not like. That I do not want to see. That I would be prepared to do anything that is legitimate and proper in this House to avoid. So that by all means, if we are going to have contributions let them be disclosed. I would say let them be disclosed at the level of the \$100, as was done in Ottawa.

You see you have to be careful, most companies that do business in Newfoundland, most companies I suppose that do business in Canada, most political parties and politicians are decent and honourable. But you will get those in every walk of life no matter what you do or where you go who are prepared to subvert the system, who are prepared to destroy it, who are prepared to twist something that should be worthwhile into something which is not. Why do I say \$100 and not \$1,000? Because I think there are certain companies in Canada who would contribute to a political party \$100 a day or \$100 a week or \$100 every two days, or \$1,000, for example, at appropriate times, if you did not bring it down low enough, so it is just not the \$100. What I think should be, Mr. Speaker, it should be the yearly contributions of an individual or a corporation over \$100 should be disclosed. You ought not to be able to just make the individual contribution and make it every day or every week or every month and get away with it. I feel that it should be the yearly contributions over \$100 should be disclosed.

The Minister of Finance said when he was speaking in this debate it would bring a whole new complexion on political parties. It would mean

that political parties would have to keep books; whether they do now or not I have no idea. I have never seen any books. They would have to keep books. They would have to publish contributions. They would have to file them with the Auditor General or whoever. There would have to be a mechanism set up.

This is right and proper because under our system in the past and the theory of the British Constitution is that political parties although they exist and although they are the means of getting people elected to Houses of Parliament all through the British system yet political parties officially under the system do not exist. When we sit in this House we are all members, those of us on this side support the government and those on the other side have a constitutional duty to oppose the government but we are all members; we are not members officially in this House of political parties. Yet we have these very real institutions exercising great control obviously through their members on the people that sit in a House and that pass and debate legislation.

So I think it is time in the British system of which we are apart. Mr. Speaker, here in Canada and in Newfoundland, it is time for formal recognition of the political parties because they are there and it is no good to blindfold the devil in the dark and say that because members do not officially sit as a P.C. or a Liberal or NDP whatever that parties do not exist.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the first point, disclosure. I think disclosure is fundamental to the proper operation of this system in this time. I am not saying nor do I know what it was like one hundred years ago or fifty years ago, how great the contributions were. Looking back to a period of fifty or sixty years ago in Newfoundland I do not suppose the contributions were very great. Who had the kind of money that could influence government or parties? Probably very few, I do not know. But now we are in an era where large amounts of money, what are large amounts for a political party, what are large amounts for politicians are very small for multi-national corporations or even large provincial corporations. There is where the danger is. So disclosure I think is fundamental in this debate, fundamental to anything that we bring into

this House.

Now the other thing which I feel is necessary, Mr. Speaker, is limitation of amounts that can be spent. Members on both sides of the House have made the point that if the candidate has money to dip into, if he has wealthy friends or associates on whom he can call that he could come up with \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 for a campaign, whereas another person who is equally as dedicated to the public good, equally able to contribute in this House may be able to get only what somebody gives him, as a sop, says here, here is your little contribution, you go and run your election on that - and then smile behind their back at him. This sort of thing has gone on too in the past.

So I think in order to give a fair chance to people who are contesting elections in Newfoundland or anywhere else for that matter I think there should be limitation of the amount that can be spent.

Now there are arguments about this, arguments that would tend to weaken that concept. These arguments I think are, the main argument is: "Oh, well you cannot control it. If member "X" who has a large personal fortune wants to spend extra money what can stop him?"

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: That is true. My point is, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to spend an extra \$100 or perhaps even an extra \$1,000 you will never know, it will never be noticed in the context of a political campaign. But if he spent an extra \$5,000 or if he spent an extra \$10,000 then I think it would start to show. You see we all have to recognize in this life and in politics or anywhere else you are not going to stop a dishonest person from doing what he wants to do. The only thing that you can do is attempt to stop it by the appropriate legislation and impose a stiff penalty so that if he is caught he will suffer for it.

You know on this question of election matters I do not think the penalty should be financially only. It is easy enough for certain individuals, for certain perhaps political parties or for certain

corporations for people to come up with large amounts of money to pay fines. So I think when you get into areas like conflict of interest and areas like abuse of elections I think we should be looking at penalties which involve imprisonment and fine, both.

So this question of limitation, we cannot limited it absolutely. We are not going to stop the man who has got the extra \$100 or the extra \$1,000 to spend but we can stop that extra \$10,000 because if he spends it, it is going to show, somebody is going to know about it. He is going to be too much on television, you know for the price of television, too much in the papers. There are going to be too many paid agents working for him. It will show. So though it will not be perfect and nothing or nobody can make it perfect, Mr. Speaker, we ought to consider limitation on the amount that can be spent both by the individual and by the party.

I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the person who has most to contribute to public life, most to contribute in terms of ideas, of knowledge, of understanding, of empathy with the people whom he seeks to represent, I happen to believe that a person who has these qualities to bring to public life does not need to float in on a wave of cash.

We may have gone a long way down in some respects in the Twentieth Century but I think people can still recognize and do still recognize the quack from the person who has something to contribute. I think the more the man has to contribute and the more ideas he has, the more things that would fit him for public life perhaps in a sense the easier it will be without money for him to get his ideas across.

The honourable the Member for Bell Island talked about my campaign and not unkindly either, in Bonavista North where I lost in the October election. It was one of the most interesting and best experiences in my whole life. I did not spend a pile of money down there but I can tell you one thing that I can say today that in most communities in that district I have gone to every house. It took a long time to do

it, it is one of the hardest things I think you could do in a sense to wake up, a cold, wet fall morning, and start off in a community the size of Glovertown and look at the housing stretching all down there in the distance and say, "Well, I am going to get to as many as I can of these houses today." It is not easy.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Maybe if he had not done it, he might have been elected.

MR. WELLS: I might have been elected, who knows. But you know it was a good experience. It is an experience that I would not have missed for the world. I came out of it with the greatest admiration for the people of Bonavista North. Because you know the one thing that I admire in a person or a group is that they stand firm for something.

Now I had been an opponent for the Smallwood Regime openly, clearly for ten years or close on it at that time. I was President of the P.C. Provincial Association back in 1964 but the people of Bonavista North for all what I thought of the Smallwood Regime they did not want to see it go. They voted accordingly even though they knew that in a great many parts of Newfoundland it had slipped badly, it was gone. I admire that. The people of Bonavista North as far as I am concerned contributed greatly to my own political education. It took money to travel down there, to get down there, to stay down there in a hotel or whatever but if you are prepared to put effort into it on a personal basis, it did not cost that much money.

You talk about hiring halls and things like that. I hired a good many halls too in Bonavista North at \$15, \$20, \$25, \$30, I think \$50 or \$60 would have been a high amount, and held meetings. Except for the hire of the hall it did not cost much to hold a meeting, even including the hire of a hall it was not a prohibitive thing.

So that I still believe although it cost money to go on radio and television, I still believe that a man can campaign and campaign well and be proud of himself after the campaign without spending \$60,000, \$70,000. I really believe that. So I think there should be limitation

of expenses because I think what a limitation of expenses would do. It would not silence a man. It would not prevent him from holding public meetings. It would not prevent him from going door to door. It would not prevent him from getting his volunteers out and organizing his committees and working. It might prevent him from giving out lashings of booze and if he is prevented from doing that, Mr. Speaker, then I think politics will improve in Newfoundland. So that is the second major thing that I would like to see legislation embody and that is the limitation of expenses.

The other thing which we have to give consideration to and I am not sure in my own mind whether we ought to go that route or not, is public financing. Now I happen to believe that most of the dollars contributed to political parties to get political parties and their members elected, I happen to believe that most of the people who contribute them, want to get them back by way of business with the government.

I agree that there are some donations which are given freely and without any kind of strings attached or any desire to have strings, but there are a lot given that want to see the money come back and the way the system works in Canada, and I am not knocking any political party or individual, but the way the system works is that very often they do come back, which is another way of saying, Mr. Speaker, that in the end the ordinary consumer of this province or Ontario or British Columbia or wherever, the ordinary consumer and citizen pays. I think that is something that has to be borne in mind. So when you argue, as the House Leader very cogently did, when you argue on this business of the ordinary person, the member of the public paying or not, my contention is that if you allow the political system to remain as is, and if you allow the patronage system to remain as it has been in all Canadian Provinces I think from time in memorial, then somewhere back down along the line the taxpayer is going to pay. He will not pay all the time. There are genuine donations that are given, no question

February 27, 1974

Tape No. 490

PK - 8

about that, but in a lot of cases he will pay and he will probably pay more, I suspect, than if he paid out of the public treasury, cards all face up on the table.

This is something that I have given a lot of thought

to and as I say I think my own inclination would be to try the disclosure system first, complete disclosure of anything over one hundred dollars, to try the limitation and see how we got on for an election or so and then work toward instituting the public financing or maybe in fairness to the candidate who did not have a lot of money - you are never going to make the thing fair. The Member for Bell Island talked about this that you are never going to do away with all the differences that occur between people in society. It is not just money. You are never going to make a man who perhaps is not articulate into an articulate man. You are never going to make the lazy man work like the energetic man at campaigning. You are never going to in this world ever balance the scales between people completely.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we ought to do whatever we can to do this, so that what I think probably we ought to do or ought to look forward to within the next three or four years is instituting at least partial public financing, of trying the disclosure and trying the limitation and then perhaps introducing partial public financing if the other things do not work to the complete satisfaction of the legislators and the public and maybe trying the public financing and eventually moving into the public financing. I do not know. I am not satisfied in my own mind that we ought to make the jump from where we are now with one crack in the next election, all publicly financed. I do agree in most ways with private enterprise. I do agree with the private system of doing things. I do not like to see the government entering into more and more fields. That is a personal view of mine.

But at the same time I recognize that there is something here that ought to be corrected and perhaps we ought to see how far it can be corrected by disclosure and limitation and then in order to give, particularly the candidate, the person who has no party affiliation, a person who wants to run perhaps as an independent

in Heaven knows what district - allow some public financing so that at least his voice is heard. I have great respect for people who stand up as individuals, for people who perhaps would never join any political party but who, as an individual, would feel he has something to contribute, "I would like to run; I would like to give the people of such and such a district in White Bay or Notre Dame Bay or St. Barbe or somewhere the opportunity to hear my views and vote. I may not get elected but I want to be able to speak and give my views and make a contribution to the campaign and to public life in that way if nothing else." I do not think the taxpayer would be wasting his money if a sum were allowed so that a candidate even of that sort could get a certain modest amount to speak and to air his views. This is how I feel about these things, Mr. Speaker.

To come particularly to the amendment; When the resolution was introduced by the Member for St. John's North, I knew when I heard it and I knew after I thought about it that I would support it and I intend to support it. I think he has done us all a service by introducing it. I am glad that he has introduced it. If you will forgive a partisan comment, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that it was introduced by someone on this side of the House, a member of the party which is the government in power. I think it says a lot that it could be done on this side of the House by a backbencher, a private member on this side of the House and that we could get the kind of debate that we have gotten since this has been debated for the past three or four weeks. I am glad he did it.

Now I have looked and thought about the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not think he is factually correct in what he says about the oft-repeated promises. To my knowledge the government, as a government, have never promised

this public financing or disclosure or any of it. The Minister of Finance - I heard him before he was a member of this government, I heard him three or four years ago speak on it. I, for instance, as a private individual, as a member of this House, have spoken on it. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition speak on it. Different people, as members of this House, have spoken on it, but I have not heard the government make any promise, oft-repeated or singly except for the remarks of the Premier on Opening Day when he said that this was a subject that would have to be looked at. I am glad he said that and I am glad that it is being looked at. There have been no promises.

The other thing is that I do not see, in all honesty, I do not see that the House should direct a government to do something in thirty days or in some such time limit as that. If this debate is worthwhile, and I think it is worthwhile, if the ideas that have been expressed are good ideas, if there is something worthy of consideration, I feel, Mr. Speaker, it will be considered by all the members of this House and that includes the government. I think we have men in this government who are capable of giving mature consideration to it. I think we have men in this government who are capable of putting aside the temporary advantage, the advantage that a government in power may receive from contributions and none the less bringing in a bill to control and deal with this matter. I have that much confidence and faith in the members on this side of the House, both the members of the government and the backbenchers. I do not think that the government have to be instructed in that fine detail to bring in a bill within thirty days. What I would say to the government and what I do say to the government and I say it with complete honesty and sincerity is that I hope that this debate and the remarks generated and the thoughts generated in this debate will have sufficient impact with the government and on this side of the House, that the government

will carry on with its consideration of this whole matter. What I would ask of the government is this: To bring a bill before this House for its consideration, either in this term, hopefully in this session rather or in the next session but in any event ask the government to bring in a bill so that when the next election comes in Newfoundland, whenever that is, that it will be under a new bill, a bill passed by this House of Assembly that governs the matter of election finances.

I would ask the government to do this. I will support the resolution when the time comes to vote on it, moved by my Hon. friend from St. John's North. I would ask the government to consider the matter and bring the legislation to this House and have it debated and passed before the next election. That is what is important, not whether it is brought in within thirty days, because if it is not done before the next election we will not get the benefit of it in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Let us say the election is next year or the year after and you add another five years, whoever is in power, after that, then you really have to wait six or seven years before you get the benefit of what we are talking about here today. I would like to see us get the benefit in Newfoundland, the benefit of this sort of legislation in the next year, two or three, whenever the election comes. This is what is important. This is what I would ask of the government. I would think it almost offensive to ask the government or to direct the government to bring in the legislation within thirty days. That is not what is important. The most important thing, Mr. Speaker

is that it comes before this House, is debated and whatever is to be enacted is enacted before the next time that we who sit in this House go to the people of Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the amendment itself and I will, when the time comes, have great pleasure in supporting the resolution of the member for St. John's North. I am glad he brought it in. I think he has done all of us, the people of Newfoundland, a service by doing so. I look forward with great interest and anticipation, Mr. Speaker, to debating a bill to govern this matter in this House of Assembly.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the amendment and no doubt we will carry over into the motion as all the other members of the House have done. I was very impressed with the member for St. John's North and the things that he had brought up. I am more impressed with maybe his mild bitterness towards the previous administration and the degree to where he would go in order to get that particular administration out of power that was put in for six and a half years or twenty-three years by the people in this province. We have not seen an actual display of bitterness conducted maybe on a personal basis. Then again, when a member of the House admits, yes, I will stoop to great levels, I will give great sums of money to put an administration out that the people did put into power for a number of years, then I feel that there is something wrong possibly either with that particular person.

This poses another subject although I have no bitterness for the honourable member for St. John's North. Maybe it is his occupation. I do not know if there is another form of weed that grows with the savory weed but then again this may have some reaction on him. We are not to think in terms of anything of that nature.

Another thing that I was very disappointed with although I support his motion, as I am sure a number of people do in this House and maybe the people of this province, Newfoundland and Labrador, welcome

this type of motion and hopefully to get into this type of legislation. The disappointing thing about it, Mr. Speaker, was the weakness by which he displayed, you know that dry - there was nothing there. It was merely a mumble and a grumble and you could not hear anything. So, that leads me to believe, is he believing in what he is doing? I think the honourable member for White Bay South said practice what you preach. Now, is he practicing what he is preaching? These are the disappointing things. These are the things that really disappoint me as my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, slipped through the whole display. I am sure that I have found it very, very interesting.

Those are things that I feel, that if you are not in this House to display something you believe in or you do not put the drive and the effort into it, then you are doing the people of this province a big disservice. I think that the display that the honourable member for St. John's North put on today gives evidence to the people of this province that that motion is a wishy-washy type motion, Mr. Speaker, and I do not really have a lot of confidence in it.

I agree in a number of things and election expenses and the public financing of election expenses and public financing of political parties I feel are two separate entities, entirely two different things. If you go to finance an election after the proclamation has given twenty-one days to work and then publicly spend money in that respect, I think this, Mr. Speaker - the government of the day, whoever is in power is not looking at that. If you bring in this type of legislation and then it says, in twenty-one days we will go on public spending, they know that they are going to issue a proclamation maybe six months before the proclamation was issued.

What happens. What is struck in from government spending, other types of spending into the party coffers in that period of time? So, if there is going to be disclosure in political parties, then we must start public financing of election expenses. You must start with

the party today, any major party. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that by starting with the party and thinking in terms of people like the honourable member for St. John's North who is anxious to get someone into power, then it creates the type of thing and brings about the situation that we are involved in now, a very distasteful situation by the Saunders scandal that exists in this province. Maybe those are the ingredients that bring this type of thing about and I am sure they are.

The honourable Minister of Finance who maybe when we think in terms of if we have - I should not discredit this because the leader said, the party is in debt some \$500,000. I am sure today that some of that fund of \$500,000 was directly contributed to the leadership race that was conducted by the honourable Minister of Finance.

So, Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about? What garbage, what utter nonsense are we talking about when we have people that are doing one thing and saying something else? I would hesitate to think in terms of bringing in legislation in this province that is going to be scrutinized or controlled or monitored by the Auditor General. The Auditor General can only monitor or control the documents that are put in the House or gone through Treasury Board. He takes a look at it. Then again, how do you monitor a candidate who is up there in Labrador North and control his election expenses? How can someone come in and talk to Mel Woodward and say, "Mel, you know, you are going to spend \$2,000 in that campaign." I may not spend \$1,000, not \$1,000 but I will spend it on booze. I spent over \$2,000 on booze in my last election. My friends like booze. I have the occasional drink myself. I do not deny this sort of a thing but what happens in this case here? I can go and no one can find where I spend \$1,000 because my associates, my friends will spend the money on my behalf. So, how do you dictate or

or control this type of campaigning. Even if it is public it is fine to say that, I think in terms of chartering aircraft, to do a particular district, this is a great expense, a tremendous expense. I have no doubt that there are a number of people who would put an aircraft at your disposal or a number of friends who would go on a fishing trip and they would maybe drop you off in a small community and after the trip is finished they would come back and pick you up. How do you control this sort of thing?

Those are the things that are going to happen. Those are the real issues that are going to take place. Now by giving someone \$2,000 to go out in his district and say that is all you get - fine the party gives it to him, the documents are made, they are sent in to government as a disclosure. That is fine. He is on his way. The government accepts the \$2,000 from the honourable gentleman. But do we put fifty-one monitors out in the fifty-one districts of Newfoundland to monitor 102 or 104 or 105 or 110 candidates and follow them around to see what money they are going to spend? Stupid, Mr. Speaker, this is utterly ridiculous.

So I support some strict controls but they have to be separate from government. We all know, as the honourable member for St. John's has expounded on to some great degree, the utilization of government facilities, the utilization of government aircraft, the utilization of civil servants, the utilization of executive assistants, you know, what value do you put on those people? I am sure that the honourable Minister of Justice, when the plug is pulled, his executive assistant, do you take him off the payroll at that time? Is there not funds coming if you do that? Is there not funds coming from some other source? Because that political assistant is the political entity in the district, while the minister is sitting here conducting the affairs of government.

There are a great number of things and I think they are too numerous to talk about but then they are also uncontrollable. How do you monitor, how do you control the situation? So what are we looking

at? Sure, I think we are looking at some type of legislation but I think that as far as the honourable member for St. John's North is concerned, we would probably get into setting up this type of control maybe ten to fifteen years from now. It will not happen overnight and it will not happen if we bring legislation, which I agree some legislation should be done, legislation into this House tomorrow.

Auditing of party books, party accounts, those are the real issues, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we are going to control what has happened or we are going to control and bring some of the undesirable things that exist with politicians during election time, not only during election time but also during the time that that particular person or that government took office and that opposition took office, Sir, we must start from day one.

We must start today to look into the financing of the P.C. Party. We must start today to monitor and audit and control the financing of the Liberal Party in this province. If we do not do that then it is obviously useless to think in terms of bringing in legislation for the twenty-one days that we are going to be on the road conducting an election. Stupid! Stupid! I do not believe in having x number of dollars for any particular election. I think that all of our rural district in this province, if we are going to get involved in public financing, I think there is some great disparity exists from district to district and there are a number of areas in this province that can be canvassed and campaigned quite easily and quite inexpensively but there are other areas where you are going to need a considerable amount of money for transportation and communications.

So those are the things that if we are going to pay seventy-five cents for a voter in a district or a dollar for a voter in a district, I do not think this will give equal opportunity to candidates particularly in the remote rural areas.

Those are a few points that I want to bring out. I want to think in terms, Mr. Speaker, of the corruption that exists within political parties and the means whereby government can hide or brush under the carpet pay-offs to political donors if you want to call it that way. No doubt there is a system exists within the government now today and maybe it will exist with every government that there are a number of people who are being paid back for the gratuity that was extended to the Tory Party during the election.

Is it showing up on the Auditor General's statement? No, Sir. If that can be covered up then the election expenses can be equally as easily covered up. So if we had disclosure of contributions then how do you monitor the expenditures and find out exactly what a candidate is spending in his district?

So when we think in terms of the honourable Minister of Finance, no doubt the honourable Minister of Finance today has probably been exposed to more political trickery, if you want to call it that, than maybe any other man, apart from Joe Smallwood, in this province.

We saw, Mr. Speaker, the big guns being pulled out and went in support of the honourable Minister of Finance to get him elected as Leader of the Liberal Party. I did not support the honourable Minister of Finance for the mere reason that my people and the people that I would want to support me would not support him. I knew that the only way that I could get elected to the House was to have support from my own district.

I think you will find in a number of cases where the big machine maybe no longer is attractive to the people of our province. I think that Joe Smallwood possibly had one of the greatest political machines that were ever set up in Canada and I have a lot of respect and admiration for a man who can develop a machine. But I think it is to the

dismal failure of the honourable Minister of Finance that he could not bring or get that type of machine going. No doubt, that if he could have gotten that type of machine in place, he would have used the same techniques and maybe the same methods that Premier Smallwood used in the days when he ran his political campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a great amount of individualism attached to any election in this Province. The honourable member for St. Mary's, no doubt, in a great part, has a great control over his election campaign in St. Mary's and not easily dictated to by a general campaign manager or not easily dictated to by someone else because he has the real feeling. He knows what money he is going to have to spend and if he does not get that money to spend it is going to develop into another frustration because he knows that this is an area or a loophole whereby he may not get elected.

The number of palms or paws you have to grease, in lots of cases, are necessary to win an election in this Province and this is very sad but it is the real thing and I am sure that the honourable member for St. John's North will agree with that. There are a number of pockets of great support in rural Newfoundland as well as in the district of St. John's and the surrounding areas that politicians, parties must pay attention to and those people have to be satisfied and if you do not have those people satisfied then what happens? No one is going into an election, knowing that they are facing a defeat.

So this is my contribution to the debate. I support the motion. I think that the debate has contributed to the way of thinking of the people of this Province. I do not think the public financing of election expenses is necessarily going to control the spending of any particular candidate that goes on the campaign trail. I think there are devious means whereby a candidate - unless we bring in the type of legislation whereby we are going to set up watchdogs and they are going to have to trail a candidate from the time he goes into the election until he comes out and then take his statement and audit the particular statement.

So that is my contribution to the debate.

MR. FRED ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether to congratulate the member for St. John's North for bringing in this particular resolution or whether, Sir, to condemn him. I honestly do not know and I will be, of course, relating to the amendment because the amendment is tied into the calibre of the resolution itself.

Sir, I commend him and I congratulate him for bringing the matter before the House of Assembly, for bringing in that particular motion. Sir, I have no idea whether his motives were sincere and that he wanted to bring this particular motion before the House. I find it quite difficult to understand why a backbencher on the Government side finds it necessary to bring a private member's resolution into the House of Assembly. Presumably the P.C. administration on the other side, as does the Liberal Opposition on this side, have a caucus and presumably the input can be made at the caucus level and it would be drafted into legislation or put into the Throne Speech or brought into the House of Assembly through the caucus, through the government itself and into the House of Assembly.

I am just asking the question; I cannot quite see why the honourable member, a backbencher on the Government side, would find it necessary to bring a private member's bill into the House of Assembly, Why not through caucus and through the government in that sense?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I beg you pardon.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No, a minister can present legislation. That is right, I agree with you. However, a minister can bring legislation into the House of Assembly based on the input that the cabinet or these ministers get at the caucus level. This is the question that I raised because it is relevant to the amendment to which I will relate in a few minutes because, Sir, the motion itself, the resolution itself, is not specific enough. It is not specific, it has no teeth in it and this necessitated the amendment that was so ably put by my colleague, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir, since this resolution has no teeth in it, it is not specific enough and legislation was not brought in by the Government itself but instead was brought into this House by a backbencher which necessitated

an amendment on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, one is suspect about the motives of the member for St. John's North. Sir, was he sincere in bringing this into the House? Did he bring it in as a private member's bill because he could not convince his colleagues in caucus that such legislation was necessary or, Sir, was it this that motivated the honourable - I did not get -

MR. A. CARTER: Would the honourable member give way for a moment?

MR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member from St. John's North has a question, I would gladly yield and attempt to answer his question but I am not going to give way, Sir. The honourable member has had his opportunity to speak.

Now, Sir, one asks this question: Why was it necessary for a back-bencher on the Government side to bring a private member's resolution into the House of Assembly respecting financing of elections?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Sir, one asks another question, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at the events of the last few months. The Liberal Government of Canada brought in Bill (C) 203, I believe which is a great step forward in election reform.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition has made several public statements over the past few months relating to the need for public financing of election campaigns, the need for disclosure, the need for limitations and all this kind of thing. This, Sir, is public knowledge. What happens, Sir? It is reasonable to suspect that members on the opposite side would assume that the Liberal Opposition would be bringing in such a Private Members' Resolution itself. So, Sir, we have a situation where we have a backbencher on the government side, I submit, bringing in a Private Members' Resolution with no teeth in it, to short-circuit what the opposition was obviously going to do anyway, because of its public utterances over the past few months.

Now, Sir, the only thing that I would accept or admit is that we were not the "Quick Draw McGraws" on this one. If honourable members were quicker than we in bringing in the Private Members' Resolution I congratulate them. What I am trying to say is that I do not know whether to congratulate, to commend the honourable member for St. John's North or to condemn him, Sir. I will leave that to the House and to the people of Newfoundland to decide.

Now, Sir, we come to the situation where the honourable the Leader of the Opposition does find it necessary to bring in an amendment and, Sir, I should relate to that amendment if I can find it. "This House urges and requests the government to implement their oft-repeated promises." Now, Sir, each member on the government side so far has attempted to confuse and drag red herrings across this amendment by picking out "Their oft-repeated promises." That is not the guts of the amendment. That is not the important part of the amendment. It is a part of it and it has been dragged out and slapped around. Whether the government have oft repeated this promise is irrelevant to the amendment. "This House urges and requests the government to implement their oft

repeated promises to the public by introducing legislation within the next thirty days." Sir, my colleague from White Bay South has said that the thirty days is not crucial to this amendment. We can make it thirty-one, we can make it sixty-one, we could make it this session. However, Sir, I would be only too happy to second an amendment to the amendment moved by an honourable member, even on the other side, that would change that thirty days to this session. I think it is extremely important that we say this session.

This is a second example of where honourable members, learned members, lawyers using their lawyer tactics, I would submit, in picking out a little phrase, a little word in an amendment to distract and cloud the important point in the amendment. The important point is, Sir, "To govern and control the financing of

election expenses, such legislation to be similar in content to legislation adopted by the House of Commons on January 3, 1974, known as Bill C-203."

Now, Sir another red herring, another attempt by honourable members on the other side to cloud the issues, to drag a red herring across this as when they say we do not have jurisdiction over such things as income taxes, the CRTC, advertising and what have you on radio and television. This amendment does not say such legislation to be identical to content of legislation adopted by the House of Commons, it says similar to and there is no reason in the world why this particular Bill C-203, which I have here somewhere, Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion in that amendment that every single item of this particular Bill be adopted in the legislation put forth by this administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is similar to.

MR. F. ROWE: It is similar, Sir, it is guidelines. It can be similar, Mr. Speaker. It can be a modification of this which can be similar, similar to the principles involved. This is the important thing. So you see, Sir, why I am suspect over the motives of the honourable gentleman for St. John's North when he moves this amendment, and as I said earlier, I can congratulate and commend the minister as a member on the one hand and there is a tendency to condemn him on the other.

Now, Sir, so far in this debate we have heard from the Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's East and the member for Bonavista South, up until today -

MR. NEARY: For the time being.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I did not have the experience of hearing the Minister of Finance because I was in Ottawa at the time, however, I did go and read through, word by word, his speech on the amendment to this particular resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Well it is a lot easier to read than to hear and see, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will grant you that.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I did hear the member for St. John's East and I did hear the member for Bonavista South and Sir, they have been deliberately attempting to cloud the principle and the substance of the amendment so ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir, each of them have demonstrated an outburst of confusion and criticism and convolution of the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, they can deliberately confuse and I will give examples of that a little later on by dragging red herrings and misrepresenting and misinterpreting some of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition. They have criticized. They have taken this little amendment, Sir, they have taken this amendment and they have used it as a vehicle to

once again criticize the opposition and attacked this opposition. They have attacked and criticized the previous administration, every single one, Sir, except one. I was in and out of the House and I did not hear the member for St. John's South criticize the opposition nor criticize the previous administration. Some objective criticism but very little. The other members have used this amendment as a vehicle to once again attack the opposition, once again attack the previous Liberal Administration and, Sir, once again attack Ottawa, if you look through the content of the speech in the verbatim report.

Sir, the honourable slimy member for St. John's East has the audacity, not only to attack the poor little Liberal Opposition and the previous Liberal Administration and the Liberal Ottawa Government, but, Sir, he decides to attack the school boards of this province and the churches of this province. The minister can stand on a point of order at the end of my speech if I fail to substantiate that particular charge, because that is exactly what the Minister without Portfolio did, Sir.

I will come to examples right from the verbatim report, Mr. Speaker. As I said, I was out of the House at the time the Minister of Finance made his speech on the amendment but I did read his intemperate outbursts. The only thing that sticks out in my mind as a result, the only thing that I can really remember, if somebody said; "Look, did you read or hear the honourable Minister of Finance's speech in the House of Assembly relating to election expenditures and the amendment thereto?" The only things that stick out are words like mischievous, pernicious, political quackery, obnoxious, trash, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota. Sir, these words used over and over again that we have been hearing over the past two years. An outpouring of adjectives and adverbs that completely distracted from the principle and the intent of the amendment which was simply trying to put some teeth into the resolution brought in by the member for St. John's North.

As I suggested, the Minister of Finance (if I can find my verbatim report) attacked the previous Liberal Administration. On page (702) (This, Mr. Speaker, is what they call dramatic attention, if the Minister of Justice is concerned about it.)

AN HON. MEMBER: He will have high blood pressure.

MR. F.B. ROWE: "For the previous twenty-three years of our existence not one jot, not a tittle nor an iota was done to reform electoral laws in Newfoundland except to bring bills before the House gerrymandering the various districts. That is all the previous Liberal Administration did."

Now, Sir, if I remember correctly the member for St. John's South suggested himself that such a

resolution as even presented by the honourable member for St. John's North ten or so years ago would have almost been unheard of. I do not know whether I understood the member correctly but if I am misrepresenting what he did say I take it back and I suggest that I would submit that point of view. Even such a weak resolution, in this day and age, as presented by the member for St. John's North would have been unheard of five or six or ten years ago.

The Minister of Finance usually attacks the opposition for disagreeing with the government or any points that the government have to make or being negative. This is the usual tactic of the honourable the Minister of Finance uses. He says that the opposition is negative, it does not come up with any constructive proposals and that you can count on the opposition to disagree with the government on every count.

Well, Sir, we saw a complete turnabout in the minister's speech on this amendment, when at a certain point the minister, and I seem to have lost that particular page, when the Minister of Finance asked why the Liberal Opposition in this House now coming on to say how much they are in favour of these changes, because they are out of power, because they are finding it more difficult to get money than the party in power. Sir, I submit that that is certainly not the reason. Here we have a case now of the minister criticizing the Liberal Opposition for agreeing with a member of his own government, with a P.C. backbencher in his own ranks.

MR. CARTER: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member know that his time has run out?

MR. F.B. ROWE: What kind of a point of order is that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. ROBERTS: Well done (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: It only seems like it. Sorry!

MR. F.B. ROWE: I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that when you do reach close to the speed of light that you do have an extension of length and time is condensed and you have mass, reaching a great

mass, there is infinite mass with increased speed approaching the speed of light. I did not realize that the honourable member for St. John's North was living in the world of Einstein at this present time.

As I suggested earlier, Sir, the Minister of Finance attempts to call the Leader of the Opposition hypocritical in supporting such a resolution as brought in by the member for St. John's North and bringing in an amendment himself relating to this election expenses resolution because of his own past performance. I can well remember the day when the Minister of Finance was marching around this province talking about the need for election reform and what the Minister of Finance was going to do if ever he became leader of the Liberal Party or when he crossed the floor to this side, the P.C. side then, what he was going to do if ever he became a part of a P.C. Government.

There were going to be election reforms the like of which Canada had never seen. On the other hand, when the Minister of Finance gets into power he is not willing to put

front teeth into a resolution moved by his own colleague. Now, Sir, if there is anybody who can be accused of hypocrisy under these circumstances, it has to be the honourable Minister of Finance himself.

Surely, Sir, it is as right, it is as correct for the Leader of the Opposition to have a change of mind, to have a change of heart based on his past experience in politics. Surely, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition was - if he does not mind me saying so - as was my colleague from White Bay South, what you would consider to be a junior cabinet minister in the previous administration. Sir, there is such a thing as cabinet solidarity, as party solidarity. You have people within cabinet agreeing and disagreeing but when you come into this honourable House, Sir, there is a united front or the Western parliamentary system would collapse as we know today if you did not have such a thing occurring.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Like the present administration. When we go over there it will be the Robert's administration not the Smallwood administration.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, there is no way, I submit, that any honourable member on the other side of the House knows the personal opinions or knew the personal opinions of honourable members sitting on this side of the House who were in that cabinet at that day. There is no way, Sir. Besides, Sir, if they did disagree with such a reform at that time, what is wrong with asking for such reform now. You live and learn, Sir. You wise up based on experience.

For the honourable the Minister of Finance to suggest that this is hypocrisy when he himself has gone in the opposite direction, gone in the exact opposite direction, Sir - the honourable Leader of the Opposition is moving upwards towards electoral reform. Sir, the honourable the Minister of Finance is going in the exact opposite direction downwards, away from election reforms with any kind of teeth in them.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution if and when amended.

MR. PECKFORD: The Minister of Finance is supporting the resolution now.

MR. R. ROWE: Well, that is correct. Well, we want to see, Mr. Speaker, some teeth in that resolution before we intend to support it. Obviously, Sir, we will caucus about this. We are not going to - even without teeth in it one has to ask oneself this question, if we do not support this resolution now, the next thing you will hear and see the Yahoos climbing all over the bogs and the hillsides of this country saying that we have voted against election reform. Sir, if we do vote against it it will be because there is not enough teeth in it. I submit, Sir, that we will probably be placed in a position somewhat similar to the New Democratic Party in Ottawa where in spite of the great election reform according to bill (c) 203 brought down by the Liberal Administration, the New Democratic Party almost did not support that resolution or that bill simply because they did not think there was enough teeth in it.

They were not happy about it, Sir, but they were forced to support it because obviously politics being what it is, they did not want to be accused of not supporting progressive legislation.

Well, Sir, the clock nearing six I move adjournment of the debate. I can go on, it is just another theme that I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, that I will not finish at this point, so I move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be noted that the honourable member for St. Barbe North adjourned the debate and I shall now call it 6:00 P.M. and leave the Chair until 3:00 P. M. tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1974.