



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 52

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. F. D. MOORES (Premier): I would like at this occasion, Sir, to pass on condolences to the Member for Bonavista South on the death of his mother a few days ago. I understand she was buried, I think it was yesterday. I know that all members of this House pass on their sympathy and feelings to the Member for Bonavista South. At any time, even though Mrs. Morgan was eighty-one, when someone dies in the family, there is always a traumatic and a sad experience. I know I speak for certainly all members on the government side and I would think all members of this House in officially recording our deepest sympathy to the family of Mr. Morgan, the Member for Bonavista South.

MR. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I wish to be associated with the Premier and with the members on the government side, Sir, in extending our condolences to the honourable member on his bereavement, on the death of his mother. Words really can be such empty things at a time when a loss like this has occurred but words are all we have and I am quite genuine when I say in words that we do extend our sympathy to the honourable gentleman and the other members of his family. Words cannot replace the loss, nothing can replace it but words may ease the pain and may make things a little easier. We quite genuinely do offer him our very heartfelt sympathy and our condolences.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I wish to announce two appointments in senior posts in the Department of Social Services, that of Mr. Jerome Quinlan as Regional Administrator for the St. John's Region and that of Mr. Peter Harvey, as Assistant Director of Employment Opportunities.

Mr. Quinlan has been employed by the Department of Social Services for the past sixteen years and has had extensive service as a welfare officer and district supervisor with the department in the

Districts of St. John's, Bell Island, Long Pond, Bay Bulls, Fermeuse, he presently or up until very recently has been working.

In addition to his wide practical experience, Mr. Quinlan has completed a year of graduate study at the Maritime School of Social Work. He is a former resident of Holyrood. He took up his duties as Regional Administrator for St. John's on February 1, replacing Mr. F. A. Davis, who was transferred to the post of Executive Director and Secretary of the Social Assistance Appeal Board.

Mr. Harvey joined the staff of the Department of Social Services in September, 1972, and served as special projects officer involved in job creation and job finding for social assistance recipients since his appointment.

The province recently appointed five special project officers to intensify efforts throughout the province in finding and creating jobs for social assistance recipients. Mr. Harvey will give direction and leadership in this special area. Before joining the department, Mr. Harvey was employed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission.

I would like to table a copy for the opposition and for the press.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate these two fine gentlemen who have been promoted in the announcement just made by the (Acting) Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Quinlan, Sir, was an employee of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, when I was minister. I am not quite sure if I made him supervisor or not but I believe I did. I believe I promoted Mr. Quinlan. He was one of the more able men in that department.

I think I was responsible for setting Mr. Harvey on his way. I think Mr. Harvey was working with a federal agency at the time he came to me, with a LIP project, I think it was. Since that time, Mr. Harvey became employed with the Department of Social Services and my understanding is that he has been doing a magnificent job because he is a man who came

up from the toiling masses, a man who came from the ordinary people. I do wish him well, both of these gentlemen well but especially Mr. Harvey because he has a man-size job, Sir, trying to find employment for welfare recipients when we have the highest unemployment we ever had in Newfoundland. I do wish him every success, Sir, and I am afraid he is going to have a great deal of difficulty in finding jobs that do not exist.

PETITIONS:

MR. B. PECKDORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of approximately 250 residents of the Community of Little Bay Islands. Really the petition should be more appropriately directed to the school board in the area, the Green Bay Integrated School Board. but they have sent me along the original of the petition and the copy gone to the school board. They have asked me to present it to the House and I do so now.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "We are dissatisfied with the present system of education at the local level. The school building is very outdated and does not serve the purpose of today's method of teaching. It lacks available space for the teaching of such subjects as science. It is lacking in such rooms as a library, an auditorium, staff room, and the washroom area in the school is limited to approximately ten square feet of floor space.

"The fact that Little Bay Islands is separated from Mainland Newfoundland makes daily commuting to a larger school impossible and we are opposed to sending our students to a larger school outside for ten months of the year to finish their education. We feel that a new school, designed in the way appropriate to suit today's needs in education, would greatly enhance our children's chances for success.

"We, therefore, are requesting the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to take action and to provide financial aid to erect a new one, a somewhat larger school at Little Bay Islands."

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this is signed by about 250 voters of Little Bay Islands. Just two or three weeks ago I was at Little Bay Islands and examined the school building there and it is in need of repair or a new school being built. I think there is some feeling on the island that perhaps renovations could be done to the present building and an extension made to it to make it suitable. In any event it will require substantial capital funds to do this and I think it is a very worthwhile thing and it is very needy. As they say in the prayer of the petition, the people are isolated from the mainland. It was only a year or two ago the people thought they were going to have to send all their students or students in Grade VI onward into Spingdale by ferry each day to the Central High School there. The people complained bitterly and the board saw fit to leave all the students on Little Bay Islands for their education from kindergarten to Grade XI.

I heartily support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and asked that it be placed on the table of this House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, of course, support the petition presented by the Member for Green Bay on behalf of his constituents in Little Bay Islands. It seems to me, Sir, to be a very reasonable request. I agree with the honourable member that even if they do have an adequate ferry service there, I do not think the children should be compelled to commute back and forth daily. I am very familiar with commuting as the honourable member knows. I believe they got an improvement in their ferry service recently, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada, the Canadian Transport Commission, the Water Transport Committee, has taken over that service.

Mr. Speaker, even at that, I do not think the children should be forced to commute back and forth every day. This is a most reasonable request, Sir, and I trust that the Minister of Education will be able to convince his colleague, the Minister of Finance, to forget some

of this foolishness that they are wasting their money on this year and give the children and the parents of Little Bay Islands the badly needed school that they require in that community.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak briefly on the prayer of the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Green Bay. As honourable members well know, when or whenever, when in the good course of time we get to the education estimates, there is a total of \$25.3 million voted for capital school construction.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not enough.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not enough the honourable gentleman says? No? The honourable gentleman and the opposition and the federation of school boards and other groups will say it is not enough. If it were doubled, Mr. Speaker, if the amount instead of \$25.3 million were \$50.6 million, it would not be enough. If it were again doubled into \$100 million, it would not be enough. Perhaps if it were \$200 million doubled again, it might be enough and perhaps it would not. Never, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland or in Ontario or Alberta, British Columbia

will it be enough? Never will it be enough? However, \$25.3 million is significant. It is a major amount or it is minuscule. I will leave it to honourable gentlemen to decide.

It is not enough, the honourable gentleman says. It is not enough, the Federation of School Boards says. It is not enough, the entire opposition say. If it were doubled they would say the same thing. That is fair enough. I do not blame them. After all, that I suppose is - I do not know if it is good politics but it is recognizable politics.

However, Mr. Speaker, the amount of \$25.3 million has been appropriated by this government for capital school construction. Of that amount the breakdown is obvious, \$13.3 million for DREE schools. That is committed. Then there is \$10 million, an increase from \$8 million last year under the general capital grant which is divided up proportionately for the various denominations according to the system which has been operative in Newfoundland and still is operative. Then the vote of \$2 million which is to the Integrated Denominational Educational Committee. This of course is under the principle of equalization.

I would certainly hope that the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member from Green Bay can in fact be granted. Well, obviously as honourable gentlemen know, these decisions are essentially within the judgement of the committees and their allocation of the amount government has made available. Then within the school boards, certainly I will be pleased to forward a copy of the petition and a résumé of the remarks made thereon by honourable gentlemen to the bodies who are involved and concerned and interested.

MR. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could say a further word in support of the petition presented by the gentleman from Green Bay on behalf of a number of his constituents on Long Island. In common with the Minister of Education and my colleague from Bell Island, I agree with the prayer of the petition and I hope it can be granted. In common with both honourable gentlemen,

I realize that schools are not built directly by the government of this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, at Long Island.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Little Bay Islands.

MR. ROBERTS: Little Bay Islands? I am sorry. I am in the right district but the wrong island. The schools are not built directly by the government. Instead, they are built by the denominational authorities.

The Minister of Education has agreed that the \$25 million which the government asked the House for in the estimates for capital construction for education is not enough. We will have an opportunity to go into that.

Let me draw the minister's attention and Your Honour's attention to the fact that as I understand the situation, that \$25 million is already spent. Unless the people of Little Bay Islands through the relevant board, the Green Bay Integrated School Board I would assume - unless they already have what amounts to an assurance that it is in the agreed programme for the period under discussion in the coming year, then as I understand it, Sir, it will not be done because the significant thing about the amount of \$25 millions to which the minister referred is not just that it is not enough. That is significant. I suspect he is right when he says that it will never be enough.

The significant thing is that it is already all spent, all committed, the most of it going to service the debt of schools already in use. The DREE money in respect of schools, the final \$2 million of the \$25 million amount, Mr. Speaker, is not an equalization payment. It is a payment that is necessary to bring the integrated people up to their proportional per capita entitlement as laid down in term 17 of the Terms of Union.

So, I would not want anybody to think from the Minister of Education's statement and I know he would not want anybody to think

that that amount of money while it is a large amount of money will mean very much for the people of Little Bay Islands or any other community in this province unless they have already received an assurance from the appropriate authority, in this case the Integrated Educational Committee, Mr. Hatch or the secretary or some spokesman for that committee, that this project, this particular school project is in the agreed programme for this year.

If not, Sir, it is not going to be done, not on the amounts of money for which the minister is asking approval.

MR. SPEAKER: It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries Mayor Roy Best and the council of Gaultois. I would like to welcome these gentlemen to the galleries today.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. W.G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Collection Agencies Act Regulations for 1974.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

HON. T. DOYLE (MINISTER OF TOURISM): Mr. Speaker, I have some answers here to some questions which were asked on the Order Paper of April 18 by the honourable member for Bonavista North and my friendly shadow. I have sufficient copies here to table for all concerned.

The questions I refer to are as follows: Question no. 21 with reference to the "S.S. Kyle"; Question no. 22 which has reference to the issuance of moose-hunting licences last year; No. 28 which asks what amount of advertising was placed by the Department of Tourism in the "Town Crier" in the last two years to which the answer is nil; Question no. 29 which asks a similar question in regards to the "Newfoundland Express" in which case the answer is also nil; Question no. 33 is a detailed question and answer concerning rabbit hunting season on the Avalon Peninsula; Question no. 34 has to do with salaries and other total costs for the Anniversary Celebrations as of a current date; Question no. 42 is in connection with the Harbour Grace jail and its reference to having been declared a historic sight or not; Question no. 43 refers to the furnishing and outfitting of the Fisherman's

Museum at Grand Bank since April 1, 1972; And question no. 46 refers to expenses involved with transportation and other expenses for the hosting of groups of travel industry personnel - the answers to which are here and the answers given show Newfoundland's share of a national programme which is financed jointly by the federal and provincial governments of Canada. (See index attached for tabled answers)

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. DOYLE: No. This is the input of travel agencies, travel agents and airline people that go from province to province.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, in the hope that they will go back and recommend.

MR. DOYLE: Right. Right.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOYLE: Plenty of them, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions?

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, this was not on the Order Paper. It was asked orally. Am I at the right time now? Thank you for your guidance, Mr. Speaker.

This is the thirty-fifth attempt to try and answer a question asked by the honourable member from Bell Island with respect to the DOSCO houses. I previously, Mr. Speaker, gave the honourable member information that there is money held by the St. John's Housing Corporation and by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. The amount of \$35,560.57 retained by the St. John's Housing Corporation. Now this may have increased somewhat because of accrued interest since the last time I checked. The other amount held by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, \$31,358.10 at the time that I checked.

Now, I think the last question the honourable member asked with respect to this - well, it was more a statement than a question -

to the effect that this money had to be transferred over to the Bell Island Community fund under the terms of the previous Order-in-Council. Well let me clarify the situation as I see it, I stated to the honourable member that government's position was that this money was being used to repair homes that are presently occupied by tenants on Bell Island and that the final balance, a decision would be made on that once the homes had been brought up to the stage where they are suitable for continued occupancy and tenancy.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: He said that was not a proper use of the funds. Well I will read the terms of the Order-in-Council. This is the only one we can find. As he may have known, there are some gaps in the documents that have been left with this administration but May 17, 1971 there was an Order-in-Council passed ordering the following action with regard to the disposal of housing on Bell Island and related matters be and it is hereby approved.

"First, approximately ninety homes acquired through the Bell Island special housing programme be now offered for sale to their present occupants on say a five year mortgage arrangement in order to prevent speculation, to provide the occupants with the opportunity for ownership and to enable them to undertake repairs and maintenance.

"Secondly, five houses on Railroad Street be offered for sale, following the proper appraisal, to their present occupants at a fair price.

"Third, when the action set forth in one and two above have been taken, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to proceed to make repairs to and maintain the houses on East Track and any of the houses on Railroad Street which are not disposed of pursuant to, in order to bring them up to such a standard as to make possible a proper landlord tenant relationship.

The cost involved in so doing to be financed out of present accrued rental revenues.

"Four, the balance of accrued rental revenues after such capital improvements have been carried out, as well as revenues from sales of houses to be deposited to the credit of the Bell Island Community Fund, together with the net annual revenues received from the continuing rental of houses pursuant to three.

"Fifth, the amount of \$7,500 derived from the sale of the DOSCO guest house to be paid over immediately to the Bell Island Community Fund."

MR. NEARY: Would the minister before he takes his seat inform us if that has been done? Have the houses been repaired? Will the balance now be turned over to the community?

MR. BARRY: As I already stated, Mr. Speaker, I am informed that these repairs are continued to be carried out, it started some time ago and that when a final balance has been reached and homes have been brought up to the proper standards, then a decision will be made with respect to what will be done with the funds that are left at that stage.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Health, Sir, would care to make a statement on the serious strike at the Waterford Hospital. Would the minister care to bring the House up to date on what is going on down there?

DR. ROWE: MR. Speaker, I cannot be very specific on what is going on. I do not need I think to say that we are very concerned and very disturbed over the strike which is taking place. I would only say this, that my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and myself, having been in meetings a considerable time this morning, are going back to meetings now, this afternoon. I think it would be very wrong and very inappropriate for me to state what proposals may be going back and forth but I will say this; as soon as we have any information

which indicates settlements, my colleague or myself will make an immediate statement either to the House, if that be open, or to the public.

I think it would be wrong for me to give any specific details of what things are being discussed as far as proposals at this moment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the minister if the strike is a lawful one and how they are manning the hospital today, just what is going on down there? Could he give us some more information?

DR. ROWE: On that point, Mr. Speaker, yes the Chairman of the Board informs me that as of the present time they are coping satisfactorily with the situation. I do not think I need to say anything further than that at the present time. He is happy that the situation is under control at the hospital as at this time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not indicate whether it was a legal strike or an illegal strike, I wonder if the minister would indicate that and if so what is the cause of this strike? Would the minister tell us? The minister obviously knows the reason for the strike. What is the main reason for the strike?

MR. ROUSSEAU: There are some problems that have been made public but I think if the honourable member were Minister of Labour for a while he would not want us to answer that while we are still in discussions. I think that often what is reported may not be the cause and we are discussing the problem with the parties concerned and when the appropriate time comes I think that will be the time to make a statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a very satisfactory answer. Let me ask the minister if the main reason is the two days when the state of emergency was declared in St. John's by the Mayor and these employees lost two days work and the hospital board has refused to pay for these two days? Is that the main reason for dispute? If so,

before the minister stands to answer the question, if so then the Minister of Finance has already offered the board the money to pay for these two days. Have the board requested assistance from the Treasury Board? Are they going to take advantage of this money?

It seems to me to be an unnecessary strike if this be the reason for it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, this is certainly one of the matters under consideration amongst others.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no point arguing about it. We are not going to get any information anyway. But, Sir, the other hospitals are likely to be out tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am only trying to head off a serious situation that is developing in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well why do you not do it? Treasury Board has already offered the money.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Premier is in a better mood today than he has been when I asked him this question on two or three previous occasions. Would the Premier indicate to the House if he is yet in a position to let the House know and subsequently the people of Newfoundland if there is going to be any contracts let on the Lower Churchill this year, how many men will be employed on the Lower Churchill this year. Would the Premier please tell the House? I have asked the question a half a dozen times and I have not gotten the answer yet.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island, the first question was he was wondering if I am in a good mood. The answer to that question is yes. He was wondering what contracts are

going to be let on the Lower Churchill and how many people will be employed this year; the answer to that question is, we will advise the House as soon as we know.

MR. NEARY: Great stuff, Sir. I wonder, Sir, if I can have any better luck with the Acting Minister of Social Services. In view of the fact that we may be in for a prolonged postal strike, would the minister indicate to the House if his department are making alternative arrangements to have the Social Assistance cheques delivered to recipients at the end of the month?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the answer basically and simply is yes that plans have been made whereby in the event that at the end of the month when the Social Assistance cheques are due or when Social Assistance recipients do expect them that there will be drop offs in the various district welfare offices and that people will be able to pick them up at the various district welfare offices. So contingency plans have been made in the event that the postal strike is still in operation at the end of the month.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing would inform the House what steps his government have taken to grant the residents of Labrador City a municipality to replace the present improvement council in Labrador City and give the people an opportunity to elect their own representatives to a municipality?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, this is not a simple question, it is a very involved one at the present time. We have some consultants in Labrador City carrying out the necessary investigation to see just what is entailed. Pending the receipt of their report, we will then decide what action is to be taken. But in the meantime I might inform the honourable member that a very intensive enquiry is going on at the moment into all aspects of that situation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, Would the minister inform the House who is doing this enquiry? Is it civil servants or

is it independent of the Civil Service? Just who is doing the enquiry? Could the minister be a little more specific?

MR. EARLE: The firm concerned is I believe called Harnett Kane and Associates.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture and Resources could inform the House, Sir, what his department's policy is on granting crown land in the Deer Park to construct cottages and summer homes?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. E. MAYNARD: I am in the process of filing a statement which I hope to make to the House tomorrow outlining the precise details in answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there has been a number of criticisms of late of the policy of the minister's department I wonder if he could incorporate in his statement just why certain applications are rejected and other applications are approved, especially in the Deer Park where one person makes an application for a piece of land to build a summer cottage and it is turned down and some senior civil servant then gets permission to build on that piece of land.

Could all of that be incorporated in the minister's statement tomorrow?

MR. G. DAWE: That was before 1972.

MR. NEARY: It was not before 1972. It was last year.

MR. DAWE: Ah! Before 1972.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any happenings of that sort but I can assure the honourable member that if he or any member of the public were to make me aware of any situation where it has happened, I shall have it investigated immediately.

However, I cannot go through the list specifically and state which applications have been approved on the statement tomorrow.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Name names! Name names!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Twillingate.

MR. H. GILLETTE: I have a question that I would like to address to the Minister of Tourism. First of all I want to thank him for the answer he gave me last week concerning the allocation of funds for the restoration of the "Norma and Gladys". I am wondering whether or not included in the \$57,748.00 -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Dick Greene, George MacLean.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GILLETTE: Whether or not this includes the supply of the two diesel engines which were installed? Whether or not his department had anything to do with the supply of those? Whether calling for tenders, if tenders were called or how they were purchased?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to get some clarification and make sure I understood the question correctly. I will take notice of it. As I understand the honourable gentleman, he wants to know if the costs I gave him last week include the two diesels and whether or not tenders were called for those diesels. Is that correct?

MR. GILLETTE: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: Fine. I will have the answer for the honourable gentleman tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House whether his government is carrying on any negotiations at present with Mr. Spencer Lake in his interests for the establishment of industry in the Bay D'Espoir area?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

HON. F.D. MOORES: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker. I have not been talking to Mr. Lake for quite some time. He sent in a proposal regarding some thoughts he had on it and as I understand it the Department of Industrial Development are taking a look at it but honestly I have not talked to him for quite some time.

MR. SIMMONS: Something, perhaps to the Minister of Industrial Development. In response to the proposal which Mr. Lake submitted I believe on the twenty-second of January, can the minister indicate to the House whether a committee has been established to study this proposal as was indicated at the time?

HON. W. DOODY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the resource policy committee now has this in hand and are studying it at the present time. They are doing

it in conjunction with the R.P.C. study which is done simultaneously. In order to evaluate one, one has to assist the other and they are examining them both with a view to establishing as quickly as possible some viable industry in the Bay D'Espoir area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is the end of that ... (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I wonder could the minister indicate at what time he expects a report from the committee?

MR. NEARY: The election after next.

MR. DOODY: It is difficult to put a time date on it, Mr. Speaker, but we hope to have it within a matter of two or three weeks, at least some indication of what course should be followed or which direction we should go.

MR. SPEAKER: This being private members day, we shall continue with motion number (5) I guess on the Order Paper. I think the honourable member for Green Bay adjourned the debate last day and I understand that he has spoken for twenty-five minutes and he has twenty minutes left under the new rules to end his debate, except by leave, of course.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this resolution that is presently before the House can easily be seen by the length of time that we have been spending on it but because private members' day only occurs once a week very often we might tend to forget the whole resolution and the amendment thereto.

Just to acquaint ourselves again, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's North put this resolution on the Order Paper: WHEREAS the financing of election campaigns and political parties is a matter of vital public concern; AND WHEREAS members of this Honourable House have from time to time publicly advocated legislation to govern and control these matters; AND WHEREAS the Parliament of Canada has recently passed Federal legislation with the support of the major political parties: NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That this House request the Government

to introduce legislation to govern and control

(a) the public financing of election expenses; and

(b) the private financing of election expenses and other expenses of political parties with suitable controls involving: -

(i) disclosure of contributions,

(ii) the limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties.

As a result of that resolution and some discussion that ensued, Mr. Speaker, the opposition saw fit to move an amendment to it. The amendment was moved by the honourable Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the honourable member for White Bay South which read; " That all of the words after 'that' be deleted and the following words substituted therefor ." " That this House urges and requests 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 the legislation adopted by the House of Commons on the third of January, 1974, known as Bill C203."

Now there has been a great deal said, Mr. Speaker, on this amendment and on the main resolution really, as well as about the general election expenses, how the bill C203, what it means in actual fact, the Federal bill, whether this Province should follow blindly the lead of the Federal Government and just how we should proceed on the matter.

A number of ministers of the government have stood up and spoken on behalf of the government and more or less outlined the government's attitude and policy on public financing of election expenses. It is still our feeling on this side of the House that various measures are needed in this sphere but that we do not think that it is at all desirable that this amendment be passed, Mr. Speaker, whereby it gives the government thirty days to come up with legislation on an issue which will not affect in any way anything in this Province

until another election is called, a provincial election is called.

Of course, that provincial election, I submit, to be next month or the month after - so that the government has some time to look at the Federal Bill C203 and to read the verbatim reports of the discussions and speeches given in this honourable House on the matter and then to bring some legislation before the House before the next election.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, this is my own view as well, that there is no hurry here, that this amendment was only a ploy by the opposition to try to embarrass the administration, to try to make them do something which is of no great significance and in contrast to that wanting a great forestry bill which will be discussed later in this session of the House, a bill on forestry, the like of which has never been seen in this Province before, wanting that kind of bill, which will have some impact upon the economy of the Province, wanting that shelved while simultaneously saying to the administration, "Thirty days," the administration to pass a bill on election expenses, which will have no direct or indirect effect on the Province for the next year, two years or perhaps more.

So this kind of ploy, this kind of tactic by the opposition bears no great consequence to the administration. It is the feeling of this side of the House that and I think a number of the honourable ministers have said that the administration intend to get down to business on these election expenses, that they intend to try to rationalize it and bring some measures before the House before the next election on it. Hence we will vote against this kind of an amendment as it is now proposed by the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for White Bay South who seconded the amendment.

The number of points that have been

made, Mr. Speaker, on the election expenses, more or less are centered around three or four major points, one of which was that there has to be a distinction between those people who contribute to a political party - because on the one hand you have the individual, the citizen who is politically involved, who believes in the philosophy and the policies of a given party and who wants because he believes strongly in it, to contribute in a financial way to the success of that party.

So, we have on the one hand the individual contributions of individual citizens around the province who perhaps, I submit, should be allowed to continue to contribute to the party of their choice, because these contributions being rather minor ones, between \$10, \$20 or \$30 and so on and, of course, free labour that is involved during election time like this.

Then on the other hand we have the corporations, the businesses who contribute in a substantial way to political parties, not only I submit for the sake of having their philosophy or policy that they think a government should bring in and adhere to but when that party becomes the government, in actual fact to obtain from that government, that party in return, when it gets into power, some favour for the substantial sums of money that the corporation had given that party.

So, Sir, there is a decided difference between the two.

This is one of the points, Mr. Speaker, which have come out in this debate and which government should pay attention to when considering what kind of legislation it should bring in on it. It is the corporation or it is the big business in Newfoundland as well as in other provinces and in other countries which really paints the whole political process and makes many individuals and citizens around the province suspicious of the kinds of things that are going on in government. It is here that regulations or some kind of legislation has to be brought in.

Of course hand in hand with that then, if we say that something has to be done in this sphere so that corporations will not have a decided advantage within a given administration because of the substantial sums of money they have contributed, the only way perhaps that this can be stopped or at least curbed is through some kind of disclosure. That

it should be incorporated in legislation that businesses and corporations should have to disclose the amounts that they contributed to a political party. Then everyone being aware that company "X" gave \$500,000 or \$100,000 to a party, then if in the future when that party becomes the government and that it is soon seen that that corporation suddenly got a contract or whatever from that government, then everyone would have high reason to suspect and they would not have to go searching around to try and find whether or not in actual fact that business or corporation contributed money to that party because under the disclosure system they would know, The public would be aware of just exactly who gave what to whom and when.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very important distinction because I do not believe in my own mind that one should discourage contributions to political parties per se, because there is something to be said for quite a sizable number of individuals and citizens who want to contribute because of their own views, because of their own philosophy towards the maintenance of and pursuance of that political party in power. And that individual or that citizen should have the right to support both morally and financially that political party in its push for power, if you want, power in the best sense of the word.

Along these lines, I pointed out, the last day that I spoke, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely unfortunate that with our mass media and so on today, and of course perhaps we would not even need that to know - one only has to read the history of politics in Newfoundland over the last hundred years or so to be well aware of the shady deals and so on that are often done in the name of good government. But particularly now, Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear every day of Mr. Nixon's troubles in the United States, the Watergate Affair and other related matters to the Watergate which are almost as significant although they do not get the same press coverage.

MR. MARSHALL: One does not have to go out of Newfoundland.

MR. PECKFORD: No, one does not have to go out of Newfoundland when it comes to that.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the English situation right now in England and in the United Kingdom with the policy there, there is the allegation of corruption in that country. You have quite a bit of it in France and throughout all the Western World there seems to be risings to the fore an attempt by many people to get to the bottom of the corruptness that has been taking place in those countries.

So what has happened over the last five or ten years, perhaps it was true always, it seems to me over the last few years individuals, responsible citizens, taxpayers had become even more suspicious -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, count the House.

MR. PECKFORD: Sure the proper thing.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): We have a quorum.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order -

MR MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order because we forgot to put it in the rules. I think perhaps we ought to ask the honourable member for Bell Island what he is doing over there, when he is going to clear off his desk and make the contribution that he is obviously making for the third paper mill over there. It is absolutely terrible. Really, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid he is going to be buried and crushed under it. I think he should remove it forthwith, carry it to the third mill or -

MR. NEARY: I am setting up the barricade, Sir, to protect myself against the Minister of Finance.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on that point, if we are going to talk about election expenses, we are talking about creating an image in the eyes of the public. If we are going to do that and we have the honourable Member for Bell Island there with a stack of papers upon his desk there, it really does not look too nice, if everybody else had theirs like it -

MR. NEARY: Send over the Minister of Public Works to clear it off.

MR. PECKFORD: We will send over a truck tomorrow morning.

The point I was trying to make,

Mr. Speaker, was simply that regulations of some kind have to be brought in in legislation in order to show the public that the people they have elected are attempting to come to grips with this business of election expenses and with corrupt practices in government. I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that you can have whatever regulations you like, whatever legislation you like but if you have people who want to do things in an underhanded way then that will continue regardless of however much legislation we have. I think it would go some way to indicating to the public that the people they elected are concerned about this problem and are trying to come to grips with it.

The other point that was mentioned a number of times, Mr. Speaker, besides business of disclosure - I am just dealing with the principles - those people preparing the legislation can get down to the more detailed, although some details were brought up on this point as to when you disclose and how much must you disclose, should it start at one hundred dollars or should it start as one thousand dollars

and so on, the main point of the thing is that there should be some kind of disclosure so that everybody is aware of who contributed to what party so that then if any corporation tries to take advantage of the fact to that government, then everybody will be aware of it.

MR. NEARY: If the honourable members do not come to their seats, we have no choice but to ask for another quorum call. I am not going to do it because I do not want to delay the proceedings of the House. Sir, if they do not come to their seats, we are going to have to ask for a quorum call.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Bell Island was out of order that time.

MR. NEARY: Let us have a quorum call.

MR. PECKFORD: All right, we will call it then

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Stagg): The honourable member has about three minutes left .

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me that the time taken for the quorum count is counted as part of the speech?

It would seem to be that that is the case if I only have three minutes left. I ask for a ruling from the Chair on that point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Point of order: Mr. Speaker, before you rule. To the best of my knowledge, time taken out of an honourable member's speech, while a quorum is being counted, would not count as time during which a member is speaking. I bring that up so that the matter can be reviewed before a decision is made because it would be a precedent. We have a new rule now whereby there is a three minute pause while a quorum is being made. To the best of my knowledge, it would not be customary that that period of time during which the officials of the House count a quorum would be subtracted from a member speaking. To the best of my knowledge that would not be the customary interpretation of the rule.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order: May I point out to the members of the House, Your Honour, that it is being subtracted during the debate on the estimates or the discussion of the item by item of the estimates. Sir, if Your Honour should rule now in favour of the point of order that has been raised by the Member for Green Bay, you shall then have to add on all the time that has been deducted from the discussion that we have had so far on the estimates.

Sir, if the rule is to apply to both sides of the House, then the Member for Green Bay only has three minutes left and even that is three minutes too long, Sir.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point of order. I agree with the submissions made by the Hon. Minister of Education. I think the rules refer to the time that the member has to speak and not to the time that the House is in session. I think the rule with respect to time for discussion and debate on the estimates is the actual time spent by the committee so that there is a different designation; one is the time spent by the House and surely, as my honourable friend for Bell Island realizes,

it is House time but it is not time charged to the member. The House is actually meeting, we are all here, but it is not time that can properly be attributed to him in his speech. There is a distinct difference and I respectfully submit that the rule provides that the member has so much time to make his speech. The time my honourable friend is talking about is time when the House and committee are in session. I think there is a distinct difference and it should not be subtracted from the time.

MR. NEARY: There is one more point that I would like to make in connection with that point of order, Sir, the fact that there are thirty-two members on the government benches and when a member sitting on the government benches is speaking, at least they should have the courtesy and the member should see to it that his colleagues are in the House to hear what he has to say. It is not our fault over here, Sir, that they do not have a quorum in the House. They are getting paid, Mr. Speaker--

MR. PECKFORD: That is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They are getting paid, Sir, to attend the sittings of the House and the absenteeism I have never seen so bad, Sir, as it is this session of the House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Point of order: I would like to make a further submission before Your Honour rules and that is with respect to the position before us now. Now the rules, of course, have not been printed and distributed so I do not have them verbatim in front of me. But as I understand it, the two rules are: (1) That there are seventy-five hours for the committee to consider estimates. The committee consists of all members - that there are seventy-five hours for the committee. (2) No speaker, apart from the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition and various exceptions, may speak in excess of forty-five minutes.

Now to take a specific instance: Let us say that in committee an honourable member of any side is speaking and during the course of his speech he is interrupted five times by quorum calls there is, therefore, three times five, fifteen minutes of time. That is fifteen minutes of time occupying the committee but it is not fifteen

minutes of time to be subtracted, let us say, from the Hon. Member for Bell Island's speech. He is entitled to speak for forty-five minutes and if every ten minutes, three minutes is taken out while there is a quorum call, that three minutes does not count as the honourable gentleman's speaking time. It does count as part of the overall committee's time. That would be my submission. Obviously, we await the Chair's ruling.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before Your Hour's makes

a ruling which will be very important because it will establish a precedent in this honourable House, I would like to point out to Your Honour that if we followed the line of reasoning and logic just put forward by the Minister of Education, Sir, that what they are saying in effect is that all the government members could leave the House during the seventy-five hours we have to discuss the estimates and just barely leave nine or ten of us on this side of the House. The House could be left without a quorum for seventy-five hours, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Minister of Education is saying.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, Mr. Speaker, because if there were no quorum, then the House adjourns and obviously when the House adjourns no time is counted. Let us say when a quorum is counted then the rules now say there are three minutes before the count is announced. If the count is announced and there are less than a quorum, then the House adjourns. That period after three minutes when the House adjourns does obviously not count as part of the seventy-five hours.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker. My point is still valid.

MR. EVANS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that the member from Bell Island was absent for four days through no desire of his own and we still maintained a quorum. We did not hear half as much foolishness either when he was out.

MR. NEARY: I will have the honourable member to know that I have not missed one second of this session so far, not a second let alone four days. I am in my seat continuously.

Mr. Speaker, my point -

MR. EVANS: How did we get you out of a quorum then?

MR. NEARY: My point in response to what the Minister of Education said is still valid, Sir, because there are only ten of us on this side of the House. They could all walk out, Mr. Speaker, and leave five there who could wander in and out at their own leisure calling a quorum whenever they felt like it, interrupting the discussion of the estimates and leave us hamstrung on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, that does not make sense. I hope Your Honour will take that

into consideration when Your Honour is making the ruling.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, just to that point. I think the honourable member from Bell Island made a good point but it just works in reverse. For example, if the party with the majority so desired, they could effectively do what he suggests. If we made the rule that he asking Your Honour to make, then certainly the speakers in the minority in the House could suffer a serious hardship in that if you kept say five counts and you went out for fifteen minutes, which means that the honourable member for Bell Island who rarely speaks, spoke once for forty-five minutes and we called five quorum counts, he would lose fifteen minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, I am talking about the estimates now, the seventy-five hours.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes, I know but I am talking about the - yes, I see what he means. As far as the time of the speaker is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very, very important matter. I think the rules cover it. It is the time that the speaker has to speak not the time the House and the committee itself is in session. That is the point that we made earlier.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point. There are two separate issues here. The point of order raised by the honourable member for Bell Island, he is more concerned with whether they are going to lose time on the estimates when quorum calls are called by various members. Now, the point here, Mr. Speaker, is whether an honourable member when he gets up to speak on private member's day or a Budget Speech or a Throne Speech or some speech outside of the estimates, whether that -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Including today but not including the estimates. There are two separate things, whether the time is to be subtracted from the time he has for his speech when quorum calls are called or not.

Now, the estimates are an entirely different matter altogether I submit, Mr. Speaker. All I am asking Your Honour to do is to rule

whether when the quorum calls were called this afternoon here in the House whether that time should be subtracted from my forty-five minutes. Whether the other matter of whether it should be subtracted from the time for the estimates is a matter completely different from what should be of concern to what is right here now, Mr. Speaker. That is the point.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I am amazed at my honourable friend the Minister of Education, my honourable friend the member for Placentia East, Green Bay and Bell Island that they would even debate this matter because these rules were impeccably drafted. They are absolutely crystal clear, Mr. Speaker. An infant could almost understand them.

I think Your Honour will have to take this under advisement. When we are talking about subtraction or times there is a marked distinction between when somebody is speaking and their own time is limited and when the time of the committee itself is limited. I think Your Honour is going to have to, as I say, take this under advisement. It seems to me to be crystal clear anyway. That is the interpretation given so ably by the three members who spoke on this side would appear to be the most sensible one.

If we are talking about subtracting times, if we could subtract the member for Bell Island rather than subtract the time I think we would be in a better position. I think Your Honour is going to have to take this under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Yes, honourable gentlemen I think I have heard all the points or the basic two points of view which cover all the points of view. I certainly think it must be taken under advisement because a hasty decision on a matter of such importance will certainly be out of order.

For the interim, I think we will afford the honourable the member for Green Bay nine minutes more.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear correctly. Are you saying that I have nine minutes now to go rather than three?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Yes.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, fine because I was going to ask whether if you were going to take it under advisement, whether I would have that time built up for some other time to continue on this matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We could always adjourn to give the Chair a chance.

MR. PECKFORD: We could adjourn. Mr. Speaker, could I submit that you adjourn and take it under advisement and then you could rule so that this matter could be dealt with once and for all because otherwise it can still be argued and argued with some degree of force and validity, Mr. Speaker, that I still have more time than the nine minutes. So, it would seem to me that we should resolve this major difficulty with the rules posthaste, as quickly as we can, Mr. Speaker. So, could I have some ruling?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): I think the honourable member has now used two minutes of his time in his rising on a point of order. I will consider this matter over the rest of the day. I do not wish to adjourn at this time. The honourable member has nine minutes. It is as if he had won his point.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now, where was I before I was rudely interrupted by the honourable member for Bell Island?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member interrupted himself.

MR. PECKFORD: I did not interrupt myself.

MR. NEARY: He raised the point of order. I did not interrupt him. Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of keeping the record straight, Sir, I did not interrupt the honourable member. Your Honour said, "The honourable member for Green Bay has three minutes left." He questioned it and he raised the point of order.

So, would you please, Your Honour, set the record straight and tell the member for Green Bay what went on.

MR. PECKFORD: What I meant, honourable Sir, when I said that the honourable member interrupted is because of the quorum calls, that the origin of the whole situation, the prime origin of the whole thing rests on his shoulders and on his shoulders alone because the honourable

member had the audacity, the outright gall to call a quorum in this honourable House. It is unheard of in the annals of parliamentary democracy.

Just so I can clew up, Mr. Speaker, on this amendment obviously -

MR. NEARY: How much time does the honourable member have left?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Six minutes.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor and the right to be heard in silence? You are replying to questions from the honourable member from Bell Island while he was still in his chair.

The only other point I wanted to make on it - I was talking about individual versus corporation contributions to political parties. I mentioned the business of disclosure so that all would know.

Then the other point that is of importance here, Mr. Speaker, I submit is the business of limitation, how much should be spent on campaigns of political parties. Should there be a ceiling of how much an individual member should spend in a given district, whether there should be a limit on how much a given party should spend on a given campaign for the whole province and whether or not each member should be treated the same way? In other words, that if you decide upon \$5,000 say for example for each member in the province, whether this would be a fair allocation and limitation considering the fact that many districts geographically are larger than others so that the amount required in one district might not necessarily be the same as wanted in another.

Take for instance the district of St. John's Centre where perhaps one meeting or two would suffice and other districts of the province like my own in Green Bay where you have large distances to cover, you would need to hire halls and have many public meetings. So, there is a difference in cost there.

The other thing involves the media and whether there should

be a limitation on that or whether that should be contained in the overall limitation. In any case, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that I think government in its consideration of bringing in legislation should be guided by.

So, Mr. Speaker, we intend - at least I do and I think the majority of members on this side of the House intend to vote against the amendment as proposed by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, that we must bring in legislation within thirty days, because that is foolish and crazy and totally unnecessary at this time, in that it is government's intention to take this whole matter of public financing of election expenses under advisement and to consider bill C-203 and all the discussion and relevant points made in this debate and to come up with suitable, sensible, rational legislation before the next election to do the very thing that wants to be done. Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe most of the arguments that the members of the official opposition would want to make have been put. I just have a couple of other points that perhaps require some elaboration.

First of all

MR. SIMMONS: I certainly rise in support of the amendment which has been introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for White Bay North. There is no doubt in my mind that the original motion as presented by the Member for St. John's North is considerably improved by the amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to have a resolution which states in rather broad terms that the House request the government to introduce legislation. Anyone who has paid any attention at all to the debate, on the government side, on this particular motion must be painfully aware of the message coming through from the members from the government side. The message is clear.

The message is, "Yes, we will take it under advisement but we do not intend to do very much about it." That is the sum and substance of the message we are hearing from all speakers on the government side. It is that kind of thing that we in the opposition want to avoid and have tried to avoid by introducing the amendment and by thus giving to the House an opportunity to take a stand on a particular set of proposals for public financing of elections.

The Bill C-203 which is now law and which was passed by the Federal Parliament is one that has had the consent of all the parties in the House of Commons, The P.C. Party, the N.D.P., the Liberal Party have all supported the bill that we are proposing be the basis for the legislation here. It has undergone a considerable amount of study. We have not said that it ought to be word for word like that but similar to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been told that this amendment is but a ploy to embarrass the government. It would embarrass the administration. It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that it is not very difficult to embarrass the administration. We do not need motions to do that. There are all kinds of opportunities every single day of the week, if our game were one of embarrassing an administration, we would do nothing else. There are so many golden opportunities to do that!

A case in point is the one, just to take a present example, not at all the only one that comes to mind but certainly a case in point is the issue I raised during question period today the issue of the

proposed industrial complex for the Bay D'Espoir Area, one that has been espoused by Mr. Spencer Lake and his colleagues -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable member is not relevant to the amendment.

MR. SIMMONS: For my enlightenment, Mr. Speaker, I take it that this will be the procedure from now on that the matter of relevance will not require the interruption of another member.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): In reply to the honourable member, the issue of relevance in matters such as this has always been the rule.

MR. SIMMONS: As long as both sides are treated equally, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could we have a quorum call, please?

I am sorry. I am awfully sorry.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I presume that comes off my time or does it not?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): No! That does not come off the honourable member's time until the ruling has been made and it has been confirmed that this may or may not be the correct ruling.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the introduction of the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition is but a ploy to embarrass the administration. I say there are many, many examples, Mr. Speaker, if we wanted, if that were our game, to seek to embarrass the government on a full-time basis, there are thousands of examples, thousands relating to election financing and related to other matters as well. I could certainly raise the item that has been raised many, many times about the Saunders issue. No one can debate that that is not related to elections and the calling thereof and perhaps the financing thereof.

There are all kinds of examples that we could get into were the time opportune to illustrate that there are easier ways, more opportune ways, more frequent opportunities to embarrass the government if this were our game. No, Mr. Speaker, our game is clear and it is serious. It is to put before the House a set of guidelines for the House to consider. Unfortunately the speakers for the government side have not seen fit to consider them. The only one criticism, two if you like,

the only two criticisms of the Federal Bill C-203, the only two that I have heard from the government side are (1) it is a different situation because the province has no jurisdiction in communications and so on. Well that is a point that must be obvious to anybody who got any brains at all; that it is obvious that the opposition are not suggesting that we take those items that do not apply to us. Nothing would be more ridiculous.

The other argument that we are hearing from the government spokesman is that thirty days is not enough time. We think thirty days is enough time. If thirty days be not enough time in the opinion of government people, where are the amendments to the amendment? Do they want forty-five days? Do they want sixty, ninety? I have heard no suggestion from any of the government people, government members, that they would be in favour of it if it were over a longer period. Now I do not know to what degree I would be prepared to go in terms of time. I would have to hear the amendment first.

But I invited a member of the government side to introduce an amendment to this affect. If it be the time shortage that is bothering them, our concern on this side is that the thing be done within a reasonable time period, not over the next year or so. We are told, "We do not know when there will be an election." I do not expect an election soon. I would like to have one soon. All of us on this side would like to have one soon but I do not expect one very soon because I do not think the Premier wants to call one very soon. I think he has got some very good reasons insofar as he is concerned for not calling it very soon. I think he would come off quite badly if he called it fairly soon. I can understand his logic for not wanting to call the election.

But it is one thing for government to say, we do not intend to call the election and quite another thing for government to presume there will not be an election because there could well be a set of circumstances in the not too distant future which would precipitate an election quite before the time the government had in mind or the circumstances could change to a degree that government would see fit to call an election sooner than it thinks right now. As it stands now they will go right to the

wire, Mr. Speaker, go right to the five years if they can. They will hang on to the very last inch, Mr. Speaker.

But circumstances could change. For some reason, we do not know now, there could be an election a lot sooner than we think. Government, of course, want to delay the election. This is evidenced by the lack of action on the Redistribution Bill, it has been ready for several months now. Certainly government cannot plead that they cannot find the persons to do the drafting.

If there be one bill that requires very little drafting beyond the stage at which the commission presented it, it must be The Redistribution Bill. The boundaries are established. The wording is established and I fail to see what a draftsman could do with it anyway. It is obvious that the reason for the delay in introducing The Redistribution Bill has nothing to do at all with the difficulty in getting someone to draft that bill but rather it reflects another aspect of the government's fear on the whole business of elections.

They somehow feel, Mr. Speaker, they somehow presume that if there are enough reasons they are not ready then the election will not come so fast. So they shy away from a redistribution bill. They shy away from an amendment which would put this thing in proper perspective once and for all, which would put election financing down according to some established procedures and rules. Why? I will tell you why because the whole thing in sum total gives them the jitters about a subject they do not want to think about, the subject of the next election.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it cannot be done in thirty day. I am willing to be convinced. Perhaps it takes sixty. Perhaps it takes ninety. I invite someone on the government side to introduce a motion to that effect. I will say too that I look forward to supporting this kind of an amendment. It is a kind of legislation that this House should be concerned with. It will do the whole province a great service. The sooner we get this kind of legislation the better for all concerned and in particular the better for the political parties involved in the election process in this province. Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think that the honourable member for St. John's North should be most sincerely congratulated for bringing in this resolution. It only reflects on the quality

of the opposition that they see the need of amending it. The resolution in itself I think was quite adequate for this situation although I do feel that even in the case of a resolution a question of this sort needs a lot more detailed study and certainly it could not be adequately dealt with within the thirty days terms of the amendment proposed by the opposition.

After all, many provinces and many countries throughout the world have been wrestling with this problem for a long long time and the federal government did come up with a bill, C-203, which I think was readily admitted, in all the speeches and reports that we heard on the discussion on that bill, that it was far from perfect. It was not contemplated that it would meet all situations. In fact I think it was accepted by both sides, all parties, somewhat with tongue-in-cheek that this might well prove not to be adequate legislation for a situation of this sort.

Therefore, I cannot see why the opposition in this House would propose the need of dealing with this matter with such great urgency and speed. We have a lot to learn probably from the experience of other provinces and from the federal government as to how this thing would work. Also, of course, I think we have adequate time to study it properly. There does not appear to be any election in the offing and there is no immediate need of an election, so why rush into this thing until we feel that we have given it proper attention, proper study and act with proper knowledge?

The honourable member who just sat down seemed to indicate that we were afraid of an election, that the government as such would not welcome an election and I noticed in several speeches which he has made during this session he referred to such things as a panic situation in Newfoundland, and the reason we were not bringing in redistribution, because we feared it and all this sort of thing. This is absolute nonsense. What the opposition are worrying about and it is quite obvious from all the speeches we have heard from the other

side is that this government is approaching things in an orderly, systematic and well-thought-out manner. I think this is borne very much to the forefront by the nature of the resolution brought up by our honourable friend from St. John's North.

This, in my opinion, was a resolution which was meant to test the feelings of this House and it has led to quite good debate but it does not mean because we have had an opportunity to debate it that precipitated action should be taken of a measure of this extreme importance and long lasting significance. Perhaps as one of the members on this side of the House who has had the experience of working as a Liberal member and as a P.C. member, I am one of the fortunate few who can compare the way elections are conducted and I more than anybody else would feel that there is need of adequate control of election expenses.

The public as a whole, it is quite evident from everything you see and read and listen to, are gradually getting a very, very dim and poor picture of politicians. They are coming to the conclusion -

AN HON. MEMBER: A quorum call.

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

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of observation, this -

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member rising on a point of privilege or a point of order because there is really no such thing as a point of observation?

MR. MORGAN: Point of order, The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that we have been seeing these quorum calls continuously this afternoon. It seems to be a game with the opposition because since the House sat this afternoon in the opposition benches there has been no more than three members at the one time and I feel that these useless calls for quorum calls should not continue because it is merely a game on the part of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member perhaps was indeed rising on a point of observation not a point of order because it is not really a point of order. The point perhaps is well taken. It is just the opinion of the Chair that it is the responsibility of all elected members to see that there is a quorum in this honourable House. But the point raised by the honourable member for Bonavista South is not really a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: They are getting paid as well as we are. What for, I do not know though.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted, was the credibility of politicians and of course of this House has slipped very badly in recent years, not least of the reasons for which is the question of election expenses and the outrageous amount of money that is being spent by all parties in conducting elections. Before I go on with that, I would like to refer to the fact that what we have seen here this afternoon in the calling of needless quorum whereas the members are known to be in the wings is just flaunting the standing of this House. It makes it look ridiculous in the eyes of the public. Anyone who is sitting in the gallery must think that this is a bunch of monkeys.

MR. CARTER: Very low, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I submit to Your Honour that the member speaking, Sir, is not relevant to the amendment and that it is the duty of every member in this House to be

in his seat every possible moment during the sittings of the House, Sir. It is up to the government to maintain a quorum in this House. They have thirty-two members and they have been continuously absent from the House. I would submit, Sir, that the member is completely out of order. I would ask Your Honour to enforce the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is aware of the rule of relevancy as I just stated and as perhaps just suggested by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. It is the duty of every honourable member of this House, that includes both sides of this House, to see that there is a quorum present.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I most certainly bow to your ruling. I feel that the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Bell Island was not at all necessary. It just goes to illustrate.

I am talking about election expenses, expenses of Government and expenses of conducting this House, which are all relevant to the same subject. I wonder has anybody ever stopped to consider that when we have foolishness of the nature that has gone on during this session of this House, when the House is not doing business for minutes on end and for long periods, just how much that is costing the public. I wonder has anybody ever stopped to figure what this House is costing to operate every minute that it sits and we are not entitled, as members elected by the people of this country to waste their time or their money. This is the point that I am making. It is making a shambles of this House. It is absolutely ridiculous.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I am sure the Hon. Member for Bell Island is well aware that when a member is speaking, he does have the right to be heard in silence. I suggest that he pay strict attention to that rule.

MR. EARLE: The question, Mr. Speaker, of election expenses is closely related to all the expenses of conducting political campaigns and trying to get a party elected. As I was saying, I have had the experience of working both with the Liberals and with the Conservatives. Having been a member of both parties, I can make a very accurate comparison.

First when I went to Fortune Bay as the chosen member for that district, I was given a certain sum of money to conduct my election expenses. I was absolutely flabbergasted frankly by the amount I was given because I felt it was entirely unnecessary for a district of that sort. Quite frankly, in those days, in that section of the south coast I need not have gone to the district at all. My name could have been announced as supporting Joey Smallwood and I would have been elected without the slightest trouble. It did not matter who the opponent was. The only question that one was asked, to make a person feel absolutely useless and worthless was, "Be Joey's man." Being Joey's Man, one could get elected. That is all there was to it. It was almost kindred to hero worship of a sort that no sensible argument, no amount of money spent on election campaigns or no sensible approach at all could defeat it. I might say that that carried on for some years until younger people began to come along, began to get better educated and began to understand a little bit about politics. It is gradually improving to the stage today where an intelligent argument and a proper approach in an election campaign does now have effect.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I went down in that district I was given, as I say, by the Liberal Party of the day quite a sum of money to fight the campaign. I think that the treasurer of the Liberal Party got the biggest fright in his life because after the campaign was over I returned to him \$700, which was completely unheard of that a member for a district came back with \$700. I could not spend it. I did not know what to do with it so I gave it back to the party.

Now I ran a second campaign in Fortune Bay and at that time I was given about the same amount of money and I returned

to the treasurer of that party, after that election, which I won by acclamation, incidentally, \$600 or \$700 because it could not be spent in that election.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that in the intervening years the cost of election campaigns, through the behaviour of governments and parties, has accelerated beyond all reason. It is looked upon now in many sections of the country, an election is looked upon as a new industry. It is a place for everybody to milk what they can out of the province while the going is good. If one took the case of hiring halls or hiring boats or getting help of any sort, the amounts that are asked are simply astounding. Normally one would expect to hire a parish hall in any small place for perhaps \$20 or \$25 for a night. It is nothing at all to be asked for \$100 or \$150 now to hire a hall for a night. The same goes for every aspect of campaigns. The people have cottoned on to this and it is a reflection on the quality of politicians that this sort of, I might add dishonesty has been fostered in our people.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the people of Newfoundland and the people of all the Provinces of Canada look upon politicians with such absolute distain. They feel that they will do anything to get elected and will spend money without reason. I think it is high time and in fact it is long past due that some means be found to limit the amount of money that is spent on election campaigns. If one cannot attract to politics people that will behave in an ethical manner and spend money properly, there is only one solution to it and that is that they must be legislated into spending money properly. I would like to see legislation that would limit the amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, apart from everything else on the humorous side, it is an absolute unheard of assumption on the part of us as politicians to feel that we can blast the public day in and day out, night in and night out, with all sorts of rubbish. There is a great deal of rubbish talked about during election campaigns. We saturate

the airways, we saturate the press, we put everything else in the background. I think the only reaction of any normal person to a campaign of that sort is one of absolute disgust. What sort of people are trying to get elected to represent us when a barrage of this type is used to try to persuade our thinking. What in the name of heavens do they think of us! Do they think that we do not have enough intelligence to make up our own minds as to who to vote for or who the persons are who should represent us? I think the fact is that the reaction is quite the reverse. The people think; "Well for Heaven's sake! let us pick the least of all evils! Let us pick the fellow that appears to be somewhat sensible." They are not at all influenced by this vast waste of money. In fact, if anything, they are influenced quite the contrary.

Now undoubtedly in elections as in everything else, human beings are human beings and certain persons are always liable to be bought if that is what one should want to call it, and buying it is. They feel that they must get something out of it. This in itself is the very trend that makes politics so confoundedly distasteful. The fact is that when a man stands on that sort of a platform and indicates by his actions and by his expenditure that he thinks that people can be bought, they in turn after the election expect him to be bought. What I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, is that they expect him to react to all of their wishes because they will write him letters and say; "The next time mister, we will not vote for you" or "The next time, if you do not do this for our settlement or that for our settlement, you need not come down here again," regardless of the sense of the request, regardless of whether it is spending money in the proper way.

The whole ethics of politics has been outrageously offended by the fact that it has become a big-time power game. We have seen, it in the United States of America, the Watergate thing has been a very revealing revelation when the largest, most powerful and most wealthy nation has allowed politics within its borders to sink to such a low level. Here in Newfoundland, I suppose the Mainlanders would say or somebody would say; "Well,

They are a fairly simple bunch of people they go along with what is done in other places."

I think there is here a golden opportunity, a real opportunity with proper thought for Newfoundland to come up with some sensible legislation that might possibly set a pattern for other places. Now sensible legislation and a proper approach to such a big question as this is not something that is going to be thought out in thirty days. It is not something that could be rushed and it should not be rushed. That is why the resolution which was made by the opposition is so entirely ridiculous. It is completely in line with everything that they have said in this session of the House.

They are showing haste in every action and demanding haste because they think that by the cautious, steady, thought-out approach something may happen to this country that they do not wish to see happen. That is that the people may realize that that is the way this country should be governed, not through jumping on the bandwagon at every whim, not by catering to everybody's wish and not by jumping into a gap where things need to be done in unseemly haste.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution proposed by the honourable member for St. John's North is not in itself the complete answer to the situation. I support it but I would like to see it placed probably before a committee of the House so that they would study the thing in its entirety over perhaps the course of the next twelve months and come up with what we can really be proud of in the way of proper legislation for this type of action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think much more can be said on this subject because all shades of the thing have been given in this particular argument but it does come down to and here I am repeating myself but I think it needs to be repeated: It does come down to the fact that the unwarranted expenditure of money in the eyes of the public only takes away from the image of our political life in this Province. Extravagance of any sort is foreign to Newfoundlanders. Newfoundlanders are fundamentally a cautious people who like to see

their money well spent and properly spent. They do not like to see politicians or anyone else throwing it away. It is all very well to say that it is only party funds.

Party funds. My heavens! That brings along another thought as far as elections are concerned. Who remembers the great leadership convention in 1969? Well, literally millions of dollars were poured down the drain by the political party in power in those days, namely the Liberals, to elect a leader. That was the show to outdo all shows.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: It was a show which was a sham and a shame to all Newfoundlanders.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: The booze that flowed, the gratuities that were passed out, the things that were done will go down in history as the biggest item of shame that ever came to the Province of Newfoundland. I think this set the pace and set the tone for, it is despising by the people all politicians as such. You put on a three ring service, everybody enjoys the circus and they would love to go but they go to a circus for entertainment. They do not go to a circus to elect a leader of the Province because they think the circus is for clowns and they do not elect a clown to operate the affairs of their country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Unfortunately, the only clown we have seen in this Assembly is quite well-known to all of us. He comes from a little island over in the bay. The people will judge for themselves. When they see a clown they know one and we have all been well aware of clowning in this session of the House.

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy, do not be making a fool out of yourself!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Order! Shut up over there!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask your forgiveness for being distracted like this but naturally I have to react because anybody can take a certain amount of clowning but when clowning of this sort detracts from the standing of this House and the dignity of your House.

MR. NEARY: Can I raise a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the minister made a statement Sir, that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland provided all of the booze for the leadership convention in 1969. I would like to point out to Your Honour that it was the individual candidates, Sir, who paid for the booze at that convention including the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice and the former Premier and anybody else, Mr. Speaker, who was a candidate. The Liberal Party did not pay for the booze and the minister knows the difference of that, Sir. The minister knows the difference and I ask the minister to apologize to the Liberal Party for making such a nonsensical statement.

MR. A. EVANS: What are they going to serve at the next one? Ginger Ale?

MR. EARLE: To begin with Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement. I said that the booze that went down on that night, I did not say who spent the money on the booze. All parties spent money on booze. I said it reflected on politics generally.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can speak for my own party, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! This could very well drag into a needless debate. The point raised by the honourable member for Bell Island was rather late in coming. If he were rising on a point of order, he should have risen on that point of order immediately upon the statement made by the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, which he did not do. His point at any rate was not a point of order.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the only point of order in all of this is the fact that the gross extravagance, regardless of who spent it or what party spent it, is a general reflection on the conduct of politics

in this Province. It is, I am afraid, unfortunately following the example of not only Canada but most of North America which we have seen culminate lately in the sort of national disgrace we witnessed in the Watergate investigations.

So it should be quite clear to all people in politics that if this sort of trend should carry on, there is only one way to end it. We are all politicians; and that is something of the nature of Watergate investigation. Before any such investigation would be necessary in this Province or in Canada, I would hope that we would show enough political sense to put our own house in order. This is what this resolution is attempting to do. That is why I would support it most strongly.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of who says who pays for what, there is only one person that ultimately pays for all expenditure and that is the common, ordinary consumer, the man in the street. It is all very well for a political party to come out and run a huge leadership convention and spend millions of dollars and say, "Oh! This is party funds!" Party funds are only given to be recovered and when they are recovered the person who pays for it is the person who pays some contractor to build a public building or some contractor to do a government service of some sort, and this is well-known.

Therefore, the people who are footing the bill for that convention are not the people who show up so blightly at these affairs, who wave all the flags and do all the shouting, it is the man on the street who eventually has to pay them.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, why all of this political expenditure - and I feel very strongly on this point indeed, is reflecting so badly upon the political life of this Province. I suppose when I sit down people may say, "Well, this is senseless thinking. You know that life is as it is and conditions are as they are and you may as well live with them."

Of course I know that conditions are as they are. I know that

human beings are what they are but I do feel that when we accept the responsibility of coming to this House that we are called upon to show some example, some good example that may help direct people's thoughts to regarding politics as an honourable, decent profession.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no better way in which we could do it than to think out properly and come up with proper legislation controlling election expenses but not do so as has been suggested by the opposition, in a hasty, thoughtless manner which would not bring the results at which we are all aiming.

Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile.

MR. A. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss after all of the experience I have had in election campaigns if I did not contribute a few words in this debate.

I do not go back as a member of the House to the days of Dr. Seisnewald but I can remember when he was spirited out on an R.C.A.F. jet. Of course that gave the Liberal Party another twenty-one years extension of office. They would have gone out that year if they had not spirited him out of Newfoundland. He could have blown the roast right then.

Now; my first active participation in an election campaign goes back to 1956. I can remember quite as well as if it were yesterday -

MR. S. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, what about?

MR. WOODWARD: The honourable member is misleading the House. There were not any jets twenty-one years ago.

MR. EVANS: Well, you have them today but we do not have them now. So, we will have a fair exchange on that point, a vocal trade.

As I said earlier, my campaigning experience goes back to 1956. I had quite a district then right from Cape Ray down to Muddy Hole, almost down to Hermitage Bay. I came in here to prepare for the campaign, a greenhorn of course. I was given a check for \$500. "What am I going to do with that, boys?"

"Well, that is up to you. That is all we have." So, I went home. The first thing I had to do was arrange a long-liner. Of course, we have not got all the roads yet but we are getting them now. We had to use a long-liner to go right down the coast, about a twelve day trip. I got the boat for thirty dollars a day. Well, that took a nice chunk out of the \$500. Of course there was \$100 for nomination fee. I took in the coast.

That was the same year I think they just put the hand on the magistrates and hauled the two of them out of their seats and ran them. My opponent was created Minister of Fisheries in a fishing district about three months before the election took place. As I said, he was given unlimited money and a going fight in a rural district where, as Joey said, "You could send a yellow dog at the time."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, he did not say that.

MR. EVANS: Oh, he did. He did. The honourable gentleman might not have heard it because he was caught in the same category but he said it.

Anyway, I went down and I fought in the election. If anybody would ever take the trouble to look over the figures, I made a pretty good representation for our party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: No, I did not because there was one, what we would call more or less semi-urban section in my district. In the rural district

where the yellow dog was supposed to be paramount, I took a majority. Even in spite of the fact that when I got back I got another \$500. I made up a thousand. I really made good use of the bit of money that I had.

Now, in the next election, in 1959, it went down. Fortunes were getting worse. "Mr. Cost-Plus" had everything tied up. We did not get any donations for refuel. Most we got was from the federal level. In that election I got \$500 but they cut down the district a bit so I came out pretty well square, I guess, on the issue. Of course, there was a lot of fun in the election.

I remember one occasion in particular. I went into a community and this guy came along - I knew him quite well. He said, "Where is the rum, boy?". I said, "I do not have any rum." "Well," he said, "the other fellow got lots of it." "Well," I said, "boy, look if you want to vote for a liquor store, I am out. Suit your own mind."

There was only one thing that really did me a bit of good that time. I did not do any illegal financing, that is for sure. I was in one community and they were working on the road, working with their bit of road money that year. I said, "Boys, are you coming to the meeting?"

"No, Sir, we cannot come to the meeting. We are going to lose a couple of hours work."

I said, "Boys, do not worry, you will still get paid." Well, they came to the meeting. I only lost three votes in that community. I was the only fellow who ever paid them for a job yet without working for it. A holiday with pay, is it?

Now, I heard just now - it was brought up by my honourable colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs - about the amount of money that was spent in the Liberal convention. Yes, there was quite a bit of money spent there. There was a wisecrack made by the member from Bell Island that the booze was paid for by the members of the party. I do not know who paid for it.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Members. Oh, fine. Well, I do not know who paid for it but I believe I know who drank some of it because they are still in a befuddled state now after even four years more.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: John Crosbie, right?

MR. EVANS: Oh, no. He was not there at that time. He was running against the establishment.

MR. NEARY: Is it his colleague, the Minister of Justice, the honourable member is talking about?

MR. EVANS: The Minister of Justice ran against the establishment. He found out it was Communist and could not run for it. He went Liberal.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He did not have any booze.

MR. EVANS: He did not have any booze.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Yes but he paid for it.

I remember back in the 1966 election. I had \$300 in that election campaign.

MR. NEARY: Tories having a hard time.

MR. EVANS: Oh, they were. The honourable gentleman is still in the past.

I remember I was talking to a provincial government official in my district during that election and he said to me, "How much money have you got for the election campaign?" I said, "Boy, I am doing pretty well. I only have a small district you know, only about a hundred miles to cover by boat besides the road work and the halls and so on. I have \$300."

"Ha," he said, "your opponent is up there with \$8,500 in his pocket." I said, "Yes, and he will carry it back. He will not spend a cent of it."

"Oh," he said, "that is not half the story. The Premier and his staff stayed at the hotel here in Port Aux Basques for two nights and it never cost them a cent." I said, "Yes? Big deal. Does the hotel realize how much it is going to cost them? Probably \$10,000 to get the smell of skunk out of it."

Anyway, they won the election but I did not fall out. I came back in 1972 stronger than ever. Whatever time we call the next one -I do not think there will be any need of calling one when the five years is up because it will only be a waste of money anyway. It is just as well to leave us in for another ten years.

Regardless of the fact that we did not have cost-plus on our side or any of the rest of it, finally the people of this province saw that there was no alternative only to put a new government in. Of course, we fit that category.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The member should be Minister of Fisheries.

MR. EVANS: Well, I can fish. There is no doubt about that. There are some large fish on that side I must say. We will educate them after a while.

I give credit to my colleague, the member from St. John's North, for having the guts, pure, unadulterated guts to bring in a resolution of that type after the type of politics that existed in Newfoundland, the type of financing that existed in Newfoundland for so many years. Now, we have an opposition or the replacement opposition over there that want this implemented within thirty days when they were twenty-three years and did not implement anything only to get more and more money for election expenses.

As I say, I support the resolution in principle but at the present time I cannot see how it can be implemented. The day will come when there will have to be controls exerted. I think this resolution is a forerunner of greater things to come.

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, does the honourable "Snow White" member have something to say over there?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: The "Super-Taxer"? Mr. Speaker, this is a matter on which I think all members of the House should comment. Speaking with respect to the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, of course, Mr. Speaker, I have to vote against that. It is the typical ill-advised suggestion of the opposition to rush into something blindly without considering

the alternatives carefully and without preparing the policy carefully. They would have us do in thirty days I think it is, Mr. Speaker, what they and the party they support showed no intention of doing for the twenty-three years that they were in power.

New times are upon us, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that personally I support the motion that was made by

The Member for St. John's North where he submits the principle of election expenses, having controls on the private financing of election expenses, controls involving disclosure of contributions and the limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that these ideas appeal to me and I will explain why as soon as we get fourteen bodies in here to listen.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Will the Clerk count the House, please?

We have a quorum.

MR. J. A. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It was established some time ago, within the last week or so, that we do not have to necessarily ring the bell and count the House everytime an irresponsible calls for a quorum. The Clerk is perfectly at liberty to decide whether or not there are in fact fourteen members present. Then upon notifying the Speaker, the Speaker can then ask that the quorum bell or the division bell be rung.

So I think that in future, Mr. Speaker, we would be well advised to hesitate for a few seconds after some irresponsible member on the other side decides to call for a quorum for reasons best known to himself. I would suggest the reasons are mischievous ones and not at all in keeping with parliamentary democracy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have heard, I was going to say - no, I better not. Sir, I want to speak to that point of order. The procedure that is followed in this honourable House since the new rule changes came in, Sir, is for Your Honour to count the House and then ring the bell. That was the procedure that was followed on this particular quorum call. As a matter of fact, Your Honour took a little longer than usual because he could not find the button to ring the bell. In the meantime, Your Honour had counted the House or the Clerk had counted the House and then, Your Honour rang the bell, in keeping with the new rule changes.

I may point out for the benefit of the honourable member who raised the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty and the responsible of any member in this House or the Speaker, when there is not a quorum present in the House, to call for a quorum. As a matter of fact,

a government member called a quorum one time this afternoon, which is most unusual for a crowd that had thirty-two members, Sir, who cannot stay in their seats five minutes. This is the problem. It is not being irresponsible, it is being responsible, Sir. We have to keep the government members in their seats. That is why we are having quorum calls, due to the absenteeism in this House by government members.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if that squall has passed, maybe I can continue with my -

MR. NEARY: I am ruling on the point of order, Sir. Could we have a ruling?

MR. BARRY: There is no point of order there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The Member for St. John's North raised a point of order, Your Honour has not ruled on it.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I mean the procedure is quite clear. I do not know what the honourable Member for Bell Island is getting excited about at all. The fact of the matter, when a quorum call is called, Mr. Speaker looks around the Chamber, the Clerk or the Assistant Clerk of the House looks around in the Chamber, if there is not then a quorum present, the bells are rung in accordance with the rules. The division bells are rung, as they are rung in most other jurisdictions and you have three minutes within which to do it. I do not see the necessity for the honourable Member for Bell Island to be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not see really the necessity, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable Member for Bell Island, I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is absent, the honourable Member for White Bay South is absent. He is exercising his putative leadership of the party maybe but I do not think there is any real need for him to get excited. I think that is the situation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not so. It is either a point of order or it is not a point of order. The Chair has to rule. The Chair could say, "No, it was a foolish opinion expressed by the Member for St. John's North. It was just squirting out his poison and his dirt again." But the Speaker has to say something. It is either in order or it is not in

order.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: To that very point of order, all I was saying was we do not need to react like padlocked dogs every time somebody says, "Oh, Mr. Speaker, is there a quorum?" I could get up right now and say, is there a quorum? If I followed the procedure, we have been following all afternoon the House would have to recess for three minutes, the division bells would have to be rung, the House would have to recess for three minutes and I think it would be irresponsible of me to do so.

By the same token I am saying that it is utterly irresponsible for the Member for Bell Island to be constantly crying "Wolf".

MR. NEARY: Your Honour would have to rule whether it is a point of order or not or whether it is just foolishness on the part of the Member for St. John's North.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The points were well taken on both sides of the House. I think the procedure was followed. There was not a quorum in the House. The bell was rung. Three minutes elapsed and we had a count and a quorum was here.

So the point of order by the Member for St. John's North was no point of order.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I think the excitement of the up and coming Leadership Convention must be getting to the honourable members on the other side of the House. Of course, I hear they have been having internal problems as well, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I believe, the honourable Member for Hermitage was suspended from the Liberal caucus, I heard indirectly -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, is this relevant to the amendment that is before the House? I would like for Your Honour to give a ruling. The member should sit down when a point of order is raised.

MR. BARRY: He is right! He is right!

MR. NEARY: Will the honourable minister take his seat?

MR. BARRY: I am sorry.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they have to learn the rules of the House and they may have to do it the hard way, Sir. But the minister is out of

order, Mr. Sneaker. He is not relevant to the amendment and I would like for Your Honour to rule on that point of order, please?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I think I would submit that I should be permitted to finish what I have to say, then Your Honour can determine whether it is relevant or not. I had just gotten started when the honourable member cut me off, so if I could, I think I can very well show how it is relevant to this motion that is before the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The Chair would like for the member to continue and possibly he can establish the connection here in the statement he just made.

MR. BARRY: Well actually, Mr. Speaker, it was like this: As I heard it the honourable Member for Hermitage was suspended from the Liberal caucus for thirty days.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: The reason was that he was caught running through the lobby of the Confederation Building down here saying that the Leader of the Opposition is incompetent. "The Leader of the Opposition is incompetent." They suspended him for thirty days, five for telling secrets out of caucus and the other twenty-five are for insulting the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this is relevant because, I think if we had proper controls over election financing -

AN HON. MEMBER: You would not have people like that -

MR. BARRY: The members on the other side of the House would not have the money to waste in having leadership campaigns because they would be forced to see that they have a leader there in the Member for Bell Island who

you know will receive the outstanding support of I am sure ninety per cent of those attending the Liberal Leadership Convention and it is complete and utter waste of time for them to be engaging in a leadership convention. The member for Bell Island has it by acclamation as far as this side of the House is concerned. Does he not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal Party deserves it.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the motion introduced by the member for St. John's North is a timely one. I think it is a proper one. I have to be frank and say that the ideas that are contained in his motion involve my sympathy. I support the idea of public financing of election expenses. I support the idea of requiring disclosure of contributions and I support the idea of limiting the amounts that candidates and parties are permitted to expend in election expenses.

Mr. Speaker, if I could give my reasoning for this, I will do this shortly but I think first I would like to clear up a few matters that have been raised in the press since this debate started. I think we have some confusion here in Newfoundland and probably off in other places between patronage and corruption, bribery, graft whatever kind of corruption. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be trying to spit against the wind to try and distinguish between patronage and corruption but I submit it is something that we should attempt to do because what this motion that is before the House is designed to do and the suggestions contained therein are I submit, designed to do away with the undesirable aspects of patronage. It has nothing to do with corruption. This in no way will prevent individuals, if they be so inclined, from becoming criminals, becoming corrupt, misusing and abusing their offices, but it could, Mr. Speaker, do something to alleviate some of the harmful aspects of patronage and for that reason we should attempt to look at the differences, if any, that there

exists between patronage and corruption, why should we distinguish between the two.

Well, Mr. Speaker, patronage has already been defined. One definition has been given by the Leader of the Opposition as meaning the support obtained from a patron or the power or the right of distributing office, a more specific definition usually applied to political office. It boils down to, Mr. Speaker, the granting of favours in return for favours previously granted or favours hopefully to be granted in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at first glance this might appear to be corrupt in itself. My submission is that patronage can become corruption if carried to extremes. Patronage can be carried to corruption if a proper balance be not kept but I submit that patronage in itself is not corruption because if that were the case then we should have to say just about every man, woman and child in Newfoundland, in every province of Canada and probably every part of the civilized world would be corrupt because patronage exists at every level of society.

There is patronage when you have individuals going out looking for employment, when they come and ask for a recommendation from somebody in a particular position they are asking for patronage. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. Where patronage does become wrong and where patronage is undesirable is when it comes into areas of activity, as for example in government, and you have decisions being made on the wrong basis. You have where there are two men for example who are looking for a particular job and one man is obviously more competent, more capable of performing that job than the other. I think that the accepted ethic, Mr. Speaker, would be for the more competent individual to get the job, particularly if that is in the public service since to have something else occur would be to have the best interest of the province not being looked at.

But, Mr. Speaker, what if you had a situation where there

were two individuals and there was no one distinguishing characteristic between the two except the fact that one had done you a favour and the other had not. This could be in business, somebody looking for a job or it could be in government, somebody coming to government and looking for something. Again it could be a job or it could be something else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that all other things being equal, you will see the favour being given or the job being given or the thing being done for the individual who has done the person in power the favour. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is human nature and that, Mr. Speaker, is not necessarily corruption. I submit it is not corruption.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, and I make no bones about it, that while it is not easy to reach that stage where you are certain you are at that stage but I say and I make no bones about it that I will probably be guilty of political patronage because when it comes down to the case of my having to, and I say again all other things being equal, having to choose between doing something for an individual who has supported me in politics, supported me in an election and an individual who I do not know from Adam or who has not supported me or who has worked against me, then, Mr. Speaker, if I can without harming the public interest, and that is why I stress all other things being equal, if I can I am going to

look with favour on my supporters. I think it pure hypocrisy and lack of sincerity on the part of any individual who denies that this happens. You have for example, Mr. Speaker, a choice of nominating a person to fill a particular position, a particular board. Who are you going to suggest to put on the board, Mr. Speaker? Are you going to go and pick out individuals who have worked against you in the last election, who have denounced you for being something less than human in the course of the election, who have done everything but put splintered glass in your beer in order to avoid your getting elected? Are you going to put those people up, Mr. Speaker, for nomination for this particular board or office? Are you going to go out of your way to do that? Or are you going to look with somewhat more favour on individuals who have been out because - not because they were out for their own particular interest, I hope, but because they took a civic interest in the election activity and they thought it was either time for a change or they wanted to see you elected for one reason or other? They went out and they worked for you. You admire their philosophy of life. You respect them as intelligent, hard working individuals.

Now what is wrong with your saying, you know, "I like that guy. I respect him. I think he is intelligent. I think he can do a good job. I am going to nominate him. I am going to appoint him to that board." Is there anything wrong with that? Mr. Speaker, that happens every day. It has happened every day in the past and it is going to happen every day in the future, because there is absolutely no way you can prevent it happening, Mr. Speaker. As soon as you have a discretion being put in, as an individual then you have to recognize that there are certain traits of human nature. You have to realize that people make decisions based on the realities of life, such as their personal attitude towards individuals. I do not mind admitting that I am human. I suspect, I think, I am not sure, but I suspect some of the honourable members opposite are human.

AN HON. MEMBER: No boy, we are not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some of them.

MR. BARRY: This is why I cannot understand why there has been all this beating around the bush about what is involved here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down and do not be so ...

MR. BARRY: How do people get jobs, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland or anywhere else? Well I think the common saying is; "It is not what you know it is who you know." Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunately true to a great extent. Now I do not agree with it, that it is good. That is why I get back to all other things being equal. Because unless you have a hiring practice or unless you have a method of making decisions generally, whether it is related to jobs or not, that gives you an opportunity to evaluate the merits of the various individuals applying for the job or for whatever you are making the decision about is, unless you have a process whereby you can determine where respected individuals fit and how they compare with each other, then you are just making arbitrary decisions, you are not making decisions that are going to be in the best interest either of your business, if you are an employer hiring, or in the best interest of the province, if you are a government making the decision.

So you have got to have some sort of fair hiring practice, I would submit in a case of a business, unfortunately, in all too many cases these fair hiring practices do not exist. You have jobs being obtained by individuals who either have relatives working in the position where they are going looking for work or they have friends working in the position they are going looking for work. These people in turn talk to the personnel manager or the manager of the business or so on, "Can you take on my nephew? He is looking for a job. Can you take on my sister's husband? He is looking for a job. Can you take on my brother-in-law?"

All of these decisions, Mr. Speaker, are made from day to day. Now I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that I expect this to stop. I am not saying in fact that there is anything very wrong with that, with my trying to find a job for a friend who is in trouble because he cannot find employment. Or for you, Mr. Speaker, finding a job for a relative or a friend of yours who is in dire need or want. That is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing to apologize for, for doing that.

But what I say is wrong, Mr. Speaker, is if you have a system where this is the only way that decisions are made. Now I do not think we are at that stage in Newfoundland, I do not think that all decisions are made that way. I think that we do have certain procedures that try and get a fairer method than pure patronage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: You have, Mr. Speaker, an attempt in government to do it by way of a Civil Service Commission, to hire, interview applicants for jobs and determine their qualifications and so on before the choice is made.

You have in the case of many businesses, you have personal officers who advertise the position that is available and interview people looking for the job. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are far from the ideal in Newfoundland either in government or in the case of private enterprise, in the way these decisions are made.

In other words, you have patronage, Mr. Speaker. You have patronage. You have the dispensing of favours by individuals to other individuals, who in turn will presumably return the favour or have already previously returned the favour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to this just to try and point out how I see that there is a difference between patronage and corruption. What I have been talking about here is not corruption. What I have been talking about up to now with respect to practices in hiring and so on is not immoral, is not illegal, it is not even fattening.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And look like him. Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed by the horrible harasser

AN HON. MEMBER: we have been suffering long enough.

MR. BARRY: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a danger in the media, there is a danger in members of this House getting up and at the drop of a hat saying, "Corruption, shocking corruption, terrible corruption," when what they mean is patronage, patronage which can be criticized but which should not be confused with corruption.

MR. NEARY: Why? What is George McLean? There is a corrupt practice. This is patronage leading to corruption - corruption of a high authority.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: There are three lost causes, Mr. Speaker, in this House - three lost causes, all sitting opposite.

MR. NEARY: Now granted Cabot Martin is patronage, George McLean is corruption.

MR. BARRY: The honourable member has his opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have patronage as I said occurring daily in private enterprise, in government. But where

it becomes wrong, Mr. Speaker, where it becomes bad is when decisions are made where all things are not equal, when you have decisions made to hire an individual solely because he worked for you in an election campaign or solely because he made a political contribution or solely because he is your brother-in-law or solely because he is a friend of yours.

In all of these cases when you have decisions made solely for that reason, then that is where patronage is becoming wrong. That is where patronage, in my opinion, is not acceptable. That is where patronage, in my opinion Mr. Speaker, is not acceptable, when it reaches the stage where all other things are not equal.

MR. NEARY: What about Nutbeam?

MR. BARRY: I did not refer to Mr. Nutbeam. The honourable member has had his chance to speak and will have another opportunity, I am sure, to speak. If he would sit back and learn for a while he might have some material to use in his next speech.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is a quorum here.

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

We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, patronage in itself has always existed, has always been with us and I would submit always will be with us but it is a question of the amount of patronage. When it reaches the stage where decisions are being made for patronage reasons that are not in the public interest, decisions made to hire somebody. I have said because they worked for you in an election, when they are not the person most competent to do the job in the public service, then, Mr. Speaker, patronage becomes harmful, becomes wrong.

So it is a matter of proper balance, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that this is one of the things the electorate looks at and bases its decision on in the following election. How did the party in power handle itself with respect to patronage? Amongst other things. If, Mr. Speaker, the party in power abused its position, made decisions that were not in the public interest, for patronage reasons, then I would

hope that the people instead of saying, "Well, they are my party and it will be my turn at the trough next," I would hope that they would say, "This party did wrong. This party did not govern in the public interest and this party should be replaced."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Here! Here!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to put my record as a member against any of the records on the other side of the House with respect to political patronage.

MR. NEARY: How about your government, friend?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say that any political patronage there has been on the part of this government could not even be seen, Mr. Speaker, if stacked up against what that other honourable crowd did.

MR. NEARY: That is not what the member for -

MR. BARRY: It could not even be seen, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we just would not get away with doing what they did and I say thank God for that! Mr. Speaker, this leads me to another point.

To a great extent, Mr. Speaker, what a party in power does, when we move to political patronage, to a great extent what a party in power does depends upon what the public attitude is, what is the attitude of the people, what will be accepted or what will not be accepted. This is where I see a danger in hysterical cries of corruption, you know, at the slightest glimpse of patronage because credibility is lost, the credibility of the opposition, the credibility of the media is lost by doing this. Save the cries of corruption for when we need it, when that other honourable crowd get in on the other side of the House. We will want to have that label then.

MR. EVANS: The honourable member will be too old to know anything about it.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the public is an interesting thing. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that things have gone on here in Newfoundland and things have become public in Newfoundland -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where are the other honourable crowd gathered?

MR. BARRY: Things were revealed to the public of Newfoundland, Mr.

Speaker, that hardly caused a ripple. I have to confess that as a member of the public, at the time some of these things were revealed I did not get as upset as I should have gotten.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Listen, will he sit down and let me carry on with my speech. I am having a hard enough time with the crowd on the other side.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is coming back. He is coming back. There is no other way. Yea! He is back. The leader is back, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY: Hail! The leader!

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there are things that have happened here in Newfoundland not too long ago that have been made public that put Watergate in the shade.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, -

MR. BARRY: That put Watergate in the shade, that put Mr. Agnew in the shade.

Well, one that comes to mind and it amazes me every time I think of it is that magnificent edifice on Roaches Line.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: On Roaches Line, Mr. Speaker. Now that building, that house that was built over there for the former Premier, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: What about the Mount Scio House?

MR. BARRY: By contractors who were doing business, Mr. Speaker, with the government at the time, who were coming to government and getting government contracts -

MR. NEARY: Does he know who built the swimming pool?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, and who were building a house, supplying labour and services and material to the Premier at the time -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Department of Agriculture, that is the truth.

MR. BARRY: Free gratis.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A second electric stove.

MR. BARRY: Favours.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That cannot be true.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, were these gentlemen philanthropists?

MR. NEARY: That house belongs to Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mention this to go after the former Premier, Mr. Speaker, he has troubles of his own. He has troubles of his own.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so low and dirty.

MR. BARRY: I am raising that

MR. EVANS: It is definitely clear water.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so low.

MR. BARRY: Is that not true?

MR. NEARY: It is not true. That house belongs to the people of Newfoundland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is the only thing that is.

MR. BARRY: Oh! When was that decision made?

MR. NEARY: Go down -

MR. BARRY: Yes, when was that decision made? After it all came out.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No, that is not much.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go into it. Look, I would get sick if I went through the garbage of the past like that. I do not want to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please!

Earlier in the afternoon I called the member for Hermitage to order because he was not relevant to the amendment under discussion. I suggest that the honourable minister has embarked on a course which is similar.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sit down when the Speaker is speaking. Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member is not sitting down.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): That the honourable member is not sitting down is quite true.

Having held this office before me, I would suggest he probably knows he is supposed to be seated. I also suggest the honourable member be relevant to the amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order and a point of privilege I would just like to point out for the benefit of the quorum calls today, there was nobody in the House on the opposition side for about five minutes and we could have just put the estimates through and the budget debate and the whole works at the same time but for the interest of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted in the records.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I accept of course your ruling with respect to relevancy but the reason I raise this, Mr. Speaker, and I would have made it relevant if the honourable member had permitted me, the reason this was raised was to point out the lack of outcry that went on in Newfoundland at the time that this was revealed.

Mr. Speaker, it is symptomatic because Mr. Agnew got caught in the same sort of trouble. Mr. Agnew, as far as I can understand, as second hand, as what we all read in the press, Mr. Agnew in the United States got caught doing something that had been normally accepted practice for years and years and years in the state where he was governor at the time. As I understand it, it probably went down after he left, but from other convictions that have taken place since then.

So, Mr. Speaker, what you had was Mr. Agnew getting nailed by a change in public opinion. Now I think that that is what happened to the previous administration. They were nailed by a chain to public opinion but it was not carried to the extreme of impeaching or prosecuting members who had been involved in this sort of thing in the previous administration. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if that sort of information came out today you would hear a hue and cry in Newfoundland that would make these rafters ring and I say that is the way it should be.

I really do not understand, Mr. Speaker, why people used

to accept that sort of thing happening in government. I say, Mr. Speaker, I hope they never have to or never will be willing to accept that sort of thing happening again. I was reading a book the other day called "The Lion and the Throne." It is a biography of Sir Edward Cook who had a very distinguished career in the public service in England back in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, no seventeenth.

They had a little episode there dealing with the impeachment of Sir Francis Bacon, I guess we have all heard of Sir Francis Bacon but we may not have known that he was impeached. Sir Francis Bacon was Lord Chancellor and it came out that Sir Francis Bacon had been accepting money from individuals in the Court of Chancery while their cases pended and he received other things other than money as well. In one case he accepted a dozen buttons. In another case a cabinet worth £800. In another case he borrowed £2,000. In another case, in a business between grocers and apothecaries, a fight between grocers and druggists, he borrowed from both parties, £200 from one and £150 from another. He had a case coming up before him - wine merchants, and he took fifteen kegs of wine and so on.

Now all of this, Mr. Speaker, was at one time accepted in England. It was accepted for honourable members involved in public service to take gifts from people who they would affect with their decisions later on. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir Francis Bacon, like I would say Mr. Agnew in the United States and others, had the misfortune to be in office at a time when public opinion changed, when public opinion was no longer prepared to accept such flagrant abuse of office. Mr. Speaker, Sir Francis Bacon had the great Seal of the Lord Chancellor removed from him and he had become ill and taken to his bed and he had hung the Seal on his bed post and they came into his bedroom to take it away from him and he said, "God gave it, by my own fault I have lost it!" Mr. Speaker, he was a broken man, just like the

honourable crowd on the other side were broken men, Mr. Speaker, after the 1971 and 1972 election.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we have now reached the stage in Newfoundland where people are prepared to have public funds spent on financing election campaigns. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of opinion amongst members of this honourable House, I think some members on this side of the House disagree with the position I am taking. But, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, there is just too great a danger of pressure being put on elected officials by their having to go out and request favours from individuals who will later be coming to them and requesting favours in return.

Mr. Speaker, however fair and impartial an individual wants to be, his job is made more difficult and I submit he cannot perform his task as well if he has had previously to put himself in a position of accepting favours from individuals whose cases he is later set up to judge or decide upon. I would say that any money spent on the public financing of election expenses, even if to do nothing else but take away that cloud of suspicion that attaches to anybody going into political life, would be money well spent.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to requiring the disclosure of contributions, I submit that this is a good idea because you then have an opportunity for the public to police the way members, ministers or members of government make later decisions because if contributions are disclosed and decisions are later made effecting somebody who has made a contribution, the public can look at that decision more carefully, and they will look at it. They will scrutinize it and make sure there was nothing improper went on. Mr. Speaker, you see examples now of cases that are raised in the United States where they had heavy election contributions made and then shortly after the contribution was made you had a decision by government to do certain favours for industry for example or for a corporation, do certain things that in law they could do, nothing illegal about it,

but Mr. Speaker, if that contribution had been disclosed before government made the later decision, you can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that the public would be looking at that decision very closely to ensure that it was not being made just because of the election contribution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties, I think there is only so much money that can be spent usefully in an election campaign. One could probably spend every copper you could haul out of Fort Knox but

I say one can only spend usefully a certain amount. That is a reasonable amount. It is not an exorbitant amount. I think for that reason to avoid wasteful spending, spending on buttons and posters and all sorts of paraphernalia that one has a tendency to overdo, I would say that it would be good in the public interest to limit the amount that could be spent by candidates or by political parties.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable minister permit me to interrupt him?

Even including the various quorum calls, the honourable member has spoken as I have just learned for some forty-five minutes. If the House wish to grant him leave to continue, I am sure they have only to ask.

Does the honourable member have leave to continue?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is making a little bit of sense now, Sir, so, we will agree that he carry on for another few minutes.

MR. BARRY: I am almost finished here, Mr. Speaker. The limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties would be in the public interest. It would limit the amount of harassment that the electorate gets from television advertising, radio advertising and so on. Although I must say that some of the money that is thrown around in election campaigns I see as a sort of income redistribution. I think that the public, the average person, the ordinary man on the street benefits when an election comes around and that there is some cash moving from one pocket to another, a little redistribution of income, a few jobs created.

I think, Mr. Speaker, by and large there is an awful lot of waste goes on during elections as well. I say that for that reason there should be controls placed on the amount that can be spent by candidates or by parties.

Now, I have not bothered, Mr. Speaker, to go into the mechanical details of how you insure that you do not have nuisance candidates and so on. All of that can be worked out very easily, Mr. Speaker. It

boils down to your establishing certain principles, the principle of democracy, the principle of giving individuals an opportunity to run regardless of their means, regardless of their income. This is a very important point, Mr. Speaker.

One wants to have the election of candidates less dependant upon the establishment, less dependant upon monied interests, less dependant upon the status quo. If one wants to have freedom, democracy, Mr. Speaker, one wants to be able to permit individuals to feel that they can make a contribution to public life, get into it without being financially ruined by taking that step. There are all sorts of ways of avoiding nuisance candidates, Mr. Speaker, some of which have been used in the federal legislation. We do not automatically have to go holus-bolus and follow the federal legislation. We can get our own devices.

The main objective is to give anybody who is sincere and conscientious and honest in his desire to serve the public an opportunity to run and to give the public an opportunity to vote for persons who are in politics not to get something for themselves, not to promote their business interests or their law practice or whatever but to serve the public.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this sort of thing will be done and will be helped if we have public financing of election campaigns for anybody of any income level. They can be assured of support, financial support if they want to put themselves before the public and offer their services for election.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to compliment the member for St. John's North on submitting this motion to this House for consideration. I can say that it is a matter that I have been talking about for some time and that I intend to continue to lobby for. I, Mr. Speaker, hope that the members of this honourable House give the honourable member from St. John's North, give his motion support but, of course, vote against the amendment proposed by the opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the members want to vote on the amendment

we would be agreeable on this, or they can close it off or whatever they want.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this the wish? Are there any other members who wish to speak to this amendment? Maybe the honourable government House Leader might like to indicate -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I know there are other people who wish to speak on this very important topic. So, I suggest we call it six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Thursday.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 23, 1974.

Answer to Question 21 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

- (1) What is the total amount of money which has been spent to date by Government in restoration work on the vessel known as the "Kyle"?

None.

- (2) Were tenders called for restoration work that has been carried out to date on the vessel known as the "Kyle"?

No. No work has been done on the "Kyle".

- (3) On what date do Government expect any restoration work, outfitting, refurbishing and furnishing of the vessel known as the "Kyle" to be completed?

No work has been done on the "Kyle".

- (4) What was the cost to Government of the towing or otherwise transporting the vessel known as the "Kyle" from its former location to Salmon Cove, near Victoria, Carbonar district and to what person, persons or firm were amounts for the expense of such transportation paid by Government?

The vessel has not been moved from its former location.

Answer to Question 22 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

- (1) During the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 what is the number of moose-hunting licences that were issued to (a) residents of Newfoundland and Labrador and (b) non-residents?

During 1973-74 the number of moose hunting licences issued to (a) residents of Newfoundland was 9,692 (all licences for Area 3 (Harbour Deep) and Area 11 (Dashwoods) were not sold. (b) non-residents was 1,698.

- (2) During the aforementioned period what is the number of resident moose-hunting licences that were issued for each designated moose-hunting area?

During 1973-74 the number of resident moose-hunting licences, by area, was as follows:

<u>Quota</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Resident</u>
1380	Management Area 3 - Harbour Deep	1,037
681	Management Area 4 - Taylors Brook	555
370	Management Area 5 - Trout River	370
260	Management Area 6 - Corner Brook	259
430	Management Area 7 - South Brook	430
300	Management Area 8 - St. George's	298
611	Management Area 9 - Anguille Mts.	357

432	Management Area 10 - Port aux Basques	259
1088	Management Area 11 - Dashwoods	541
100	Management Area 12 - Buchans	48
175	Management Area 13 - Gaff Topsails	93
170	Management Area 15 - Twin Lakes	171
310	Management Area 16 - Sandy Badger	287
209	Management Area 17 - Millertown	143
250	Management Area 18 - Granite Lake	161
1190	Management Area 19 - Gray River	928
300	Management Area 20 - Round Pond -	273
370	Management Area 21 - Rattling Brook	310
100	Management Area 22 - Lewisporte	97
280	Management Area 23 - Bonavista North	281
420	Management Area 24 - Northwest Gander - Gambo	420
335	Management Area 25 - Bay D'Espoir	278
170	Management Area 26 - Long Harbour	121
340	Management Area 27 - Terra Nova	340
200	Management Area 28 - Black River	200
100	Management Area 30 - Burin Peninsula	100
90	Management Area 31 - Placentia	90
200	Management Area 32 - Cape Shore	200
290	Management Area 33 - Salmonier	288
260	Management Area 34 - Bay de Verde	260
510	Management Area 36 - Southern Shore	502
<u>11,911</u>		<u>9,692</u>

- (3) For each designated moose-hunting area, and for each community in which a licensee resides, what is the number of resident moose-hunting licences that were issued during the aforementioned period?

The records of licences issued are not maintained by community for the various moose management areas.

Answer to Question 28 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

For his Department and for each Crown Corporate Agency, Board and Authority the funding for which is provided out of the Votes for his Department or for which he is otherwise responsible or accountable to this Honourable House, what is the value of sums expended for advertising in the publication formerly known as "The Town Crier" magazine during each of the following periods:

- (a) January 18, 1972 to March 31, 1972
Nil.
- (b) April 1, 1972 to March 31, 1973
Nil
- (c) April 1, 1973 and as of a current date?
Nil.

Answer to Question 29 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

For his Department and for each Crown Corporate Agency, Board and Authority the funding for which is provided out of the Votes for his Department or for which he is otherwise responsible or accountable to this Honourable House, what is the value of sum expended for advertising in the publication formerly known as "The Newfoundland Express" during each of the following periods:

- (a) January 18, 1972 to March 31, 1972.
Nil
- (b) April 1, 1972 to March 31, 1973
Nil
- (c) April 1, 1973 and as of a current date?
Nil

Answer to Question 33 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

- (1) Was the length of the shooting season for rabbits extended from December 31 to the end of February during the past three seasons for those areas of the Avalon Peninsula north and east of the Witless Bay Line?

The rabbit shooting season as originally declared for the years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 was October 1 to December 31 except on that part of the Avalon Peninsula north and east of the highways running from Holyrood, C.B. to Witless Bay, where the season was October 1 to February 28 next.

- (2) Was the length of the 1973-74 shooting season for rabbits extended from December 31, 1973 to February 28, 1974 for any areas of the Avalon Peninsula other than the area being north and east of the Witless Bay Line and if so,

(a) what are the names of those electoral districts, and

(b) at the request of what interested parties, if anyone, did the Minister take such action?

In 1973-74 the rabbit shooting season was, as in previous years, with the exception that the late season area of the Avalon Peninsula was enlarged. The larger area lay east and north of the highways from Dildo, T.B. to Colinet, S.M.B. The general shooting season then was October 1 to December 31, but on that part of the Avalon Peninsula indicated above it was October 1 to February 28.

(a) The electoral districts added were:-

- (1) Part of Trinity South
- (2) Part of Placentia East (very small part)
- (3) Part of St. Mary's
- (4) Part of Harbour Main (part was in former area)
- (5) Part of Ferryland (part was in former area)
- (6) Port de Grave
- (7) Harbour Grace
- (8) Carbonear
- (9) Bay de Verde

(b) Interested rabbit hunters, individually and collectively, contacted the Department enquiring about the possibility of having a larger area for winter rabbit shooting.

Answer to Question 34 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as a current date, what is the total cost for

- (a) salaries, and
- (b) materials, services and other expenses incurred by the Government for the Silver Anniversary Celebrations of Confederation?

Salaries	60,608.00
Materials	339,168.00
Services and other expenses	192,229.00
	<hr/>
	592,005.00
	<hr/>

Answer to Question 42 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

Have the Government made a decision to declare the Harbour Grace gaol to be an Historic Site in accordance with the terms of the Historic Objects, Sites and Records Act and to arrange to have it acquired by the Board of Trustees of Historic Objects, Sites and Records for this purpose, and what is the nature of any such decision that has been made?

No.

Answer to Question 43 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

Since April 1, 1972, what is the value of all amounts which have been expended for refurbishing and outfitting the Fisherman's Museum at Grand Bank?

\$36,300 which includes \$27,600 in salaries.

Answer to Question 46 on Order Paper dated April 18, 1974

What was the cost during

- (a) the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1973 and
- (b) the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date to Government for transportation, hotel accommodation, meals, entertainment and other expenses for the hosting of groups of travel industry personnel including the agents and employees of automobile clubs:

Answer

(a) \$4,500.00

(b) \$5,750.00

This is Newfoundland's share of a National Programme financed jointly by the Federal and Provincial Governments.