



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome all visitors to the galleries today but I would in particular like to welcome six Grade X and XI students from the Mount Carmel High at Mount Carmel, with their teacher, Mr. Ryan. I would like to welcome sixty-two, Grade VIII and IX students from St. Francis of Assisi in Outer Cove, with their teachers, Mr. Croke and Mr. Rose. I have just been passed a note to welcome to the galleries, as well a delegation from the Town Council of Upper Island Cove.

We trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this statement will be of some length because of the complexity of the area in which I wish to inform the Legislature of government policy.

Last year the government announced its intention to improve the method of allocating teacher salary units and to improve the overall pupil-teacher ratio for our schools. In order to investigate the matter fully and to establish criteria for recommending changes, a committee was appointed last fall to examine present policies and to suggest appropriate changes. The members of the committee were: Mr. Cyril McCormack, Assistant Deputy Minister of Education; Dr. Phil Warren, with Memorial University of Newfoundland; Mr. Len Williams was President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association; Reverend W. J. Bellamy, Confederation of School Boards; Mr. W. C. Woodland, with the Denominational Educational Committee and Mr. Joseph Kinsella, who is a district school superintendent with one of the rural boards.

I am pleased to announce that the committee has concluded its deliberations and has submitted its report to me. Before I outline the exact measures we propose to take, as a result of the recommendations contained

in the report, I should say that the overall pupil-teacher ratio has been reduced considerably in the past two years. These are academic years I am speaking of.

In the academic year, 1972-1973, i.e., there were 162,818 pupils registered in our schools. Altogether, 6,648 teachers were paid from government funds. These do not include supervisory and administrative personnel attached to school board offices. This year the total enrollment in our schools has dropped to 159,523. This related with the decline in the birth rate. The number of teachers on our provincial payroll has increased to 7,113. In the last two years, therefore, there has been an increase of 465 teachers paid from public funds, even though the number of pupils in our schools had decreased by 3,295. I emphasize that this decrease resulted from a lower birth rate.

Mr. Speaker, this very significant increase in the number of teachers has taken place for two main reasons: (1) We have been providing additional teachers to school boards, which have established special programmes for children with learning disabilities; (2) We have amended our regulations to permit school boards to retain teachers even though their enrollments have decreased as a result of natural causes, again the decline in the birth rate.

I now turn to the recommendations of the committee. I repeat, the recommendations of the committee is what I will now outline.

The committee has recommended that a new policy be established for allocating teachers to school boards which shall have the following four components; the first component shall be an initial allocation of one teacher for every twenty-five pupils registered in a school. The second component will be the allocation of specialists teachers for special and additional programmes. The teachers provided under this second component will be specialists in a number of areas such as reading, home economics, music, industrial arts, religious education, art, guidance counselling, physical education, etc.

The allocation of specialists teachers will be based on the following scale; the first, if you wish, column, what I am reading is a column, the first item refers to school district pupil populations, and the second, number of salary units under this component. The school district with a pupil population of less than 2,999 - ten salary units. In a school district with a pupil population of from 3,000 to 4,999 - fifteen salary units. In a district with the pupil population 5,000 to 6,999 - twenty salary units. In a district with from 7,000 to 9,999 - twenty-five units. In a district with a population of from 10,000 to 14,999 - thirty salary units. In a school district with a pupil population of 15,000 and above - thirty-five salary units.

The third component will be the allocation of teachers for what is now termed special education, that is programmes for children with learning difficulties and disabilities, also for native children and for programmes in small, isolated, multi-grade schools, and this will be in accordance with policies which now exist.

The committee examined the policies with respect to programmes for children with learning disabilities, for native

children and for those in the small, multi-grade schools referred to, and recommended that these policies continue for the present.

The fourth component of the committee's recommendations was that there be an allocation of supervisory personnel to school boards and this in accordance with the following scale; 2,000 students and under - two supervisor salary units, 2,001 - 3,000 students - three such units, 3,001 - 5,000 students - four units, 5,001 - 7,000 - five units, 7,001 to 10,000 students - six supervisor salary units, 10,001 to 13,000 - seven units, 13,001 to 16,000 - eight units, 16,001 to 19,000 - nine units, 19,001 to 22,000 - ten units.

Based on present estimates of school enrollment and data on birth rate, these new proposals would provide over 800 teachers more for the children in Newfoundland than would be provided under existing regulations. The committee recommended that the proposals, which would cost approximately \$6.3 million, be implemented over a two academic year period. I wish to be very precise on this, I will repeat it, the committee recommended the proposals which I have just outlined be implemented in a period of two academic years. However, because of Government's desire to increase its expenditure this year in other areas and aspects of education, it has decided to implement all of the proposals as recommended but over a period of three academic years. In other words, the government has accepted the recommendations of the committee in total but has decided to implement them in a three year period rather than a two academic year period.

I now wish to outline the specific measures to be taken to implement the recommendations over the next three academic years.

Next year 1974-1975: (1) An initial allocation of one teacher for every twenty-six pupils, that is the first component; (2) One-third of the specialist teachers, referred to previously as a second component in the overall programme; one-third of them. (3) The allocation of teachers for special education (that is those with learning difficulties) and for native children and in small isolated schools in accordance with policies which now exist; (4) The allocation of supervisory personnel to school boards in accordance with present regulations.

Altogether this new policy will mean that next year, academic, we will be providing the school boards 300, approximately, teachers more than they would be entitled to under the continuation of present regulations.

In accordance with the recommendations of the committee, no school board shall be allocated fewer salary units next year than it has during the present year, 1973-1974. This is because it is not our intention that any school board entitled to a certain number of teachers when a new allocation programme is fully implemented should suffer in the provision of educational services during the interim or the feed-in period of the three academic years of which I was speaking.

In the second year, the academic year 1975-1976, (1) An initial allocation of one teacher for every twenty-six pupils; (2) The second component, two-thirds of the specialist teachers, or special on expanded programmes, in accordance with the scale outlined earlier; (3) The allocation of teachers for special education. These are children with learning difficulties or native children and for small isolated schools in accordance with policies that now exist; (4) The introduction of the fourth component of the proposal which is a scale for the allocation of supervisory personnel previously outlined.

The introduction of the second phase of the implementation of the new proposal will mean the provision of an additional, approximately, 200 teachers to school boards during 1975-1976.

In the third year, 1976-1977; the initial allocation will be changed to one teacher for every twenty-five pupils. Furthermore, the remaining one-third of the specialist teachers, provided for in the scale outlined earlier, will be made available to school boards. These measures will involve something over 300 additional teachers. This will mean that the proposal in its entirety, with the four components I described earlier, will be fully implemented.

Two years ago when this government assumed office the overall pupil-teacher ratio, which is the ratio which takes into account all the components, was one teacher to every 24.5 pupils. Starting next September, as the result of the first year of implementation of this new teacher allocation programme, the overall ratio, again taking into account all components, will be one teacher for every 21 pupils. In 1976, when the programme in its entirety will be implemented, the overall ratio will then become one teacher for every 20 pupils or fractionally less. It must be understood, however, that this does not mean that there will be only 20 pupils in every classroom in the province; there will be classrooms with considerably more students and there will be classes with considerably fewer students, depending on the subjects taught and the way that the students are organized and grouped for classes. It does mean, however, that classes will be smaller.

If I may, I wish to thank the members of the committee for their work in this difficult and important area during the past several months. It is my intention to have a continuing committee to advise upon the implementation of the new teacher allocation programme and to evaluate it on a continuing basis.

The government is committed to taking every reasonable measure within our financial resources to facilitate and encourage the improvement of the quality of education throughout the Province. I am confident that these new measures will enable both teachers and school boards to improve the quality of education for our children.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

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

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of The Special Warrants issued during the present financial year.

Once again our new departure is stricter financial controls, working out very well. The total of the special warrants issued this year to date, Mr. Speaker, is \$9,062,900.00 and I will table a copy of the summary of the special warrants and also a copy of each special warrant. We might find out, Mr. Speaker, that the special warrants authorized this year, to date, total less than 1.5 per cent of the estimates that were approved by the House last year and it is certainly a record when one looks at what have happened in the last ten years. I would just like to give a description of some -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman knows very well what the position is on special warrants. We used to have forty million or fifty million dollars every year. But the estimates now, Mr. Speaker, are being done as accurately as it is humanly possible. However there are still some changes, as there have to be, during the year.

Some of the special warrants that are issued as I might just describe, for example in legislative, an amount of \$20,000 additional is needed for salaries and allowances, and along with \$250,000 that is for group insurance premiums, that was required, Mr. Speaker, because the government adopted at the beginning of January a Group Insurance Plan for the Government, something that has been badly needed for a number of years now in which we share the cost of the Group Insurance premiums with civil servants and members of NAPE. So \$250,000 was required because of that new policy that was instituted on January 1.

There is an amount of ex gratia payments, \$253,000, under Finance. The explanation for that, Mr. Speaker, is that last year, in the budget Speech, the House was asked to authorize and did authorize an increase in pensions to those people who were presently receiving pensions from the Government of Newfoundland, ex-civil servants, teachers and the like. Since the legislation had not yet been amended the

payment of those pensions had to be an ex gratia payment.

There is a special warrant in Manpower and Industrial Relations for \$120,000 covering instruction costs and supplies and salaries. In Justice, a special warrant for the amount of \$140,000 for royal commissions. It is very difficult to estimate what royal commissions are going to cost.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Some of that is the Royal Commission on Labrador, some are other royal commissions that were paid for during the year. \$20,000 for the Electoral Boundaries Commission, whose report to the House we will shortly be debating, and salaries of the constabulary and Her Majesty's Penitentiary for amounts that were estimated too low, totalling \$335,000 altogether. Miscellaneous fitness and recreational projects, matters very dear to the hearts of this Government, physical fitness and recreation - there was

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And that account is included, Mr. Speaker, an amount for subsidization of electric power delivered to stadia, a great new step forward in the recreational policy of this government that was not in the estimates. So some \$200,000 are included for that purpose and for other fitness and recreational projects.

Salaries in the children's homes, \$200,000. There is a special warrant for trading supplies and produce in the Northern Labrador Affairs Division of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation, \$1,100,000. That amount - they underestimated, apparently, the amount that would be needed for trading supplies during the year for Northern Labrador. Apparently, the position is now that there is a lot more money available to the people who live up there. They spend a lot more money. They, therefore, require a lot more supplies and varied supplies.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: But as against that additional expenditure of \$1,100,000,

February 13, 1974.

Tape 199

RH - 3

of course, there is the appropriation-in-aid, the price for which the goods are sold. The Canadian National Institute for the Blind, \$40,000, a special warrant. In Health, there were special warrants totalling \$5,000,000 - Newfoundland Medical Care Commission.

Salaries for nursing services \$300,000: Hospitals not operated by government \$1.6 million. Equipment and other services in hospitals not operated by government - some of that, of course, is because of increased wages and salaries during the year -

In tourism there are a number of small special warrants totalling \$572,000 altogether. The Silver Anniversary Celebrations \$203,000, Special projects \$201,000. I believe they relate to the museum and galleries.

AN HON. MEMBER: The "Norma and Gladys."

MR. CROSBIE: Right. The "Norma and Gladys," there is a large appropriation made in connection with this as the federal government is being persuaded by the efforts of the Minister of Tourism to extend additional funds to our museums and refurbishing the "Norma and Gladys" to be used as a travelling museum.

Wildlife, Historic Sites and so on; there had to be some small increases there. Grant in aid of library services increased \$50,000.

Provincial Affairs and the Environment is a special warrant totalling \$775,000. One of those items, Mr. Speaker, is for loans to co-operatives \$675,000. That was necessary to provide financial assistance to the Carol-Wabush Co-op Society, that was in financial difficulties. It also involved the Terra Nova Credit Co-operative Society. The government took immediate steps to investigate what the problem was there to take steps to correct it and to advance loans to the Carol-Wabush Co-operative Society so that it could continue to operate in Labrador City and Wabush. That is the principal reason for that special warrant. An amount also had to be paid to the Midland Consumers Co-op which got into difficulties in the Corner Brook Area. The rest of the items there are very small, are for small amounts.

Mr. Speaker, the total special warrants for this year - there may be one or two others before the end of the year, so they will be tabled in the House within three days after they are approved - is \$9,062,900, and is another example of the responsible financial

control which the government is exercising and the accuracy of the estimates that are being now laid before the House as compared to the old ways which are no longer with us. Here are three copies.

MR. EVANS: The days of cost-plus are gone.

MR. NEARY: What about the regional college in...

MR. CROSBIE: Special warrants for the regional college - no need of that. We can do regional colleges without special warrants. There will be a special warrant for the honourable gentleman some day and they will take him away. Is there someone to relieve me of these bundles?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: There is more to come. I would also like to table and I know the House is waiting with bated breath, Mr. Speaker, for the following regulations and orders. The Social Security Assessment Amendment regulations 1973: (I do not know if honourable gentlemen would like me to read these so they are read into the record of the House) Anyway, that is the first lot and there are copies for those that want them. Then there is the Retail Sales Tax Regulations 1973, and copies.

In the old days, Mr. Speaker, there used to be one copy tabled and we would scurry around to see if there was a government copying machine that we could have a lend of to get a copy of many of these documents but according to the new policy of treating the opposition with courtesy, care and consideration and with making the press's life more easy and more livable, (I hope they remember this) we are providing a couple odd dozen copies of all of these.

MR. NEARY: We will be up all night reading them.

MR. CROSBIE: The next set are the retail Sales Tax Amendment No. (2) Regulations 1973. As I mentioned in this regulation of simple interest (The honourable gentleman from Bell Island will be able to understand simple interest, I do not know if he would be able to understand compound interest. Mr. Speaker, there is also, the Retail Sales Tax

February 13, 1974, Tape 200, Page 3 -- apb

Amendment No. (3) Regulations. We are not sitting doing nothing, we
are - they are regulations all in order

order. These are not in simple interests. I do not think the honourable gentleman would understand those.

MR. NEARY: I know where the honourable gentleman made his money, compound interest.

MR. CROSBIE: I hope you are right.

The next set of regulations, Mr. Speaker, are the Retail Sales Tax Amendment, No. 4 Regulations. These deal with an exemption from S.S.A. Tax for aircraft purchased for use solely in transportation of fee-paying passengers in the province here. This was a great step forward, Mr. Speaker, because heretofore the only airline that had an exemption from sales tax in Newfoundland was Eastern Provincial Airways Limited. The other operators and there are six or eight others on the island, in the commercial business, flying business, had no exemption from payment, as I say, of tax when they brought in aircraft or spare parts. We saw no reason why there should be such discrimination. Therefore, we have amended the regulation so that no commercial operator, operating in the province, carries this S.S.A. Tax; rather than just having E.P.A. exempted.

The next regulations are the Retail Sales Tax Amendment, No. (1) Regulations. This, Mr. Speaker, this exemption, came into force on January 1. By this regulation the government exempted the people of Newfoundland from further payment of S.S.A. Tax, the seven per cent, on petroleum products known as furnace fuel and stove oil. This tax was imposed by the Liberal Administration on the public of Newfoundland who had to pay seven per cent each time they bought a gallon of furnace or stove oil. The present government, being all heart, has revoked that and granted exemption particularly in view of the recent trends and the price of heating oil and fuel. So, this is the Progressive Conservative Amendment that did away with the Liberal impositions of the seven per cent tax on furnace fuel and stove oil. The Minister of Finance is all heart is what that proves. I pleaded with my colleagues to allow me to do it.

The next set of regulations will be of some interest to some

honourable gentlemen opposite, particularly the member for Bell Island. They are the Liquor Corporation Regulations, 1973. We have completely reformed the liquor corporation and it is no longer now of interest to the honourable gentlemen opposite.

Then, here is another set of regulations, Mr. Speaker, of great interest to the honourable members of this House and to the "Evening Telegram" and those who stand first and foremost for the public interest. It is the Conflict of Interest Regulations, 1973, passed under the new provisions of the New Conflict of Interest Act, the first one passed by any province, the Dominion of Canada. Although it may or may not have some loopholes, it is a tremendous step forward. These are the first such regulations passed under the first such act in Canada. I suppose the honourable gentleman opposite has got snow blindness from looking at all the returns.

Then there is the next set of regulations - let us see, what is this - further regulations under the Conflict of Interest Act ordering that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, the Liquor Licensing Board, the Power Commission and Computer Services be covered under the provisions of the Conflict of Interest Act.

The next set of regulations, Mr. Speaker - this never used to happen until just the last year or two, Mr. Speaker, we never used to get anything tabled - is the Conflict of Interest, No 1 Order, 1973. It lists the positions that are clerical, nondiscretionary and non-decision making and therefore the occupants do not have to file conflict of interest statements.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Security Replacement Regulations, 1973. These regulations do, as the title indicates, deal with the replacement of security. If the honourable gentleman could take those.

Mr. Speaker, I also have great honour, as required by section 45, subsection (2) of the Financial Administration Act - I am required to report within fifteen days all temporary loans

raised under Section (44) and (45) of the act. The act, Mr. Speaker, is a fine piece of legislation enacted by this House last year and presented by the government. It was a complete reform of the Revenue and Audit Act. In accordance with it, I want to table a statement on loans for the period from April 1, 1973 to January 31, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that these are all temporary loans. The first one was borrowed on May 9 and repaid on May 11. What kind of a record is that? I remember two years ago, Mr. Speaker, if you borrowed it one day, you were lucky if you ever got it back from the Newfoundland Government. The second loan was borrowed on May 10 and repaid on May 11. How is that for speed?

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, it was \$1,800,000. Then on May 14 we borrowed \$900,000 and we repaid it May 16, so on and so forth. There are a couple of loans still outstanding. There was \$183,000 borrowed on January 16. It was still outstanding as of January 31. It will be paid off in due course. These are all temporary loans made during the year. There was \$4.9 million borrowed on January 17 and repaid on January 18. It is a fantastic record. I have also listed the Treasury Bills, issued and redeemed during the same period.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in tabling these documents. I hope to have next Wednesday to floor more.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. S. A. NEARY: Sir, I ask leave to move adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent, public importance:

"WHEREAS the Federal Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament from Newfoundland have described the unemployment rate across Canada of 5.5 per cent, a strangulation rate; and

WHEREAS the unemployment rate in this province is 20.1 per cent, nearly four times as great as the national average; and

WHEREAS the Premier and his colleagues confessed they

expected this situation to happen and failed to do any serious planning to provide jobs for those whom their expectations indicated would be out of work;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the matter now be debated on the floor of this honourable House, to see if the combined efforts of both parties on either side of the House can come up with plans to deal with this emergency and I, therefore, ask leave to move adjournment of the House for discussing this matter of urgent public importance; namely, the all-time high of 36,000 Newfoundlanders who are according to Statistics Canada presently unemployed in Newfoundland and Labrador."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I find that this motion, in essence, is basically for the same matter as the motion made by the Hon. member for Bell Island yesterday. Yesterday I said that while the unemployment situation was a matter of interest and concern to many people, I felt that it did not warrant the adjournment of the ordinary business of the House. I feel that in a matter of twenty-four hours it is not that much more important so I do not think it warrants the adjournment of the ordinary business today for that purpose.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very disappointed. We will try again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get further clarification from the Minister of Tourism on some information that the minister gave this honourable House yesterday afternoon, Sir. Would the minister inform the House if Horizon Communications is under contract with his department or with any agency of his department or has done any work for his department or any agency of his department or has -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister gave certain information to the House yesterday and

MR. NEARY: I want to make sure that I have it straight. Or has Horizons Communications volunteered to do any work for the minister's department or any agency of his department?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member finished his question?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that that question be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if Your Honour is aware, Mr. Speaker, but I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is the oral question period and no speeches are permitted and I will recognize the honourable member for Bell Island if he intends to ask the question of an honourable minister.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism if he deliberately or undeliberately misled the House yesterday in the information that he gave the honourable House?

MR. WM. MARSHALL: The honourable member for Bell Island is not allowed, and we say this for the nth time, to accuse, by innuendo or any other means, any member of this honourable House of misleading the honourable House and I would ask that he be asked to retract this remark.

MR. WM. ROWE: On that point of order: The honourable member for Bell Island is legitimately trying to illicit some information from the Minister of Tourism. Your Honour has ruled on the question. The reason he wants the information is to make up his own mind, as a member of this House, whether in fact this House has been misled with information.

I would suggest, if the minister wants to answer the question, he be permitted to do so because it is a very important matter effecting this House.

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has already ruled on that matter and this is another attempt by the opposition to debate Your Honour's rulings which they have done in the past three sessions and it will not be countenance for much longer.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the honourable member for Bell Island's question is referring to basically the same one which I asked him to put on the Order Paper and I will have to ask him to do the same with this one.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Transportation and Communications please inform the House the reason, if he knows what the reason is, for discontinuance of the CN road cruiser service to Norris Arm. Is it due to: (a) road conditions; (b) fault of the driver; or (c) is the matter still under investigation?

HON. T. HICKEY, Minister of Transportation and Communications: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to answer that question. It is due, as far as I am concerned, to the indifferent attitude of CN for the concern of the people of this province and providing an adequate passenger service, which the honourable member for Bell Island is most and very well aware of, when he and his colleagues connived with the federal government to do away with the rail passenger service in this province. He should not even ask the question. He already has the answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure Your Honour would have been interested in the answer to that question. We still did not get the answer, Sir.

I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the honourable the Premier inform the House if he is aware of any up coming lay-offs in the construction industry due to a shortage of plumbing material and other construction material in the province?

HON. F. D. MOORES, PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any more of the lay-off now than we could expect to due to the

shortage of materials in the housing industry generally, not necessarily just the plumbing industry or the plumbing segment of it. The situation is that our supplies are short in the province. One of the reasons that housing starts will not be as much as we had hoped this year, they will only be up thirty per cent over last year, is because of lack of supplies, and the prosperity that this government has brought about, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable Premier inform the House if he is aware of any recent lay-offs at McNamara Industries Limited?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no and I might add to the answer of the same question as we are talking about lay-offs and employment, as this House has been asked to adjourn for an emergency session to debate labour statistics, unemployment and employment, for two days. It is amazing to me that the opposition have done this for political reasons and have not got guts enough to get up and ask a direct question in question and answer period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the reputation that this crowd has for answering questions, Sir, no wonder we -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, seeing the Premier is in such an insensitive mood today, I wonder if the honourable Premier would inform the House when his government intend to do away with the municipal tax on furnace oil as was promised by the Premier some three or four months ago?

MR. SPEAKER: This question will be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the information that came out today on radio and television and the newspapers, I wonder if this would be considered an urgent question? I would like to ask the minister responsible for housing, Sir, what steps his department is taking to deal with the emergency housing

situation in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: This question will be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Order paper, Mr. Speaker? 1,000 homes ready -

MR. MURPHY: ----- for twenty-five years.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister wish to answer the question, he is permitted to do so of course.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer for one purpose only, if I may, that the emergency housing situation of which the honourable member asked a question is not something which occurred yesterday or the day before or the day before that, but it does give me the opportunity to refer to some remarks which were made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition in his remarks about how backward we were in housing in this province and what we are trying to do to remedy that situation. He said that we were by far the most backward province in Canada. I got some statistics from the Housing Corporation and St. John's Housing Authority which indicate that in the past two years, that is coincidental with the coming into power of this Progressive Conservative Government, the housing starts in Newfoundland have soared beyond anything by comparison with previous years. I would just like to quote a few figures actually.

The percentage in thousands of starts in Newfoundland as compared with the rest of Canada have gone up as follows: in 1966, the percentage of starts was 4.3; in 1967 it was 5.5; in 1968 it was 5.7; in 1969 it was 4.8; in 1970 it was 5.1; and in 1971 it was 7 per cent. Since 1972 and 1973 we have gone from 7.3 to 8.9 per cent. This means that Newfoundland's comparison with the rest of Canada is that we have now reached, on the average house construction in Canada, the position of being 73 per cent of the national average. This compares with what was as little as four years ago, 57 per cent of the national average.

In other words, our increase in housing starts has gone up in the last four years from 57 per cent to 73 per cent. I might say that the small loans programme of the present government made 464 loans for houses. This went from a low three years ago of 61 to 464 in the present year. This, incidentally, was just four houses below the National Housing Corporation's total buildings in all of Newfoundland. We did 414 I believe and they did 420.

So when you get the great National Housing Corporation with all the multi-million dollars provided by the federal government, the fact that this small province was able to give loans to 464 while the CMHC gave only four more, I think that speaks for itself. This government is not backward in what it is doing for housing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now if the minister if finished patting himself on the back, would the minister please tell us what his department intends to do about the catastrophe we have in housing in this province today?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We are not interested in the past. We are not interested in the past, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know what specific plans, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: We would like to know, Mr. Speaker...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question of the minister. Would the minister inform the House what specific plans his department has to deal with the present situation we have in the province today.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister should wish to answer he may but it is a question that could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would delight in answering the honourable member because he will be confounded later in the session with the housing plans of this government which will be revealed. I am not ready to reveal them yet but I shall be before this session is over.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North:

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Industrial Development, who is smiling encouragement across the way. I want to ask the minister if he would inform the House if Shaheen Resources or any of the Shaheen Companies have made application to the government for land for development in Lake Melville Area in Labrador or have they already obtained land in that area for development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Industrial Development:

MR. C.W. DOODY (Minister of Industrial Development): To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, they have neither applied for nor obtained land in the Lake Melville Area. If they have I have not heard of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North:

MR. PAUL S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister inform this House what percentage of the value of the gear lost by the fishermen of the Northeast Coast, that is under the disaster programme, will his department be paying? What percentage of the cost?

MR. COLLINS (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, that is a question

that has been asked in the House about one dozen times. I indicated and contemplated that this year we will be paying out about a million and a-half dollar which is fifteen hundred times more than was ever paid out in any single year before. What the percentage is - I indicated to the honourable member that I would be bringing before the House within the next few days and he will have to wait until that comes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries? Can the minister tell the House whether or not it is the policy of his department or of the government to supply fishermen with Japanese cod traps as the previous Liberal Government did?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem we have had since we assumed office, since I have been in the Department of Fisheries, is trying to find people to go out and set the Japanese cod traps and set them properly. There are very few people who believe in them, believe it or not! As I indicated to the member from Bonavista North, in the next few days I will have a statement for the House which will indicate what our gear damage subsidy is, what our regular subsidy is. I am afraid honourable gentlemen will have to wait until that time comes.

MR. WINSOR: A supplementary: Mr. Speaker, this is not a question on the gear damage or the loss of gear. The minister stated that that was so many million but the loss was so much greater than any other year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please!

MR. WINSOR: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. May I rephrase my question to the honourable minister? Is it the intention to supply Japanese cod traps. That is all! It is as simple as that! Yes or no is all I need.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Japanese cod trap may or may not come under our subsidy programme. What I would like to hear, Mr. Speaker, from the members opposite who profess to know all there is to know

about the fisheries, instead of asking questions about what we are going to do in terms of storm damage and what we are going to do in terms of subsidies, why do they not realize what the difficulties are in the offshore fisheries and try to offer some real suggestions as to what we might be doing to help the fishermen.

MR. WINSOR: Yes or no is all that is required.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just give a yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Will the honourable the Premier inform the House if any progress has been made towards the development of the Julienne Lake iron ore reserves?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island in his great camaraderie with Mr. Doyle would know more about that than I would.

MR. NEARY: That is a good answer, Mr. Speaker. Talk about arrogance! Sir, I would like to direct another question to the honourable the Premier: Would the honourable Premier inform the House if any progress is being made toward the establishment of an aluminium plant in Newfoundland and the third paper mill at Come by Chance.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question can be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: On the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker?

MR. THOMS: The Premier is going to answer it.

MR. NEARY: We will never get an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I am not questioning the Speaker. I am questioning the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the Speaker's decision.

MR. NEARY: It is not the Speaker's decision,-it is the Premier's ability to reply to questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! On last private member's day the honourable Leader of the Opposition made one amendment to a motion brought in, I

think, to notice of motion brought in by the honourable member for St. John's North. It was ruled out of order and then he changed the wording of it somewhat and submitted it again and it was found to be in order and he adjourned the debate. I assume that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has the right to speak to that amendment today.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask Your Honour a question on procedure? I moved the amendment and it has now become an order; do I have the right to close the debate on the amendment, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a hypothetical question.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker. I am asking Your Honour...

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure - I will have to think about it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure either. I rather think I do not but I do raise the question. It is not hypothetical, for the benefit of gentlemen opposite, the thing could be very practical. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I shall not say very much today on this amendment. I made quite a lengthy talk last week on the main motion but I should say a word or two about the amendment and why I moved it.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, is designed to make sure that the government do act on this matter. I think it is very important and it is very timely. I hope that when gentlemen opposite speak on the amendment they will say, and I invite them to say, that the government will bring into the House in this session meaningful legislation. I think that is important, Sir, because the examples we have seen in Newfoundland - all right, let me refer to it - let me refer to the Saunders case once again, where the Premier who gives every appearance of having something to hide on this matter tells us we will not have an investigation. I think, Sir, that the facts which I outlined in the House the other day, which are directly related to elections and to money in politics, are quite germane to this, and I think the day when we could have the sort of

incident that surrounded the somewhat mysterious resignation of Mr. Saunders, because the facts are still undealt with -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I said the Premier was not in the House on Friday, Sir, he was ill I gather. At least he was not here. I said then and I say again that if the government wished to investigate Mr. Burgess, Mr. Shea and Mr. Oldford, I for one would welcome it. I would be delighted. Nothin would give me more pleasure, Mr. Speaker, than to hear the Premier or some man speaking for the Ministry on this matter stand and say that we are going to set up a royal commission and that we will look into the affair surrounding Mr. Saunders' resignation, Mr. Oldford's, who resigned in somewhat mysterious circumstances, and Mr. Shea who did not resign but who crossed the floor of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is worse.

MR. ROBERTS: And Mr. - well! Worse? Gentleman opposite have crossed and recrossed. Funny how what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: A good cause.

MR. ROBERTS: A good cause? Typical of the gentleman from St. John's West, Sir.

MR. COLLINS: They are over here for a good reason.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Gander now, Sir. What is sauce for the gander is now becoming sauce for the goose.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to investigate Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess I do not fear the truth. I say that if we do not have an investigation it is because gentlemen opposite fear the truth. They do not want the truth to come out about what happened to Bill Saunders. Why did the man resign? When was the governor told he resigned? Surely, it must have been on Wednesday evening His Honour was told, otherwise, His Honour would not have sat in that Chair. He would not have sat

there and read the Speech from the Throne. Did any honourable gentleman opposite know that Bill Saunders had resigned? That letter was written on Monday, in Carbonear, it got to the Governor on Wednesday evening. Where did it go? Did the Canada Post Office have custody of it between Monday and Wednesday? Or did some honourable gentleman come on to it? Who brought it to the Governor? Did the Premier bring it to the Governor?

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The House has already heard a number of hours of this and I really think the honourable gentleman should be relevant to this motion which resolves that the House introduce legislation to govern the public financing of election expenses and the private financing of election expenses, disclosure of contributions, limiting amounts to be spent by candidates. The motion does not deal in any way with resignations of members from the House of Assembly or events that could result.

There is already a motion on the Order Paper and it is quite improper for the honourable gentleman now to be debating this Saunders matter. There is a motion, No.10, which deals with exactly the same fact, asking, Sir, that the House

direct the government to appointment a commission of enquiry. Now, it has been dealt with, in the Speech in Reply by the Leader of the Opposition. There is another motion on the Order Paper and it is irrelevant and not germane to this topic here. So, I ask Your Honour to rule it out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak to the point of order before Your Honour rules?

MR. WILLIAM ROWE: For a change. Before he rules for a change.

MR. ROBERTS: Speaking, as I do, under threat of expulsion by the House Leader. I dare to raise my voice. Mr. Speaker, the matter I raise is perfectly relevant to the amendment, which is that action be taken immediately to bring in this legislation, because I suggest, Sir, that the Saunders case is related to electoral improprieties, disclosure of contributions, disclosure of money in politics. Nothing, Sir, could be more germane to this resolution than the sort of thing that involved Mr. William Saunders. I suggest, Sir, that I am perfectly in order and that I should be allowed to continue to speak in support of this amendment. I await Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has debated this issue previously. It is an item which will be brought before the House at a later date. I do think that it is stretching the latitude, that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is requesting far too much latitude so far as debate is concerned. Accordingly, I would ask him, while he may make some general remarks on the subject, that it is not to become the subject of a long debate. I ask him to observe that in continuing his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. I shall, of course, observe your ruling and I shall carry on as I was because what I was saying was merely pointing out that the merit of this amendment, the merit of the resolution which it proports to amend, is that we hope we can avoid precisely the sort of thing that we saw with Mr. William Saunders, precisely the sort fo thing. That is why we need this amendment, Sir. That is why we need legislation immediately. That is why we need it and that is why

we need an investigation because I say, Sir, that the sorts of things this amendment will prevent are precisely the sorts of things which should be investigated.

I say, furthermore, that the people of Newfoundland are beginning to believe that honourable gentlemen opposite are trying to cover up something, that they are guilty of something, that they know of some guilt or that they would not be blocking this. I say, Mr. Speaker, there is only one alternative and that is let the truth come out and let the truth come out in this amendment and let it come out in this matter. I say, Mr. Speaker, that no man need fear the truth, no man.

The gentleman from St. John's Centre need not fear the truth. The bible says the truth -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Keep saying it, because he does not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let him stand and support this amendment. Let him stand and support this resolution. Let him stand, Mr. Speaker, and support the call for an enquiry into Saunders. Does he know anything of it? Did he know of that letter Monday? Did he?

MR. MURPHY: Not a word.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he is so stupid he would not have. I agree. I accept his word.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable the Minister of Social Services, if this type of interchange continues, it will lead to complete debacle of the general order of business in the House. I would suggest that the remark made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition referring to the honourable the Minister of Social Services as stupid is certainly a remark that is very distasteful and certainly not conducive to orderly proceedings in this House and indeed is certainly a remark that should not be repeated.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I agree, Mr. Speaker, but I invite Your Honour to protect this side and that side equally. I invite Your Honour to make

sure that the ignorant harassment which I am being subjected to by the gentleman from St. John's Centre not be allowed to continue. He consistently tried to interrupt me and even when Your Honour was on his feet making a ruling, Sir, he was still speaking, babbling, going on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the right to speak in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition, if he wish to speak to this amendment, he may do so. The Chair is not going to recognize any amount of digressions from that amendment. If the honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to have the floor, he is going to have to maintain relevancy and certainly if he choose to get involved with interchanges across the floor, then I shall have to rise and interject quite often.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, Sir, I think Your Honour would but would Your Honour extend the members on this side the same protection as afforded the members on the other side?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Now, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, by inference, in his last remarks would indicate that the Chair is not being impartial. Certainly that is a matter which is not taken lightly by this House nor certainly by the Chair. Of course, it is the duty of the Chair to protect members of the House but the honourable the Leader of the Opposition should recognize that if he provokes response from the other side of the House, then he operates at his own peril.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I meant no inference and I resent that Your Honour should draw that inference. If I provoke response, Sir - there is a deliberate plot to try to intimidate this side in which all honourable gentlemen opposite have been jimmied up. They have caucus to discuss it. The House Leader goes outside and inside the House I gather and threatens me with expulsion. Well, I am quivering in my boots.

All I have said, Sir, is that I expect from Your Honour - and I have no doubt that I shall get from Your Honour - equal treatment

with that side. If the gentleman from St. John's Centre is to be allowed - he went on for three or four minutes and there was no call for order. Finally I had to try to defend myself against that unprovoked and violent onslaught from the gentleman as only the gentleman from St. John's Centre can. I would submit, Your Honour, that I should be allowed to proceed and to carry on with this debate.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: What personal attacks, Mr. Speaker? What personal attacks on anybody? What personal attacks that the gentleman, if such he be, from Bonavista South - he has not spoken in the debate except his distinguished contribution on opening day. That is still ringing throughout the island. That is still ringing from Cape Ray to Cape Race to Cape Bauld. They are still talking about him.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before the most recent series of interruptions, this amendment is necessary, Sir, and the events of the last week have shown why it is necessary to have legislation to make these things public. These things are necessary. Let the Tory Party reveal, Sir, what they spent in Hermitage and I will reveal what we spent. I will reveal our contributors if they will reveal theirs. Let them. If they believe in ending the system we have had in Newfoundland, let them act. When a minister speaks, as he will shortly, some minister I hope will speak, let him support the amendment and let him support the resolution and let them act on it. The resolution is a good resolution. The resolution should go further, Sir, and that is why I have moved the amendment.

I hope the gentleman from St. John's North will support the amendment. I think it strengthens his resolution. I think it strengthens the case which he brought in. I expect other honourable gentlemen; if they have courage to say publicly what they have been talking of - then let them support this. The amendment, Sir, makes the resolution meaningful. Without the amendment the resolution is but an expression of good wishes. With this present administration, Sir, that is not good

enough. The only answer is to make them do things, Sir. Since we cannot because of the Speaker's ruling, on the authorities, direct the government to do this, then we can urge them. I ask the House, Sir, to support the amendment and I ask gentlemen opposite to support the amendment.

Let us end the system that led to the William Saunders - the gentleman from St. John's East is guilty of a cover up I fear from his smile - let us end that system. Let us find out. Let us expose - no man need fear the truth, no man and if gentlemen opposite have - or, Sir, are they interested in only political investigations? Well, we will see and this amendment will be a test. There will be other tests, Sir. So, I shall support this amendment and I invite my friends on this side to support it and I invite gentlemen opposite to support it, Mr. Speaker. I say to them that people all over Newfoundland support this and that this must be done. It must be done for the sake of Newfoundland. It must be done for the sake of public life in this province.

Let me close by citing words of the "Evening Telegram", that yellow rag of journalism, that scurrilous yellow-dog paper, and my authority for that, of course, is no less than the honourable the Premier.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A bad day.

MR. ROBERTS: A bad day, it is true but he said it.

- in which they said Monday evening, I believe, Sir, in an editorial they said that this government was elected to try to add and to bring some integrity and some decency to public life. I believe there are some gentlemen opposite who want to do that. Well, let them do it, Sir, and here is a way they can do it, by supporting this amendment and by supporting the

the resolution as amended. So I shall support it, Sir, and I will ask them to do the same. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. STAGG): The Hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful resolution, not the amendment. It is a wonderful resolution that has been introduced to the House. (I have a cough drop here, if Your Honour will excuse me, If an attendant comes along I would not mind a glass of water). This is a wonderful resolution that has been introduced into the House by the honourable member for St. John's North, Mr. Speaker.

It is not something new to the government and it is not needed from the point of view of having the government consider whether reforms along these lines should be instituted because the government were considering certain changes and reforms before the honourable member for St. John's North put forth his resolution.

It does not mean to say that the honourable gentleman's resolution is not going to serve a very good purpose, because this debate, and I envisage this debate will continue for at least another ten or twelve Wednesdays, I see no reason why it should not as it is one of the most important matters affecting public life in Canada and North America generally. I shall be sadly disappointed if it does not go on for at least the next ten, twelve or fourteen weeks. If every member of the House did not speak on the amendment and did not then speak on the main motion and did not then speak to another amendments that are proposed by honourable gentlemen in the House, I would be very disappointed because the motions all give us a chance to get the views of all honourable members on what should be done in this area.

There are today before the government certain proposals in connection with the matters covered by this resolution but the government have not yet made any firm decision on which of the matters suggested to it should be effected. The government has not made up its mind on what particular measures should be brought before the House. So doubtless this debate will be valuable and indicating to the government and to the government

caucus what changes in particular members feel should be instituted and what certain members feel should not be instituted. So that the resolution itself is going to serve a very useful purpose.

The amendment to the resolution, of course, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against. I dare say every member on this side will give against it because the amendment to the resolution, I have not the wording here, is mischievous and pernicious and just introduced as part of a campaign, a political quackery.

The amendment says that the resolution should be changed to say this House urges and requests the government to implement its oft repeated promises to the public. The government have made no oft repeated promises to the public without changes, along the lines suggested in this resolution. The government have promised that this matter would be considered and certainly I as one person who is now a member of the government have been keenly interested in this since 1969. When, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution before the House, while I was sitting here as a Liberal backbencher, like my honourable friend the member for St. John's North, when I introduced a resolution before the House requesting action similar to that requested by the honourable the member for St. John's North in his recent resolution, I spoke on it and was scorned by the government of the day about it, by the Leader of the Government, treated with contempt. Of course, I was already sent to Coventry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I was in the process of being buried eighteen feet deep. A man who is buried eight feet deep can at least have a good night's sleep. I will not go on with the rest of it. I was in the process of being buried

In any event the resolution was not accepted by the House. The Premier of the day piled three or four reports on the table and said that this was trashy and the House should not consider it. It was obnoxious. It was redundant. It was pernicious. It was everything under the sun. That the member who moved the motion was the same way. Nobody on the Liberal side of the House, and four of the honourable gentlemen

opposite were in the House then, supported it whatsoever. For the previous twenty-three years of our existence not one jot, tittle or iota was done to reform electoral laws in Newfoundland except to bring bills before the House gerrymandering the various districts. That is all the previous Liberal Government ever did in this direction.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not living in the past I trust but the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition mentions the past occasionally so must I.

So I was more than surprised, Mr. Speaker, I was dumbfounded, nay, I was thunderstruck. I was nonplussed when I turned on my radio this summer to hear a former honourable gentleman who had laughed with scorn election campaign reform in the years before he was put out by the electorate. Who had gone berserk when I introduced a motion on conflict of interest in 1969, who went berserk in this House, he turned purple. He got almost violent. He said that "The conflict of interest and the idea of introducing such legislation was a vicious attack on all the government employees, civil servants in Newfoundland." He urged all of his followers to vote against it and they throw out the conflict of interest resolution in 1969. That same gentleman, Mr. Smallwood was heard on the air this summer by me, I heard it with my own ears, both of them, then I listened again to the next newscast to make sure I had not got it wrong. He was saying that if he ever came back into politics he would come back just for three purposes, not one, not two but three. One would be to reform the electoral law so that no longer would the large corporations and donors be permitted to contribute money to the political parties. So he could come back and lead us all into the promised land and completely reform the law. So that he could come back, come back and put in a conflict of interest law that would really have teeth in it, that would really mean something. That was his second major objective in life.

The third one I believe was to get the Hon. Leader of the Opposition out of his present position and take over the Liberal Party himself.

AN HON. MEMBER: And take that crowd over there ... House.

MR. CROSBIE: These were the two great reforms.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, he will not live that long.

MR. CROSBIE: That, that honourable gentleman was going to bring if he ever runs in politics again and forms another government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the peoples memories are short. That was the last on the priority list of Mr. Smallwood and his Liberal Administration to reform election financing practices in this province. Last on their list.

Conflict of interest - If we had, had the present law in 1969, we all know who would be in jail today as a result of it. It was never thought of. Now the honourable gentlemen opposite are not satisfied -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The fact that the member for St. John's North has introduced this legislation to be debated, think that they are going to make political hay by introducing an amendment that they know the government are going to vote against because of its wording, urging and requesting the government to implement oft repeated promises which were never oft repeated. To introduce legislation within the next thirty days. The honourable gentlemen opposite are going to force us to introduce legislation within the next thirty days. I heard somebody mention arrogance a few minutes ago. What could be more arrogant than the House of Assembly passing a resolution like that. You are not only going to introduce legislation gentlemen - the members of the House tell us - you are not only going to introduce legislation, you are going to do it within the next thirty days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Whoever heard of a resolution moved a House of Assembly Assembly or a Parliament (I wish I were in good voice) before,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: within thirty days we are going to do it. Such legislation to be similar in content the legislation adopted by the House of Commons. Now there is a bankruptcy of ideas. They have not a single suggestion

of their own. They want us to introduce what has already been passed in the House of Commons -

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member can still speak with that in his mouth.

MR. CROSBIE: I hope this is not ptomaine or potassium cyanide or -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we are now suppose to meekly follow the House of Commons of Canada. Oh, tomorrow will they bring in a resolution that the honourable House, you know, some other act passed by the Parliament of Canada. Will we be asked to pass our own Family Allowances Act? Will we be asked to pass the National Defence Establishment Act? Will be asked to pass a LIP Act? We do not need it we have lots of lip across the House. Is this House now going to be asked to be just a shadow of the Federal Parliament and to enact legislation that the Federal Parliament adopts? Can they not come up with any suggestions of their own? Do they not know

that in the legislation passed by the House of Commons are matters which this House cannot deal with at all. This House cannot make deductible from the income tax a political contribution made by some individual to a political party. It is only the House of Commons which can do that. This House as far as I know has no jurisdiction over radio and television. We cannot pass legislation directing the radio and television stations to make free-time broadcasting available to political parties in Newfoundland. There is no way even if we were so inclined, Mr. Speaker, that we could plainly adopt the legislation passed by the House of Commons. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is barefoot of ideas. If that is all he has to suggest as a resolution, we are going to be more than delighted, it is going to give us extreme pleasure, it will even give us extreme unction to vote against this amendment to this resolution. We are not going to go for that.

Mr. Speaker, what the government intend to do is to listen to what individual members have to say, seriously we hope, on this subject and see what the various views are. Then perhaps for this session or perhaps not, there may not be legislation brought forward until the next session. The next election is two or three years away. The legislation may not be brought in during this session. We have lots of other legislation to bring in. We have lots of other programmes to bring in. This legislation would be quite complex and complicated. Mr. Speaker, there is going to be no promise that there will be legislation on this subject during this session. I have no reason to believe that there will not be legislation before the next election but it will not be in this session because there just is not time, with everything else that the members of government have to do, for us to decide the complicated and serious matters that have to be considered in legislation such as this.

The resolution of the Hon. member for St. John's North, with one or two words amended perhaps or perhaps without amendment, is certainly one that the government can approve.

MR. CROSBIE: Now what - yes?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the resolution of the Hon. member for St. John's North will be supported, with or without a word or two amended. The intent of it and so on is the government's intent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the intention of legislation along this line? Why is it necessary? I personally am a firm believer in the fact that this kind of legislation is necessary, that there must be reform of the financing of political parties and there must be reform along the lines of disclosure of contributions, limiting of the amounts to be spent on election campaigns and the rest of it. Why? Because, under the present system, large donors have too much influence, large corporations, large businesses, large unions. Under the present state as they are in Canada, they have far too much influence over what parties or governments do or do not do. Large corporations, large businesses, large unions do not make large contributions to political parties unless they are going to ensure some returns for themselves. The return they want may either be some specific thing or it may be something general, some to do with the tax laws, how the tax laws should be changed, depletion allowances or a thousand or one hundred thousand and one things that they want. With labour unions, of course, they have their own points that they want covered in legislation and the rest of it, if they can get a party elected favourable to their views. That is why reform is needed.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just in Newfoundland. Newfoundland is no different in this respect than any of the other nine provinces nor is it different from the Government of Canada. Patronage is the system in all ten provinces and in the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the fuss that was made last year about one George McLean, who got several small advertising contracts from the Newfoundland Government, and compare it with the situation in Ottawa, where tens of millions of dollars are paid out yearly to advertising

companies that run the Liberal Party's advertising and political campaigns, nationally, it just makes me wonder. Patronage of the sort that McLean got in Newfoundland is small potatoes compared to the patronage being handed out -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you admitting that McLean got patronage?

MR. CROSBIE: I certainly admit it. What else do you think he got. I mean we are not fools here, are we? The public are not fools. I will tell you what happened, as the honourable gentleman knows.

Advertising people help you with your political campaign. Every government have certain advertising work that it needs done so what do they do? They appoint, as their advertising agent, people who assisted the party during the election. It is done in every other province. It was done here by the Liberal Administration; it was done here by the present administration and it is done in Ottawa in the tens of millions of dollars. Now if we are going to debate this resolution seriously, we may as well cease the hypocrisy. I do not mind admitting that McLean got an advertising contract. He got it because he assisted the Progressive Conservative Party during the election. It is the same as McLaren. Who was that odd ball? Goldfarb, Goldberg and the rest.

MR. NEARY: Where does Horizon Communications fit in?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know where they fit in but I hope they are good.

MR. NEARY: They are probably fronting and being paid by Mr. Nutbeem.

MR. CROSBIE: I neither know nor care who they are fronting for and it is typical of the Hon. gentleman for Bell Island to make that kind of statement. He knows nothing about this Horizons Limited. I know nothing about them. I, therefore, do not know who they are nor whether they are fronting for someone or not. It is like the honourable gentleman to make that kind of statement in the House of Assembly, where he cannot be sued. Go outside and attack Horizons Limited or say they are fronting for someone or go outside and say that they have a contract because of graft or corruption or who you think is behind it. You will darn soon find out about it. We are sick of the honourable gentleman's

tripe and insinuations. This is why, Mr. Speaker - the lawyers will even defend a person like him. That is the wonderful thing about the law.

Mr. Speaker, this is why this kind of thing is needed. Election campaign expenses are gone out of hand altogether; they are out of control. I would venture a guess but I do not know because I have never led a political party in a general election campaign in Newfoundland but my guess is that you cannot wage a decent, sensible campaign even across the province, in all forty-two seats, without spending at least \$500,000 to \$750,000. That would be without throwing the money away or going foolish altogether. It would cost at least that. Now where does the money come from? We all know that there are not thousands of small donors giving amounts like this to the Progressive Conservative Party or the Liberal Party. We know that they are not giving it to the New Democratic Party. They have never had much of a campaign here. If it is not coming from tens of thousands of small donors and it is certainly not coming from them, where is it coming from? It is coming from large donors and medium size donors and people who donate a thousand dollars or five hundred dollars, not from tens of thousands of small donors. Why are they doing this? Some are doing it because they like the philosophy of the party they are supporting or they wanted a change of government and others because they want friendly treatment if they think one party or the other will get in, they want more advantage. That has been the system for the last one hundred years.

Mr. Speaker, it is even much more the system on the federal scene because there you are dealing with tremendous amounts of money. Just in changing the tax laws, think what it involved for the corporations, when the new reformed tax law, as a result of the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation, was brought in by the Government of Canada. That could cost them hundreds of millions of dollars, if

depreciations allowances went or they stayed or the capital cost allowances, were treated one way or the other, or resource companies were treated one way or the other -- hundreds of millions of dollars. No wonder the federal parties never had any trouble finding \$5 million, \$6 million or \$10 million to finance national campaigns. When they accept that kind of money, they are accepting indebtedness from the persons who gave it to them. The only possible way that we will ever change that is if we introduce legislation to provide for the public financing of election expenses, to provide for the disclosure of contributions, to prescribe maximum amounts beyond which you cannot spend, to provide for auditors who will audit the accounts of the political parties and to limit the amount spent by candidates and by the political parties. That is the only way that that will ever be accomplished. It is a step that is desirable, to equalize opportunities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why was this not done, say, when the Liberal Party were in power, apart from many obvious reasons? Why has it not been done by other

parties when they are in power. Well, the answer is simple because parties in the government always feel that they have, that they are a step ahead of the parties that are not in government. They can get money more easily than the parties who are in the Opposition and that is generally true. The party in power can much more easily get political contributions than the party out of power. So, parties that form the government, whether it is in Newfoundland or any province or wherever, do not introduce these kinds of reforms because they think that they have the advantage over the party that is in the Opposition. Why is the Liberal Opposition in this House now coming on to say how much they are in favour of these changes? Because they are out of power, because they are finding it more difficult to get money than the party that is in power.

Their former days of wine and roses vanished in March of 1972. They find it harder to get the money. The Progressive Conservative Party, and I do not handle their finances and I am sure this is true, the Progressive Conservative Party finds it a lot easier. So the Opposition is getting up in the House here and saying, "We are Democrats, we are for reforming the system, the good is on our side."

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

So now, the Liberal Opposition says they want this and they are hoping the Government will come out and say we do not want it. You are suspecting that the Government would say that but this is a different kind of Government. We are such good, decent types that want to reform the system so much, that we intend to do something with

this anyway. We do not need their urging but it is silly for us to do it because in a way we will be only cutting our own throats or giving the Opposition a better chance in the next election but if you look at that in a practical sense, so what. Give them all the chances you can. They are not going to make it anyway and they need a little boost-up.

So, that explains why. Now the Federal Government being a minority government - five years ago, Mr. Trudeau was going to reform election financing, 1968. He did nothing, nothing, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota, not a comma or a full stop did he do but after he was almost defeated in October of 1972 it was a different kettle of fish. He then had a minority parliament. He could be defeated any time. The Opposition parties wanted this changed. Result - that now we have the House of Commons passing, whatever it was, Bill C203, reforming the Electoral Campaign Financing System in Canada and the Opposition parties have had a lot to say about how it should be done and their amendments were treated sympathetically and the rest. That is why it is being done in Ottawa. It was promised in 1968 but it was not done from 1968 to 1972, not likely, because Mr. Trudeau was persuaded by his political brethren who surrounded him. It will be giving the Opposition a hand and a help but it was passed this year when that no longer mattered and he was in jeopardy himself.

So, if this Government bring in legislation along the line suggested - we are doing it, we will be doing it against a council of common sense that will be given to us by professional politicians and by people who want to play the whim and do not think that anything should be done to help Opposition parties.

Let us not be hypocrites about it, Mr. Speaker. The Government does this and the Government is contemplating it and it will certainly be acting, whether in all the directions suggested by the resolution, It will not be in the crass political interests of the Government. It will be more in the interests of the Opposition and why should it be

done at all: because we should equalize opportunities, because every party, organized party should have the opportunity to present properly to the electorate what its views are and what its platform is and to attack the government properly and the rest of it. If they are to have equal opportunity and if there is to be any fairness or equity in the political system then this kind of change is needed.

What is one of the reasons why the Smallwood administration was able to be in power here for twenty-three years? Was the one-sidedness the whole situation? The fact that the P.C. Party could hardly have two nickels to rub together when it came to an election campaign while the Liberal Party had hundreds and hundreds of thousands, if not millions and in other provinces where one party has dominated for years and years, that is partly the reason.

So, it may be that if we enact legislation like this we will have less chance of being in twenty-five years. Well, who wants it? Twenty-five years is enough. Somebody put on my bumper the other night, a placard out there saying, "Twenty-five years is enough". I do not know what it relates to. I know that twenty-five years of the P.C. Government would be enough and twenty-five years of a Liberal Government would be enough. I do not know whether twenty-five years of Confederation is enough, but certainly, I think a couple of terms is enough for any party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who wants it?

MR. CROSBIE: Well one term is enough to get started and two terms is enough to finish it.

Now, what are some of the things that the resolution asked us to consider? The public financing of election expenses. Well now this is not new, Mr. Speaker. It is being done in the Province of Quebec and it has been done there, I believe, since 1966. In the Province of Quebec each candidate is entitled to get so many cents per voter in his district back, I believe after the election is finished, as long

as he gets twenty per cent of the vote. That is to discourage nuisance candidates. You can hardly expect the public to finance election campaigns for candidates who have not got a chance to get at least ten to twenty per cent of the vote. Otherwise we would have thousands of candidates out running needlessly and uselessly in election campaign. So there has to be some criterion like that and in Quebec the political parties involved have to register and they all receive so much for each voter in the province from the Government of Quebec, and the Federal Government is adopting a similar system.

I believe it is Quebec, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and British Columbia have some kind of legislation along these lines. Quebec is the most advanced. Nova Scotia had a Royal Commission Report three or four years ago. I think the Royal Commission was headed by Mr. Green, Mit Green, who is the President now of Bowaters at Corner Brook. He headed a Royal Commission in Nova Scotia to investigate the salaries and allowances paid members and election financing, I believe it was. He made a report to them and as I remember it, in his report he recommended the public financing of election campaigns in Nova Scotia with certain safeguards and the Barbeau Commission investigated the federal scene about eight or nine years ago and they have now adopted many of their suggestions and Quebec has done this.

Manitoba does require - has certain disclosure legislation and I believe British Columbia has certain disclosure legislation. So, this is not uniform across the country yet, Mr. Speaker. There has not been a province except Quebec that has really done both parts of what the member from St. John's North suggests in his resolution because there are two subjects. One is the public financing of an election campaigns. Should there be public financing? Should the taxpayers money be used to help finance election campaigns? That is one issue. The other issue is: Should there be disclosure of contributions where people contribute to political parties or election expenses? Should there be limiting

of amounts to be spent by candidates and by political parties? Now you can do one of these without the other. Quite frankly, the Government has not made up its mind, the Government has not made up its mind whether it wishes to do both of these things.

There are suggestions before the Government but the Government has not decided and now that we are having this debate, the Government will not decide, until the debate is completed, whether it wishes to do both of those things because you can easily enact legislation requiring disclosure of political contributions limiting the amount that can be contributed by any individual or company, limiting the amount that can be spent by candidates, limiting the amounts to be spent by parties, providing for parties to register, providing officials to audit their accounts and insure the legislation is in force. You can do that without providing public funds for election campaign purposes. These are two entirely separate matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, our support of this resolution does not mean that the Government has agreed that it is going to do both those general things. The Government may introduce legislation that will involve them both. It may introduce legislation involving only one aspect. The Government has not made up its mind as to whether it will

it wishes to do both. There will be legislation on this general area. Whether the government agree that election campaigns should be financed through the public treasury or not is a matter not yet decided. One can certainly be done without the other.

Where legislation like this is introduced, Mr. Speaker, it introduces with it a degree of state supervision of political parties which can also be quite a tricky matter, because party revenues and party expenditures will have to be subject to audit by public officials. Parties would have to report their revenues and their expenditures. Candidates are supposed to do that now. We have legislation that requires that now. They would have to report what they have done. There would have to be penalties for offences. Political parties for the first time would be recognized in our political system. They are not recognized now really. They are recognized in an informal sense but not in a formal sense. They would be recognized for the first time in legislation. So all of these matters had to be carefully considered as to whether we wanted to proceed in that way and just how far.

Now there is a large school of thought, and this was not done in federal legislation, there is a large school of thought that feels that corporations should not be permitted to make political donations at all, that a corporation is not a person, it is a legal person but it is not a natural person. A corporation does not breathe and eat and sleep, it is not human. Why should a corporation be permitted to make political donations? A corporation does not vote. It is not a person. What purpose can there be in permitting corporations to make political donations. There is a large school of thought that feels they should not be permitted to do this at all.

It is becoming an important issue in Canada because of the multi-national corporations. As Professor Hugh Thorburn has said in a brief he presented to the House of Commons there; "Essentially elections are occasions when the citizens exercise their choice of who will represent them in parliament and thereby designate

which political party or parties will form the government. This is an individual act which should be the result of a rational process of choice. Accordingly there is no room in such a process for interference or participation by other than citizens of Canada." Citizens in this case means human beings and not legal fiction. "I can find no rational justification for the participation in a rational election process by interest groups which are merely concerned to defend their selfish concerns and which may be very wealthy and therefore able to make very important interventions in the election by making large donations of campaign funds or by making available a large number of skilled campaign workers."

He goes on, "If we continue to permit corporations and trade unions to play a predominant role in the electoral process, we will be reducing the democratic content of the elections substantially and inviting manipulation by groups merely intent on furthering their own interests."

I believe that the statement he makes is correct. It is a correct statement. Now if we are going to forbid corporations, who are the main donors to political parties under the present set-up, to forbid them to make donations to political parties for campaign purposes, then the necessary funds will have to be made up some other way. The only way I can see is by the public financing of election contests. It points up what the problem is.

Corporations, mind you, Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, are debarred from making contributions for campaign expenses. We have all heard and read and seen the Watergate business all this year. In the United States the law was, in 1972, that a corporation could not make a donation for political campaign purposes. Now we have all seen how they got around it and how officers of the corporations were provided with money by the corporations themselves and the officers of the corporations made donations and all the different kinds of things that went on so they could disguise that corporation "x" had contributed \$100,000 to

Nixon's campaign. They would do it through officers or they would send it out to the Bahamas and it would be washed in the Bahamas and come back in through Florida and all the rest of it. Any law can be broken. But the United States has already forbidden corporations to contribute to campaign expenses. There will always be ways around it but ways will have to be found to stop it.

Mr. Thorburn says and I think that this is the real nub of it; "Corporations can have interests but they cannot have opinions. They are not human but they collectively have interests and they should not be allowed to decide what party is going to govern in any province or in the country generally and if they are not they are going to be prevented from doing that, they have got to be prevented from making contributions to the political parties."

Well there are many facets of this in this whole area. This is why this resolution, Mr. Speaker, has got to be considered so carefully. If we agree that corporations should not be permitted to contribute to political parties for campaign purposes or generally, we should encourage individuals to contribute. Then you have got to decide are you going to set some limit beyond which you will not permit individuals to contribute. What the limit will be. How much are they to be permitted to give to political parties or not give? Should their contributions or donations be tax deductible?

I personally think that if there is a ceiling on what an individual person gives to a political party, he should be allowed to deduct it, to encourage him to support the political party of his choice. So it is my own view that there should be a ceiling on what an individual can contribute a year to a political party and it should be tax deductible. Now what the technicalities are there - I know that the federal government has now, in their new legislation, made provision I believe for it to be tax deductible. Contributions

of the federal parties to be tax deductable I think, I am not sure what the ceiling is and the amount. I have not got it here but it can be easily looked up. Now we should consider the same. This is the federal.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$100

MR. CROSBIE: \$100, is it? You are allowed to donate \$100 a year and deduct \$100.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. Well then we should consider the same kind of thing. Disclosure is the other - of course if we provide for disclosure, Mr. Speaker, if we provide an effective disclosure law, you will see contributions of political parties dry up immediately because the people who donate large amounts of money are not going to want their names disclosed when they do it. So even by passing the disclosure you know - if the only law you passed was one that you had to disclose what you gave to a political party in excess of \$100, you put the political parties into bankruptcy anyway because all the large donors that have been giving to them in the past would cease giving. They are not going to want it known that they give, and that of course would lead to the problem of how you finance political parties in election campaigns.

MR. WOODWARD: You should not do it.

MR. CROSBIE: Should not do what?

MR. WOODWARD: Should not finance them.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, if we do not finance them, who will? The honourable gentleman opposite I am sure has financed a few campaigns.

MR. WOODWARD: I do my own.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can afford to. What about the poor cases like me?

MR. CROSBIE: That reminds me, I want to address myself to the fugitive from Green Bay, who represents Hermitage, when he comes back in the House on a matter you just mentioned, if he comes back in the House.

MR. WOODWARD: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not coming back.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I only started 4:10 p.m. and I am not sitting down until I use up my hour-and-a-half, I will guarantee you that right now. So I do not mind waiting for him.

Now what is my next point -

MR. NEARY: Sit down boy and let somebody intelligent get up and make a speech.

MR. CROSBIE: Any moment in this House, Mr. Speaker, that somebody other than the member for Bell Island is speaking, is a moment of blessed relief for all the rest of the members of the House. We constantly hear his -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Finance has more election expenses in this province than anybody else I know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that?

MR. NEARY: Do not be so hypocritical.

MR. CROSBIE: Now there is a question, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Family contacts on both sides.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, has the honourable member left the floor?

MR. NEARY: Family contacts. Come over and sit down here.

MR. CROSBIE: Not finished.

Mr. Speaker, I am battered with this caterwauling across the House. They have got me knocked speechless. I cannot remember what my next point was.

Radio and television services, Mr. Speaker: Now the honourable gentleman opposite from Bell Island does not use radio or television in his election campaigns because that sort of turns off the vote. He is best going around his district without the help of radio or television but there are some photogenic members of the House for whom radio and television do a lot.

The honourable Leader of the House is so solid in the affections of his people in St. John's East that it will take an earthquake to get him out.

MR. NEARY: I bet the Minister of Finance would not win any popularity contest.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister of Finance will run anywhere in the island today. If the honourable gentleman vacated his seat, he would run there against him. Anywhere, Bell Island, any district in the country and he would beat him two to one. The honourable member who is now speaking will not have to do that because the honourable gentleman will not be with us in another couple of months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, radio and television: These are two main reasons why election campaigns have gotten so expensive today, that is radio and television. It is true radio and television, the medium is the message and all that has happened in the last twelve years indicates that you have got to have radio and television if you are to have any hope of forming a government. That brings in the advertising agencies and the television stations and radio stations and their respective owners, all of whom have to be paid - at least certain parties have to pay them - and all of whom have got tremendous influence and too much influence over what happens in political campaigns. So, if we are going to touch this area, we are going to reform this area of the law or of society, then we have to control what television and radio station owners can do during election campaigns.

Mr. Speaker. I am well aware of the pernicious influence of radio and television and what they can and cannot permit and I am well aware of how spineless and how useless the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, C.R.T.C., is because for two years they permitted a radio station here to violate every sense of fairness and decency by permitting the ex-Premier of the province to be on that station fifteen minutes a day, five days a week, uninterrupted, to spread his propaganda around the island, to attack individuals personally in every other way that he could think of during that whole two years.

The fact that right finally triumphed does not excuse the cowardice with which the Canadian Radio and Television Commission treated a complaint when it was put to them during that period - absolute cowardice with which they treated that complaint. They would do nothing to enforce rules of fairness and decency because they did not want to upset people in the Liberal Government at Ottawa, who did not want to upset the head of the Liberal Government here in Newfoundland. So, if we are going to deal with this area, if we are going to deal with reform of election campaigns and the rest of it, then we have got to deal with the radio and television situation.

Now, at CBC we are dealing with a media that is publically owned and who has, as far as my observation is, been scrupulously fair during election campaigns and they allowed so much free time and so on, in accordance with the regulations.

In the area of private radio and television there has to be, there should be laws passed to provide that they give each political party, each one with candidates, one in every district or a majority of the districts, equal time on their stations. So much time should be provided during each election campaign free radio and television. Now, the Federal Government has just provided it, I think, in the amendments passed by the Federal House in so far as this relates to federal election campaigns. The same thing should and must be done in connection with provincial contests.

MR. NEARY: How about owning your own newspapers. Can that be allowed?

MR. CROSBIE: If I owned a newspaper, I would be interested in that question. The only thing I have got to do with newspapers, Mr. Speaker, is that I read them every day whether I need to or not.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: Oh! He is a bitter man.

MR. NEARY: Oh no, I am not.

MR. DOODY: Oh! He is a bitter man.

MR. NEARY: I know what I am talking about.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an area that should not be forgotten because the private radio and television owners of this country are acquiring too much power, far too much power. I cannot see myself why federal regulations permit any one individual to own more than one television or radio station. The situation that we have in Canada where private individuals are allowed to control two or three television stations and eight or ten or five or six radio stations, is not sensible legislation. It gives them too much authority and too much power. If they are to be allowed to own and operate that many radio and television stations, then we should have somebody that regulates them, that has some spine and some backbone and that has some independence. That is not the Canadian Radio and Television Commission because that body has no independence and no courage. If we are left to their protection. We may as well give up in despair. So, that is another area that has to be considered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can see some of the reasons why we cannot accept the dictate of the Leader of the Opposition in his amendment, why we are not going to leap into the House within thirty days or twenty days or thirty-five days with legislation on this subject. It would be silly to do that. After ten or twelve weeks of debating and discussing these issues and hearing each member of the House on those issues and then on the amendments, and the amendments to the amendments and the motions to the amendments to amend the amendments, we will have a pretty good idea what is acceptable to the members of

the House and we will be able to move.

MR NEARY: And Mr. Rutherford down there at \$200 a day - he should be able to draft legislation.

MR CROSBIE: There is lots of legislation to draft.

MR NEARY: Another nail. Another nail.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Inaudible.

MR CROSBIE: I thank the honourable gentleman for his interruption. "Silly Twit" is a very apt description of a silly twit. I have not heard a better description since this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how short some peoples' memories are. When I look across the House and I see the Leader of the Opposition and he trying to engage in indignant and righteous wrath about the resignation of a member of this House two years ago, it fair makes me throw. It almost makes me throw because then I throw my memory back to November of 1971 when forty-six per cent of the electorate of this province voted for the Progressive Conservative Party and forty-one voted for the Liberal Party. Despite that and despite the fact that the number of seats were equal or the Progressive Conservatives had one seat more than the Liberals, members opposite clung on to government in defiance of the polls and the will of the voters in this province in defiance end of October until January 18, 1972, in defiance of every cannon of decency and good sense and parliamentary practice ever recorded in parliamentary annals. They hung on by their fingernails and they hung on by their toenails. They clung on to power. They defied the public will of this province, the popular opinion in this province. The one thing that they did not want in March of 1972 was that the public have another chance to vote. They did not want the public to vote. No, because they wanted to try to sneak and squeeze and squeg their way back in without a vote. They wanted to get back in without a vote in March of 1972.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I am talking about elections. They could not take it, cannot take it. The honourable Leader of the Opposition brought this

up and now I am going to address myself to it because the most contemptible anti-democratic movement I ever observed was in the ranks of the honourable gentlemen opposite from November, 1972 to January, 1972 when they tried to cling on to power using every device under the sun to stay in power.

The Tom Burgess story and all the rest of it, we know the story. I would be ashamed to even bring it up again. I think that period should just be forgotten about, the Tom Burgess story and how he was wheedled and bribed

to support the Liberal Party. The Hughie Shea story and the rest of it. I think that should all be forgotten. Thank God we had an election in March of 1972 and the people of Newfoundland were allowed to express their opinion on what they thought should be done for that bunch opposite. They gave their opinion loud and clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coward!

MR. CROSBIE: We have another government here now that is doing a darn good job for the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coward!

MR. CROSBIE: If Mr. Saunders' resignation was the means for that election I say 'Thank God' Mr. Saunders resigned, the same as some other honourable gentlemen did here the other day. I know no more about it than that. The honourable gentleman opposite puffed up and what they think is a righteous indignation going on day after day about Saunders. Forget Saunders. Try and come forward with some positive suggestions of your own.

Now I am glad to see the fugitive from Green Bay, who is the member for Hermitage, has returned to his seat. Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it was one of the poor features of the political atmosphere before March, 1972 that the then Premier adopted terms of personal abuse and invective against members who were in the opposition or opposed him generally. I remember that honourable ex-Premier getting on the air and talking about me and addressing meetings and saying that I you know, was born with a silver spoon in my mouth. He was a poor boy who clawed his way up and all this business... Trying to arouse the ordinary members of the Liberal Party in the electorate against me because I had not been born in a poor family, I was born in a comfortable family. I am certainly not apologizing for. But he used to get on with all of that diatribe and that low gutter innuendo during those years. He said a lot about me and I fought

back. We all know what finally happened. I am darn proud that I did and that I did not succumb to that kind of tactic. I am very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to have the honourable member for Hermitage District on an "Open Line Radio Show" yesterday trying to get on with the same line. Trying to emulate the ex-Leader of the Liberal Party. Getting on the "Open Line" and saying "You know that John Crosbie was born with a silver spoon in his mouth." So what? What is the relevance? Suppose I was born with a dozen silver spoons or gold spoons in my mouth, how does that make me a different person?

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

MR. CROSBIE: The point of order is on discussing election tactics.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Speaker, may I make a point of order? If the big ballon from St. John's West if he could take his seat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I will take it.

MR. ROWE, W. N. My point of order, Sir, is that this is not the Throne Speech. We would be delighted to hear these remarks on a general debate. The only motion before the House at the present time is an amendment to the honourable member for St. John's North's motion. The amendment being that we adopt similar legislation of that in Canada.

Now there is no way that the honourable minister's remarks can be brought under the aegis of that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to rule that the honourable minister stick strictly to the amendment before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of relevancy, of course, is the most difficult one to make a ruling on. Quite a bit of latitude is usually given to honourable members in debate. I feel that the honourable minister might be straying a little from the relevant topic. I could caution him to this fact.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, what I am addressing myself to is radio and television, how it is used on political campaigns. Because there is a political campaign on now, Mr. Speaker, there is a political campaign

on now looking towards the next election. It is a campaign of calumny and a campaign of spreading lies and a campaign of vicious innuendo already started looking to the next election campaign. I am addressing myself to radio and television.

The "Open Line Shows" on radio and television that are used to spread this kind of matter. I am disappointed in the honourable gentleman opposite if he is going to introduce that kind of tactic on the public airways again. What relevance has it if one of us has a silver spoon in his mouth when he was born? I was not the cause of my own birth. The honourable gentleman opposite was not the cause of his own birth. If he were one of fifteen born to a poor family he had nothing to do with it, it was an accident of birth. If I were born to a comfortable family, I had nothing to do with it, it was an accident of birth. What you have to look at is to see what has that person done with the advantages he had or in the conditions he was born in. I will lay my own record against any gentleman's in this House whether he was born with fifteen, twenty or twenty-five, because for two years I heard this guff that I was suppose to be hard-hearted and cold-hearted had ice-water in his veins and so on and so forth, because I thought there should be some rationalty in governmnet policy. Because I was not content and would not succumb and fall over and play dead because I disagreed with Mr. Smallwood. If I am going to go through it again now I am going to start counterattacking it again now. I hope the honourable member for Hermitage will give up that kind of business getting on the "Open Line" with his "He was one of fifteen, and I am a silver spoon - and I will be a good deputy minister." The same junk that Mr. Smallwood got on with here, month after month, in this House. He would get up and say "The honourable the member for St. John's West he would be a good deputy minister but he will never be a minister." The same thing going out over the airways yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Never mind subpoenaing the tapes but I heard about it and I am here today to defend myself about it. The honourable gentleman

I hope, I expect better of him unless he fancies himself as another Smallwood. Maybe that is it. If he is he should not use Smallwood tactics. So -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Good.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: The new member has spoken!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, to get back to -

MR. SIMMONS: The honourable minister is initially off the point now he is trying to get back.

MR. CROSBIE: To get back to the central part of the resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep her going! Keeping her going!

MR. CROSBIE: If we are going to have integrity and decency in our public life - if we are going to have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: very touchy, very tender.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot - the honourable gentlemen opposite, some of them occasionally get up or they often get up and they start to make a speech and you would listen, the Leader of the Opposition does. He thinks he is making some good points. You would start to listen to him, a few minutes later this kind of stuff that is uttering out of the House Leader for the Opposition comes out. It all gets spoiled. Spoiled by nastiness. There seems to be a permanent streak of nastiness in the ranks of the Opposition. Forget it.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good point.

MR. CROSBIE: Forget it. Make your points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman who is now speaking was never offered a bribe and never received one, so he has nothing to tell you about bribes. But he is fully familiar with the confines of politics

and he is fully familiar generally speaking the same as any member here as to what went on from November 1971 to March of 1972 and finally a blow was struck for Democracy and we had an election. Because all that the resignation did of Mr. Saunders from the House of Assembly was to result in an election. The honourable gentleman opposite did not want an election, they wanted to get back into power and stay in despite the electorate. They did not want an election. They wanted to stay in by inveigling members from the P.C. side over to sit with them. That is what they wanted to do but the P.C. Party wanted an election. It wanted the public to speak again - did they want the P.C. Party or did they want the Liberals? Mr. Saunders resignation permitted that there would be an election - that is all it did, permitted there to be an election. There was one and the public spoke resoundingly. In the next election they will speak again. If this party here does a decent job and if it can overcome the whispering campaign and some of the tactics that I have mentioned it will be returned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: If we are sensible and want to look at these matters sensibly we will perhaps have some legislation to make it easier for all three parties or however many there are to go on when the election comes.

Now I have all kinds of information here, Mr. Speaker, on what is being done in various provinces. If we are going to have a system whereby the public treasury contributes towards election campaigns we have to decide how much. There are various amounts in the various provinces. There are various limits set. In Manitoba candidates are not permitted to spend more than forty cents a voter. In Quebec you are not allowed to spend more than sixty cents a voter - or sixty cents for the first 10,000, fifty cents for the next 10,000 or forty cents thereafter. Nova Scotia you are not allowed to spend more than \$1. a voter up to 5,000 voters in your district, eighty-five cents for the next 5,000; seventy-five cents in excess of 10,000; British Columbia

does not set any limitation. What limitation should we set?

This is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of a legal draftsman sitting down and drafting a piece of legislation. If we are going to do this or bring legislation in along these lines every one of these questions is an absolutely essential question of principle. What should be the limit? If you have 5,000 voters in your district should the law

be not spending more than \$5,000 or not more than \$4,000 or should it be \$10,000. Should the public treasury pay you back twenty cents a voter after the campaign is over or twenty-five cents a voter?

In Quebec the candidates are reimbursed, they get fifteen cents a voter. In British Columbia - no, they do not get either in those provinces. In Quebec, it is fifteen cents per voter of expenditure to the candidate. I have forgotten what the federal government is now providing.

Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of major issues that are going to have to be covered in this. In dealing with the parties generally: Manitoba restricts the party's central campaign committee to not more than eight cents per voter in districts where they have a candidate and a limit of \$25,000 in party expenditures and details of what kinds of expenditures the party can pay for. Should we have that? Should our legislation tell the parties themselves what they can spend money on and how much? There are all kinds of complications.

In British Columbia, you have to report within sixty days of the expenditures on what you spent the money on. You do not have to give them information about your revenues between elections. In Quebec you have to make a return on the expenses within 120 days, with vouchers but you do not have to report on what the party's revenue was. Manitoba requires now that you file annual detailed reports of party expenditures, not just when there is an election campaign on. In Manitoba every party has to file every year a return showing what money is collected during the year and what the money is spent on. Should we require that? These are the major questions that have to be decided before legislation is brought in here. These are just some of them.

Mr. Speaker, should we provide full disclosure for every amount contributed by a contributor, together with his name or only if it is over a certain amount? Will we discourage people

from making small contributions, if they have to disclose their name? In Manitoba the candidate has to disclose the source of all contributions in excess of fifty dollars. This is not an easy nor an uncomplicated matter. This is a very complicated matter. If we do this, it involves a political party becoming registered, which naturally gives somebody the power to de-register them if they do not observe the act. What protection should there be in that connection? What should be deemed election expenses that we regulate or not election expenses? What responsibility will the official agent take and so on? There are hundreds of difficult questions to be decided before legislation comes before this House.

Mr. Speaker, it may very well be that some or all or many of the provisions in the present federal legislation will be suitable to be introduced in our legislation. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest seriously that within thirty days the government introduce in this House a law on this subject, similar to that passed by the House of Commons in Bill C - 203, is the height of ludicrousness. He is asking the House to do something so ludicrous and so unheard of that it boggles the imagination. I would say that his amendment must have been drafted by the member for Bell Island. It certainly was not drafted by anybody who is fair-thinking. It was drafted by the Hon. member for Bell Island. Well it is certainly mixed up enough to be. In all these important issues, we are not supposed to exercise any judgment of our own, just follow blindly what the House of Commons did.

Mr. Speaker, now what is being done down in the U.S. on this? This whole subject is coming up down there also. Legislation has been introduced by Senator Kennedy, a bill "To Elect The Presidential Election Campaign To Amend The Presidential Election Campaign Act And For Other Purposes," which did not get through the Congress this session. I think it was passed by the Senate and rejected

by the House Representatives. Before the next election, they are bound to have the same kind of legislation down in the United States for presidential election campaigns. Why? Because they have become so fantastically expensive. Look at the money that Nixon had, compared with McGovern. Nixon had \$55 million or \$60 million and McGovern was lucky if he could scrape up \$18 million or \$20 million. No wonder Nixon won the election. Well they are going to have legislation to change that, presumably in the United States before the next election. It is certain a step forward that we should take. It is not a simple matter and it has a lot of complications. There will be a lot of political strife about it before it is all over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on. I have all kinds of information here but I will be able to speak again on this, Mr. Speaker, because I am only speaking now to the amendment. After we have spoken to the amendment, we are all entitled then to speak on the motion. The amendment is 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 legislation adopted by the House of Commons on the third of January, 1974, known as Bill C - 203. That is the amendment, which should be laughed out of the House, scorned out of the House because it is the first sort of that kind of amendment ever moved as far as I know by an opposition of the House, that a government and a house just give us all their independence of thinking and will and judgment and surrender it to somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, I know we have at least four excellent M.P.'s up in Ottawa whose lead we should follow: Mr. Marshall, Walter Carter, Mr. Jim McGrath and Mr. John Lundrigan. I know that we could very well surrender our wills, our intelligence and our senses to them and they would be a good lead to follow. There is Bill Rompkey and who is

the other chap? There is a fellow - Mooney is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Rooney.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, Rooney! There is a chap Rooney. I think he is a federal member. There is the Hon. Donald Jamieson who expressed his unbounded admiration for this administration about a week ago on television. The Hon. Mr. Jamieson is a statesman. As a statesman, he had to frankly express his support and admiration for Brother Moores and Brother Doody on their administration and their approach on CBC television about ten days ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Brother Crosbie?

MR. CROSBIE: Brother Crosbie? His admiration is even more unbounded but he did not want to leave a high level of statesmanship to go to a plateau. The honourable gentlemen opposite want us just to follow the lead of our seven M.P.'s in the House of Commons. Now really? I hope you are going to vote against it yourselves. I am sure that caucus of yours, which meets daily, the nine of you - Mr. Thoms is tired.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: What is Mike Martin, going to shift is he?

I am sure that this caucus which meets daily could not have considered this amendment before it was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure it has sprung full-blown from his bow as he was speaking last Wednesday on the introduction of this bill. I am sure that if he asked the permission of this House to withdraw his amendment, before the members of the House throw it out in disgust, we would be only to pleased to give him permission to amend it. What does it all boil down to, Mr. Speaker? It boils down to this:

The government have a genuine desire to change the law that regulates the financing of election expenses. The government have before it now certain proposals that have to remain internal to the government. The Hon. member for St. John's North has presented a resolution to this House asking the House to request the government to introduce legislation.

the government in control: the public financing of election expenses; private financing; disclosure of contributions and limiting the amounts to be spent by candidates and by political parties. There is no need of the House to request the government to consider this or to introduce it because the government are now considering and intend to introduce legislation. What the final form will be will depend to a large part on what the individual members of this House say as to whether they support or believe in or do not believe in when they discuss this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the government intend to vote against the amendment, which is merely a political move, as I have explained before by the Leader of the Opposition and intend to

support the resolution if the honourable member for St. John's North should feel that it needs to be brought to a vote, because it is only requesting the government to do something they are already doing. If it comes to a vote the government will support it although they might tidy up the wording in one or two particulars once this amendment is dealt with.

It is a serious subject that deserves serious consideration, and I myself sincerely believe that if the political process, if our political system is to be changed, it is to be made viable, if the political parties are to be given a fair chance each to put forward their best of their programmes and their candidates to the electorate, if they are to have equal opportunity, if new parties if they arise are to have a chance, that although this favours parties who are not in power, that it is the kind of legislation that a government should introduce.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from what I have observed over the last eight years and from what I have seen and read and the rest of it, that this is the most pressing and urgent reform of the political system that is required. I myself sincerely believe that if we are to cull the influence of interest groups and private interests to the low levels where it should be then we have to regulate whether they can contribute at all and if so, how much? They have to be made disclose what they contribute, election expenses have to be brought under control, free radio and T.V. time has to be provided and members who run and receive a decent vote, say at least ten or fifteen per cent of the electorate in their district, should receive some compensation from the electorate to help meet their expenses.

I think it would be a pity if this were not treated extremely seriously and it would be a pity if we just thought that in Newfoundland that Newfoundland is the only province that has this problem. They all have this problem. The federal government have that problem. We can look with much profit on what they have decided, but the ultimate decision has to be made by us. Whether the government

will finally decide that the public financing aspect of this should be done or that just the regulation and the publicity and the regulating of the whole matter, whether that should be the area that is covered or both, we frankly do not know yet. We are willing to listen to your suggestions and then the government will have to decide as a government exactly what legislation will be brought forward.

We cannot promise, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to be this session. If not this session it will certainly be next year or before the next election.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, we will support the member's motion unamended. We will vote against the amendment. This is not something that is new to the government. As the Premier said on opening day, the government intended to bring forward something in this line at the present session. If it is not ready for the present session it will be brought forward next session. I therefore intend to vote against the amendment and support the motion. I will be extremely interested as a member of the government in listening to what everyone's observations are, because this is one of the major problems to be corrected in our electoral system.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South:

MR. W.N. ROWE: The honourable House Leader is eager to get away his venom this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. He has been boasting about it all week and he is trying to get on his feet. He will have to wait until next Wednesday or when the Throne Speech comes on.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member for St. John's Center will permit, I would like to say a few words on the amendment as proposed by my friend, colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. Before doing so, Sir, I would like to make a few comments on what the honourable Minister of Finance had to say in his remarks on this amendment.

I must say that it is a disappointment to see him in action

these days, Sir. There was a time when an hour and a-half of debating time was as a second. Now he finds it hard to drag himself through an hour of debate. He finds himself running out of steam, running down and having to sit down after an hour or so, not unlike the government of which he is a part as we have seen them in the past few days in this House of Assembly. Jitters, the heart gone out of them, bankrupt of initiative and intellectual ideas. He is the paragon of the symptom surrounding this government since this House of Assembly first sat a week or so ago.

Aside from that, Sir, I would like to comment on one or two points of substance the Minister of Finance made. There are, I believe, in politics two broad types of hypocrisy and hypocritical conduct. One type of hypocrisy, Sir, would be where you are in power and something is called upon you to do, people, the public or a member of the opposition calls upon the government of which you are a part to do something and you do not do it. Then after leaving power you go in the position yourself where you call upon the present administration to do the very thing which you voted against before. This is the type of hypocrisy that the Minister of Finance has accused us of.

Several of us here were in an administration where he, and all credit to him, brought in a bill, introduced a bill into the House calling for essentially the same thing as the general motion before the House today. I was part of an administration and a side of a House who voted against his motion. I voted against his motion in the same way as the present Minister of Municipal Affairs voted against it, that paragon of strength and virtue. I voted against it in the same way that the present Minister of Justice, that unctuous gentleman, sincere gentleman voted against it.

The reason we voted against it is clear, we were part of a party system where a decision was taken to vote against it, not to give the member for St. John's West, as he then was and still is, the

political kudos of initiating this. That is why it was voted against. Cleary, nobody is naive or childish or stupid about political maneuvering, Mr. Speaker.

Now we are in opposition and we are calling upon the government along with the esteemed member for St. John's North, we are calling upon the government to introduce legislation governing election expenses and so on. So we can be called hypocritical. I suppose that word hypocritical does apply to us in a certain strained way, but that hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy I have just spoken of, is nothing compared to the hypocrisy of a man who when he is not in power calls upon something and after calling upon it, getting into power does nothing about it except utter weasel words concerning the same question he proposed when he was out of power. That is the kind of hypocrisy that the Minister of Finance is guilty of today.

When he was out of power and knew he could do nothing about it and knew the government of the day was constrained by political motives to vote against his motion he brought it into the House. Now when he is in power and to listen to him talking, has great sway over his colleagues in the cabinet, when he can do something about it what does he say? He gets up and says: "Oh this is the kind of thing I have been talking about for fifty-nine years, this is the kind of thing I have always been in favour of, this is the kind of thing that we in the government presently are considering. We are going to do exactly as the member for St. John's North has advocated. Oh we will tidy up a few phrases here - perhaps we cannot pass this aspect of it or that aspect of it, maybe it will not be this session of the House, perhaps it will be the next session of the House or maybe fifteen elections from now. We will live up to our promise made to the people of the province."

Now, Sir. I do not mind being accused of being a hypocrite if I am now calling for something to be done which I voted against

on that side of the House. I do not mind being called a hypocrite if my hypocrisy is stacked up against the hypocrisy of the Minister of Finance, the man of great virtue, Mr. Clean himself, Mr. Clean incarnate when he was in the opposition in this House, Mr. Clean when he was sitting in the back benches as a Liberal and then as a reformed Liberal and then as something else and then as a P.C. in this House, Mr. Clean, calling for everything to be done immediately. When he is in a position to do it, suddenly it becomes difficult to do, suddenly it is a matter of utmost complexity and complication. It cannot be done overnight, it cannot be done in thirty days. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that unless some of the back, some of the more

independent back-benchers on that side of the House can prevail upon the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to get something into the House by way of legislation, this session or next session. It will never be done if it is left to the initiative of the Minister of Finance. My hypocrisy, I plead guilty to, his hypocrisy, Sir, is ten times as bad and he has the brazen gall to stand here now and use weasel words as to why they will not do something, why his government will not do something which he called upon governments to do the past four or five years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the member for St. John's North for introducing the original motion. Our amendment, I hasten to say, our amendment in no way derogates from his motion. His motion is an excellent motion. Our amendment was to guard against exactly the same kind of wishy-waffle with the airy-fairy attitude shown in the House of Assembly this afternoon by the Minister of Finance. We wanted to tie down the Government, to do something under the direction of this House. The member from St. John's North has put forward a good motion.

The only problem with it, that we see as members of the Opposition, is that it allows the Government too much leeway. It allows the Government to say well, as the Minister of Finance has said, "Well, we cannot do this because it is impractical or we cannot do that because it is impractical". Therefore, we suggested by way of an amendment to his motion, a bill which is already law across Canada, a bill which is more progressive, more forward-looking than any other law pertaining to election expenses and disclosure than any other law in any province in Canada and in many aspects more in advance than the laws which prevail in the United States and the individual states of the United States.

That is why we brought in the amendment. We did not bring it in because we have no originality of our own. We brought it in because there are two forms of government in this country, the federal system and the provincial system and we think that for the benefit of politicians and for the benefit of the general public, wherever possible, laws

pertaining to electioneering, election campaigns, election expenses, should be as similar as possible, one to the other, federal and provincial.

We realize as well that there are many things in that bill that this House has no power over but we realize as well the reasonableness of the Federal Government and they would be sure to pass the necessary legislation to pertain to provincial elections if this House were by resolution to ask them to do so. There is no problem there, Mr. Speaker, no problem at all. The bill which was passed by the House of Commons in Ottawa was one which was subscribed to by all parties, reluctantly by the N.D.P. Party because they wanted to go further. They wanted to go further than the actual bill, Bill C203, but they agreed with it as far as it went.

I think that bills and acts pertaining to election expenses should go further and election disclosure of expenses and limitation of expenses and public contribution to elections should go further than this bill as well, Mr. Speaker. I think that before too many years are out we will have a much more stringent, a much more strict act before Canada governing elections and what goes on in elections but this is certainly a good start. A start proposed to the nation by a government which has vast, which has access to vast expertise in the field, parties, large parties which have vast expertise in the field and I am not saying that we should not improve upon that legislation if we can but we think that the legislation should, perhaps as a start, be similar. Then as we learn our way, as we grope around during the next two or three elections, see how this particular legislation works, then we can make other improvements to it as well. That is why we are offering this amendment to the honourable member's motion.

We do compliment the member for St. John's North for his amendment, for his motion rather. I remember a couple of years ago in this House, when we on the Opposition, my colleague will remember, gave the honourable the member for St. John's North what might be considered a rough time when he was the Minister of Education. It might be considered

February 13, 1974.

Tape 214

RH - 3

a hard ride at that particular time. He was Minister of Education and we consider some of his policy or the policies of his government, that he was articulating, we thought that

They were inept and incompetent in the extreme. We do not revise that idea now, as when he was Minister of Education, but we do recognize that in other fields, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's North certainly has his head screwed on right. No doubt about it at all, for him to bring this into the House at this time as a backbencher of the government was a very sensible move and a move which called for some initiative and we are glad to see that he did it. It is too bad the honourable Premier did not, rather than throwing him out of the cabinet ignominiously, why he did not move him to a new area of government where he perhaps could perform a little better than in education.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourism.

MR. WM. ROWE: Tourism might be one aspect of it or agriculture or something maybe, some portfolio like that. But instead the Premier of course, ignominiously and without ceremony, booted him out of the cabinet and the only surprise that remains is that why the honourable member, after being so humiliated by the Leader of the Party and the Leader of the Government does remain on that side of the House. I am not suggesting he join this opposition, he probably has more contempt for us I am sure than he has for his own colleagues, and God knows he has contempt enough for them. But perhaps he should be somewhere sitting as an independent in this House rather than suffer the humiliation of being in the backbenches of a government that unceremoniously and ignominiously threw him out.

MR. MURPHY: There is a backhanded compliment from the liberals.

MR. WM. ROWE: "Ank" is very familiar with backhanded compliments, having been the receiver of most of them I suppose in St. John's. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North is to be complimented.

This whole area of legislation is something I would say which would be more welcome to businessmen and unions and other organizations, more welcome to them than any other segment of our society. Businessmen

are forever, I would submit, although I have never been a bagman as it is called for a party, businessmen, I submit, are sick and tired of having the bite put on them by aggressive bagmen for various parties, especially the government party.

The rumors going around the province now concerning the aggressive activities of certain bagmen representing the government party for example would be enough to curl your hair, Mr. Speaker. I would say that businessmen in this province would fall down on their knees and give praise if something along the lines of the Bill C 203 were passed in Ottawa or passed through this House, to limit the expenses, to make sure that there is disclosure.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: The Lurp from Burgeo strikes again.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the way the system is today I would say that only a businessman whose actions and motives are suspect could want the system to stay as it is now. Only a businessman who might be a little bit say on the crooked side or whatever word applies to unethical dealings, could want the system to remain as it is today, Mr. Speaker.

99.9 per cent of the businessmen in this province would like to see the changes which have been suggested by the member for St. John's North and suggested by us in our amendment. They would like to see them. They would like to get out of the situation where they have to give contributions to various political parties.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the invitation was extended for the member for St. John's North, not St. John's Centre. We do have some taste, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House. We do have standards. If the member for St. John's North wants to come over he is welcome but St. John's Centre, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: What an insult.

MR. WM. ROWE: Everybody is looking at the member for St. John's Centre, Mr. Speaker, wondering what is wrong with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: That is right. Why do businesses contribute, Mr. Speaker, to political parties? Is it because of their love of Democracy? Is it because of their -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour mind referring to the Standing Order that

members are supposed to keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's point is well taken. Honourable members will observe the rule of silence while the member is speaking.

MR. W. ROWE: The dulcet tones of the member for Burgeo are just too much, Mr. Speaker. It makes me lose my thought.

The Minister of Industrial Development is ashamed, Mr. Speaker, to be sitting next to him. He is over there trying to hide his head under the desk - I hope my friends do not see me next to this honourable member of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I believe one of the rules of this honourable House, Sir, is that you are not permitted to speak, only from your own seat in this honourable House. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker? If so, would Your Honour enforce that rule please.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's point is well taken. Also honourable members are not permitted to speak even from their seats unless they have the floor.

MR. NEARY: True, Right.

MR. W. ROWE: Why do businesses contribute, Mr. Speaker, heavily to parties? Why do unions contribute heavily to parties? Is it because of their love for our democratic system, our adversary system of politics? Do they love that? Do they think that only - or do they think that the philosophy of the Progressive Conservative Party is so overwhelming in its import that they have no choice but to lash out \$20,000 in a political campaign or do they think the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party in the case of unions, has such a valid philosophy of government generally that they should drain their purses in order to support that philosophy. You know, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more poppycock than that kind of an attitude.

We know why business particularly contribute to politics, to political parties. We know that they are looking for friends in court. We know that they are trying to get the edge on the other fellow when it comes to contracts or when it comes to dishing out goodies by governments. That, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, is a sad commentary

on our system. It is certainly a very bad, very pernicious type of thing to have going on under our system. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the remarks of the Minister of Finance, that corporations, soulless, bodiless corporations should not be permitted to lash out large contributions to political parties.

Mr. Speaker, another point made by the Minister of Finance is that as time goes on, they may bring in legislation but probably not this session. He alluded to the reason why this happens in government. He even admitted why his party may not be willing to bring in legislation quickly or even at all regarding this. It is because when a party is in government, by the Minister of Finance's own admission, they are much more successful in putting the bite on businessmen to make large contributions to the coffers of that particular party that is in government. The professional politicians, as he referred to them over there on that side or in the back rooms, are busily giving advise to the government, the leader of the government and the cabinet ministers, not to be so stupid and childish and naive and foolish as to deprive the Progressive Conservative Party of this political advantage. "Do not give up this political advantage where we will get ten dollars of contributions for every one dollar that the Liberal Party might get or the New Democratic Party or any other party. Do not give up that advantage now that we are in power. Let us keep that advantage and it will keep us in power perhaps for a little longer perhaps than we ordinarily would be in power." That is why the minister said it is doubtful as to whether it will come in this session. I would say it is doubtful as to whether this government will bring in any legislation relating to election expenses, not only in this session but in any session that they are in this House as the government.

The New Democratic Party, it is said by some political experts in the Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, will be the one that will benefit most from the legislation presently enacted throughout Canada on election expenses. The New Democratic Party will

profit most from the Federal legislation it is said. Now, I do not believe that because I believe that the contributions from the unions to the New Democratic Party have been almost as great in many respects as the contributions from some of the businesses across Canada to the other two major parties.

Even if it does, Mr. Speaker, even if it does give the New Democratic Party or any other party a better advantage

in an election, before the House. Mr. Speaker, would you draw the honourable Minister of - what is he? Provincial Affairs? No.

Welfare, to order? It is a discourtesy not only to myself but to the House for him to be wandering around talking in a very loud voice. It is against the orders and the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I am not quite sure of the honourable member's direction here.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the honourable member for St. John's Center, having starred in the House yesterday, he is obviously high today, ebullient on the great ovation given to him, by this side as well. He cannot contain himself to allow the same courtesy to this honourable gentleman as was afforded him yesterday. I would ask Your Honour to direct him not to interrupt me when I am trying to speak to the House.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, I did not even try to interrupt the honourable gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Now he can make his point of order.

MR. MURPHY: Sit down will you 'Steve' like a good boy. Mr. Speaker, look, I did not at any time interrupt the speaker. I think that is unqualified, unjustified.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Let us suppose all honourable gentlemen might resume their places or which ever place the honourable gentlemen wish to resume. I draw to the attention of all honourable members that the member for White Bay South does have the right to be heard in silence. He inferred that the honourable the Minister of Social Services had spoken in a loud voice. I must admit that I did not hear it myself. However, if the honourable minister did speak in a loud voice, I would ask him to refrain from doing so in the future.

MR. W.N. ROWE: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, even if the legislation before the House or passed by the House of Commons in Ottawa, gives the N.D.P. Party or any other party a greater advantage than it has

had in the past, I cannot see how anybody interested in politics in this country can use that as a reason why such legislation should not be passed in Canada or in this province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the only criterion that should be applied to political parties is that in equal debate or equal form or under equal circumstances, people of a country or a province make up their minds as to the candidates presented, the policies presented, the platforms presented, the leaders of the parties and the possible cabinet ministers that might be in the parties if they form the government. These are the only things that should be considered by the electorate, Mr. Speaker.

The public should not be fooled by some party being packaged up and sold like a package of Spic and Span. It should not be the power of advertisers, like McLean or anybody else, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McLean's enterprises or any other enterprises, Goldfarb or anybody else. It should not be within their power to decide because a party has more money than another party, to be able to put on a slicker campaign because of more money and thereby fool the people or suck the people into electing this particular crowd when in equal circumstances they would not have done it. That is why the honourable member for St. John's North should be complimented for introducing this motion.

Hopefully, if the government will only go along with what he has to say, and especially with the amendment which we have proposed, then we will stop this situation in Newfoundland. The Minister of Finance will not go for the amendment which we have proposed and I would submit, Sir, that the reason he gave for not supporting our amendment about the lack of ideas, or we should make up our own motions and submit them to this House is the wrong one. I would submit, Sir, that the only reason the Minister of Finance got to his feet in order to ridicule and condemn the amendment, before the House that we have presented, is in order to be consistent with the general line which has been assumed by this

government of hand out, get what you can out of Ottawa, hand out, beg, try to get as much money as you can squeeze out of Uncle Ottawa and at the same time, at the same time, try to convince the people of Newfoundland that this government is standing up for the independence and integrity of this great province of ours. Pure and simple confrontation politics, Mr. Speaker, which is fooling nobody in this province.

We saw it one the energy question, we have seen it on nearly every question which has been raised in Dominion

provincial relations, federal-provincial relations, the Minister of Finance particularly and other ministers for this pure sake of doing it for no other reason, kicking at Ottawa, trying to assert an independence which does not have to be asserted, Mr. Speaker. Nobody doubts the independence of Newfoundland, in Confederation, in Canada. The Minister of Finance does not have to stand up and in his arrogant bully-boy fashion try to build up a political issue or a campaign issue in Newfoundland eyes, that we are standing up for Newfoundland against old Ottawa who is trying to grind us under. The same Ottawa trying to grind us under, which contributes, I suppose eighty cents of every dollar spent in this Province and as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, as long as I was in the Government and as long as I have been in politics I have never known Ottawa to consider this to be anything but the just due of Newfoundland.

I have never heard them express the idea that we have to do something, sell our souls in return for it, that we have to grovel and bow and scrap and genuflect when we go to Ottawa. I have never heard that expresses once, Mr. Speaker but here we have an artificial issue raised by the Minister of Finance and his colleagues exemplified in the way he said we will not vote for the amendment, you know, trying to persuade the people of Newfoundland that an issue exists where in fact no issue does exist, that there is some need to preserve the independence of Newfoundland, that Ottawa is trying to turn this into a unitary form of government where we are all sort of county-council governments or something and great Ottawa rules the roast. Nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

The problem in Canada is not the power of the central Government. The problem in Canada is not the power of the provincial government. The power in Canada is the type of attitude expressed by the Minister of Finance where on every occasion possible, joins hands with Alberta to try to kick over the traces, every occasion possible trying to bring stress and strain on a very fragile union of provinces in this nation and for no reason. We would not mind if there was a reason, Mr. Speaker.

We would not mind if there was some real issue at stake that Newfoundland was being ground under by some tyrannical central government. If it was not for the fact that Ottawa, if anything in many respects, does not have the power to cope with the problems in Canada like regional disparity and other things. If it were not for that, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Finance says might be true but this is just another example of his desire, his wish, to try to make it look like he is once more standing up for independent Newfoundland against tyrannical Ottawa by saying, "Well if a bill which has been passed through the House of Commons in Ottawa after a great deal of thought, after a great deal of expert attention has been applied to it, after all parties in the House agree with it, the only exception being that it has not gone far enough, suddenly, and we make the suggestion that this should be used as a guide for us to mesh with, to meld with the legislation here and the legislation in Ottawa. What can the Minister of Finance say about that?"

The only thing he can say, Mr. Speaker, is that it is ludicrous, it is ridiculous, bankrupt of ideas. That is all he can say, pure confrontation politics. If you mention Ottawa to him, Mr. Speaker, mention Ottawa to the Minister of Finance and he gets his back up and he has to start kicking out immediately unless of course, Mr. Turner in Ottawa lashes out \$24 million and saves the Minister of Finance's neck, Mr. Speaker, then of course, he remains mute and quiet for thirty minutes or an hour and then lashes out again at the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I propose - I do not think I will have time to do it tonight, today - I propose to make some mention of this bill, this act which the Minister of Finance has stated should not be even used as a guide to legislation in this House.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR ROWE: Who is blindly accepting it, Mr. Speaker? What nonsense is that? To propose legislation similar, similar to the act passed by the Parliament of Canada. If the honourable minister were introducing an act and came in and said "Well, I cannot do this because it would

be ultra vires or we cannot do that because it does not apply here. The Yukon is mentioned in the federal act and there is no Yukon in Newfoundland - You know, everybody in the House would agree, Mr. Speaker. Everybody would agree with that, no problem at all. Instead he, without even considering it, he had not even read the act as far as I can make out because during his speech he constantly referred to things which were either wrong or erroneous or he had some half-baked notion of but had never really come to grips with in reading the act.

It is for his benefit more than anyone else that I would like to refer to some of the things that are mentioned in this bill which has been passed by the House of Commons.

and which has been hailed as being the most progressive legislation of its kind in the Western World. I do not say it goes far enough. The honourable minister brought up this aspect of corporations contributing to political parties, which I believe is not banned by this bill, which certainly should be banned. Perhaps when we bring in legislation here, we could think about adding that to the general legislation that the government are going to bring in.

The Election Act, Mr. Speaker, which was approved on January 10, which far-reaching and no government, not even a New Democratic Government, although they spout off a lot about it, has brought in anything which closely approximates it.

This Liberal Government bill requires, Mr. Speaker, public disclosure of the names of donors who contribute one hundred dollars or more to a registered party or candidate - public disclosure, if you give more than one hundred dollars to a registered party or candidate. I dispute what the Hon. Minister of Finance said that this will dry up all funds over one hundred dollars from many sources. I do not think that that is true at all. I think there are people who are fairly well-off in the province, who would not mind giving a thousand dollars, i.e., to a political party. Probably, they would give a thousand dollars to both political parties merely to make sure that there is good, stable adversary government in the province. I do not think any problem, especially if it were income tax deductible, Mr. Speaker, or a portion thereof, I do not think any man would be ashamed of doing that, if he had the resources so to do.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. John Shaheen gave \$103,000.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, the friends of the government - Mr. Shaheen gave \$103,000 to a particular party, quite openly, no problem at all with it, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it would necessarily dry up. I do say though that it is absolutely necessary to have this kind of public disclosure of amounts over one hundred dollars or whatever figure is arrived at. Perhaps one hundred dollars is a good round figure.

The bill in Ottawa, the government bill, places strict limits (I will mention it later. I will go into a little detail later) on the amount of money spent during election campaigns by political parties and candidates -- very strict limits which cannot be exceeded by political parties and candidates when there is an election campaign on, Mr. Speaker. Another aspect of this bill in Ottawa, which gives blessed relief to all of Canada, is the fact that it shortens the time period during which political advertising will be allowed throughout Canada to twenty-nine days. Probably they should have cut it down to ten days or twelve days. It is twenty-nine days rather than two months or more during which political advertising was permitted under the old system, even more than that, of course. If people knew when an election was coming, they could start campaigning months ahead of that even. During a two month campaign it is nice to know that advertising of a certain type, which I will refer to later, has been restricted to twenty-nine days. For this relief, much thanks will be the cry I am sure of most Canadians.

MR. ROBERTS: It will also limit the amounts of expenditure within that twenty-nine day period.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, there are regulations relating to that.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, establishes fines and prison sentences as penalties for breaking the law. There is teeth in the legislation. It does not pussyfoot around. It provides fines and prison sentences as penalties for breaking the law. It provides assistance to candidates with the idea of encouraging active participation by as many candidates as possible and as many parties as possible. It provides financial assistance. The legislation creates a tax credit system to encourage small donations to parties by many -- a tax credit system which is somewhat different, as we will see later, than a straight deduction, Mr. Speaker. The overall effect of it is to encourage people to donate small amounts of money to various political parties of their choice in the province or in Canada, as far as this act is concerned.

The idea expressed in the House of Commons, the provision for the reimbursement of candidates, expenses and the tax credit system, the idea behind that is simple, Mr. Speaker, it is designed to ensure as much as possible that politics in Canada does not become a rich man's game, as it is becoming in Canada and has become to a large measure in the United States. If anybody looks at some of

the candidates for the Senate in the United States or that many candidates for the House of Representatives in the United States, you are amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the number of rich people by any standard, millionaires and near-millionaires and multi-millionaires who are involved in politics in the United States. It is a disgraceful situation, because on any statistical measure not nearly as many wealthy people should be involved in politics. There should be more people from the solid middle income groups and the lower income groups, especially the solid middle income groups, Mr. Speaker, who, after all, do represent the majority of the people in a particular country and who are the backbone of that country. These people are effectively precluded from getting into politics by the system as we know it in Canada today in large measure.

Mr. Speaker, the spending limits which I mentioned - I do not know if the House Leader wants to -

MR. ROBERTS: We do not need a motion.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This is Wednesday so we can - the Speaker leaves the Chair until tomorrow.

As far as spending limits are concerned under this Ottawa Act, Mr. Speaker, the act limits the amount of money which political parties in Canada can spend in an election. Parties are allowed to spend no more than thirty cents for each elector registered on the preliminary voting lists in every constituency in which that party has a candidate. Candidates are limited to one dollar for the first fifteen thousand voters registered on the lists, fifty cents for each of the next ten thousand voters and twenty-five cents for each voter over twenty-five. There we have the party itself, Mr. Speaker, in its expenditure are allowed to spend no more than thirty cents for each voter and a candidate is limited to a dollar for each fifteen thousand voters and fifty cents for each of the next ten thousand voters and twenty-five cents for over twenty-five.

So, you can see that in a constituency that has fifteen thousand voters, for example, fifteen thousand dollars would be the limit that would be able to be expended by a candidate or a party in that election. If there is a twenty-five thousand dollar constituency, twenty thousand dollars would be the limit. Mr. Speaker, I notice you are eyeing the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It is six o'clock and I note that the honourable member for White Bay South has ended the debate today and will get the first opportunity to speak on next Private Member's Day.

I do now leave the Chair until three of the clock tomorrow Thursday, February 14, 1974.