



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 4

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 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 am indeed very happy to welcome all visitors to the galleries today but I would especially like to welcome fifty-three grade nine students from the Stella Maris School at Trepassey, with Sister Ester Moore, Mr. John Brazil and Mr. Ted Winter and I would also like to welcome forty-one grade five students from Curtis Academy here in St. John's and their teacher Mr. John Greene. We trust that your visit here is most informative and interesting.

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bay de Verde.

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of seventy-two residents of Bison Cove near Old Perlican. The prayer of the petition is, "We the undersigned residents of Old Perlican in the electoral district of Bay de Verde hereby petition the honourable Minister of Highways and the honourable Minister of Agriculture to have the one half mile road, commonly known as the Georgie Hill Bisom Cove Pond Road reconstructed.

"The main purpose of this request is to bring back into production a large area of very fertile farm land which has been out of production in recent years. This section of road is not costly to reconstruct and it will not only bring into production good farm lands but it will also give a second access road to Bisom Cove which will prove very valuable to residents, especially during the winter months.

"We also request that the road be constructed early in the spring so as the ground can be fenced and prepared for early cultivation."

I support this petition and I would like to point out that Bisom Cove lies on the fringes of Old Perlican but it has not been incorporated with the Town of Old Perlican. Since persons today are trying to get into the agricultural field, I strongly recommend

that this be carried out. I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of this House and be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by the member for Bay de Verde. I at this time wish to bring to the attention of the honourable House that agricultural land in Newfoundland is not as plentiful as it is in the other eastern maritime provinces and I believe if we can salvage a few acres of land on this half mile of road, I believe the government should place the reconstruction of this piece of road as its top priority and allow the people of the Old Perlican Area to farm this land.

Just in a report I believe yesterday from

some part of the Mainland of Canada some of our food agencies predicted that an increase in vegetables this year would roughly be around twenty per cent. If this is going to happen in Mainland Canada then you can very well count on possibly twenty-five per cent to thirty per cent in Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, we trust that the department concerned will place the construction of this piece of road at the top of its priority and that maybe we can get this done early in the spring.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. W. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Real Estate Licencing Regulations as amended for 1973 and the Real Estate Licencing Regulations as amended for 1974.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on the 28th. of February 1973 a select committee was appointed to deal with the denturists matter. The committee have now prepared its report and I am ready to table it this afternoon.

I am not sure of the rule but my understanding has been when I consulted the officials of the House that a select committee dies when the House is prorogued. If that is so, Sir, I am not sure, in any event I would ask you if there is any doubt to immediately reconstitute the select committee and then we can table this report and get the matter over with. Perhaps there might be unanimous consent of the House so that that could be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to reappoint the select committee on denturists? Agreed. I therefore appoint the select committee on denturists to consist of the honourable member for St. John's South, the honourable the member for Bonavista South, the honourable the member for Twillingate, the honourable the member for Bonavista North and the honourable the member for Carbonear.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do now ask leave to table this report.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Ferryland.

HON. T. M. DOYLE (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Paragraph (3) of Section (9) of The Private Homes For Special Care Act, 1973, I wish to table three sets of regulations, The Private Homes With Special Care Allowances Regulations 1973; Private Homes With Special Care Allowances Amendment 1973; and The Private Home of Special Care Allowances, Regulations Amendment 1974.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a copy of The Annual Report of the former Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation for the year ended March 31, 1973.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that copies of the annual report have already been forwarded to honourable members of the House and further copies are available if needed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Minister of Finance.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table The Public Accounts for the financial year ending March 31, 1973. A Report of The Auditor General for the financial year ending March 31, 1973.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the earliest time that was ever presented.

MR CROSBIE: With an addendum. I would like to point out that -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It must be a record.

MR CROSBIE: Yes, I think it is a record, the speed with which it has been presented. I think it is a lot slimmer volume than usual, Mr. Speaker, although doubtlessly there will be some interesting material in it. There will be copies supplied to all the members in a few minutes.

MOTIONS

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a motion to appoint a committee on the Public Accounts and on the Auditor General's Report with the power to send for officials and papers to sit in and out of session.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I will have a copy very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I gave it as notice of motion.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may just point out to Your Honour that there is already before this House a motion with respect to the committee on the Public Accounts. I think consequently that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's motion while to a large extent it meets with the government's intentions is

really a duplicate of it and therefore, I would submit Your Honour that is out of order

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman I submit is wrong. There is, true, before the House a notice of motion. There is nothing to say that that motion will ever be called. There is nothing to say it will be proceeded with. There is nothing to say that it will be adopted by the House, therefore it is not anticipatory. It may be that if the motion to which the honourable gentleman referred, which stands in his name as Motion No.1, is adopted, it may be that my motion is superfluous but on the other hand, Sir, to say that that is superfluous now would be to anticipate what the House will do with respect to the motion which has not yet been called.

I therefore submit that my notice of motion is in order.

MR SPEAKER: I shall take this under advisement and rule on it later.

MR CROSBIE: How can there be a motion when there is not any motion presented to the House - or any notice of motion - when a motion is not even before the House? In addition to which, Mr. Speaker, not only is the notice of motion superfluous, frivolous and vexacious but the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is also.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Agreed.

MR SPEAKER: I shall take the notice of motion under consideration and rule on it later.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. WILLIAM ROWE (White Bay South): On orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Education. Would the honourable minister inform the House whether he or any of his colleagues has entered into negotiations with DREE, any officials of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, to have the specifications or standards of what is known as DREE schools lowered

to the extent to the point where it becomes viable economically for this Province to support and maintain the schools?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I believe that with respect to discussions of negotiations between provincial governments and the federal government that it would be improper, certainly for me impromptu to answer that question. I will take it as notice of question.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well, the answer is no, then.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No the answer is I will take it as notice of question.

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

MR. F. B. ROWE: A question to the Honourable minister of Education. Does the minister have any data or any proof or any indication that the maintenance costs for technical or fisheries colleges or technical institutions would be any less than that for day schools, the maintenance cost?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose for oral questions is not for information which would require a careful financial analysis or a detailed analysis. If the honourable member from Bonavista North, a couple of days ago he wished to answer a question that his colleague directed toward me, he wished to answer it. Now if his colleague wished the honourable member for Bonavista North to answer it, presumably he would have directed it to him and your Honour would then have decided whether in fact it was legitimate to direct the question to the honourable member for Bonavista North, but he has not yet directed a question to the honourable member for Bonavista North unless that honourable gentleman wishes to propose himself as Minister of Education to whom the question was directed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the two honourable gentlemen, they are sitting very close to one another, as a matter of fact seatmater, deskmates, whatever the term is, and I would suggest that it would be no difficulty for the honourable member from St. Barbe North to ask a question to the honourable member from Bonavista North and they could have a very fruitful dialogue, I am sure. The point before the honourable member from Bonavista North presumes to answer on my

behalf - that certainly was very kind and considerate and relieved me of the problem and the difficulty of replying to the question and I recognise the kindness and consideration which prompted it. The point that I was making was that my understanding -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now we are going to get another answer. I would think, Sir, that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I shall take it as notice of question. I attempted to answer it, but I am impeded by the colleagues of the honourable gentlemen who asked me the question. I shall therefore take it as notice of question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable gentleman from White Bay South.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary question to the non-answer to that question, Mr. Speaker: When has the honourable minister or any of his colleagues entered into negotiations with DREE concerning the specifications of vocational training schools or fisheries colleges? If so, will the specifications be similar or the same as those for other vocational training schools built under the auspices of DREE or is he hoping to lower the standards and specifications of vocational training schools that might be built by DREE funds in the future?

MR. OTTENEHIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the first part of that question was really answered in my reply to the honourable gentleman's former question. The second part; what will the specifications be, presupposes an answer to the first part. I would think that that is an area (and the honourable gentleman is aware that I know that he is aware of it but that is fair enough) where if any clarification of any real information is going to be available it is in the debate not in a questions and answer period. I will take that as notice of question.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the minister is not prepared to answer that question but I have another question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Education inform the House when the report of the Committee on Education and Human Resources Development will be completed and whether it will be made public and whether or not it will be tabled in this House?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I would hope to have the final report within six weeks to two months. I would hope to have it. Obviously I am not writing it so I cannot say for sure but I would hope and would expect to have it within a six weeks to two months period. I myself can see no reason why that report would not be available to the House.

MR. F.B. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: What was the term of office of that particular committee?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there is no specific date upon which the committee would cease to exist. There was no specific date upon

which that committee would no longer exist.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that really should be directed to the Minister of Education but I think I will by-pass the minister and go straight to the Minister of Rural Development who is directly involved in this, Sir. Would the Minister of Rural Development inform the House what steps he has taken to put his buses, the buses that are operated by him in Winterton, Holy Trinity Regional High School, what steps he has taken to put the buses in a safe driving condition? In good mechanical condition? Because the parents over there sometime ago expressed very grave concern about the mechanical condition of the honourable minister's buses.

MR. MARSHALL: That question is entirely out of order, insulting and directed by the honourable member for Bell Island in the usual spirit with which the opposition conducts itself in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear the self-righteous hypocrisy of the Government House Leader. He has an intolerable position, I know, but he does not have to be intolerable about the way he exercises it. The question may or may not be out of order but that is for Your Honour to decide. Sir, I submit the question was not insulting. It was asked of the gentleman, a member of the government, who owns a number of buses. Apparently these buses are considered by the parents of the children who ride on them not to be safe. If the honourable gentleman does not wish to answer that question that is up to him or if Your Honour says that the question is out of order that is fine but the hypocrisy and the insulting language of the House Leader, Sir, is not worthy of the position he holds, be it on a temporary basis or not.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister wishes to answer the question or declines to answer the question that is up to him.

HON. J.G. REID (MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT): Sure. I do not mind answering the question. Those buses are generally inspected by the department. Not only that, I think we have had a pretty good record in bus business throughout Newfoundland and I have a pretty efficient bunch of fellows working in my garage and I am very concerned over the condition of these buses. I am quite confident and I feel quite confident that the people who are servicing these buses and the department are making darn sure that these buses are kept in a good shape.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister for his very frank and honest answer and I hope, Sir, that he will inform the editor -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the honourable member from Bell Island wish to ask a question, he may but he should not preface it by speech or comment.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions. If the ministers would just relax, sit back and enjoy themselves, I have a number of questions to ask. The next one is directed to the Minister of Public Works. I would like to ask the Minister if he would inform the House, Sir, what the estimated cost of renovating Mount Scio house is going to be and what sort of an arrangement his department has with the university whereby the minister's department is paying these expenses rather than the university who owns the house.

HON. DR. T.G. FARRELL (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS) (ACTING): I am sorry. I did not hear the last portion of that question.

MR. NEARY: I would like to know, Sir, what arrangements have been made with the university to reimburse the minister's department because the university are the owners of the house. What I am trying to find out here, Sir, is what peculiar arrangement is being made with the university whereby the minister's department is financed.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, there has been no peculiar arrangement made with the Department of Public Works and the university. This work being done now is being done at the request of the university who own the house, has been arranged with the tenant and the university. This

question would be asked of the tenant because this is a personal matter, an arrangement made by the tenant, with the university, to arrange for whatever financial arrangements have been made. When these figures are available, I am sure we will be delighted to present them to the House. At the moment we do not have them.

MR. EVANS: Does he want a position as door mat?

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the minister correctly that he does not know what the estimated cost of these renovations are going to be?

DR. FARRELL: At the present time, Sir, we do not have the cost on the alterations, the estimated cost. Persons have been arranged through the Department of Public Works for various persons to come in and do the work.

HON. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, further to that and in a genuine effort, as the minister has himself shown, to get at the legitimate information, could he undertake to find out and table in the House a list of the firms or individuals or persons as is applicable to who have been retained. They must be retained on some terms, either to do a specific job or for a fixed cost or cost plus or cost plus fixed fee or some arrangement. Who retained them? What authority, cabinet, cabinet directive, ministerial, estimated cost of the job? I think, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could get us that information on this point, that would help. There may be a number of other questions. So, by means of a supplementary let me ask that much anyway.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, has this question been placed on the Order Paper?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to put it on the Order Paper as such. If the honourable gentleman wish to take it as notice, fine. If not, I shall raise the matter at another time and debate it. It is no answer for the ministry. Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking to a point of order.

HON. JOHN C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): To a point of order. I submit the honourable gentleman is not asking a question. This is the question period. He has been asked to put his question on

the Order Paper and Beauchesne quite clearly says that there will be no argument if a question is not answered or put on the Order Paper.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not debating the minister's refusal to answer the question. The minister asked me whether I would put it on the Order Paper and I said no. If the honourable trout fisherman from Gander perhaps would be quite -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not go trying to drag red herring and red trout into it.

MR. ROBERTS: Sit down "Crosbie." You have to sit when there is a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did ask a supplementary question to the (Acting) Minister of Public Works. He requested that it be put on the Order Paper and I think it should end at that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question, to the Minister of Public Works in connection with Mount Scio House. Would the minister inform the House what rental the client will pay in Mount Scio House?

DR. FARRELL: Again, Your Honour, I must say that this arrangement shall be made between the tenant and the university authorities. I do not know. I would like this on the Order Paper. I will find out the answer and I will be glad to give it to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary - I appreciate that the minister is only the acting minister and obviously does not have all this information. Could the minister find out for us as well, please, Mr. Speaker (this could be taken as notice, if he so wish - I can understand that) who ordered the alterations to be carried out? Was it the university?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, listen to "Crusty Crosbie."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I proceed with my question, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

There is some question on this house, quite legitimate. We have been told here that the university own it; we have been told that the university do not own it. Who ordered the alterations to be carried out? That is all we would like to know at this instance and then when we have that information, there may or may not be some further data which would be required. We will see about that.

DR. FARRELL: I will find out the information.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Will the minister inform the House when the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government will be completed?

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the information has already been given in the House and I do not think it is necessary to have any repetition. If the honourable member would listen, he might learn.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: When was that information given?

MR. EARLE: A couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker. Refer to Hansard.

MR. F. ROWE: We only have one copy of Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COLLINS: That is an improvement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

CAPT. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Fisheries. He appears to be in good humour this afternoon. Is it the intention of the honourable minister to table the report of the special committee set up by his department to study the direct effect on the fishing operations caused by the tanker route in Placentia Bay?

HON. H.A. COLLINS (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, we have ourselves involved in an area which is completely within the federal jurisdiction. We have a committee set up to look into the problems which were posed to the poor fishermen. We have a good group of people on the committee. They have done a lot of work. I have received a draft copy only. Within the next few days, please goodness, Dr. Templeman will give me the final draft. Once we receive that, it will be tabled in the House within minutes, if that is possible.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the honourable minister recognizing the fact that he too has some responsibility for the fishermen of this country.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister please inform the House what steps his department has taken to establish a -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have a little order on that side of the House, Sir, please?

I would like to know what steps the minister's department has taken to set up a crown corporation to construct and rent or lease trawlers as outlined in the Speech from the Throne on March 1, 1972?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the question should go on the Order Paper but out of the goodness of our hearts over here, (we are always trying to present all the information which we can think of presenting) our policy in that regard will be unfolding within the next few days and we are ready for it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister inform the House of any negotiations which have taken place between the province and Japan to construct any of these trawlers?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we called tenders for the construction of some trawlers. I say "some" reservedly and advisedly. I believe a Japanese yard did, on the tenders; I think a Norwegian yard did, on the tenders; I think a Polish yard did; several bids were received from Canadian yards. To get back to home, in Newfoundland, which is part of Canada, we received bids from Marystown. Within the next few days we will have it all analyzed. I may say that the next few days

when they are all analysed we will have some information for the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance, one which I expect he is awaiting. What steps have been taken by him or by his officials to recover the amount of \$517, paid under his authority to the Act III Restaurant for a dinner tendered to the Progressive Conservative caucus.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What?

MR. ROBERTS: The Auditor General, on page 53 - the Auditor General says, and I am sure the honourable gentleman is quite familiar with it. "In my opinion this payment does not represent a proper charge against public funds." I would suspect that most would concur with that. Five hundred and seventeen dollars for thirty of them is one of the greatest drunks I have ever heard.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this question is out of order for a number of reasons. While I will not refer to Beauchesne, the question is ironical, retorical, offensive and contains innuendo, satire and ridicule. I submit it is trivial, vague and meaningless. I submit that it is hypothetical but it contains imputations. Let me see what else. It might prejudice appending trial in a court of law and raises a matter of policy which is too largely dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question. It seeks information about matters which are in their nature a secret. It refers to matters which passed outside the walls of the House and do not relate to any bill or motion before the House. Dispite all those reasons, why the question is not really germane. That is an item that only came to my attention several days ago, and my customary dispatch steps have been set in motion to recover the payment, because we agree it is not one for the account of the public treasury.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the arrogant answer I would have expected from a minister who is responsible for this. Would he undertake to find out what money is owing by the Progressive Conservative

Party or any agent thereof to the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission as of this date and whether any bills are unpaid?

MR. CROSBIE: For whom?

MR. ROBERTS: The Meade Campaign owes \$3,000 in round numbers to the Minister of Energy through the Power Commission for putting up Tory workers and Tory campaigners during the election.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question is quite improper but since it has been asked by the honourable gentleman, there is, as far as I know, no money owed by the Power Commission or anyone in that connection.

MR. ROBERTS: Owed to the Power Commission.

MR. CROSBIE: We have set in motion a number of investigations as the honourable gentleman knows but it had to do with monies involving the Liberal Party but there have not been any necessity in the other.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister undertake to find out, Sir, whether in fact nearly \$3,000 is owing by the Progressive Conservative Party or some agent thereof, in connection with the rather unsuccessful and abortive campaign mounted by his party in Hermitage, to the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the question you know is not only scandalous but it reflects the character of the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition has some information to indicate that there are any such bills owing, then I would be quite pleased to have the minister in charge, or I myself would be quite pleased to have this evidence presented and we would follow the matter up. I am certainly not going to agree to go off on some wild goose chase because the honourable Leader of the Opposition gets up and makes these imputations. I know nothing about it and if the honourable gentleman has some reason to believe there is anything wrong he can let me know and it will certainly be looked into.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have reason to believe and good reason to believe. I produced my statement in this House, that to my belief, as of last Friday, the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland owed the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think that this question has led to a debate between honourable members and I hereby rule that debate should cease.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the Minister of Industrial Development, my old sparring partner? Could the minister tell the House when construction is scheduled to commence on the second oil refinery at Come By Chance?

MR. DOODY: It is right now contingent on the situation in England. They are having some difficulty in arranging a turnkey contract. As soon as they can get the British Government to resolve its difficulties over there with supply and get their three day week resolved, we will get on with the construction of a second refinery. Hopefully it will be in the spring. Everything is ready except for the British -

MR. NEARY: No wonder the minister answered the question with a grin on his face, Sir.

MR. DOODY: I always do when he asks one. He does not expect me to take him seriously.

MR. NEARY: Well let us see if we can put a grin on the other side of the minister's face. Would the minister inform the House if the demolition of the steel plant at the Octagon is yet completed and if all the assets have been disposed of and if Mr. Don Wilson is still on the payroll of the Newfoundland Steel Company?

MR. DOODY: Now is that one question?

MR. NEARY: That is three questions.

MR. DOODY: Could you give them to me one at a time - in baby talk.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister get out his pencil and make a few notes while I am asking the question.

MR. DOODY: No, just ask me one at a time and I will answer.

MR. NEARY: Number one, Sir, has the demolition of the Newfoundland Steel Plant been completed? Have all the assets been disposed of? Is Mr. Don Wilson still on the government payroll?

MR. DOODY: First, the Newfoundland Steel Mill was never contemplated as an object of demolition. It never has been said that it will be demolished, hopefully it never will be demolished.

MR. NEARY: Is it still there?

MR. DOODY: Well it was there yesterday.

MR. NEARY: The buildings are there but the steel plant is not there.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: There was quite a breeze in the wind last night.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, could you ask himself to contain himself?

The contents of the mill, the interior equipment and machinery has been sold and is in the process of being dismantled and shipped to the site of its purchaser. Don Wilson, was it? Is he still employed by the government?" He was never employed by the government. He was employed by the Crown Corporation, Newfoundland Steel 1968, Limited and his services have been terminated since he has finished his job, and an excellent job it was too I must say.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism.

MR. DOODY: Is that all for me?

MR. NEARY: That is all for the honourable minister. I will get back to the steel plant later on.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House, in view of the radical statements that were made in Halifax yesterday by the honourable the Premier, if the minister still intends, Sir, to go ahead with the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations of Confederatinn?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister inform the House if the Premier was speaking as Premier of this Province or in his previous capacity, Sir, as Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I will not presume to answer on behalf of the honourable the Premier who is quite capable of doing so himself.

MR. ROBERTS: He is never here.

MR. DOODY: You can thank the weather for that.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Could the minister inform the honourable House if he has had any consultation with the small saw mill operators of this province and if not does he contemplate having any consultation with them as far as the report of the Forestry Task Force is concerned?

MR. MAYNARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would assume the honourable gentleman is talking about the Saw Mill Operators' Association, would I be correct? I have had contact with the Saw Mill Operators Association. They have requested a meeting with me. I have had a meeting with them. They have requested another one which I hope to have in early February. They have not asked me to discuss the Forestry Task Force Report with them at this particular time.

MR. NEARY: A question for the Minister of Agriculture: Would the minister inform the House if the government has revised its position on the hard line taken on freezing all land, both agricultural and non-agricultural in the greater St. John's Area.

MR. MAYNARD: To answer the question, Mr. Speaker, there is no freeze on land. There never has been a freeze on land. There has been an area of land in the Avalon Peninsula Area that has been declared a land development area. Since the declaration was made by the government there have been a number of applications approved for buildings of various kinds and we do not at this time have any intention of changing our policy in that regard.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing said that he answered my question two days ago. I looked through Hansard, Sir, and I cannot see the answer to the question so would the minister be kind enough not to display his arrogance and answer the question that I asked a few moments ago. I might have missed it but I cannot see what reason there is for the minister to show the type of arrogance that he did.

MR. WM. ROWE: Who is that, the Minister of Justice?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

CAPT. WINSOR: Before Orders of the Day, might I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Health? Has he received a request from the people of Fogo to have a third doctor stationed at the hospital there?

DR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I

have not received a request so I wrote to have a third doctor stationed there.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M. MARTIN: A question for the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications: Would he tell the House what steps the government have taken if any, up to this point, to ensure that the residents of that section of Labrador South from Red Bay to L'Anse-au-Clair, are not deprived of their air-service link to Deer Lake?

HON. T.V. HICKEY (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, we are waiting additional information from the carrier. The proposal is before Treasury Board and hopefully, when we get that information the decision will be made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Member's Day we shall commence with motion (2) put forth by the honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. J.A. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine by now, that all honourable members are familiar with the contents of this motion or resolution whatever you would like to call it and therefore I think I can dispense with reading it.

This is the first opportunity I have had to speak in this session so therefore I would like to preface my remarks by welcoming the honourable member for Hermitage. He brings with him to this House youth, an alert intelligence and a widely travelled experience and a great knowledge of Newfoundland. If there is an aphorism that would apply to him, I would think it would be; "To whom much is given much will be expected."

I am also happy, Mr. Speaker, to see the Leader of the Opposition is back in his seat after a very short illness. I imagine...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: I will allow the opposition to answer that. The one I was referring to was the member from White Bay North. Again his vigorous youth has reasserted itself and possibly his easy access to elixirs has caused him to be able to fight off the germs that had the gall to invade his system.

Although I can dispense with reading the motion itself, I think it would not hurt at this time (I wonder could the page bring me a glass of water,,please? I did not realize I had the power to call forth spirits but could the page bring me a glass of water please? Everyone can hear,I presume.) to restate the purpose of the motion rather than the actual content; I believe that its purpose is threefold:To put some reasonable limit on both the public and private costs of elections.

We have probably become inured to the process of inflation but it occurs to me that the cost of elections is quite out of control and that there should be some long, hard looks given to the costs that the electoral process put upon the public and private sectors. It is also an attempt to find some dollar formula to recommend to the government. Perhaps we may not succeed in the course of this debate but I think we should try. We should be able to come up with some sort of an agreement as to what sum of money would be applicable, would be useful or fruitful to apply to election expenses. The third purpose, of course, is to try to prevent some political abuses.

Here again I would address my remarks to a wider audience than this House itself,if that is permissible. I do not have any high hopes that our labours will be extremely fruitful. Although I am certainly not cynical, I have come to the conclusion that progress consists of an infinite number of infinitely small steps. Therefore, if we can get the traffic moving just a little bit along these lines I will feel that we have succeeded.

I would like to point out, both for the opposition's sake and for other members in the chamber, that while I am making these remarks I would certainly welcome any questions or comments and will gladly give way if a point should suddenly burst into an honourable member's mind. If he cannot contain himself,I would suggest that he feel free to get up and give us the benefit of his thinking. I will expect the same courtesy to me when other honourable members are

speaking in this particular debate. I think that is only fair as it is a two-way street. If other honourable members are speaking during this debate I would like to be able to contribute my five-cents-worth from time to time. I welcome it while I am speaking so I think it is only fair that I should get the same treatment.

My purpose in making the motion, I suppose it is impossible to crawl inside anyone else's mind and it is perhaps difficult enough to look into one's own mind to see what one's purposes were to make a motion like this. As honestly as I know how I will tell the honourable House. They were as follows; I am not very old, I hope to have a reasonable future in politics in terms of time. I do not know how much success I will have but I do feel confident that I have a few years ahead of me. It is inconceivable to me for any party in the future in Newfoundland, because of the political climate, to have a stranglehold on government. I would like to make sure that, certainly when the day comes and our party is forced to relinquish its hold and return Newfoundland, at least, in as good a shape and hopefully in a better shape that it was when we found it, I hope that when that time comes we will not be precluded from easily being able to get power again.

In other words, I want to try and build in protective devices against the abuse of political power that we have seen in the past twenty-three years. I realize that the public is very cynical in these matters. The expressions that you hear; "They are all tarred with the one brush," "They are only in it for what they can get out of it," "It is not what you know it is who you know," and many other expressions are current. I think it is a pity. It is probably a reflection on the political life of this province.

Another point to be considered too is that unfair rules are unpredictable rules. If the rules of the game are not fair then they are not predictable and it is impossible to base any sensible appeal when you realize that the ground may be cut from underneath your feet by someone who has private power.

I do not think it is outside the scope of this resolution, either to ask the question, if only briefly: What is politics itself? We are discussing the cost of politics and I do not think it is out of the way to define our terms. As far as I am concerned, politics is the art of persuasion, the art of the possible. You can have either open politics in which decisions are arrived at as a result of open and frank public debate or you can have closed politics, secret, murky maneuvering. I prefer the open type of politics and it is to this end that this resolution is directed.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that it is relevant to consider, since we are talking about elections, election to what? What is it we are elected to? Whom do we represent? I think therefore that a very brief discussion of the form of government itself is relevant to this motion. Here in Newfoundland and in Canada generally we accept and are governed under the cabinet system. There is a concentration of powers in the cabinet. Those who serve in cabinet have to be elected first. That can or cannot be an advantage. It is certainly a debatable point.

Unfortunately, we are cast into the role of adversaries, the opposition and government. At times it is fruitful perhaps to have a

devil's advocate, as we so often see in the House, now I have observed this House, I have observed the House of Commons in Ottawa and I have also observed very briefly The House of Commons in Great Britain and I am able to report that foolish behaviour is not confined to this House.

I suppose it is because the members who are not speaking or not directly participating in a debate have really nothing to do and therefore the Opposition often feign massive indifference; the rest of the government appear to look busy but in reality they are bored and I do not blame them. It would be a very rare speaker indeed that could hold the attention of people who by their very nature have spent a great deal of their life listening to speeches. If there were any way of estimating how much listening the members of any House have done it would surely be massive. Therefore, one would need to be a very Demosthenes to hold their attention. So this is probably a disadvantage of the system itself.

I myself see some merit in the American system where the legislative branch are legislators, nothing more or nothing less, they spend all of their time legislating. While they are controlled to some extent by party discipline nevertheless they have a freedom and flexibility that we might well admire. The most important thing in my view, legislation gets well chewed over. We might well ask ourselves who are the real legislators? I would suggest or it has been suggested that in our system the legislative draftsmen are the real legislators, so the best of us are only rubber stamps. The question has been asked, is a House of Assembly a charade, a play, a show for the public? Is it a sham? I hope not but these questions are asked.

In fact a trip aside from being held forth occasionally both opposition and backbenchers are excluded from input. As the mate, Sam Goldwin, might say "We are included out."

Again, I think at this point I would like to compliment the civil service, that other branch of government, the fourth arm of government. I must say and I would like to say it for the record that speaking as a

member, I have had nothing but the greatest co-operation from all members of the civil service. I think that we in Newfoundland are extremely well served.

Now because this motion is designed to control and prevent abuses in government it might be worthwhile reflecting for a few moments on what kind of abuses can occur in government. I have no wish to shock honourable members, especially honourable members opposite; I am sure they have read of all possible abuses. They have probably thought about them, perhaps even dreamed about them, nightmares.

However, this part of my address might be entitled "How to rob the government."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Well not necessarily in order of priorities but I will start off with cost plus. I do not think I need to explain the device of cost plus. Contracts are put out and in other words whatever the contractor spends plus a fixed percentage is what he gets. Now it can be cost plus or its legitimate grandchild, project management, which is another variant of it, a sort of hybrid variant - not necessarily evil in itself. Systems cannot be evil only men can be good or bad. It is the use to which they are put that decides whether they are good or bad. I think that the only thing you can say is that some systems are more easily perverted than others.

I myself favour the open tender system which was discussed in this House yesterday as being a better system, less easily perverted - better in that sense.

Another way to rob the government is to build a building and rent it to the government. You could rent it say for twice too much like the infamous liquor stores of recent memory. Or you could rent nonexistent space, I think one of the unkindest cuts during that particular investigation was that it was not the high price that the government had to pay for the existing space, it was the high price that they had to pay for the space that did not exist. Of course that was infinitely

high.

Another variant, another way to get something for nothing is to get an interest-free loan. Now an interest-free loan is worth whatever interest that amount of money would bring. It can sometimes be negotiated but it is certainly a great advantage. You could become a bond agent for a government, sell bonds for the government, become a fiscal agent, get a liquor agency, get a monopoly. In the Elizabethan times of course this kind of behaviour was the accepted thing, a civil servant or a minister was expected to live out of his position - a judge lived on his bribes and a minister on favours granted but times I hope have changed.

AN HON. MEMBER: I wonder will we revert back to it? Just, for instance, if you and I were in on it.

MR. CARTER: By all means. Maybe we had better withdraw for a moment.

The use of privileged knowledge for one's own advantage is another device that can be used, or one could actively seek conflict of interest, or subcontracting is a very lucrative field. There it seldom comes to public notice but what starts out as being dictated by need of course to fill party coffers becomes an all-out assault on the treasury. It is to prevent this kind of thing from ever happening that this motion is designed to offset this.

Now on the other side of the coin there are perfectly legitimate and inescapable costs of elections. I will very briefly run through them. I am sure all honourable members are quite familiar with them. There is the cost of printing a brochure, a platform. Well, in the average district there are 7,000 voters to 10,000 voters, I suppose there would be anywhere from 3,000 to 5,000 households; you have to at least print that many brochures and these days they are expensive, somebody has to pay for them. Of course, it comes out of the candidates own funds. It is a considerable expense. If you want to present yourself as a creditable candidate of course you have to try and do a fairly smooth job and put out a fairly attractive looking brochure. This can be expensive.

Press, radio and television - television has been described as a licence to print money. It is very expensive \$60 a minute, \$250 for a five minute spot, even a fifteen second spot I think is something like \$20 or \$30. The press, so much a column inch, very expensive, and radio although, much cheaper, since it has to be used more often to be as effective it is still very expensive.

Then there is the headquarters office material, phones, files and all the minutiae, all the bits and pieces that are required just to set up and maintain an office.

Then there is paraphernalia, stickers, billboards, window signs, buttons etc. and here the candidate may use his imagination as much as he likes. We saw examples of "I like Ike," "Jail Joey," perhaps someone might come up with some Neary dolls, with a big pin

we could stick them whenever we got angry and frustrated with the way the election was going. Another possibility would be a bubble pipe with the face of a candidate, our choice, and as we blew into it he would foam at the mouth. All sorts of possibilities present themselves. I am sure I can leave it to honourable members' imagines to come up with similar devices.

However, to be serious, one of the biggest costs, of course, is polling day expenses and by tradition agents and transportation are a proper charge on the candidate. This amount of money, this cost can sometimes be as great as the rest of the campaign put together. Therefore, I might suggest later on in this debate that there be some way of approaching assistance to a candidate. If a candidate should get so far as to require agents, if he should get to polling day, that is, if he should get nominated and with certain other qualifications, this might be the answer to defraying probably the largest cost of a candidate's election.

Again I think that here we could ask for observations from various other members of the House. I think for instance that the more northern members and I am looking at some more northern members across the way, they can point out how costly transportation and communications are in their district not only to run in the first place but of course these are costs that they face daily when they try to travel around their district. Newfoundland is a hard place to travel around and especially in the more rural and more northern areas. Of course, in a district like St. Barbe South you have to take special precautions against burnt ballots. In a district like St. Barbe South one has to take special precautions, possibly provide a fire truck outside of each polling booth to prevent - asbestos ballots is another suggestion.

I see a look of shock and consternation on honourable members opposite but I am sure some of them have heard tales like this at their father's knee or some low joint like that. However, I am sure we can all elaborate and add to these observations that I have made. During the course of the debate I look forward to such examples.

Now, there are also illegitimate and quite unjustifiable costs of elections. I do not think it hurts to elaborate these. Again not in any order of importance but in the order in which they occurred to me, I have jotted them down. The first possibly could be excessive public relations and here I am thinking of a programme that Malcolm Muggeridge was on some years ago, an open television programme, in which he discussed the election of the late President Kennedy. He said, "How can you ever get to know the man? His speeches are ghost written. His press interviews are scripted and rehearsed. It is like peeling an onion. Each time you take off a peel there is another layer underneath." Now, I was certainly awake and alive during the Kennedy era and I have read as much about it as most people, I suppose. I am unable to form any opinion of the late President Kennedy. I think that is unfortunate. I think possibly he was a great man. I do not know but all I am saying is that I do not think we are able to get at him. We do not know really what he was like. Unfortunately, public figures today are like this to the extent that they use this sort of image-making. To that extent they become unknown, shadowy apparitions, silhouettes.

Another way of course, to an unjustifiable cost of elections, is the use of government facilities for purely political purposes. Now, here you are into an area of grey because government must go on and yet government members are required to campaign. So, to what is one using government facilities for political purposes and to what extent is one using government facilities for purposes of governing? It is an area of grey. It is hard to control but there is no doubt about it, when it is excessively used the public pays.

Of course, the wholesale distribution of booze, just outright bribery, that can be extremely expensive. It is seven dollars a quart even for "rot gut". It can mount up. I have seen examples of that and I am sure honourable members have too.

Then there is the production of "hate literature", the wisper campaigns. All these cost something. They do not come free. The "Newfoundland Bulletin" was quite a charge on the public treasury. This

was an expensive operation while it lasted. In my view it should have been printed on softer, more absorbent paper. It would have been more useful. Of course, there is the perversion of news and news media, the abuse of the pre-election blackout. During one campaign I recall a certain radio station kept pointing out that it was a terribly stormy day, that if anyone had any sense they would not venture out because there were winds of unimaginable severity and rain of incredible intensity and hail and typhoons and cyclones, all sorts of bad weather.

Then, of course, if one wants to get into perversion of voting procedures, this is an expensive business, stuffing ballot boxes. Honourable members I am sure have read about such perversions. Again, as I was going to say, there is another side of the coin but I have already dealt with two sides, so we are talking about possibly a cube with more than two sides.

There is the business of election financing which is relevant and proper to this discussion and I think we can talk about how it should go. Now, this is presuming, of course, no government assistance or no direct government assistance, were parties and candidates are free to go and collect money as they see fit. Now I think we can perhaps subdivide the type of contributions that one looks for and one receives into several categories.

In the first category I think is the large contributions and I will choose the very arbitrary figure of perhaps from \$100 to \$1,000 as being a large contribution. Some people might agree. Some people might say these are very large. Well, I will take that as an arbitrary figure. People who give this amount of money, I would suggest, frequently give to both sides. I am not suggesting that there is anything improper about this. I am not suggesting there is anything wrong. I am merely discussing what I understand to be the case. One might well ask what is it that they expect. I think it is quite easy to answer. I do not think they expect a great deal or perhaps in effect, Mr. Speaker, they expect far more than a political party can deliver. They expect good government. They expect some half sensible incumbents, half sensible candidates. They expect that this is the normal cost of being part

of the business community, that when election time rolls around you dig in. It is a very small proportion of their total budget. It is a very small proportion of their total profit figure. They feel that as good, corporate citizens, if you like, that this is properly and rightfully chargeable to their account even though it is not tax deductible. They give willingly. They give with a heart and a half and they give to both sides and I say God bless them.

Then again, quite arbitrarily, I would like to talk about the small contributors. There is, in my view, a difference here. I think that they only give to one side. I do not think that they try to play both sides. I do not think that they see themselves as big corporate citizens. I think that there there is more partisanship, if you like,

expect and again I am still speaking of people who sensibly and properly give to election campaigns. They expect first of all a change of government. Also they want to have a sense of identity with the incumbents. "Well, we cannot run, we are too busy but good luck to you, go ahead, do what you can." They give out of pure enthusiasm. If the issues become hot enough and the people think strongly enough about the public issues, they do get caught up and often they give far more than they intended to and perhaps even far more than they can afford. They do give. In fact I would suggest that if there were any way of doing total reckoning that these amounts are far greater than the so-called large contributions. It is the small contributor who makes political life, as we know it, possible.

Then, of course, there are those who do not have any money they can afford to give but they give freely of their time and materials. They lend their cars on polling day; they are the canvassers, the poll captains, the area captains, all the army of troops that go out and help to get the candidate elected. I can see by looking around the Chamber that, I think, we all agree that this is the way it should go; this is the way it often does go and we are very thankful for the support.

Then, of course, there is the collecting that is done between elections for the maintenance of the party. Every party worth its name has to have an ordinary headquarters, staffed by some permanent paid official or officials. You need a telephone; you need some way of paying for long distance calls; you need to be able to afford a mail out. Although these costs are not great, yet they are constant and without the support of maintenance money, this would not be possible.

Mr. Speaker, another source of campaign funds and of course, it really still comes from the same source but through a more round-about route, is money from the national party or from other provincial parties. They can and do help. We are all very grateful, I am sure.

Again, to take the other side, there is election financing and how it should not go. Again, I will try and use the same division. First of all, large contributions: Here the large contribution is usually in the form of a kickback in return for some favour already received. These large contributors, I think, give to both sides. It is with a view to insurance rather than any act of generosity. Then one might well ask, what do they expect? They expect some favour. I think that here the amount of favour that they expect is probably very high in proportion to what they are willing to give. I have no direct knowledge of this but if one believes what one reads in the papers, one could deplore this type of contributor more for his greed than anything else.

Again, I think, using the same division that I used a moment ago, there is also the small contributor who probably gives to one side, and these would be the enforced collections or periodic assessments. I think there is a large element of fear in this type of collection. It does exist; it has existed and we certainly deplore it. Then, of course, there are the volunteers.

Where in a country, I suppose, particularly in a non-democratic country, where elections are seldom held or if they are held, they are perverted; where power is not diffused and where government is the sole or chief employer, then, of course, the employees of any corporation are fair gain for that government or that party to drag them into squads to do the bidding of the government or the the bidding of the party in power.

So, there are good reasons for contributing. Many who wish to help, some do not have the time, do not have the money. Some who do not have the money would have the time. I think we can say that one volunteer is worth ten paid help because there is this element; it is hard to assess but it is very real, this element of enthusiasm.

I think also another comment that could be made on this type of financing is that the financial and material response that a candidate or a party gets is a very reliable guide to the candidate's or to the party's popularity.

Here again, almost as an aside, I would like to point out that there is no way of preventing unknown supporters from enthusiastically getting out support for a favourite candidate. This can happen. It is probably rare. It is probably all too rare. It can happen. No government, no party, no candidate, no one can have any control over this phenomenon. I do just mention it since we are trying to discuss the control of election financing. This is something we cannot control and never will be able to control. In fact I think it is a phenomenon that we obviously cannot know about.

Mr. Speaker, there are also bad reasons for contributing. Many are afraid not to contribute. Some are assessed, periodic assessments. A mid-term assessment is always good for the party coffers. The bagmen go out and the influence peddlers go out in some South American countries but, of course, we are talking only about very backward countries in this discussion. The money rolls in.

Of course, the fear of loss or hope of gain, a contract, position, you name it, is the motivating factor. I suppose the party probably figures that one terrified toady is worth ten hangers-on and, therefore, this is the kind of sum that they do. Of course, the cumulative total of resources that can be mobilized are a very reliable guide to the candidate or party strength. Again there is no way of ensuring that unknown supporters for a favourite candidate are not an attempt to blindfold the Devil in the dark. There is no way of knowing whether a candidate deliberately put a few dollars to one side into someone else's pocket to go and organize a so-called, "spontaneous demonstration of support." Again this is something that will be very hard to control.

So, if there is a conclusion that I can come to and, of course, because it is very early in the debate and I am confident in the expectation that the debate will be long and very worthwhile, and the conclusions that I will be able to make when I speak to wind up the debate will be much more sensible and much more profound than I am possibly able to make now. I still think it is necessary to make a few initial, tentative conclusions and that is: I feel that there is a need for two things; government control of election financing and government contributions towards election financing, that is to say, control of expenditure. The reasons for these are to see that the reasons for contributing are good ones. I have tried to point out during these few remarks that it is quite impossible to control people or to prevent people from freely giving to a political party for good reasons. I think this will continue. It will continue as long as men are men. I think we must try to ensure that election collections are properly conducted. If we remove bad reasons for contributing, the good reasons will assert themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also necessary to contribute and control so as to prevent the need for excessive sums of money at election time. What is an excessive sum? Again it is debatable. How much one should have to spend to get elected to this House varies, of course,

with the larger districts. I heard on the news just the other day, it was on Front Page Challenge, that an American Congressman pointed out that he had an electoral of 450,000. Now, obviously, it is going to cost him an awful lot more to get elected there than it is in any Newfoundland seat where even the largest district and I believe I represent the largest district in terms of numbers in Newfoundland and in round figures, the number there is 20,000 electors. So it is still quite small in terms of the North American Scene.

So, we want to eliminate the bad reasons for contributing, to prevent elections from being conducted under duress and to prevent the collection of excessive sums with consequent auctioning off of one's political soul. Now, how you control? Again I hope that this debate as it progresses will give some, bring forth some fairly good ideas on this. Do you have enforced disclosure of contributions? That could be a Pandora's box, if we think about it. Do you have enforced disclosure of expenditure? That could be difficult to enforce. Do you have both? These are some questions I would like honourable members to consider and if the government in its wisdom decides to contribute towards the cost of elections, how and when and at what point do you contribute? Do you contribute before an election, based, say on party standing in the previous House? After an election, based say upon the actual results? Do you give assistance during the campaign? All these are points that would have to be considered.

Another thing, and this is a trickier part of the debate perhaps, that is, if the government does contribute. Are you in fact contributing to a multi-party system? I, myself, believe very strongly in the advantage of the two-party system. I think it is - when you have a three or multi-party system it makes it much easier for candidates to get elected with far less a majority and then you may well ask to what extent do these candidates who represent the people, win the public's

confidence.

I suppose all of us who run for public office, to some extent, are public exhibitionists but I would like to suggest that the - let us try and get the best exhibitionists in rather than the worst. So, in many ways we are damned if we do and we are damned if we do not, but the problems will not go away. So we have to wrestle with them. One way or another, government pays for an election. So I say why not regularize it. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman's speech was short and for him succinct and for him much to the point. Let me, first of all, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the honourable gentleman on his speech. He and I have not always agreed on political questions and I doubt if we will agree on many political questions. Indeed, I should be concerned for my part if I were to find that I were in agreement with him on very many political questions. But once in a while, his political judgment is in my view correct and he comes to accept a position that my colleagues and I accept and this is what he has done in this case. I think he should be congratulated on moving the motion which stands in his name. I thought he made quite a good speech in presenting it. He raised a number of questions, some of them rhetorical, some of them I think genuine in that the honourable gentleman was looking for answers and looking for information.

In the few remarks I wish to make today I shall try to deal with some of the points the honourable gentleman has raised. I did not note them all down but I think many of them I would have covered or will cover in my own remarks and perhaps at the end if there are some points that he would like me to touch upon that I have not touched upon I should be happy to do so. I say that Sir, not because I am any expert on party finance and on election financing and on what have you, but I think I can bring to the debate two or three perhaps unique perspectives, certainly unique in the House as it now stands.

First of all, I have made a study of this. It may not be the most extensive study and it may not qualify me for a doctorate but I have made quite a study of it and indeed I have made a number of public statements on it. As long ago as 1972, I made a speech in Buchans. The high school there asked me to address them, their graduating class and this is one of the subjects I dealt with and I discussed it since. I think it is an important subject and I think it is one that goes very close to the heart of the Democratic process. Then too, as leader of a party, a party which true is in opposition and which is handling relatively small sums of money, certainly compared to the amounts being handled by or on behalf of the leader of the other party or I suspect, although I do not know the gentleman who preceded him, leader of my party. I have had some experience that perhaps denied private members or those other than the small inter-group of any party, because of course no subject, I suppose, in politics is more mysterious, more talked about or less understood than the question of money in politics.

I do not pretend to know everything about it but since I have become leader I, of necessity and quite naturally been told a great number of things affecting my own party, affecting our position and how we operate and how we should operate, and we have brought in some changes and we hope to bring in some others.

I do not propose to go into the past in any way although it might be good fun in a sporting sense to talk about the past. I know no more about the activities of the past than any member of the House, or any really remote case, any member of the public. If honourable members opposite wish to bring up, Sir, they could probably, although they would not embarrass me, they would not embarrass any of my colleagues. They might be able to take a few stripes of hide off those who preceded us in the direction of the affairs of the Liberal Party. If that makes people feel happy, I cannot stop them and I would not want to stop them, but my concern is with the situation from here on in.

I think that it is obvious that in Canada as a whole and may I say Sir, our system of financing elections even today and by elections I mean the party aspect as opposed to the government aspects of printing ballots and what have you, hiring returning officers, our system of financing elections is essentially the same as that followed all across Canada, in every province. I think that there is a very real likelihood that in every province there have been abuses. Without referring to any specific case or indeed having any specific case in mind, I think it is obvious that these abuses can continue to exist as long as we have a system in this Province or in any other that is open to the abuse. The present system, Mr. Speaker, is open to abuse. indeed it almost invites abuse.

For all of these reasons, we will be supporting the motion moved by the gentleman from St. John's North. Indeed Sir, we welcome his support for the policy which we have advocated and espoused, at least since the period that I became leader of the party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR ROBERTS: They were about contemporaneous. Leader of the party and leader of the opposition were about contemporaneous.

That is quite true, if the gentleman from Bonavista South want to go into the past I cannot stop him. I will defend what I have done or what my party have done but I am not going to say we are perfect. I may say that if honourable gentlemen opposite wish to rake over the past they should feel at liberty to do so. They have the right to speak.

My colleague from White Bay South reminds me that that can be a two-way street, and that debate might be entertaining. It might give people lots of fun and gossip. If it were profitable I would be all for it. I fear it would be sterile. I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said many times in this House, that if any law had been broken or any criminal activity has been entered into, it should be followed up and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

February 6, 1974.

Tape 84

RH - 5

I have no hesitation in saying that, none at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No matter what the party.

MR. ROBERTS: No matter what the party or who the individual and that is equally applicable to the party now in office,

the party that preceded them in office and the party that will succeed them in office.

MR. CROSBIE: Right!

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine.

MR. CROSBIE: Right on!

MR. ROBERTS: I would be delighted to allow any questions the honourable gentleman wishes to ask.

MR. MORGAN: The honourable gentleman mentioned that he did not refer to this topic until June 1972. Is there any reason why it was not mentioned earlier by the same politician? Prior to June 1972?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is the same as the answer to the question; why the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South did not mention it in April 1958. There are 104 topics that I have not addressed myself to publicly even since I have become leader. I think I can say that with the possible exception of the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, who, if I recall, raised the matter, I believe as a private member's motion in the House, I guess it would be in 1970 or 1971.

MR. CROSBIE: It was 1969.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it 1969? I do not believe any party, that party, this one or any other raised this question. If the honourable gentleman should wish to go on with this line of debate I am not going to. I intend to approach it as a serious subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman should wish to charge me directly or indirectly let him be man enough to do so. If he wants to charge me with not mentioning the subject, I could tell him that I have not mentioned several thousand nor has he. If the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, wants to ask me if I have stopped beating my wife, you know, that is the caliber of the question he is asking.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I was in government...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Tory Party was in government in the early thirties. What about the Alderdice - Bond scandals? This could go on and on.

MR. MORGAN: What about the Squires scandal?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes! What about the Squires scandal? What about Sir John A. MacDonald and the Pacific scandal? What about it? What about it?

MR. DOODY: What about the spar scandal?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes. What about that?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is sterile. It will lower the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from St. John's West - his grandfather answered that in quite a famous interchange or he is alleged to have answered it. If the honourable wants to descend into the political gutter on this one, let him. He will have his chance to make his speech and I shall listen to him with the attention it deserves, whatever that may be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman said something?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable speaks the facts, Sir, that would be both a change and an improvement and on each count I would welcome it.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are not a matter of debate nor opinion. His opinions are usually not debatable. Mr. Speaker, the bible says: "The truth shall make ye free." The bible also says, and I would recommend it to the gentleman from Bonavista South; "Quick ye like men be strong."

Now, Sir, if I may go on and try to deal with this subject in the seriousness with which the gentleman from St. John's North raised it and which I believe it deserves, I invite all honourable members to take part in this debate and all honourable members can

join in in a serious way. We intend to support the motion. Indeed, we intend to divide the House, Sir, to give every honourable gentleman present the opportunity to record his opinion. It may well be but I do not remember whether the motion in 1969, the House divided or not. It may well have been that the House did divide and it may well have been that I voted against whatever motion the gentleman from St. John's West brought in. He will doubtless tell us. I do not recall it and if I did I make no apologies for what I did I did it openly and above board. Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds and I think this is now an idea whose time has come.

Sir, our only quarrel with this motion is that we do not think it goes far enough. We think, Sir, at best, that it is an expression...

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Burgeo has a contribution to make to the debate I would invite him to make it in the appropriate, proper and normal way. If not, Mr. Speaker, they say you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. In the case of the honourable gentleman you can lead half a horse but you cannot make him understand.

SOME HON. GENTLEMEN: The wrong end of the horse?

MR. ROBERTS: I did not call the honourable gentleman the wrong end of the horse, Sir. Mr. Speaker, let him try to contain the bursting enthusiasm for the debate of the House which he shows.

Now, Sir, as I was saying before the gentleman so gallantly interrupted me with his germane point, the "Burp from Burgeo," we do not feel this motion goes far enough. We would like to see a motion and I shall in due course be moving an amendment which I am sure the gentleman from St. John's North will support - would the page take it over to the gentleman from St. John's South please -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: North.

MR. ROBERTS: North. I am sorry! I am sure the gentleman from St. John's South would agree too because he is the other independent man

over there with the courage of his convictions.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The great independant.

MR. ROBERTS: We feel that the motion as the gentleman from St. John's North has moved it is not specific enough in that it does not pin down the government to do anything. I think he will agree that this motion means nothing unless a bill be introduced. It may be said; "Why cannot we bring in a private member's bill? The Premier is fond of trotting this out, the Premier with his vast understanding of the parliamentary procedure, his intimate knowledge of parliamentary affairs. He does not seem to realize that under the - now if he would guarantee us government time, if he would guarantee us that we could have a debate on second reading we would be prepared to bring in a bill. Indeed, I would be prepared to put it on the Order Paper as quickly as our rules would permit. Otherwise, Sir, one Private Member's Day goes for notice, another Private Member's Day goes for first reading, another one goes for second reading and then on until second reading is concluded. Another one goes for committee stage and another one goes for thrid reading.

The Private Member's Procedure as our rules set it forth is not in any way conducive to the introduction of legislation. The gentleman from St. John's East brought in some bills when he sat on this side of the House. I believe the House Leader of the day, the honourable Mr. Curtis, consented that they come to second reading and they did. They were debated at second reading but I am not sure that they came to a vote or whether they just stood on the Order Paper. They were not accepted if the government did not accept them. That is fair enough!

This resolution is the only real way in which a private member can proceed. It does not in our view - it is not specific enough and so we propose an amendment which we believe will do that.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Also, we cannot require the government to spend money.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is the further point. Quite rightly so. Any

bill we believe should also call for subsidies from the public chest of election expenses. I will deal with the point later but, of course, it is quite out of order. The Premier, I realize, would not understand this but the Constitution says that no bill requiring the expenditure of money may be introduced by anybody other than a minister who is also a member. Nobody but a minister may propose expenditure in this House. It is set down in the British-North America Act. It applies across Canada and it applies in Ottawa, in the Federal Parliament. Nobody but a minister may propose any expenditure of public funds. It may be well known to the honourable gentlemen but I do not think the Premier has ever heard of it. Indeed the Premier probably has not heard of the honourable gentlemen.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable Premier is not here right now.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not making a personal attack upon the Premier requires him to defend himself. The Premier should be here.

DR. FARRELL: He happens to be delayed at the present moment by...

MR. W.N. ROWE: Energy crisis.

MR. ROBERTS: I realize the Premier has been in Halifax making a speech and that is public business. I do not blame him for not being here.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is over making an anti-confederate speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will be proposing an amendment. I invite honourable gentlemen opposite to support this amendment because the amendment which I shall be moving a little later, which I am not ready to move as yet, Sir, will be to the following effect: It will be seconded by my friend from White Bay South. I do not know if copies have been supplied to Your Honour and the Clerk as yet, but if not, they are around and they are enroute, Sir. The amendment is to strike all the words in the resolution after the word "that" and to substitute, therefore, the following words: "This House requires the government to implement its oft repeated promises to the public by introducing legislation within the next thirty days to govern and control the financing of election expenses, with such legislation to

be similar in content to legislation adopted by the House of Commons on January 3, 1974, known as bill, (C-203). That of course is the name of it in Ottawa. It is the Elections Expenses Act, I believe in the short title. In the long title it is; "An Act To Amend The Canada Elections Act, The Broadcasting Act and the Income Tax Act In Respect Of Election Expenses."

I think that will be a test, Sir, a meaningful test of whether honourable gentlemen opposite are sincere and genuinely want to come to grips with this problem.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South insists

upon intruding himself upon the notice of the House. I do not mind that, Sir, he is like any little cracky but would he try and observe the rules, Your Honour. Let him make his speech, I will listen to him in dignified and decent silence. Indeed, Sir, he has the right to be heard in silence. If he had any intelligence he would speak in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, are we going to have a ruling? Can we have order in the House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. ROBERTS: And not enough listening that is the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this whole question of election financing, Sir, is an idea whose time has come. A few years ago, a very few years ago there were very few people in North America who had really had come to grips with this problem. I believe the first province to deal with it in any way was the Province of Quebec and I think about 1968 they enacted into law and Mr. Lesage I believe was Premier - yes? No, Mr. Lesage was not Premier in 1968, he lost in 1966. It was done during the Lesage years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Johnson.

MR. ROBERTS: Johnson was Premier in 1966, he won in 1966 but the law became law during Mr. Lesage's tenure as Premier. Mr. Lesage lost in the June 1966 election. That administration put on the books an act to limit expenses and to provide subsidies to certain extents.

Other than that, Sir, I am not aware of any legislation in Canada or indeed the United States that dealt with this problem in any meaningful way. We have had in Newfoundland for many years a law requiring members of the House of Assembly and unsuccessful candidates to file their election expenses or returns with the Minister of Provincial Affairs. Most of us I would suspect file and I suspect that is where the matter ends. I am not sure how complete the declarations are. I am not sure whatever happens to them. I am not sure if anybody ever looks at them. As I recall under the law after a twelve month period they are then destroyed. The law for what it is worth is not very effective.

The House of Commons had similar provisions for many years. They only brought in effective reporting provisions indeed for the last federal

election the one held in October 1972.

But the question of controlling election expenses, Sir, is one which really had just been left aside. All politicians were equally involved in the system because the system was the same no matter who was in office. The people, including corporations, gave to the party in power and to the other parties. They gave perhaps genuinely. Perhaps! Who is to say? How could anything be proved? Monies were subscribed. Monies were spent. There were no controls over subscriptions of money. There were no controls over expenditures of money.

There were undoubtedly were abuses. There are a number of cases that went into the courts. Mr. Martineau, a former Minister in Quebec, I believe went to jail for two or three months, Mr. Speaker, for collecting election subscriptions in dubious circumstances. There is indeed a section in the Criminal Code I think it is 110. The fact remains that these were considered the aberrations. The system as a system just went on; every party had its collectors. The honourable gentlemen opposite have raised money the same way over the years. By the honourable gentlemen, I mean their party. I do not mean individuals. The Liberal Party in Newfoundland raised money. I do not know how much it raised. I know what was paid to me as a candidate. I have no hesitation in saying I know what was paid to me as a candidate. I know how it was spent.

The Liberal Party of course raised money, so did the Liberal Party of Canada and the Progressive Conservative Party in Canada and the CCF and every other political body.

The system seemed to struggle on and nobody seemed to bother very much about it. As I said there was the odd scandal and the matter came up and was disposed of as -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a good voice but the gentleman for Green Bay and the gentleman for Humber East and whoever is having that tête-à-tête are speaking somewhat loudly, if they could carry on outside

the House, I would not be offended.

MR. PECKFORD: I surely regret it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the honourable gentleman has much to regret, Sir, and I accept his regret. Mr. Speaker, the greatest thing or one of the great things about my role as leader, that the honourable gentleman is not a follower of mine. For that I am devoutly grateful, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: However, we are training some poster snatchers.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we do have a few poster snatchers in training. Perhaps the honourable gentleman could give us a little illustrate in technique.

MR. W. N. ROWE: How to snatch them.

MR. ROBERTS: How to take posters from twelve year old children. It is a high art.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a truthful allegation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying - why is it they will not let me speak in peace? Why is it they have to keep trying to interrupt me and harass me? Trying to beat down poor little old me! Why? Oh why? Oh why? Why they do not just ignore me? You know the Hon. Minister of Finance; the House Leader ignores me, indeed he is one of the most ignoring members in the whole House. The others just seem to bite every time. Sir, the gentleman for Bell Island has the same reactions, it is like flicking a fly out with a hundred hungry trout.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Why are they jumpy, Mr. Speaker? Why are they edgy? We were told yesterday by the gentleman for Port au Port, our nonpartisan Deputy Speaker, Sir, that he thought the government were over the jitters.

AN HON. MEMBER: How wrong he was.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean why?

AN HON. MEMBER: They might be over the jitters but they have something else.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a terrific comment, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely worthy of all most anybody over there except the gentleman for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may, Sir. Would Your Honour remind the honourable members, Sir, that they are not permitted to speak from somebody else's seat in the House? When they are addressing the House they have to speak from their own seats.

MR. ROBERTS: He is in his own seat.

MR. NEARY: In the coming events.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a little jest and joshing goes well. The other side do not seem to be very zestful or jesty or jolly. Now we are getting a smile from him, the gentleman for Humber East.

MR. FARRELL: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable member has not followed his instructions. "Tommy Baby!" Mr. Speaker, back again on that one. My mother still feels the same way except more strongly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the matter is a serious one. I shall try and approach it seriously perhaps the honourable gentleman opposite - I in this vien enjoy this bantering, this repartee. Some of them come half armed to a battle of wits. I mean if they want to engage in it that is fine but I am prepared and propose to treat this matter quite seriously and I invite them to do the same. If they do not want to, I shall attempt to defend myself. If they do want to, if they are at all interested in what I believe is a very serious matter, then let them sit and be quiet. If they do not want to listen, that is their problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are all listening patiently.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if Your Honour would remind the Minister of Finance, Sir, that the only time that he can speak in this Honourable House is when he is in his own seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I wish to remind all honourable members that when they speak in this Honourable House they should speak from their proper place.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, maybe it is his proper place, Sir. Maybe there is a reason why the honourable gentleman for Humber West has not returned to the province, from his most recent foray out.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not blame him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a fine be imposed on the Minister of Finance for not observing the rules of this Honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, we will fine him.

MR. ROBERTS: Fine, Mr. Speaker, that is just fine. Oh my.

The reason that this type of legislation in our view is needed today in Newfoundland and elsewhere in Canada is that the system of financing elections that has been in effect in this province for a hundred and twenty years, as long as there have been elections, the system that has been in effect across Canada, largely across the English-speaking world is in grave danger of breaking down completely. The reason for it, I do not know. Maybe people are getting to expect a higher standard of conduct

from politicians. I hope they are and I hope politicians live up to that higher standard. I think the gentleman from St. John's North was fairly close to the truth when he said that most persons think that politicians are in it for what they can get. That is certainly a common view. Most persons are very cynical and perhaps with justice. Perhaps politicians have given that impression, perhaps they have given that truthful impression.

The other reason, Sir, why this is so important and why it is so timely is that the costs of financing elections have gotten completely out of hand, completely out of hand. There might have been a day when a man could get elected to the House of Assembly for \$500 or \$1,000 and to carry him around his district and a few posters being printed, that sort of thing but that day is gone.

The Liberal Party in the Hermitage by-election spent somewhat over \$20,000.

MR. WM. ROWE: About one-fifth of the Tory Party.

MR. ROBERTS: We got 2,050 votes, that is \$10 a vote. I have no idea what the Progressive Conservative Party spent, Sir, but I will wager that it is at least four times what the Liberal Party spent. They spent \$80,000, Sir, if they spent a cent.

Now, Sir, they may not have bills for that amount. They may not have paid that amount. They have, for example, still outstanding with the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission the amount of \$2,693.40.

AN HON. MEMBER: Prove it? Tell us what it is for?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I make the statement. Let the honourable gentleman disprove it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You prove it. No proof.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, how can you argue with a gentleman who cannot argue, who cannot comprehend?

MR. ROBERTS: The facts are that as of Monday the Liberal Party owed the Power Commission \$191.60. The Liberal Party owed the Power Commission for board at the staff house down there - \$191.60. "A cheque for that amount went forward yesterday, sent by our treasurer."

The Progressive Conservative Party as of Monday owed the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission for board and lodging, mostly I suspect for Cabinet Ministers who were down there staying during the election.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are suspecting. You cannot prove it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not suspecting. I make the statement. \$2,693.40, nearly \$2,700.00, I was told that by the Power Commission. That is how I know it. It is nothing secret. That is what they owe.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Who would tell me? Certainly the chairman did not ring me up.

MR. PECKFORD: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am all for it. The Liberal Party itself owes from before my tenure as leader about \$500,000. There is no money owing other than some from the Hermitage campaign, during my period as leader that we are responsible for, none of which I am aware. I make that as a categorical statement. The honourable gentleman can say whatever he wants. I am talking about October 1971 and before.

I was not leader in October 1971, from that period we owe roughly \$500,000. Some of it may be owed, for all I know all of it may be owed to the gentleman from Green Bay.

MR. NEARY: Some of it incurred by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know where it was incurred. That is another story. I mean the Liberal Party owes in Newfoundland today, as far as I am aware, from before the period when I became leader, about \$500,000 in round numbers. It is a lot of money. It is.

The Liberal Party owes from my period as leader, to my knowledge, some accounts in respect of Hermitage that have not been paid and nothing

else.

MR. EVANS: They got poor value for their money.

MR. ROBERTS: Not as poor as the people of Burgeo are getting for their money.

MR. WM. ROWE: If they paid ten cents they were gypped.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: I would rather be bankrupt financially than bankrupt ideologically as the other party are.

MR. WM. ROWE: Or intellectually.

MR. ROBERTS: Or intellectually.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the cost of getting elected in this province has risen astronomically. I say that the Progressive Conservative Party in my opinion spent about \$80,000 in the Hermitage election if they received bills for the two helicopters that were down there full time. There were two helicopters there. Correct me if I am wrong? The gentleman from Hermitage was in the district throughout the piece.

MR. PECKFORD: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well maybe the gentleman from Green Bay who managed the campaign in its initial stages and then was removed.

MR. WM. ROWE: He became a driver after.

MR. ROBERTS: There were two helicopters there. They were there. I sat and used to watch them pop in and out of Camp Boggie. I was down in Hermitage one day and out popped one and out popped the gentleman from Trinity South, visiting rural development projects. They were there. I am not talking about what may have been spent paving the roads under the snow or shovelling aside the snow, that is not what I am talking about. I am talking about what was spent by the Progressive Conservative Party. We spent over \$20,000 for 2,000 votes.

Let me take \$25,000 off what I think they spent. Let me say they only spent \$55,000 or \$60,000 for 1,300 votes, or 1,400 was it they got - 1,450, 600 less to the exact vote. Now, Mr. Speaker,

those figures are frightening. I do not pretend my figures for the Tory Party are correct. The only one of which I am at all reasonably confident is that as of Monday they owed the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission \$2,693.40. That may have been the only money they spent in the entire by-election, I rather doubt it. My guess is that they spent about \$80,000.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: More than that? Well maybe the gentleman from Hermitage when he speaks, and perhaps he would say a few words, can add to that but this is the sort of money and the people of Newfoundland should know that because as the gentleman from St. John's North said quite properly that all of that comes out of the public purse one way or another, because that money does not come, Sir, from widows kicking in nickels and people buying \$1.00 membership cards, that money comes from corporations and from companies and from wealthy individuals.

If I am not mistaken twenty-nine separate contributions we raised was it? Twenty-nine separate groups or organizations donated to our collection in aid of Hermitage? We still owe - I do not know the exact figure, I cannot give it therefore, but we still owe between \$5,000 and \$10,000 for accounts in Hermitage District. We will pay them off. We will raise the money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, Sir, I agree there is \$500,000. I am not writing it off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will you pay it all off?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. We shall try, being honourable men we shall try. We owe it. I make no secret of it. The Tory Party to my knowledge owes money from way back in the years when it was in the wilderness. I have had persons all over Newfoundland tell me that.

MR. WM. ROWE: It does not owe any money now.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if it owes any now or not.

MR. WM. ROWE: Not with the way they have been collecting it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the cost of elections is escalating and it is escalating rapidly and there is no end in sight. Hermitage was maybe not a typical example. I would not for a moment pretend it would cost the Liberal Party 20,000 times 50 districts, \$1,000,000 for a general election campaign, obviously not. Even if it only costs \$5,000 a district to run a general election campaign, you are talking \$250,000 a party, you are talking \$500,000 for the two parties.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he sure there would be only two then?

MR. ROBERTS: There might be twenty-two, Sir, in which case if the honourable gentleman cannot multiply and I do not think he can, that would come, Sir, to \$5,500,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Public funds.

MR. ROBERTS: Not the sort of public funds that saw the Tory caucus taken to dinner and charged to general contingencies, not quite. But of course it comes out of public funds. It comes out of a company's profits one way or another, if not they have committed an offense against the Income Tax Law and if they take it out of their profits, Sir, they either take a lesser degree of profit or they build it into their price somewhere and somehow. There is nothing unique about Newfoundland, nothing unique about Canada, that happens everywhere.

What I am saying is that the time has come when it should not happen. The time has come when a government should come to grips with it. They can say that when I was in the government, my colleagues and I did not come to grips with it and that is true. That is quite true but having said that, is that their only defence or now that they are there are they prepared to come to grips with this? That is the test for the gentleman from Bonavista South, not what may have happened twenty-three years ago or even three years ago, what has happened has happened and is on the record

and if there is a political price to be paid we have paid it. If laws have been broken, let the men who broke them pay the price. That has no problem. This government have taken no action. The motion that was brought in was by a private member, indeed a private member who has no reason to think very much of this administration because they treated him shabbily. They treated him poorly. He brought it in as a private member not as a government bill. I am going to propose an amendment shortly to require the government to bring in a bill.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You do not need to.

MR. ROBERTS: You do not need to! The government have said this time and time again. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Premier says something, I submit, Sir, is not conclusive evidence that it is going to come in. As a matter of fact, Sir, it may be conclusive. The Premier - I have a list which I will reading tomorrow or the next day, 150 promises, most of them from the mouth of the Premier; that have never seen the light of day. I realize what the Premier said on opening day. On opening day, as recorded in Hansard, he said, "In this House, as well" - "in this House," I do not know what that means. This session, this week, next month, this general assembly? - "In this House, as well, we will be considering the public financing of elections, for instance, among other things." If that is a commitment, I would like a little more details. I would like to hear the government when the time comes and some minister speaks to stand and say that they will accept this motion, that they will accept the amendment, that they will propose to bring in some meaningful legislation. We will see, Mr. Speaker. We will see.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is repugnant.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the honourable gentleman is repugnant, Sir. The honourable gentleman is repugnant. The motion is perfectly fine.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from St. John's West should know that for a couple of days, earlier this week, I was suffering from a medical condition that ended with the sound "rhea". He is suffering, Sir, from a different condition which I would define as logorrhoea which is an "orrhoea" of verbs, of words. Logorrhoea; I commend it to him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will bring in legislation. I would like to have seen it in the Speech from the Throne instead of an offhand reference by the Premier. I may say the Premier's reference, the Premier's commitments are not worth the words that they are made out of. The man must stand on his record and his record shows that he is not a man whose word can be relied upon. That is a fact.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you calling him a liar?

MR. ROBERTS: I am not allowed to call him a liar by the rules of parliament, so I do not call him a liar. I have merely said that his words are not to be relied upon nor are they. That is not just I saying that. There are hundreds of thousands of people all over this province who say that, hundreds of thousands all over the province who say the same thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the costs of elections are rising rapidly and they are going to keep on going up. They are going to keep on going higher and higher unless some controls are brought in, unless some rigid levels are put on. The controls can be brought in and expenses can be controlled. I suggest, Sir, that is the obvious remedy. The gentleman from Bonavista South says no cost to the taxpayers. It will come out of the taxpayers one way or another. One way or another, Sir, the taxpayers will pay for everything. Of course they will. They will pay for everything. It is true whether the Tories are in or whether the Liberals are in or whether the New Democratic Party are in or whether anybody is in. Cape St. Mary's pays for all. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman has nothing positive to contribute, let him be quite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable members on my left are quite aware of the standing rule which is that the member who has the floor has the right to be heard in silence. This, of course, has been often abused in the past. It may be abused in the future but I ask the honourable members to observe it as much as they can.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful for Your Honour's protection in my hour of travail and trial, Sir, buffeted as I am by

this cruel and biting satire and brilliant repartee.

I will in a moment touch upon the question of public financing but first let me try to get off a few thoughts about disclosures, about requiring by law that the monies parties spend be made public, that returns be filed with some official, perhaps like our conflict of interest legislation, except hopefully with some more teeth in it, with some more bite, with some more meaning and substance and not so many loopholes. That can be done, Sir. The parliament of Canada has gone a long way towards that. Following the last Federal election, the people of Newfoundland and the people all across Canada had the illuminating experience of seeing printed in the newspapers and made public through the normal and proper means the reports of the expenditures incurred by different candidates in their election campaigns. There was no real disclosure of where the money came from because there was quite a loophole in the act but there was disclosure of expenditures. For the moment I am speaking of disclosure of expenditures.

I say now that if the gentleman, the Premier, will disclose the expenditures of the Tory Party in Hermitage district in a by-election, I will disclose the expenditures of the Liberal Party. I have no hesitation in saying that what we have spent we have spent properly. I was somewhat taken aback when I saw the totals and I am a little taken aback when I see the debt that must be paid off but I know that what was spent was spent properly. I am not suggesting that what was spent on the other side was not spent properly, not suggesting that but I am saying it was far more, two or three or four times as much as the Liberal Party spent. We spent somewhat over \$20,000 in that campaign, staggering, much too much. Where does it go? Well, Sir, it all goes for perfectly lawful expenditures. I am not aware of any expenditures by any person in my party, in Hermitage or elsewhere, since the time I am responsible. I should be aware of what is going on and I am responsible for what goes on, whether I am aware or not of money being spent improperly or unlawfully or illegally. It goes for the normal and obvious heads of expenditure.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Wisely?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am aware of some that is spent wisely and some that has been spent not too wisely.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Which heading would Jack White come under?

MR. ROBERTS: Wise.

It goes for television, Sir, a very expensive medium. Radio. We broadcast a great meeting from Hermitage, from the Cannon Watkins High School, the last Saturday Night of the election. We clewed up with that, two or three hours of inspired oratory from the gentleman from Hermitage as he now is, an aspiring and humble candidate as he then was. The gentleman from Bell Island, humble and aspiring. The gentleman from White Bay South, a few words from your humble servant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Have you got a recording?

MR. ROBERTS: For a charge the honourable gentleman would be allowed to listen to it. He might learn. The honourable gentleman would not recognize humility, Sir, it is so foreign to his nature.

MR. NEARY: He was not even allowed down in Hermitage.

MR. ROBERTS: It is the luckiest thing that ever happened to them. I have no doubt that the honourable gentleman is on his knees nightly giving thanks that he was not allowed into Hermitage because now with disaster and debacle on every hand he is free of it.

Let me tell about the Minister of Justice who went to Hermitage.

MR. CROSBIE: Let us get our hands on it.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman should put a tax on rope in that case and it might be that we would balance the budget on the proceeds of that tax.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice went to Hermitage though. I think it is worth telling about his election expenditure in Hermitage. He went down to Seal Cove.

MR. CROSBIE: Let us hear about Seal Cove.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to hear about it because I saw and heard with my own eyes the Minister of Justice on the television emoting to the good people of Seal Cove, as only the Minister of Justice, oozing

sincerity at every pore as only the Minister of Justice can, as only he can. I think all of us who know him would agree with me. I notice the gentleman from Humber East and the gentleman from Harbour Main and the junior member are probably in agreement that only the Minister of Justice can so ooze at every pore. Unctuous is a good word. Only he can be so humble and so sincere all at once. Extremely unctuous. Extreme unchon is more like what he is going to need. He went down to Seal Cove, Sir, and there was a mass rally. I am willing to bet that just about everybody in Seal Cove was there. It was Saturday night. The CBC were there to record such an historic event for all posterity. I have no doubt, Sir, that Mr. Burnham Gill down at the Archives has received a deposit copy of this film, certified probably by the Minister of Justice's very own hand, maybe under his signed manual and his signet and probably attested to under affidavit by his deputy minister as well. It is preserved down there and fifty years from now, Sir, the school children will not be brought to t

this House of Assembly. They will be taken down to the Archives with a showing of the film of the Minister of Justice in Seal Cove, one night in November, 1972.

MR. HICKMAN: Let us get back to the motion.

MR. ROBERTS: I am perfectly on the motion, Sir. I am talking about election financing in the Hermitage District. I have no doubt that among the expenditures incurred by the Tory Party was the money necessary to carry the honourable gentleman to Seal Cove. Unfortunately, for the province, if not for the Tory Party, they also incurred the expenditure to bring him back. The people of Seal Cove would probably have taken up a contribution and then helped.

Sir, the Minister of Justice went to Seal Cove, obviously because it had voted Liberal even in the dark days of March, 1972, when about the only thing protecting the Liberal Party around Newfoundland were the small game laws, the very small game laws. Seal Cove voted Liberal. I think it voted, correct me if I am wrong, 159 to 63 - I am sorry, 150 to 59, about three to one. Bless them! The people of perception, the people of intelligence and the courage of their convictions went out and the fifty-nine of them marked their ballot for the Progressive Conservative candidate and one hundred and fifty marked their ballot for the Liberal candidate. That was in the dark days of March, 1972. The Progressive Conservative candidate, of course, was returned in the district as a whole, with quite a handsome majority, about 860 as I recall.

The Minister of Justice, the heavyweight - now there were a number of supporter actors sent with him but he was the undoubted heavyweight; he was the pièce de résistance, Sir, the icing on the cake, the sine qua non, there could not have been a meeting in Seal Cove without the Minister of Justice, the major attraction, the star attraction, the star billing, the reason people came from far and wide, from 200 to 300 yards away some of them, to hear him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Superstar!

MR. ROBERTS: It was the Minister of Justice. He gave them quite a speech. I was not there but one or two friends of mine were. We did have a sketch; we did see it on the CBC. That film I hope is reserved in the Archives. I really hope so. My Lord, what a tragedy it would have been, Sir, if that film is not in the Archives. It is too bad the Minister of Tourism - maybe he is on his way to the Archives now to double check it and have a copy made, maybe sent to the National Archives, maybe in that hill in Colorado wherever it is the big mountain is tunnelled out.

MR. CROSBIE: Do you know where it is? It is with the film, "Come Home Newfoundlander" with Al Vardy in it.

MR. ROBERTS: In that case, Sir, they are both in good company. They are both in good company. That film too should be in the Archives as an example.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is he saying, that we are squares?

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now! Hold on! Wait! I mean I would not attempt to say what the minister said. How could I be as sincere or as unctuous as the gentleman from Burin. I would not dream to be. He made a powerful appeal, I know that because the CBC assured us that the appeal had just about swept Seal Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come to the climax, quick! Where did he stash it?

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder what makes my friend from Bell Island think that there is a point to this story? There is a point. Of course there is. There is a moral. After the Minister of Justice who had gone down to Seal Cove - what way does the point, come to think of it? After he had gone down at such vast expense, which hopefully was not charged against the public - it might be interesting to get his expense account and see whether a trip to Seal Cove - the Minister of Manpower told an open-line show in Grand Falls that he was in Hermitage during November on public business. For two weeks on public business? We are going to have a look at his expense account to see if he charged this off? I would like to know what the devil the public business was

that required him to be in Hermitage for two weeks and furthermore when he is going to be there for two weeks again. I think the people of the Hermitage District would like to see him again. He is a fine chap. He was probably in Labrador South during the festivities there in August, 1972. I suspect there has been little attention paid by others to that district since.

The Minister of Justice was there and he made this powerful appeal. It had its effect, Sir. It had its effect because there were no longer 150 Liberals in Seal Cove, Sir. There were 150 Liberals when we lost the district but this time the tide of fortune favoured us. Our total, following this impressive appeal for protection of the rural areas - that is what the minister was talking about, the minister who grew up in a rural area and like most people, came to St. John's to practice his profession, the minister made a moving appeal, an eloquent appeal. You could practically see the tears rolling up to Furbys Cove.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: My honourable friend, the Minister of Justice is not here and we have listened to this for about ten minutes. It is not, I submit, relevant to the resolution, which concerns the public finance of election expenses, disclosure of contributions, limiting amounts to be spent by Canada. It is entirely irrelevant to that. The honourable gentleman himself does not want to go into the past, and he has just spent half his speech in the past, about three months ago. We are also interested in hearing any serious points that he has to make on the resolution. Really, I think we should be kept within some bound. I submit this is not relevant.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I think the point brought up by the Minister of Finance is well-taken. However, we have borne with this line of speech by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for some

time and all honourable members probably reflect the request of the member for Bell Island that maybe the honourable member will make his point a good one.

MR. ROBERTS: My friends are getting me in trouble and my enemies are not allowed to save me. I think the honourable gentleman for St. John's West has quite properly called me to order. I had strayed somewhat, Sir. I do not think I should say anything more about the Minister of Justice in Seal Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not leave us up in the air.

MR. ROBERTS: Either my friends get left up in the air or I get left up in the air. I think, Your Honour, in all deference to your ruling (I do not often find the gentleman from St. John's West to be right. He is not often right on points of order) I do not think I should say anything more about Seal Cove.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to carry on. I submit that I was relatively relevant to the resolution because, of course, presumably it was election financing that carried the Minister of Justice to that place I am not going to tell him about any more. Maybe the gentleman from Hermitage could mention, he knows that they knew more or the gentleman from St. Barbe North; maybe even my friend from Bell Island. Anyway that is another time and I have been properly called to order. I thank all concerned.

Sir, I was saying the money goes on television and radio. We carried the meeting in Hermitage, that is what got me on to this and that cost \$700. Most people are not aware, Sir, of the large sums of money it costs to advertise on radio and television. In all, in the election in Hermitage, if my memory serves me, Sir, we spent \$7,000, \$8,000 or \$9,000 (I am not sure of the exact figure but it is of that order) on radio and television. It is a vast sum of money. The Tory Party spent far more, Sir, because we bought CJOX radio because it gets into the area; we bought CJCN television which comes down into

Grand Falls, from Grand Falls into the Bay de'Espoir Area, for the coverage. The Progressive Conservative Party bought the full province-wide network. Mr. George McLean, I am told, was doing their scheduling. He was spending money with a free hand. The Progressive Conservative message was carried in Corner Brook, on the CION network and carried in Grand Falls, carried in Bonavista, carried everywhere. They bought a full-page advertisement in the "Evening Telegram", \$500 or more. I do not know what it cost. We could not afford any money in the "Evening Telegram." We had a penetration study and it turned out, Sir, that only fifty people in Hermitage District subscribed to the Saturday edition of the "Evening Telegram." If we take the cost of a full page on Saturday as being at least \$1,000, that is \$20 per person seeing the message.

Mr. Speaker, we had our posters printed locally. The Progressive Conservative Party had theirs done on the Mainland, a place called, Woodstock. It was either Woodstock, Ontario or Woodstock, New Brunswick, I know not, but they had them printed outside the province. We spent all that money on television, radio and publicity; very expensive. We only had, I believe, two newspapers and the Tory Party, I understand, had four. Was it four? They were printed very extensively and carried out.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: What about January 1823? Tell me what happened on the Gregorian

calendar, July, 1704'

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman got his lesson in October 1971 and he will get it in October 1977 or whenever the next round comes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also in Hermitage spent quite a deal of money on bands, John White and others. I think we had a total of bands for seven nights.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Bands. B- A-N-D-S. B - consonant, A - vowel, N - consonant, D - consonant, S - consonant. The honourable gentleman understand that? Bands. Bands. As in wedding band, as in band of hope in the Methodist Church.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wants, I will go back to Simon deMontfort for its parliament in 1273. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying Sir, bands are an expensive item. They average \$500.00 a night and then their care and feeding is an addition to that. That comes to a lot of money. Their travelling and accommodations are a lot of money. That is the sort of reason we ran up a debt of \$191.00 at the Power Commission to the staff house in Camp Boggie near St. Alban's at the head of the bay. That is the reason the P.C. party ran up \$2,693.40, a lot of money, nearly \$2,700. This is where the money goes. There is nothing wrong with any of it. What I am saying is that vast amounts are needed and then we get into the business of paying people to work. The Tory party paid people to work in Hermitage and we pay people to work in Hermitage. If you give up your days work, you cannot be expected in most cases to do without. We offered our people \$25.00 a day, am I correct? \$25.00 a day. The Tory party opened the bidding at \$35.00 a day. What did we pay people in Hermitage, pole workers? \$25.00 per day. The P.C. party paid \$35.00 per day.

Posters, badges, all this has to be paid for and that is where the money goes Sir. All of these expenses can be limited by law. I believe all of them can be limited by provincial law. I believe all

of them can be limited by provincial law. There may well be some constitutional provisions that would affect it. I would like to hear these argued. But the advise I have is that a provincial law limiting expenditures on any of these heads or indeed by any, any head by a provincial party would be a valid law and would be an effective law. Could it be broken? Of course it could. The Criminal Code has been in effect in Canada for 107 or 108 years, Sir. It is still broken every day.

You cannot draw up a law that cannot be broken, but penalties can be put in. Candidates could be made personally liable. Parties could be made liable. Controls could be imposed. We could have a disclosure of expenditures and I think we should have it. I think that one of the points of this resolution, one of the real points of this resolution is to require limits on expenditure and to require the imposition of controls. It can be done Sir and I submit on the basis of Hermitage - take the most recent example. It should be done. It should be done and I would like to see it done, Sir. My colleagues and I would like to see it done.

Hermitage may be a poor example, Sir, in that the P.C. party lost. I can only speak for this party Sir, since the fourth of February, 1972. Before that I can speak for White Bay North. The honourable member from Bonavista South is a little tender because in October, 1971, he got a trimming. No worse than the trimming his own party gave him in Bonavista North. The honourable gentleman from Bonavista North is a little tender because in October 1971 he got a trimming, no worse than the trimming his own party gave him in Bonavista North.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Quite possible. Quite possible. Quite possible. Sure. Sure. Maybe 65,000 cars, I do not know. I mean - do you want to go back? What about the meeting held in Bonavista in 1968, when every car coming to a certain meeting held by a certain political

party, not mine, was given a free tank of gas and was it not a five dollar bill for every person in it? That is the word. That is the rumor. What about that meeting?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was a federal election, but it was not my party. I am not saying what party it was but the honourable gentleman - we do not want to talk about that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why? What party? Who was the party?

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, let us go back to Kiely vis Carsons, Sir, in 1832.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If he cannot join in on the debate on the merits, do not join in. I hope it is a little better than the honourable gentleman's speech on opening day, either in content or in substance or in delivery. Now, Sir, no Sir, you cannot hurt those who have nothing for which to hurt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to pioneer. We do not have to pioneer at all in this matter. Quebec have had legislation on the books for five or six or seven years, two or three general election campaigns. As far as I know, it has worked and worked quite well. We could look there. The government of Canada, the parliament of Canada, after we crossed to the government have placed upon the statute books of Canada a law. My colleague, the gentleman from White Bay South, will be describing some features of the bill when he speaks, the features of the new act. But it generally was known to us which limits on expenditures provide for certain amounts of free time. That can be done because of course, radio and television have free time and so are under the control of the parliament of Canada. We cannot do that. We could pay for it. I think we could limit it by limiting expenditures.

It provides for disclosure and it provides for certain tax credits. I suppose we could do that in as much as we levy

a provincial income tax but we could not do it with respect to the federal income tax unless of course the parliament of Canada agreed. That is the general outline of the bill and it is a good bill and I see no reason why a similar bill cannot be brought in in Newfoundland.

I would like to go further, though, Mr. Speaker. I would like to go much further. I would like to see the public chest, the public purse contribute to the expenses of people standing for election.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: This is a different subject and I appeal to honourable members that although it is part of the same resolution and germane, the one to the other, one does not stand to fall upon the other. I think they should both stand together but I submit that in debating these, we should realize they are two separate although inter-related, but two separate subjects. I submit that the question of limits on campaign expenditures and the controlling of expenditures and the reporting of expenditures is different from the question of financing expenditures. I do think, Sir, having said that, that the time is come when the people of Newfoundland should do what the people of Quebec do, what the people of the United Kingdom have done for twenty or thirty or forty years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not talking of full. The honourable gentleman may let me make my argument. I know the U.K. rule, maybe not as well as the honourable gentleman, but I know them and as the parliament of Canada - the Government of Canada are going to do under the authority of the Parliament of Canada, and that is to pay money towards the lawful and proper expenditures of candidates standing for election. I am not suggesting for a moment that they pay all of the costs.

Before I come to that, let me say a word or two as to why in our view they should pay anything. Sir, there was a time, seventy or eighty years ago, when members of an elected body were not paid

any salary at all. Indeed, Sir, when the matter first came up in England, about 1900, the Labour Party, M.P.'s raised it. They were told and I believe that the people who said this believed what they were saying, that to pay members of Parliament would be the first step towards corrupting the independence of that body, for it is corrupting the whole body politic of England. Those are the arguments, Sir, the arguments were that only men of independent wealth, able to serve their country, should serve. England had had many such men who served quite well and quite nobly men who had means, private means. They also had many men who did not have private means, many lawyers served in the House in England and carried on active practises.

Indeed, Sir, I am not sure just when it was ended but as recently as 1910 or 1911, the attorney-general of England appeared in a private case and he was able to carry on his private practise, the attorney-general, the chief law officer of the Crown. It is not at all unusual. Many of the leading

cases of English law feature the Attorney General and the Solicitor General appearing before one of the parties to a private case before the law courts, not appearing for the Crown, that would be part of his duties. That was the way things were done. Today it would be unthinkable for anybody to say that members of parliament should not be paid. We may argue over how much they should be paid and as to under what terms they should be paid and how their pay should be set. Those are all subjects for debate but nobody would seriously maintain member of the House of Assembly or Members of Parliament should not be paid, should not receive an indemnity and an expense account and assistance financially to help them perform their duties. Of course not, it has been accepted and it is wise.

Otherwise we would not have very good people standing for office. The only people who would stand for office then would be those who had vast private resources or those who were willing to try to live on ill-gotten or fraudulent gains.

AN HON. MEMBER: Crosbie, Moores and Ottenheimer...

MR. ROBERTS: There would be very few of the honourable members in this House who would be able to stand for office on those terms. Very few would have incomes sufficient or means sufficient to enable them to stand for office and to take the time that is required to serve in the House, not just here in the chamber but helping constituents and all the things that we members should do. Very few. Sir. We would have restricted parliament to a wealthy group and that is wrong.

I do not say that those who argue against payment of election expenses out of the public purse are wrong in their motives but I say they are wrong because, Sir, the effect of not using public funds to pay part of the cost of legitimate and proper election expenses is to restrict parliament, either to the wealthy or the well-to-do or those who have well-to-do friends or access to money. That is true today. That is true today, Sir. What is the minimum campaign, the minimum one has to spend to get elected to the House of

Assembly, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000? I spent in my own behalf in White Bay North, in March 1972, \$2,600. I suspect that was - what did the honourable gentleman from St. John's West spend? \$4,000 or \$5,000 probably.

MR. CROSBIE: Not in that election. About \$3,000.

MR. ROBERTS: About \$3,000, and each of us was reasonably certain we would be returned to his seat. I think he was probably going to win in St. John's West no matter what happened and I was probably going to win in White Bay North no matter what happened. \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000 is the minimum a man must spend to put up a credible campaign, to rent halls. People expect to be paid, Sir, if people are going to leave their jobs and go to work for you. Most people living on weekly wages cannot afford to give up a day's pay or two days pay. We have not yet come to the happy state where employers will say to a man; "Take a day off and go work for the candidate of your choice and we will stand your wages." That does not happen or very seldom does it happen.

Candidates have to move around, cars have to be hired or paid for, boats in some cases. Publicity costs money even without getting into bands. A campaign that costs \$4,000 or \$5,000 is a pretty minimal campaign and that is not counting the overall central party election costs because the gentleman from Bonavista South spent \$4,000 or \$5,000 or whatever he said it was in March 1973. He had the benefit of advertising done by his party and he did not pay one forty-second of that advertising. If his party spent, say, \$200,000 then \$5,000 of that could be attributed to his costs. I think he would agree with me on this. That cost must be assessed too.

People must have access to money to get into the House and that means, Sir, that those who do not have access to money do not get into the House. The gentleman from Labrador South probably spent less money in his campaign to get elected, the one which was successful, than most members did. I think at best that he spent \$3,000, \$4,000 or \$5,000, because it is an expensive district to move about in. Maybe

somebody gave him a boat or lent him a boat but it costs money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Someone paid for it.

MR. ROBERTS: Somebody had to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Not wrong that the money must be spent, the money must be spent but wrong that it comes from private sources. I see no reason, Sir, why the public cannot. I see no difference between that, between the public paying part of the legitimate costs of election, maybe providing each party with so much television time or so much radio time

or giving each party a free mailing. That is an expensive business, six cents for a letter, unsealed, to everyone I have in my district and that is about 2,400 households receiving mail. At six cents each that is about one hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars to mail it out plus the cost of the printing. It is an expensive business if done very often. There is no reason that the public purse cannot stand this cost. This is what happens in England. As I understand it each candidate is allowed so many mailings. I believe it is two or three to every household in his constituency.

There should be limits placed on all these expenditures and then the public should help to pay the costs. How should the money be paid? The gentleman from St. John's North, I think, has a good point when he says that we have to avoid, you know, we have to be careful how we pay the money, that we do not get into undesirable situations. I think there are formulae that have been applied elsewhere. The general rules are in the neighbourhood of; "One must get a certain percentage of the votes cast - ten, fifteen, twenty." Not enough to discourage a serious appeal to the electorate but certainly enough to discourage men seeking glory, if glory it be and getting eight ballots or eight votes in a general election. Nobody suggests that that sort of thing need be encouraged without threatening democracy but a serious candidate, ten, fifteen, twenty percent be reimbursed after the election, parties be reimbursed. That is done in Quebec and I believe it is to be done in Ottawa following the next general election.

It can be done and I think, Sir, that that is no different either, to take a further point, than paying the expenses that we now pay for elections. The biggest cost of elections, in a sense, is the cost of the election machinery, the cost of the polling booths and the deputy returning officers. Why did we arrive at the figure of twenty-five dollars for poll workers in Hermitage? It is simple. That is what people are being paid to work in the government, you know, to work in the polling booths, the going rate established.

Across Canada it was \$12 million or \$14 million in the last general election. Nobody quarrels that that should not be paid by the government. Of course it should be as well as the cost of taking the voters list, the cost of printing the ballots, the cost of counting the ballots, the cost of reporting the results and all the costs that the government now absorb as part of an election. We could not have an election without ballots, boozes, boxes and returning officers, Mr. Speaker, but we could not have an election either without candidates. If it is in the public interest to have an election as it is, then surely it is in the public interest to encourage candidates.

We can go on as we have, we can go on over the years, we can go on with parties somehow raising the money. They will raise some of it honourably and honestly and perhaps there may be some that is not raised in that way but they will scabble for it. One way or another it will come. The elections will come off one way or another but the system may have served well or it may not. We can argue about that from now until the cows come home. What we cannot argue about, Mr. Speaker, is that the day is gone when the system can continue to serve as well.

We have a chance now, in Newfoundland to do something positive and something worthwhile and something that will help to reform any abuses or such abuses as there may have been in this province.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to make this partisan so I will ignore that comment by the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South.

We have the opportunity, Sir, we are not the government so we cannot do it. If we were the government the obligation would be upon us to do it or to answer. The obligation now is upon the present government to do it or not to do it. I hope that they will. We have a statement by the Premier, I referred to it, the gentleman from St. John's West, the Finance Minister referred to it. He says they

will be considering it. I do not consider that much of a commitment at all, especially coming as it did, from the Premier. A commitment from the Minister of Finance I tend to treat very seriously. I found that he is a man who does follow through on his commitments and his words. I do not quarrel with him on that.

MR. MARSHALL: Point of order, Mr. Speaker: The remarks made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition are out of order and I think he should retract them because it imputes the honour of a member of this House, namely the Premier. By these statements he is insinuating that the words of the honourable the Premier or of any member of this honourable House, he is not entitled so to do for that matter, that his word is not to be taken. That being so

that is the imputation of the words and it is definitely the innuendo that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has attempted to cast. This is the second time today. I will invite him either to retract them or to inform the House that he has no such intention.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, imputation like beauty is in the eye of the beholder. I have no intention of calling the Premier a liar. I am barred from that. Even if I wanted to, I am barred from it. Let me say again - if His Honour rule that I am out of order of course I shall abide by His Honour's ruling - let me say that I find - I do not remember the precise words that I used but what I said was that the Premier's words, a commitment from him I do not take as good enough. I do not take them seriously because I have found that in matters such as this the Premier is not a man of his words. If it is out of order, Your Honour, if Your Honour will - I mean, the Speaker is quite capable of making a ruling if he should want to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to refer the honourable Leader of the Opposition to Beauchesne, page 131, subsection 3 which states that no member can be allowed to attribute, with any intention to insult others, or to question the honour of one. I feel that the honourable Leader of the Opposition was doing that and feel that he should at least rephrase his comments. I would not like to think that he would attribute that to the honourable Premier or any other honourable member of this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no intention of questioning the honour of the Premier. I do not doubt that the Premier is an honourable man. What I said though was that I find that a commitment from him is not, in my eyes, sufficient as an indication the government will do something. Furthermore the words which he read -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour has given a ruling on the statement and the import of the words of the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Your Honour has asked the Leader of the Opposition to retract these words.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he has not.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour has given a ruling with respect to these words, that he thought these words constitute an imputation against the honour of a member of this House, and the honourable Leader of the Opposition ought to and must retract it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware Your Honour had ordered me to retract anything.

MR. SPEAKER: I did refer to Beauchesne as mentioned and I did rule that the honourable Leader of the Opposition perhaps was questioning the honour of the honourable Premier. I did ask him to rephrase his remarks but not at this point to retract them.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the gentleman from St. John's East could listen to what Your Honour has said. I quite appreciate Your Honour's ruling. Indeed I simply read the words from Beauchesne and said that I had no intention of questioning the honour of the Premier, not the least intention of questioning it. As far as I know, he is an honourable man. What I did say and I will say it again - I understand, I am in order and that is why I say it - was that I find that these words are not a sufficient commitment to satisfy me. That is not a matter of calling the man a liar. It is not, Mr. Speaker.

I have also said that I find a commitment from the Minister of Finance to be far more meaningful than one from the Premier because I have found that the Minister of Finance is a man of his word. At least he had the courage, which is more than I can say for the gentleman from Burgeo.

Mr. Speaker, I have retracted nothing. If Your Honour wish to direct the appropriate officials to have Hansard printed or typed, whatever the words are, I have retracted nothing. If I have said anything out of order, I would most certainly retract. Just because the gentleman, the House leader, thinks something is out of order, Sir, does not make it out of order. Your Honour is the one who makes it out of order.

Now, before I was so rudely interrupted and so needlessly interrupted by the - do you think the honourable member will ever learn parliamentary rules? He cannot even get the Throne Speech under way. Oh, the inept incompetence! Probably he will hear a second speech from the member from Bell Island as penalty, and dire penalty it will be.

MR. W. ROWE: Stund is what he is.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not call him stund.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, he is stund. The House leader is stund.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! These honourable members have been given considerable leeway in debate this afternoon and I suggest for the remainder of the afternoon they get on with the debate without any further interruptions.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you very much, Sir. I am glad Your Honour did that because I certainly would not call the House leader stund. I would not call his stupid either.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, the

government have an opportunity here, this resolution and the amendment I will be moving in a couple of minutes, to take a meaningful step forward.

The resolution itself, as the gentleman from St. John's North has moved it, I think he did a good job in introducing it. I do not agree with everything he said. I do not think he would expect me to, certainly I would not expect to. It is a good resolution but it does not go far enough. It requests the government to introduce legislation to govern and control the public financing of election expenses and the private financing of election expenses and other expenses of political parties with suitable controls involving disclosure of contribution and the limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties.

I think that that as far as it goes is very good and indeed it is a position which I have advocated publicly on a number of occasions. I do not think it goes far enough and accordingly, Sir, I move, seconded by my colleague the gentleman from White Bay South, the following amendment, that all of the words after the word "that" and that is in the operative part of the motion of course Your Honour, following the "whereases" and "Therefore be it resolved," that all the words after "that" be deleted and the following words substituted therefore, "This House requires the government to implement its oft repeated promises to the public by introducing legislation within the next thirty days 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."

MR. CROSBIE: Everything Ottawa does he wants to follow. Can we not even do our own thing down here?

MR. ROBERTS: Not the way the honourable gentleman has been doing things, no.

MR. CROSBIE: Ottawa suckers!

MR. WM. ROWE: His party voted for it.

MR. CROSBIE: Voted for what?

MR. WM. ROWE: That bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Oh sure, yes.

MR. CROSBIE: No, we would be -

MR. WM. ROWE: Talk about equalization now. Not only is the House Leader stund, the Minister of Finance is stund too.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he is not stund.

MR. ROBERTS: He is not saying the gentleman from St. John's West is stund too, is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. CROSBIE: Retract.

MR. ROBERTS: Retract what? I asked a question. Is anybody saying that the honourable gentleman is stund?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Is the honourable Leader of the Opposition completing -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh no, Sir, I want to say a few words about the amendment if I may. Thank you, Sir. That is the amendment and I believe a copy has been sent to Your Honour. If Your Honour wishes to put it, I would say a few words on it, if I may, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: Before Your Honour allows debate on this, Your Honour might wish to consider as to whether or not this resolution is in order. There are two or three points with respect to it: "That the House requires the government to implement," etc.

MR. WM. ROWE: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: Just calm down, just a little moment. He will have a few words in just a moment.

MR. WM. ROWE: Everything he has tried so far he has fooled up.

MR. MARSHALL: "This House requires the government." My understanding is that a private member can request the government, can ask the government but cannot require the government to bring in a resolution to require the government to pass a bill or to expend public money as

this contemplates and also the use of the words, "its oft repeated promises " and the whole tenor of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is argumentative in form and in nature and is therefore not in order for debate in this House. If the honourable members could learn to draft properly, it might have been accepted.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Sir, I accept no direction of that sort from a gentleman who cannot even adjourn the House or cannot even get the Throne Speech underway.

If I may speak to the point, Sir, first of all the House may require whatever it wants. The government are not the government, Mr. Speaker, for any reason except that they retain the confidence from a majority of the members of this House. They have no God-given right to be the government. This House gives them the right to be the government and this House can put them in or take them out so this House may require what it wishes of the government and I submit, Sir, in constitutional law that position is unassailable and it is correct.

Secondly, Sir, the words "oft repeated promises," they are oft repeated. The Premier made the promise on opening day, presumably Sir, the Premier; the Minister without Portfolio is not to be taken as denying the Premier's promise. The Minister of Finance has repeated it oft this afternoon. In any event it is part of the resolution and it is a statement of fact.

Thirdly, this resolution does not require expenditure of any public funds. It says, "To govern and control

the financing of election expenses to govern and to control - such legislation to be similar in content to legislation adopted by the House of Commons etc. etc. etc.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reference in this calling on the government to spend money. I am as aware or perhaps more aware of the British North America Act provisions on this matter as is the gentleman for St. John's East. I submit, Sir, the motion of the amendment is in order.

MR. MARSHALL: Apart from everything else, Mr. Speaker, I think at this late date it ought to be noted that it is probably also out of order because it seeks to get the public funds to help to assist in the \$500,000 debt of the Liberal Party.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, that is just about as relevant as the rest of this. The honourable gentleman cannot even admit defeat graciously.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take into consideration the comments that have just been made by the honourable gentleman but I was provided with a copy of this amendment and I did leave the Chair and the Deputy Speaker took the Chair while I discussed the thing with the persons at the Table.

It is a ruling that this amendment is out of order because if implemented ("Would require" instead of "requirement" - not a request) would require government to spend public monies. As in bill C 203, a copy of which I have here, page 23 it says: "...upon receipt of a certificate referred to in Sub-section (I) the Receiver General shall pay out of consolidated revenue fund to the candidate to whom the certificate relates as partial reimbursement in respect of the candidate's election expenses an amount equal to the aggregate of (a) the amount determined in Para 1(b) that is set out in this certificate; (b) the amount, if any, set out in the certificate in respect of the candidate's travelling expenses and (c) \$150.

So this ruling of the Chair is that the amendment is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I take no note of the replies opposite. As I was saying -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet at 5:20 P.M. He has already spoken for an hour and a-half right now in this debate, I believe his time has now expired.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted by the Chair that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition began to speak at 3:30 o'clock and he could go on until 6:00 o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has unlimited time, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House -

MR. SPEAKER: We leave the Chair at 6:00 o'clock anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes but under the rules of the House, I forget the Standing Order. I think Witch Hunt has lost his marbles today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, I am going to move the amendment again now, Sir. I am going to move the amendment again, Sir, now if I may. I will change it in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Everybody! Class quiet now! Everybody happy!

AN HON. MEMBER: If the honourable gentleman speaks now he -

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking in silence.

Mr. Speaker, I now move - it is certainly the only part the honourable gentleman could understand.

I now move that this House urges and requests the government and the rest of the words will be - so the words "urges" and "requests" the government - the rest of it stands - "urges" and "requests" or if Your Honour would feel syntactically a little more happy "requests" and "urges".

Now if that is in order perhaps Your Honour would put it, if not perhaps Your Honour will have another crack at it. Here comes the heavy artillery now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: To give a partisan ruling.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to move the adjournment of the debate. The honourable gentleman opposite, he is finished I take it.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, I have restrained -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Is the honourable gentleman finished?

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel as if I should again take this under advisement and rule on it the next private member's day.

MR. MARSHALL: It is all so affable, we will call it 6:00 o'clock.

Motion, that the House at its rising stand adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, February 7, 1974, at 3:00 p.m., carried.