



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 14

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Island Harbour on Fogo Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that in Grand Falls?

CAPT. WINSOR: No but I expect the member for Grand Falls to get up and support it. He has a very keen interest in this district. The petition calls for the upgrading of a road between Island Harbour and other communities on Fogo Island and the prayer of the petition is that; "We, the resident voters and taxpayers of Island Harbour do hereby affix our signature and petition the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to have the six miles of gravel road between Island and the main highway across Fogo Island, as well as the two miles of gravel road through the community itself, upgraded or rebuilt to an acceptable standard by engineering principles."

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition and I think the Island Harbour people are justified in requesting that this road be upgraded or reconstructed because originally the road was built, it was built about sixteen years ago, and at that time of course when all road construction was taking place on the island, I would assume that it was built of a very low standard. So I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, place this petition on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make sure you have it signed now.

CAPT. WINSOR: My petitions are always signed. Do not worry.

MR. NEARY: We know the rules over here.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Grand Falls.

MR. A. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition from the residents of Island Harbour. Being somewhat familiar with the district and Fogo Island as well, I agree with

the honourable member that the road is of very low standard and in certain sections, Sir, very dangerous and constructed at a time when many of the roads in the province were merely pushed through to provide communications to the other communities in the area. The road, Sir, must also be very important to the residents of this community as they have to travel from the Community of Island Harbour to probably Fogo or the larger communities to get their mail or much of their supplies. So I take pleasure in supporting the petition, Sir, on behalf of the people of Island Harbour, presented by the honourable the member for Fogo District.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I beg permission in this honourable House to present a petition on behalf of some 33 residents of the Area of Bryants Cove known as The Point. These people want the road that is approximately seven-tenths of a mile that is now under the jurisdiction of the Local Roads Board to be transferred or taken over

by the Department of Transportation and Communication.

I support this petition, Sir, I think there are at least ten families there. The only access to that area now is by a very steep incline, hill known as Tim's Hill. I do not think, Sir, there will be any conflict of interest in this petition because there is also a cemetery on that road. I am sure probably the Hon. Member for Bell Island who knows the Harbour Grace District well will support this petition.

I have much pleasure, Sir, on behalf of these residents in tabling this petition.

MR. S. A. NEARY: I accepted the honourable member's invitation, Sir, to support the prayer of the petition. I think it is quite important to the honourable member, Sir, to get that road placed under the Department of Transportation and Communications because, Mr. Speaker, probably the most supporters that the member has in his district at the present time are living on that road.

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if the minister has had an opportunity to supply the House with information and documentation showing that DREE schools are more costly to build and maintain than the schools built by the provincial government? Sir, the minister promised to get this information some time ago.

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

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, as I recall in replying to the oral question a few days ago from the honourable member, I suggested at that time it would be something which is to be handled orally; it could be done in the estimates. If the honourable gentleman should wish it before that time, then I think being a statistical and a mathematical matter it would be the kind of answer at least which would be a tabled written answer and that being so, then I think the question would be the same. So verbally or orally, I would

certainly be prepared to do it orally at the estimates but if the honourable gentleman should wish it before that, since the answer to that question is the kind which should really be written, it is a factual mathematical, statistical answer, then I think the question would be an Order Paper question.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. the Minister of Education not think that in order to adequately debate the estimates that this information should be supplied prior to and in writing, prior to the consideration of the estimates?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, just as two and two are four, a written question requires a written answer and a written answer requires a written question. If specific question is on the Order Paper then I shall give a specific answer. I suggest that by its very nature requires a written documented answer. It is not a question of policy, it is a question of specifics statistical, mathematically data. If that kind of answer is a written, tabled answer then the question should be the same. I suggest the honourable member, all he has to do is put a question on the Order Paper.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. the Minister of Education indicate to the House whether the government are prepared to supply emergency grants to the school boards in order to relieve

extreme current financial difficulties which amount approximately to \$3.5 million.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is evident in Hansard because it has already been answered.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Consult Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Education. Is it the minister's intention to provide a great increase in operating grants to school boards for the year of 1974-75 in order to combat the great increase in salaries paid to school board employees, heat, electricity, interest payments, supplies and transportation.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman knows that the question is totally out of order because - I presume he knows. I give him the benefit of the doubt. He should know, I presume he knows, that the question is out of order because it anticipates a specific budgetary allocation which neither I nor any minister is in a position to give before the estimates of expenditure for the next fiscal year are tabled in this House.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. the Premier, I have to direct this question to the honourable Minister of Education. Is it the minister's intention to call for an enquiry into reasons for the rapidly escalating cost of school construction and that government instituted study of allocation of funds to all branches of educational systems as requested by the Newfoundland Federation of School Boards?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, it is obvious, is going to various points made by the Newfoundland Federation of School Boards and basing his questions on them which is fair enough. Obviously he can use any material he wishes as a basis of questions.

Actually, the point made in the Federation of School Boards was a request for an enquiry into the escalating construction costs, a full stop. It was not for schools or for anything else. I mean, what effects the escalating construction costs of schools are the same factors of escalating construction costs in general. I would say that I think my answer to the honourable gentleman could be put a few ways. Perhaps the best way of putting it is that while I now have a draft reply to the Federation of School Boards, I have not a signed reply mailed to them which will be going out from my office in the next few days.

I think that in courtesy to the people who sent the letter that obviously my reply should be to them before being made public. The sub-^{to the} mission was from them to me and it is only fair that I sign a reply and ^{10/6-} allow two days for that reply to be received before answering it. When ^{11/2/74} that time has elapsed, I am certainly willing to read the reply to honourable members here.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the House Leader on the Government side could indicate whether or not the Minister of Transportation and Communications will be in the House during the question period? I have a number of urgent questions I wanted to ask the Minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I have a number too. The same sort of thing.

MR. ROWE: Well, there are a number of questions, Mr. Speaker, and if you will allow me to give some background to it. Since the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications is not here at the present time, I would like to address a question to the honourable the Minister of Justice, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications and in the absence of the Premier, if I am allowed a little latitude.

MR. SPEAKER: I will have to await the question as the honourable member is wandering too far astray.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the great Northern

Peninsula Highway, particularly in the area of St. Barbe North and I believe in White Bay North, has been blocked for a number of days and access to the St. Anthony Hospital was virtuously impossible and a number of school days have been lost and this is the time of year when this type of thing is going to continue to happen, I was wondering if the Minister of Justice could give the House some indications as to whether or not additional snow-clearing equipment can be sent into both of these districts as they are very badly needed indeed?

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a definitive answer at this time but I do undertake to inquire of the officials in the Department of Transportations and Communications as to what reports they have received, as I am sure honourable members from the North, Great Northern Peninsula have received on the transportation problems in that area. My understanding, from what the honourable member for St. Barbe North has said, is that the schools in St. Barbe North and in White Bay North are still closed -

the schools are now open again but they were out, they were closed.

Is the hospital at St. Anthony accessible now?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is accessible at this moment.

MR. HICKMAN: I will attempt to ascertain for honourable members from that area, both the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable the member for St. Barbe North, as to what representation has been made to the officials in the Department of Transportation and Communications and what remedial steps they feel are required.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition:

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask what amounts to a supplementary question and I put it in the form of a question although I suspect one would have to put a question mark at the end of the statement, Sir. The problem in White Bay North is in addition to the main road being closed. The Area in North St. Anthony which includes Quirpon, L'Anse-au-Meadow, Hay Cove, Straitsview, Noddy Bay area, the machinery has been out of action more than it has been in action and what is needed is an assurance that either new machinery will be provided or additional machinery will be provided. What we have had happen, Sir, in the last few days in that part of White Bay North is really a complete breakdown of the snow removal services. That affects not only access to and from the hospital but access to and from the schools.

All of the children, Sir, in that part of White Bay North now move by bus to the schools. All the schools are centralized. There is an Integrated School and a Pentecostal School and no other schools there. There is an all-grade Pentecostal School at St. Lunaire for all of the children of the Pentecostal Assemblies in that area and an Integrated School in Gunners Cove for all the children from grade one to grade eight. The high school children all go to St. Anthony.

In addition to that, Sir, there are no stores that carry any large food supplies any more. They all now look to - in effect, they have a two or three or four day reserve. Given two or three or four

days without trucks coming up, you do run into, not emergencies, Mr. Speaker, nobody is on the verge of starvation - but into inconveniences that are beginning to be serious inconveniences.

I guess my question is; would the minister undertake to in behalf of his colleague see the officials concerned and to impress upon them the urgency of the situation. If they wish to see either myself or my colleague we would be happy to give them the information we have. Would he undertake, possibly, to let us know, either in the House or outside, whichever is convenient, as it is of terrific concern to the people of that area? The services have broken down completely and something has to be done.

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: I would like to address a question to the honourable Minister of Justice and I think it is a very serious question, the answer to which may give honourable members on both sides of the House some clarification: Is it the practice of civil servants such as district superintendents of highways to refuse to answer an elected representative of this honourable House when asked if he had made representation to his minister for such things as additional snow clearing equipment in his own district?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the first question put by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and assure him that I will attempt to get the information from the officials of the Department of Transportation and Communications this afternoon.

With respect to the question put by the honourable the member for St. Barbe North, to me that is really not a proper question, it is an imputation. I cannot comment on the practice of public servants. As far as I know we have in Newfoundland a group of highly dedicated public servants and I do know that in the Department of Transportation and Communications, particularly in the winter months, that those who are in charge of snow clearing operations work far, far beyond the call of duty. I would be very surprised indeed, if any of them failed at any time to respond to their obligations and responsibilities.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification: I would like the House to understand that I was not accusing any members of the Department of Transportation and Communications of being negligent in their duties, I was just asking a question of principle here.

Sir, does the honourable Minister of Justice realize that two days ago a trucker carrying \$4,000 worth of vegetables, milk, fruit and cream lost approximately \$2,500 of his cargo because he was refused permission to plug the heater of his truck into the Department of Highways Depot in St. Barbe while the highway was blocked to the St. Barbe Bay Basin Area?

MR. SPEAKER: It appears to me that the question is basically out of order. It is a statement of fact rather than a question.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Finished? Everybody finished?

MR. W. ROWE: Is the "Burp from Burgeo" finished, Mr. Speaker?

May I direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Forestry? Would the minister inform the House whether any person or firm has been retained by his department or any other department of government to prepare these advertisements that are appearing in various newspapers and on the radio stations, I think, concerning the government's policy on forestry?

HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Forestry and Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been a firm retained (I just forget the firm) to do the necessary advertising on the forest policy.

MR. W. ROWE: Would the honourable minister undertake to get me the name, if he could check with one of his officials? Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition knows but I am not quite sure that it is the same firm that both gentlemen are talking about.

MR. MAYNARD: The name of the official from that firm?

MR. W. ROWE: No. I would like the name of the firm itself, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister undertake to give me or to give the House, orally, publicly, an estimate of the cost of this advertising campaign or the cost of the contract entered into between his department or the government and this particular firm?

MR. MAYNARD: I will try to provide the House with that information, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a similar question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would the Minister of Fisheries indicate to the House if the paid political broadcasts involving civil servants are sponsored by the Newfoundland Information Services or are they handled by George McLean? How much are they costing?

AN HON. MEMBER: Cover up again.

MR. SPEAKER: The question should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: We are not going to get much information from the honourable minister I can see that. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question and I think the only one I can direct it to is the Minister of Justice, the (Acting) Premier. Would the minister indicate to the House if the government have taken any decision on a petition signed by over seventy-eight per cent of the employees in Confederation Building, requesting that the lunch hour be reduced to one hour so that the working day would be from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., instead of 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.?

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now from recollection. I think all ministers were asked to look at this petition because it is not the only one. There is a great divergence of opinion amongst those employed in this building as to what the closing hours would be. Whilst we want to accommodate the public servants of this province, we do have a paramount duty to accomodate the public of Newfoundland who want to use this building and in the light of that no decision has been made.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development could bring us up to date on the government's announced second hardwood plant for Central or Western Newfoundland, which the Premier announced some time ago?

HON. W. DOODY (Minister of Industrial Development): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, there was no second hardwood plant announced for Newfoundland. As I understand it and from my comments on it, the announcement was to the effect that a Finnish firm, that is a firm from Finland, not a finished firm, had undertaken, in conjunction with the Department of Forestry and with the Department of Economic Development, to run some tests on the birch stands in the province. We undertook to supply them with some 1,500 to 3,000 cords of birch for that purpose and the results were to have been evaluated and if

found satisfactory, then we would look into the possibility of establishing such a hardwood factory. To date we have not been able to find the required size to the specification of the Finnish firm and the thing just sits there as it is. We hope to convince them that they should try some of the smaller birch that we have in this province but to date they have not come along to our way of thinking.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Hon. Minister of Health. A few days ago I directed a question in his absence to the Hon. Premier, concerning a health clinic which had been planned for the Port Hope Simpson Area, the plans for which seemed to have become lost somewhere. I wonder if the minister could shed any light on this at this particular time?

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, there is a plan in the works I had to look up because I had no knowledge that the honourable member had asked this question. In Port Hope Simpson and some other community near by, the question boiled down to whether we should divide the nurses, (there are two nurses) whether they would isolate themselves, one living in one place and one in the other or whether they would not wish to combine the services into one clinic. I will endeavour to give the honourable member the specific information when I have checked on it.

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

the Minister of Justice indicate to the House whether or not he has received a letter from me dated February 11, 1974 requesting a commission of enquiry into the Saunders scandal?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I, together with every other honourable member of the House, received a letter from the honourable the member for Bell Island. I found it a most offensive letter, a letter that would put the late Senator McCarthy's tactics in the light of that of a Sunday School teacher.

The letter referred to political wheeling and dealing. It was submitted to the press, circulated to everyone who wanted to hear it, without any allegations and to substantiate that then went on to ask if the police be involved in the investigation or something which -

MR. NEARY: R.C.M.P.

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition was very careful, and I read and reread it and I did not read it alone, in his speech to say that he was not suggesting that there was any crime involved and I have not the slightest intention -

MR. ROBERTS: I made no such statement. I made a statement with irresistible inference.

MR. HICKMAN: I would certainly not allow the police to become involved in investigating irresistible inferences.

The other thing, while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: What about the disposal of the Bell Island assets?

MR. HICKMAN: Well the honourable gentleman knows far more about the disposal of -

MR. NEARY: No I do not, the honourable minister knows all about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKMAN: The letter that was attached is an appendix to his letter from the honourable member from Bell Island, which was a copy of a letter sent to the Department of National Revenue. Well, it is not for me to advise Mr. Saunders, but if that letter is not libelous then I cannot interpret the word libel.

Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, the colleague of the honourable member for Bell Island, more than anticipated his letter because he has placed on the Order Paper of this House a resolution that we debate, the necessity of appointing a commission. I am sure that the honourable the member for White Bay South would not have put it on if he did not want to have a full and adequate debate of this resolution. I would suggest that there should be closer communication between the two honourable gentlemen.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I might say to the honourable minister that the Income Tax Department have done me the courtesy of replying to the letter. Does the minister, Mr. Speaker, intend to reply to my letter or does he intend to take the necessary steps to set up the commission of enquiry? Is that my understanding of what the minister said?

MR. HICKMAN: To the honourable member for Bell Island; my reply now there is no point in repeating it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement that the Minister of Justice just made and as the Acting Premier would the minister agree to move the resolution my colleague placed on the Order Paper ahead of all the other resolutions on the Order Paper at the present time? We can debate it today instead of -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are other resolutions on the Order Paper which are certainly of equal importance to the people of Newfoundland and which should be adequately debated and ventilated and I am sure that honourable members have to agree with that. Imagine the two resolutions on fisheries being aside for debate on this.

MR. NEARY: Coward.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Before we get into Orders of the Day, it has just been brought to my attention that in the galleries we have Mayor Janes and Councillor Browne of Change Islands and I would like to welcome these two gentlemen to the galleries today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: We continue with motion no. 3 on the Order Paper

I think the honourable member for White Bay South adjourned the debate the last day.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, does one of the officials at the table know how much time I expended last day speaking on this?

AN HON. MEMBER: Three hours.

MR. WM. ROWE: It sounded like about three hours. How much?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fifty minutes. I wish it were fifteen minutes but it is fifty minutes and I have to fill it up.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not here today. I hate to come close to slandering a man in his absence but it is not my fault he is not here. I wish he were here. Last day he got up and was slinging around all kinds of gross accusations. When it comes our time to sling a few back at him he seems to disappear, to evaporate off the face of the earth.

He talked about how when he was the shining knight in white armour or on a white charger rather, a shining knight on a white charger, Liberal Reform Leader, sitting on that side of the House with the previous administration and he called for legislation to deal with election irregularities and election expenses, we voted against it over there. Of course, it is coming close to, well I would not say dishonesty but it is coming close to something along that line, Sir, for him to pretend to the House that he does not know why. A man who was then straight on his path towards his abysmal defeat in his leadership try for the Liberal Party and he was trying to give every impression of being Mr. Clean, not unlike the Minister of Justice, unassociated with any kind of corrupt election practices or anything like that and he knew that the members on that side of the House would have to vote against

his resolution, Sir, because he had forced them into such a position.

Now, Sir, we have reached the position where one of his own colleagues, the Member for St. John's North, very wisely and very ably moved a motion before this House calling for certain legislative measures to be brought into the House and to be made in order to control the possibility of abuses at election time and providing also for the public financing of election campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance gets on his feet two years after or three years after making an urgent cry and plea for the immediate introduction of this kind of a thing, gets on his feet and says well we may or may not do it this session. We may or may not do it as the Hon. the Member for St. John's North has recommended it. Suddenly it loses the sense of urgency which he had when he was trying to become the great reform leader in this province.

Sir, last day I said and it was quoted in the "Evening Telegram" and I will say it again for the record that if there were any hypocrisy shown by any members on this side of the House when they were on that side of the House, because they voted against his resolution and subsequently now support it when we are on this side of the House, if that is hypocrisy, Sir, it is hypocrisy of a far less damaging type than a member of the House who when he is not in power cries out for something garners votes unto himself, garners support onto himself for a certain position and when he gets into a position, when he gets into a place of power then suddenly finds all the excuses in the world why he cannot bring that legislation before the House or why the thing he earlier called for cannot be done on an urgent basis. That kind of hypocrisy, Sir, is far worse, than any shown by any other member of this House, on both side of this House.

He tries to say that well we brought in an amendment which he cannot support because it involves the Government of Canada legislation. I have already said to him that the only reason we brought in that legislation is because it directs the government to do a definite thing. It toughens up, it supports in principle the motion brought in by the Member for St. John's

North but it toughens it up, it gives the government more guidelines and more direction as to how they should proceed in this matter.

We now see that we had good reason to toughen up the legislation or the motion brought in by the member; because we have seen the Minister of Finance use every tactic in the book to try and get out of bringing it in at least this session or probably at any session of this honourable House.

This government and the Minister of Finance particularly has lost his enthusiasm, since they gained power, Mr. Speaker, lost their enthusiasm for this much needed reform. That is why we moved a motion of amendment to the main motion before the House because we could see that the enthusiasm for it had been lost. We could see that a backbencher of, the government side of the House felt constrained to bring it in on his own. The government were obviously making no moves to bring it in themselves. Therefore we thought that it was necessary to toughen up the motion before the House.

Mr. Speaker, let me mention one other thing concerning this whole debate. It concerns an editorial which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" a couple of days ago when the Minister of Finance rose in this House on a so-called point of privilege. It turned out it was no point of privilege whatsoever. He asked the House to do nothing. He got up and complained about the unfairness of an editorial by a respected writer and journalist in the province. He got up and complained about it, whined about it and moaned about how unfair it was and admitted that the writer had gone nowhere near the laws of libel or slander. He admitted that quite freely. Asked the House to do nothing about it. He did not ask that the man be brought before the Bar to answer for his grave allegations or charges. He did not say that the House impose a penalty on the writer or anything like that. No, Mr. Speaker, he did not have the fortitude to take any decisive action. Instead he flings out a challenge to the writer, invites the writer to break the law, invites the writer to make slanderous and libelous allegations against the Minister of Finance so that the minister could issue a writ against him and bring the matter into court.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista North:

MR. MORGAN: South.

MR. W.N. ROWE: South. What a gross slander on my own colleague. The member for Bonavista South, I am very disappointed in the honourable member, Sir. There was a time when he was the great independent in this House, a man who would take the right side of the issue no matter who brought the issue forward. Now, all of a sudden, the Premier must have spoken to him. He must have said: "Now my son, you be a good boy and toe the line and you may go in the cabinet."

MR. MORGAN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: We are debating an amendment brought forward by the honourable member for White Bay North with regard to financing of election expenses. I fail to see what my involvement as the member for Bonavista South has to do with election campaign expenses.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Also, what the honourable member for St. John's West had to say about a so-called Journalist two days ago in this House. I ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE: May I speak to the point of order, Sir, before you make your ruling? Sir, I did not mention the member for Bonavista South until he himself ignorantly interrupted me in my speech. If the honourable member for Bonavista South persists in discourteously and ignorantly interrupting me in my speech, he can expect to get as good or better in return, Mr. Speaker. On that point of order I would ask you to so rule as well that a member of this House has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: I will remind the honourable member for Bonavista South that when an honourable member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence; and the honourable member for White Bay South was not being relevant to the amendment in question.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As far as the other point about the journalist who wrote an editorial, the editorial, Mr. Speaker,

was about election financing and the possibility of corruption and abuse. That is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member for Bonavista South is obviously too busy writing letters to the editor under a pseudonym to read the editorials that appear in the same paper. If he read the editorials, Sir, if he read the editorials he would know that what I am talking about is on point. The editorial concerned the position taken by the honourable Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's West, on this very thing we are talking about. Perhaps if he spent more time reading the paper instead of writing letters under a pseudonym, pretending that letters are coming in from Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we would get further in this House.

MR. THOMS: Surely the member is not doing that! Is he?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No. No. No. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: No point of privilege was in fact raised by the honourable Minister of Finance, no infraction of any of the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, yet he saw fit to drag the matter in and bore us to death for fifteen minutes over there, as he got this thing off his chest and whined and moaned about how unfairly he was being treated.

Mr. Speaker, let me say something about that type of editorial on election financing. As far as I am concerned, Sir, the only thing that stands between a government, this government or any other government, being completely arrogant and contemptuous of the people is a good opposition and a good, solid press corp. It is for that reason, Sir, that I say, if the Government of this Province, this government or any other government, were satisfied with the news service, if they were satisfied with the comments made on election financing or anything else by writers in this province, then I would say democracy or anything else, good government in this province would be in a very, very sad shape.

If the Minister of Finance, particularly, were satisfied with the way journalists were covering his speeches on election financing and his position on election financing, then I would say that we would be in sad shape in this province. If on the other hand, Sir, and I speak as a member of the opposition as well as a past member of a government, if any particular government, especially this one, are outraged, irritated, annoyed beyond question by the treatment received by the government from a journalist like Mr. Wick Collins, then I say that democracy is in a healthy position, in a healthy state in this province.

No one, Sir, felt the wrath of journalists more, Sir, than we did when we were in the government. Wick Collins himself, Ray Guy, Peter Simple, laterally - the Late Peter Simple - I hope his position is filled by somebody of - it would be hard to find anyone of the same calibre but somebody close to the same calibre - but nobody felt the wrath of journalists and commentators and editors

more than we did. I for one, Sir, as a member of this House in public life do not complain about it, even though some times we thought that we were being unfairly treated. I say to Wick Collins, Sir, and every other editor and journalist in this province: Go to it with a heart and a half. Pay no attention to the whining and moaning of the Minister of Finance or any other member of the government concerning the position they might be assuming on election financing. I say to Wick Collins and other journalists: Give every member of this House, if they deem fit, give every member of this House a scathing time on any position that they might assume and especially members of the government. If the time should come that we go into the government and we assume a silly, idiotic position on election financing like the Minister of Finance has, Sir, then I invite Wick Collins to give us a touch of the whip as well. Tear us to shreds this government here or any other government. What is the Minister of Finance complaining about, Sir? A government with unlimited resources, unlimited finances, unlimited practically, manpower to get his message across to the people as we have seen by the answer from the Minister of Forestry today, hire on firms and get them to sell their message, using public funds to propagandize the people. The Minister of Finance has the face and the gall to rise like a whimpering whipped pup in this House and complain about a journalist giving him a hard time in the papers.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: What is wrong with "Witch Hunt Willy?"

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we have heard for fifteen minutes about the reactions of the Hon. Minister of Finance to the paper, which has no relationship, Mr. Speaker, to the matter now before the Chair, which is the resolution of the Hon. Member for St. John's North. In other words, he is not being relevant.

MR. W. ROWE: May I speak to that point of order, Sir?

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about election financing and I am speaking about abuses of elections and controls of abuses. I am talking about the position assumed by the Minister of Finance on that very question. I am talking about a comment made by an editor on that very question. I am talking about the position then assumed by the Minister of Finance on that very question. How can one be more relevant to the question before the House, Mr. Speaker? I submit that the point of order is not a point of order at all.

MR. MARSHALL: If the honourable member wished to discuss it, the proper time for him to have discussed that, Mr. Speaker, was yesterday when it was brought up in the House. At that time, he could have objected that it was not a point of privilege or something. Now he has gone on for about ten minutes on a tirade against the Minister of Finance and we are talking about public financing of elections. I submit that he is really wandering from the subject.

MR. W. ROWE: Sit down! It hurts too much, does it?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that all honourable members are aware that the rule of relevancy is one of the most difficult ones to rule on. However, the Hon. Member for White Bay South, I think, was straying a little from the amendment in question. I would caution him to be perhaps a little more relevant as he continues to speak.

MR. W. ROWE: Anyway, Sir, I was saying that governments do have unlimited resources and this can be an election abuse. They can hire firms as the Minister of Forestry is now doing, leading up to an election, which may come a year or two from now. Using public funds, Mr. Speaker, if that is not an election abuse, what is? That is what I am talking about. I do not expect us to sink into the cerebral brain matter of the Member for St. John's East, Sir.

I do not expect that to happen. That is asking too much, Sir.
I am talking about election abuses.

A government, Sir, have everything in their favour. They have lopsided powers. I would hate to see any member of the press, if I am in the government or not, I would hate to see any member of the press, Sir, being intimidated by the "bully boy tactics" of the Minister of Finance or any other minister. I am sure that Wick Collins will not be so bullied. I am sure now that the Minister of Finance can expect one or two other editorials with mild comments on positions assumed by the Minister of Finance. I hope he does that. I hope that Wick Collins, if we get into government or any other journalist, tears us into shreds as well. There is a tendency for governments, and there is no clearer example than this one, who consist of members who are contrite and humble before going into power, there is a tendency for governments to become arrogant and contemptuous of the people and of elected members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the only bulwark standing between the government and the people is an opposition and a press. I ask the press.

to continue their scathing attacks on this government and us when we go into the government after the next election.

Let me get to the Ottawa legislation, Sir, which is the principle really of this amendment moved. I may have strayed somewhat. The last day when I was talking about this I mentioned some of the highlights of this legislation. The public disclosure of names of donors who contributed \$100 or more to a registered party or candidate. Strict limits on the amount of money spend during election campaigns. Shortening the time period during which political advertising can take place and so on.

On the spending limit, Sir, the Ottawa Act limits the amount of money which political parties and candidates can spend in an election. Parties are allowed to spend no more than thirty cents for each registered elector on the voting list, in each riding, in each constituency in which the party has a candidate.

Candidates themselves, Sir, the individual candidate himself is limited to one dollar for each of the first 15,000 voters registered on the voting list and fifty cents for each of the next. So you can see that if a riding, a constituency has say 15,000 voters registered on the preliminary voting list then the limit of money to be spent by the candidate himself would be \$15,000, in that particular riding. Of course, as I read the legislation the party itself could spend another thirty cents for each voter on the voting list which means that all the voters in Canada, in the case of the federal scene, the various parties can spend thirty cents for each elector, for each voter on the preliminary voting list.

As far as election expenses are concerned, Sir, the new Ottawa Act broadens involvement in political parties by encouraging volunteer support and small donations rather than as it has happened in the past with all parties including the N.N.P. who get large donations from unions. This new act encourages volunteer support, volunteer work and small donations rather than concentrating on the few large donors and supporters. The act strictly defines what are to be included as election expenses.

They are defined as the amounts paid, election expenses are the amounts actually paid in cash, liabilities incurred. In other words, Sir, the time will be gone when say a person or a firm can allow a political party the use of aircraft, for example, whether it is in the Hermitage by-election or somewhere else, either not billed for it or billed the government for it, add it on to another bill. That day is gone, Sir, hopefully. Any liabilities which are incurred by political parties at fair value are considered to be election expenses.

The commercial value of goods and services donated or provided other than simple volunteer labour, workers and this sort of thing, but if you hire somebody to do a job for you like McLeans, for example, George McLeans firm.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, (W.N.): I do not know but if I can gather from what the Minister of Finance said last day, George McLean and his firms either did not bill the P.C. Party at all or did not bill them as high as he should have because he was relying, according to the Minister of Finance, on the possibility of patronage from the government after that party got into power, if it did, and as it happened it did. Well, Mr. Speaker, that surely should be outlawed. That surely should become an offence if that attempt is made unless the liability incurred is listed as an election expense. That would make it fair. Then it not only becomes public that George McLean is owed several hundred thousands of dollars by the P.C. Party while he is doing government work. That becomes public. Also, of course, the fact that liability is incurred, that liability is taken on by the P.C. Party means that they are obliged to spend less money in other areas of their campaigning.

Sir, there are one or two other examples: Only registered parties, candidates and persons acting on their behalf with their knowledge and consent can incur election expenses during an election period. Anyone else incurring election expenses commits an offence against this act. That is another good and beneficial amendment, Sir. Both parties I would submit, the P.C. Party and the Liberal Party, are constantly plagued during an election campaign by the fact that unauthorized people are always running up bills during an election,

during the campaign. We had one case for example where a man looking for nomination -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Yes, ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs about Abe Godwin, clobbered him as a Liberal, would not clobber him now as a Tory, I do not think. Clobbered as a Liberal, I think Abe got a couple of hundred votes or less.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about saying it was 760 votes.

MR. WM. ROWE: Oh we are looking into that now. Poor old Abe finally had to admit at the end of the programme that somebody put him up to it. He said; "Well I really did not do it myself, I was put up to this."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would care to afford me some protection. Anyway, Abe Godwin is not the biggest problem in this House, Mr. Speaker, I would submit.

Mr. Speaker, disclosure is another important element of the federal act. All contributions over \$100 to registered parties and to candidates or their agents must be disclosed. The nature of the contributor, individual, that is if he is an individual or a corporation or whatever he might be, must be disclosed. The name of the contributor and the amount contributed must be disclosed. Good and beneficial provisions in that federal act. No contributor to a political party or a candidate can cover his contributions by making them through a third party. There will be no, well this would not happen in Newfoundland anyway, but none of the things that would happen in the United States where they try to wash the political contributions by putting them through Panama or through the Bahamas or through Switzerland for that matter, none of that kind of thing would go on, Mr. Speaker, or if it did go on it would be a gross infringement on the act and people could go to jail as a result.

All statements and documents of both contributions and expenditures

of parties and candidates during an election are required to be given to the Chief Electoral Officer and become available for public examination. That is of course the most important provision of all.

The press, Mr. Wick Collins, could have one or two comments on the expenditures of the Progressive Conservative Party or the Liberal Party and that is of course where the strength of this legislation comes through. All election expenses and contributions and reports, all reports of election expenses and contributions of candidates, will be published by the Chief Electoral Officer in a newspaper in the constituency concerned. The candidate must provide an official report to an auditor within two months of an election which is then passed on to the Chief Electoral Officer. Registered parties must provide an audited report for each election for public examination as well, Mr. Speaker.

As far as campaign advertising is concerned, we will get some blessed relief under the new legislation in Ottawa. The act in Ottawa, the federal act, provides for six and a half hours of guaranteed prime time for both television and radio to registered parties. Fifty per cent of the cost of this time, which must be sold by the stations at the lowest rate, will be paid for by public funds. That I think is an excellent indication as to the direction taken by the federal parties as well, Mr. Speaker.

Allocation of the time among parties will be made by a formula supervised by the C.R.T.C. Of course now the Minister of Finance would at this point get up and start howling, moaning, whining and groaning again about the C.R.T.C. and how they do not afford any protection, do not afford any protection to the public in Newfoundland or in Canada.

Media advertising, and that would include television, radio, newspapers, magazines, will not be permitted at all, Mr. Speaker, until the twenty-ninth day before polling day. In other words, Sir, we get about a month of advertising during a federal election campaign, that is all. No longer will we have to put up with the nonsense from all three

or four parties in Canada going on for two or three months before the election, completely satiating every elector in Canada.

Now we will at least have only one month of it, which is quite long enough I would submit, Sir, and parties and candidates and certainly the public should welcome that kind of a provision.

The only exception to that rule are for meetings whose principle purpose are the nomination of candidates. Obviously you have to advertise that a

meeting is being held to nominate candidates for parties (Well, that is okay. There has never been too much problem there, too much of an abuse there) or for the promoting of visits by party leaders and since party leaders can only be in one place at one time and Canada is a big country, then there will not be too much problem there. Lawn signs, pamphlets, and canvassing, going around from door to door, for example, will still be allowed during the total campaign period. Well, that is reasonable as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a system for tax credits, for donations to political parties, under the Federal Act. Contributions can be made on a yearly basis to political parties or to parties and to candidates at the election time but contributions can only be made to registered agents of parties and official agents of candidates to be eligible for tax credit. Not everybody can accept part funds, donations any more, Mr. Speaker. The person who can accept the funds, on behalf of the party or the candidate, must be publicly registered as such. Now I hope, Sir, we will get rid of this insidious bagman scheme that has grown up all over the Western world where nobody publicly knows who the bagman is except by rumor and usually scandalous rumor.

The job itself becomes a very unsavory one. Publicly, all kinds of things thrown around about a person who is involved in collection. The thing is now opened up, a breath of fresh air blown across it under the Ottawa Act and they are official receivers, so to speak, for candidates and for parties.

In order to widen the basis of contributions, to get as many people contributing as possible to political parties and candidates, as I mentioned the act provides for tax credits. A tax credit is a direct reduction of the Federal Income Tax payable in any given year on an individual tax form. For example, the example I had provided for me here is if a person must pay, for example, one hundred dollars in federal taxes

in an given year, if that is what his taxes are, after all deductions are made, one hundred dollars in federal taxes, but if he has made one hundred dollars by way of contribution to a political party he will receive, Sir, a tax credit on that one hundred dollars of seventy-five dollars and he would then only have to pay twenty-five dollars in federal taxes.

The formula which applies to this is that seventy-five per cent of a contribution up to one hundred dollars becomes a tax credit. Between one hundred dollars and five hundred and fifty dollars, seventy-five per cent plus fifty per cent between one hundred dollars and five hundred - in other words, there is a reducing scale but very generous tax credits are allowed. For example, if it is a contribution of one hundred dollars it is seventy-five dollars tax credit, two hundred dollars would be one hundred and twenty-five dollar tax credit deducted right off the income tax that a person would have to pay. If it is one thousand dollars that is contributed to a party, then the taxpayer can deduct four hundred and fifty dollars right off the tax which he ordinarily would have to pay to the Government of Canada. This encourages, Sir, the donations of small amounts of money to the various political parties throughout Canada.

There is also a provision for the reimbursement of money to candidates who have taken part in an election. Naturally, you have to make a provision for your nuisance candidates. If a person

If a person, Sir, thought he could run and get money from Ottawa just for the sake of running then, of course, you would get a lot of people who would be running, politically and registering parties and doing it all.

So, the act, by agreement of all parties in the House of Commons, the act provides that candidates who are elected or who have received fifteen per cent or more of the popular vote and who have provided all the information required by the act are entitled to a certain amount of reimbursement. For example, the postage cost of first-class mailing to every voter on the voter's list, eight cents for each of the first 25,000 voters on the voters list and six cents after that; up to \$250.00 to assist in payment of the auditor required by the act and in certain large ridings and I would say Newfoundland should certainly come under that particular heading; in certain large ridings the actual value of candidates travelling expenses to a maximum of \$3,000 Mr. Speaker.

So, for example, if there are 15,000 voters in a district, a candidate, besides the other things mentioned on media, advertising and that, can receive \$1,200 by way of reimbursement. If, for example, there are 60,000 voters in a particular riding, it rises but by diminishing amounts, 60,000 voters the government provides the candidate, provided he gets elected or gets fifteen per cent of the vote cast, he can receive \$3,600 from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this act has been characterized as the toughest and most progressive election expenses legislation conceived and brought into Canada and it goes away beyond what provincial governments, including N.D.P. governments who are always yapping off about this sort of thing, have brought in to control election expenses in their provinces. A good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, the only problem with it is that it probably does not go quite far enough. For example, the Minister of Finance brought up a good point in his remarks last day. He mentioned that corporations should not be permitted to contribute to political parties.

They are not permitted in the United States, although we have seen abuses of that. I agree with the Minister of Finance on it. Soulless corporations who are responsible to nobody, no conscience, no nothing, just a machine, a legal fiction, should not be able to contribute to political parties, and we would get rid of a lot of abuses if that were in fact the position. Unfortunately, it is not under this legislation. For some reason or other, they have decided that this legal fiction would be treated as a legal person for the purposes of contributions as well. I think our act, and we only call for the act to be similar to the one in Ottawa, I think that our act could contain an injunction against, a constraint against the contributions by corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I think that for a variety of reasons it is wise for us to have an act similar to the one in Ottawa. In the first place, Sir, a lot of thought and expertise has been brought to bear on this question, nationally. There is agreement by all parties as to the worth of this act, although the N.D.P. Party, in many cases, wanted to go further perhaps, in the corporation aspect which I just mentioned, I believe, but they were willing to compromise.

There is need, I think, for regularity, for uniformity of legislation in the Province and in Ottawa so that people who take part in both elections and we all know that people who get involved in one election provincially get involved in another election, federally. It would be good, to the benefit of all if there were some uniformity between Ottawa and the Provinces. The fact that we do not have the power in this House to pass legislation on certain things is nothing, Mr. Speaker. That is just a red herring dragged into the debate by the Minister of Finance because I am sure that if a resolution of this House went up to the Government of Canada saying that in provincial elections we would like this federal legislation to be passed in respect of the media, for example, the income tax deductions, in respect of radio and television, the Government of Canada would have

no hesitation at all in acceding to our request in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance said earlier, he tried to give the impression that we, for some reason, were in the hands of Ottawa in this. Can we not think for ourselves? Of course we can, Mr. Speaker. I think I have given some of the reasons why it is wise to have similar legislation. If we can convince Ottawa that certain changes should be made in their legislation, beneficial, I am all for that as well. What I am against, Sir, is the obvious attempts by the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, at every turn, to try to get involved in confrontation politics with Ottawa, for no other reason than that they are trying to, or the Minister of Finance and perhaps the Premier and some others of his colleagues are trying to give the impression that they are a great Newfoundland first Government. Mr. Speaker, nobody believes that. The simplest babe does not believe that this Government is a great, heroic Newfoundland first Government any more than any other government, any other government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: What is wrong with Poster Peckford? What did he say? What did the poster-snatcher say? The same sort of a strangled muttering when he brought the posters back.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for confrontations of this nature, no need whatsoever. Co-operation is obviously what is needed and so Sir, I would suggest that we do something along these lines. If it is a thirty day provision which bothers the Minister of Finance, we said within thirty days, we will gladly accept an amendment that says that an act similar, similar, that is all, not exactly, similar to that brought into the House of Commons and passed by the House of Commons, be introduced into this House during this session. Thirty days is not - we put in thirty days because we want it to come in during this session. We would like to see it come in during this session but if any member on this side or that side want to amend it, want to move an amendment to

our amendment and say this session rather than thirty days and that red herring is relieved, it has gotten out of the picture, well then we would accede to that, no problem whatsoever.

We would like to see some firm guidelines given to the Government by this House as to the type of legislation we would like to see brought in. It is unsettling to hear the Minister of Finance in a wishy-washy, waffling type of way say, "Well, we can support in principle what the member for St. John's North has recommended. We might not go along with the election financing aspect of it or we might not go along with certain controls, we might not go along with this."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we ever do get a bill introduced into this House, it will be about as sensible and about as useful as the Conflict of Interest Legislation which the Minister of Finance is so proud of. A useless piece of legislation that you can drive about fifteen twenty ton trucks through at any given time, there is so many holes in it. Ways to avoid that legislation - we do not want to see and any thinking member of this House of Assembly and I assume they all think, no thinking member wants to see a wishy-washy piece of legislation passed through this House for the sake of form. Let us have a piece of legislation with teeth in it. I think that is what the member for St. John's North had in mind, a piece of legislation with teeth in it, legislation that does not allow anybody by the exercise of a little bit of cunning or ingenuity to get around it, Mr. Speaker. Let us have some real controls and some real teeth into legislation. One similar to the Ottawa one would do that and there can be improvements made on that and we can test this type of election act out during the next federal election and the next provincial election, see how it works.

If it does not work, let us improve it. Let us add things to it or detract things from it in order to make the thing work properly but let us have something with teeth because, Sir, if a bill is not brought in during this session of the House then there will not be any legislation

I would submit, Sir, to govern the next provincial election in this Province or if there is legislation that governs the next provincial election it will be a total catastrophe and fiasco because there are some complicated provisions in any election expenses or election controls legislation. There are some complication in it, Mr. Speaker and enough time has to be allowed to elapse to make sure that people who take part in elections, officials, campaign managers, workers, anyone involved in it has a full understanding of the act and it would be no good to pass an act in the next session of the House, have an election called, say in June of next year, and expect that the act should be adhered to.

The old maxim that ignorance of the law is no defence, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that that too is a legal fiction. Ignorance cannot be allowed to be a defence or everybody would be pleading ignorance of the law. A person does not know one per cent of the law. Even a lawyer does not know one per cent of the law but he cannot plead ignorance of the law.

Sir, if this act is not passed this session,

if it is put off until next session as is intimated by the Minister of Finance, then, Sir, ignorance of the law will be no fiction it will be a reality and we will have a complete fiasco during the next provincial election. You will have officials, managers and people involved in elections who will have very little idea as to what they are doing. People will be ignorantly and by ignorantly I mean unknowingly, they will be infracting the law, breaking the law because some people will be doing things as they had done them before, innocently breaking the law.

Let us leave enough lead time between the time that this act is passed, some such act as this is passed, let us leave enough lead time between that and the next provincial election so that political parties can geared up to it. Even now, the Liberal Party, I know because my wife is on the executive, the national executive, the Federal Liberal Party is now holding massive meetings all over the nation trying to make sure that their officials, their managers, their workers know exactly what is provided for in this legislation. To do otherwise, Sir, would be disastrous to any legislation and a lot of innocent people would suffer.

For the good of the province, for the good of the political parties in the province, let us get an act passed during this session of the House and then spend the next number of months before the next election making sure that all the officials of various parties are fully familiar with a good, strong, controlling piece of legislation. Then I think, Sir, that the people of this province will benefit, I think the political parties of the province will benefit and certainly, Sir, if we can get rid of this insidious practice of private donations, anonymous donations made to political parties who are accountable to nobody, with people -

MR. DOODY: It sounds like the well is drying up.

MR. W.N. ROWE: We are, what is it? \$17 million in debt? What did the leader say?

MR. DOODY: Give or take a few.

MR. MARSHALL: Five hundred thousand.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Five hundred thousand dollars in debt. Oh! "Witch-Hunt Willie" remembers it, Mr. Speaker, he must be one of the creditors.

Do not tell me he is going to start issuing writs! He is going to start issuing writs, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of a writ, (it would be unkind to say that I suppose) any minister who can stand up in this House and talk about the rights of tenants, Mr. Speaker, and then next day as a member of the government appear before the rent control board and start giving the rent control board loopholes as to how a landlord can avoid the application of the act -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order! Order!

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is straying from the point now.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Provoked into it by "Witch-Hunt Willy," Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I would advise the honourable member to avoid name calling.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The opprobrious term. I will deal with that, Mr. Speaker during the Throne Speech debate, I hope. This is the worst example of that type that has been seen for some time.

Anyway, Sir, let me bring it to a close by saying that if anybody rises in this House and says; "What! The government, public money to be used to support election campaigns? Unheard of." As I suspect, my friend across the way will do, perhaps, maybe, I do not know, but I suspect...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, Sir, his mind is reactionary enough in politics to suggest that kind of an absurd notion. To say; "What! Public funds be used for election expenses of candidates?" When he should realize now that he has been in his government for some time that whoever contributes massive amounts of money, Sir, especially corporations, who contribute massive amounts of money to political parties do so with the heartfelt motive and idea that sooner or later

they will get that money back from the government if it be successful. Where does the government get the money for these corporations? For any contracts that might be awarded? The public supplies it, Sir. I say that if the public is going to supply money for elections in any event, directly or indirectly, let us do it openly and aboveboard. I am sure that in the long run as well, Sir, that kind of a contribution will be much less on the public purse than the other kind of - well, not under the table, I mean there is nothing illegal about it - it is just something that is done anonymously and nobody knows anything about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South has approximately four minutes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh! What can I say, Mr. Speaker? Let me see. Maybe if I look at the House Leader I can be stimulated into something.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: The undertaker. The mortuary, Mr. Speaker. The muttering mortuary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very useful though.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He would be too expensive I think, Mr. Speaker. It would have to be a pauper's funeral.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude with that plea to members of the House, to bring it out in the open, let us have legislation which does control election financing and public support of candidates in elections. Bring it out into the open, have complete disclosure and I think that all political parties will be better off as a result. I also think that certainly the public and this province will be much better off as a result. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister without Portfolio:

MR. W.W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we have listened for about forty or fifty minutes, since we came in this afternoon - I suppose if speeches were animated objects I do not know whether you could call it a bitter pill or bitter "Bill." In any event, Your Honour, the nature and the bleat of the remarks by the member for White Bay South, as for the member for White Bay North, were rather, I think, empty. He

spent most of his time talking about the Minister of Finance's reaction, dwelled incessantly on the fact that they may or they may not introduce legislation with respect to election campaigns. The fact of the matter is that the Premier had already announced that we were looking into this.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But are the administration going to?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes we are going to. Certainly we are going to.

MR. SPEAKER: (Stagg): Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: The Premier has already announced that we are going to. The honourable Minister of Finance, when he was talking and he was misinterpreted said that we were looking into it. It may or may not be in in this session of the House but he left no doubt that this is what we were going to do. We do have other things to occupy our time. We had a billion dollar debt which we inherited, we have forest management policies which we have to formulate, we have housing policies to formulate and by the time the next election comes, for the first time in the history of Newfoundland, it will be run on a much different basis than those elections that were called by previous governments.

The trouble with the opposition, Mr. Speaker, - you know, I used to think that the opposition, the members of the opposition were attempting to paint us as being the same as themselves but I really do not believe that they are really that way motivated. I really do not. I do not think they can help themselves. I do not think that they can imagine, they can possible imagine that the affairs of the country are carried on in any manner other than the manner in which they carried it on when they were there or that they had somebody else carry it on for them.

The member for St. John's North when he introduced this resolution, introduced it for the purpose of getting the views of this House. I think he made an admirable speech when he introduced it in such concepts as he had, as bubble pipes with members' faces on them and thereby members foaming at the mouth. I do not think that

that particular type of word picture should be lost, and should be repeated again and again in the chamber because I would certainly like to see one of the honourable member of Bell Island. I have been off smoking for two or three years but if I had such a pipe with the honourable member for Bell Island's countenance on it, I think I would go back to the tobacco.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have a pipe but no countenance.

MR. MARSHALL: In any event, the member for St. John's North posed this for the purpose of getting certain views. I would say that the honourable member with most people in this House and indeed the public would be very, very disappointed with the type of contribution that has come from the other side.

Let me say first, Sir, that there are two distinct aspects and before I go on I would like to remind the House that I am not speaking to the amendment and, of course, maybe there will be further amendments and we will all have an opportunity to speak again and again and again to the main motion. With respect to this question there are two distinct aspects: One is the control and regulation of expenses and the other relates to public financing of elections.

With the first I wholeheartedly agree with respect to the control of expenditures, because I feel that far too much money has been spent in times past on campaigns. I had a little experience with campaigns during the days of the Progressive Conservative Party and particularly during the days when it was very hard to get people to even attend a meeting of the Progressive Conservative Party for fear that one of the honourable members here opposite or their previous colleagues or the agents for their previous colleagues might be spying upon them. In any event, I have long felt that there has been too much money spent on campaigns.

This party came to power principally through the work of volunteers throughout the country who felt that a previous administration had to go because of the nature of its performance or because of its arrogance or because it had been there too long or what have you,

and the pendulum will swing full cycle one of these days. There will be volunteers although there are very few of them around and you can understand why after looking at the members on the other side. There will be volunteers on the other side who will work just as assiduously to change the government, say government should and must change.

I think myself personally, Mr. Speaker, that there is too much of a relationship, I think the Liberal Leadership Convention that we have heard so much about has left an indelible scar really in this area upon this province. Largesse were spent during the Liberal Leadership Convention, in the organization by the Liberal Party at the time. Shortly thereafter the Progressive Conservative Party also had a leadership convention, I happened to know that the budget of the Progressive Conservative Convention was approximately three and one-half per cent of the total budget of the Liberal Party.

Those two conventions were really comparable in their own way to election campaigns. There is no need. It is an insult to the people of the province, it is an insult to the private person supporting a party, it is an insult to everybody to presume that largesse of funds slashed out from all quarters are going to result in the election of a person or the victory of a party.

So I think there is far too much emphasis on and there is far, far too much money spent in this country on election campaigns. For that reason I would wholeheartedly support and endorse any action to limit the amount of contribution, to limit the amount of expenses of a political party, to explore the disclosure of amounts and to do all things relevant for the purpose of holding down expenses.

Before we leave that topic I think it is well also to point out that there are more factors involved than just the politicians concerned and the party workers with respect to the limitation of amount spent. For instance, the only industries in the past few years that we have had really were the election campaigns with the large funds that were spewed out, particularly on the other side. I will get to their funds in a few moments or get to their lack of funds.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member a question.

MR. MARSHALL: I would be delighted to receive a question from the honourable Member for Labrador North?

MR. WOODWARD: I am very curious, Mr. Speaker, the little boxes sitting on the corner, I wonder if he would tell us what is in the boxes?

MR. MARSHALL: It is for my protection. I was afraid, Mr. Speaker, in case the attitude of the honourable Member for White Bay South and the known attitude of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition translated itself, as at one time when I was speaking such things did translate themselves into physical reactions, I thought I might like to have something to be able to protect myself. I will guarantee you, I do not think I will have to use it against the honourable member for Labrador North.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this question is going to involve more people than political parties who are condemned by it. For example, during election campaigns I understand and I believe, I believe it is true that various media charged more than normal for their advertising campaigns. If the news media which talks about regulating contributions and expenses, as they do, want to talk about it and want to talk about it sincerely, the question comes up why do political parties have to pay more for advertising during these periods of time? The reason they have to pay more is because these people who like to pontificate from time to time against politicians, love to get on the gravey train as well as anyone else. So these people are going to have to subdue the public desire for money in some way.

The same thing with respect to meeting halls. You go out around the country anywhere and try and get a meeting hall during an election campaign, you do not pay twice as much or three or four or five or six times as much, you can pay many more times than that in order to do it. The people concerned who own these halls, whatever organization they may belong to and they are all the same, if they want to assist us in the limiting of the amounts spend could also take stock of their own

houses or certainly of their own halls.

I also think that it is very, very necessary to regulate the time for television and radio broadcasting. I mean how stupid is it when an election is called the organizers of political parties they run off and the first thing they have to do is to see who can get the most and the prime time. This has to be regulated.

Also we have to regulate, which I think as well, I think we have to regulate any possibility and prevent any individual member or any individual candidate collecting on his own behalf.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas, the payment of poll workers, for instance, and many other items. There are many areas in the bill, in the federal bill, for the control of election expenses that I can wholeheartedly endorse. I think that many members on this side of the House can wholeheartedly endorse them.

Certainly there is need for controls. There is no more outward indication or manifestation of the need for control beyond the revelation, the startling revelation by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that the Liberal Party owes \$500,000 with respect to two campaigns. Now if they owe \$500,000 one can only conjecture how much they actually spent. They did not run their campaigns completely on credit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Doubtless. I have no doubt that these two campaigns cost the Liberal Party many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars. The two final campaigns that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to absolve himself from -

AN HON. MEMBER: And he will deal with his Leadership Convention that is coming up in the fall as to whether or not they are going to allow him to absolve himself from the previous.

Now I turn, Mr. Speaker, to the other question, I think the much more important question of public financing of election campaigns. Now quite frankly I have some very grave reservations about the wisdom of public financing of our election campaigns. The honourable member for

St. John's North and I are good friends and have been for years, he brought this resolution before the House for the purpose of debate and private member's day is a time when all individual members can express their views and so I am going to take this opportunity to do so.

First of all, if we were in a state of Utopia or even in the Province of Alberta or even the federal government with its large taxing power, the situation might be different. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that Newfoundland can afford, I very much doubt whether we can afford in this province to provide for the public financing of election campaigns. The figures that were given and the figures that have been bandied about this House in the past couple of days are that both parties would need about \$500,000. One already I point out owes \$500,000 so it is more like \$1 million, \$1.5 million or \$2 million or it will get up to \$3 million.

What is the purpose of it? Why do you want it? Why do you want public financing? The purpose of it, Mr. Speaker, is to keep governments honest, to restrict political patronage, to restrict the political payoff. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland or the people of any province should not have to pay \$500,000 or \$1 million or \$2 million in order to keep their political institutions honest. It is utterly and absolutely to my mind foreign and I do not think that we should do it. Furthermore, I doubt whether we

can really legislate with respect to the public financing of campaigns. No doubt the desperate politicians (We have seen desperate politicians in the past. We will not mention names but we have seen them.) facing defeat will once again pull out all stops despite the public financing, will go along to the supporters and money will be put into their hands. We will see the Chateau Gai next time sprouting from the Confederation Building maybe. We will see all sorts of largess and abuses.

Mr. Speaker, we already have laws to protect ourselves against this type of abuse. It is a criminal offence to bribe a public official, to offer a bribe, and there the protection of the public is to those who are unwise enough not to heed it. This is available to them and will be given. I think it will be abused. It will also give advantages to certain politicians, to those who perhaps have more resources than other politicians. They can put money into their campaign insofar as money makes any real difference to a campaign. Really, when the time has come or when it is time for a change, I firmly believe that it is going to come regardless - not completely regardless of the amount of money but I think the amount of money is very much overcome. Some people say that it is going to give an advantage to minority parties. I do not believe so. I believe it is all the other way around. The formulas that have been quoted to us by the Quebec and Federal Government require the candidate to poll a certain amount of the votes before they are entitled to share in the public expenses. This is going to be rather hard for a smaller party, a third group to be able to poll this amount and to get off their feet.

MR. WOODWARD: You are not picking on the Member for Labrador South, are you?

MR. MARSHALL: No, I am not picking on the honourable member. I am

not even thinking of the Member for Labrador South really in this. I am thinking of minor parties, splinter parties, the type of party that the once great Liberal Party has now so obviously become. This is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, which leads me into the next - this is why, I have wondered, I have sat here with amazement and wondered how the Liberal Party can now turn around and offer and propagate and urge us to adopt this great social piece of legislation. I think the answer comes in the situation or the situation in the Liberal Party as revealed by the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking on this matter, where he said that they now owe \$500,000. Perhaps they owe some more, I do not know. I wonder whether the great desire now -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: You could. You could.

I wonder whether the great desire, Mr. Speaker, is a great desire to reform electoral law or whether or not it is a desire for the public to take them off the hook. Is this the real reason behind them now advocating the public contribution to election campaigns, that the taxpayer pay for their campaigns? All of a sudden they want the taxpayer to pay for their campaigns and I wonder why. The only reason I can think of is the \$500,000 professed debt by the Liberal Party right now. Mr. Speaker, everybody has said from time to time that Newfoundlanders are too green to burn but I do not think anybody has yet said that they are so green they can be burnt twice.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot legislate in this area. I do not think it is necessary. The reason for people who sincerely advocate public financing is fear of corruption. They are afraid of the rewards to be given to people who support the political party which is in power. I think that this can be achieved - it does not merit any one to get up and just say I am against it, without giving

an alternative. Certainly, there is no doubt in anybody's mind that these situations have existed in the past. The great cynics of our day feel that they exist in this government but this government have not been in for twenty-one years and if it ever gets to the stage, as it did two years ago, I hope we are put out long before.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not worry.

MR. MARSHALL: It did and has existed in the past, not only in Newfoundland but in all areas of Western Democracy. I feel that the remedy is not the public financing of expenses but to some extent it might be if you had the money to do it. I feel that you have to remove the possibility of giving these rewards to the people who make political donations. I really think that that is the answer. The answer to it is then to have full open dealings between the government and the private sector, such as the public opening of tenders that this government have already indicated. It put it into practice when it came into power.

In the Speech from the Throne it was announced that the government were to bring in an act with respect to the provision for public opening of tenders and public tenders in this province, the same as they have in the Government of Canada, the same as they have in most of the provinces of Canada, instead of the previous system that was allowed to exist. That is your remedy, Mr. Speaker. If you remove the possibility of the reward to the political contributor, if you make it completely open with public opening of tenders, i.e., if you do as we have done last year, amended the Revenue and Audit Act to provide that no borrowings of money could take place without the approval of the Legislature and if you generally make the dealings open and above board in public so that the public could see it, so that the public could

see when a contract was awarded that it was awarded to the lowest bidder or if it were not awarded to the lowest bidder, that the government have to get up to the people whom it represents and explain why it was not given to the lowest bidder. That is the way you stop your patronage. That is the way you stop your abuses.

Mr. Speaker, another way it could be done along these lines is the enactment of an act allowing the voiding of contracts where they have been assigned to third parties from persons who have obtained them by using political influence while in public office. Now this is an area which we have looked into, which we hope to bring in legislation for, Just as the Minister of Finance said, that we may or we may not bring in it this session, we have been looking into it for a long period of time. We are entwining it and studying it in relation to its affect upon contractual law and contractual obligations because it is a new type of pioneer legislation, the type they have really in some areas, some States of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we indicated last year that we would do this type of thing. We are still studying it and just as we studied the forestry policy of this government and after fully studying it are bringing in measures, eventually we will bring in measures of this nature. Rome was not built in a day, Mr. Speaker. I think it is most unfair. We get up and say that we are looking into these things and we indicate our intentions; for these words to be given which we give in this public House to be doubted. No, Mr. Speaker, the answer to it as far as I am concerned, I myself am not too enthusiastic about public money, the taxpayers' money, the money of Mrs. Smith and Mr. Jones going into the financing of election campaigns of the Liberal Party

or the Progressive Conservative Party or the New Democratic Party or any party. Maybe we could afford a certain amount of this if we were a wealthy province like Alberta, if we had the source of money like they have in the federal government or if we were in a more affluent society than we are. I do not think we can afford the luxury neither do I think it is going to cure the evil which the proponents of it attempt sincerely to attempt to get over, and that is the political pay-off and political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, the way in which you overcome that in my opinion is the institution of a public tendering system, open government deals

dealings and generally letting the public know exactly what is going on. I would not like to see, and I have no doubt, there is no doubt in my mind that the advocacy on the other side for the public chest to stand the expenses for the people standing in election is no more than a desire of getting the people of Newfoundland to take the Liberal Party off the hook for the gigantic indebtedness that have incurred for the purpose of having three dimensional pictures of candidates behind fish barrels and what have you and for other such nonsense that went on unsuccessfully in previous days.

I think we have got to consider all aspects of this resolution. I do not really think on looking it over that the honourable member for St. John's North means it as mandatory but he means it from the point of view of the government are considering the matters and the government is and has been considering these things.

So in conclusion, I will not continue on for an hour and a-half although I could with the empty words like the ones that were uttered on the other side. There seems to be a mania in this House that if you are allowed to speak for an hour and a-half, you speak for an hour and a-half whether you have anything to say or whether you do not have anything to say. But I will just say in conclusion that first of all I am for the regulation of expenses, the regulation of contributions, I am all for it, the strictest law that there possibly can be, yes and even disclosure but I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to remedy the evil that we wish to by providing for public financing of election campaigns. I think there is another and better way to do it and I do not think the people of this province, who are already overburdened with debt, who are overburdened and needy, you cannot furnish the needs in many areas such as housing, many areas such as education, health and what have you where we are striving every day, I do not think the people of Newfoundland will put up with, nor should they put up with, Mr. Speaker, in the stage of our economy, with the public paying into political parties, monies to finance election campaigns. There is another way of doing it and certainly

I think that they should rise up in righteous indignation, particularly when they realize that the reason that the honourable members opposite are advocating it is, as opposed to the sincere attempt by all of the members on this side, to tear up our political system, that the real reason for advocating it is to repay that horrendous, scandalous debt of the Liberal Party, when it attempted for the sixth or seventh time to purchase the good will, unsuccessfully as it was but to purchase the good will of the people of this province. Now they want to purchase the good will of the people of this province with their own money.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this amendment as proposed by the honourable member for White Bay North. It seems to me that whoever drew up this amendment is apparently clueless about the issue. For example; "This House urges and requests this 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." So far so good. Then they go on to say; "Such legislation to be similar in content to legislation adopted by the House of Commons."

Mr. Speaker, we are not able to pass legislation in this House of Assembly similar to what has already been passed in the House of Commons. For example, two major reasons, this House of Assembly has no jurisdiction, has no control whatsoever over the deductions with regards to federal income tax on contributions made to political parties, none whatsoever. That is a major part of the Bill C203, passed by the House of Commons.

Number two, the other major factor is that this House of Assembly cannot direct or demand of private radio stations, private television stations, to grant free political broadcast to any political party. We have no jurisdiction over the Canadian Radio and Television Commission. We have none. So how can we pass official legislation similar to what has already been passed in the House of Commons, because

these are the two major points on Bill C203, the two major points,
where they are regulating and controlling the Canadian Radio
and Television Commission with regard to broadcasting and where
the

contributions made to a party can be tax deductible. Mr. Speaker, in my beginning comments I would like to say again that this amendment was drafted by somebody on the opposite side of the House of Assembly who was clueless about the issues. He should be ashamed. Mr. Speaker, that is not the major contentious point with me.

Here we are, in 1974, with a bill before the House of Assembly, introduced by a private member. It is a serious issue. It is a serious matter. There are many serious questions which have to be answered. Yet the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants action within thirty days! In thirty days he wants the legislation brought before the House, passed and made law, without any looking into of the questions, the many numerous questions which remain unanswered. There is one very important question with regard to public financing: What is it going to cost the taxpayers of this province? That is the one big important question. Oh no, disregard that! Do not mind what it costs the taxpayers. We want action within thirty days.

Mr. Speaker, the same honourable gentleman who introduced this amendment never mentioned the issue in this province, never cared to even have a slight thought in that direction until 1972, June 1972, out at some public meeting in Buchans. June 1972, the Liberal Party finds itself in opposition, finds itself broke with regard to funds. They want to press upon the government to bring in legislation which will make public financing, control all the contributions to the parties so as to make their chances better to get in in the next election. It is unbelievable! It is unbelievable! When that same honourable gentleman sat on this side of the House as a private member, when the Hon. Member for St. John's, in 1969, brought in a private resolution asking for the same thing, he was

scorned, he was laughed at, he was ridiculous, he was stupid, he was kicked out of the House of Assembly. The same honourable gentlemen from White Bay North and White Bay South and Bell Island and Fogo sat in this Assembly and watched the spectacle of the honourable Premier of the day at that time scorn the issue, it was ridiculous, it was stupid, it was naive. The honourable gentlemen sat over here and did not even care to speak on the issue. What a comparison today, Mr. Speaker! What a comparison! We had a private member bring in a resolution and we had the government supporting the resolution, supporting it in principle. What a comparison with the previous government and the attitudes of the previous government. Mr. Speaker, it is hypocrisy at its very height. That is what it is; hypocrisy at its very height.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition in speaking on this amendment stressed the fact that we should not go back to the past. Oh no! Let us forget the past. The past is gone. We are living in the present. We look forward to the future. Forget the past. The same honourable gentleman stood in the House of Assembly for one full hour and talked about the Hermitage by-election. Mr. Speaker, the Hermitage by-election is in the past. I would like to go back a little further than the Hermitage by-election. I would like to go back to when first I got involved with politics in 1971. That is not too far back, it is in my day. It is when we saw the government lash out government funds to get party candidates elected, wasted money, hundreds of thousands, even millions. The programme was co-ordinated from the former Premier's office. I think it was a Mr.- I forget his name. He was working as an assistant to the Premier. He was a civil servant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Garry Brownrigg.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Garry Brownrigg, that is he. It is Mr. Garry Brownrigg.

He was co-ordinating this flush fund. He was dishing out hundreds of thousands of dollars - \$20,000 here for recreation, irrespective of whether a recreation committee formed or not, irrespective of whether artesian wells were needed here or not. Out in Bonavista South, i.e., they dished it out here and dished it out there, hundreds of thousands of dollars - government funds! What a prime example of misuse of funds during election

campaigns. We are going to change that. The first day of the opening of this session, the very first day, the Premier stood in this honourable Assembly and brought up the issue that this government was going to consider the possibility of bringing in reforms in regards to election campaign expenses and the controlling of these expenditures on election campaigns. The Premier mentioned this. It was not just the private member from St. John's North. The Premier did!

MR. WM. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: It was not the opposition. Now the opposition is wanting action within thirty days. You have slush funds, government funds, use of government facilities, whether it is done now or done then, I am one individual strongly against it, strongly opposed to it. It is wrong. It was blatantly abused in the past. If there is one major thing in the past that annoyed me, it was not just the patronage with regards to the Liberal Party supporters and giving them contracts or donating large donations to the Liberal Party. We have some big fat cat companies in St. John's and around Newfoundland. I will call them fat cat companies, who got fat and rich because the cost-plus contracts dished out by the former administration, dished out because of the donations they dished in during the campaigns.

That has got to end. That has got to end. Forget that. Mr. Speaker, let us get away from these contracts and these cost plus contracts and look at the patronage, the blatant patronage where we had a Civil Service Commission in this province for so many years, a Civil Service Commission consisting of Liberal politicians and that to me has knawed at me for a long time, because it did not just mean that the Liberals were bringing in politicians, and appointing political appointees normally only last as long as the government last, but this Civil Service Commission had to be partisan. In my view they were partisan. They were appointed by a former Premier because

they were his followers. They were his politicians, defeated politicians, has-beens.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: They were set up to do what? They were obviously partisan. So over a period of years, Mr. Speaker, we had a situation where many of the permanent jobs today that exist in this Civil Service Commission, I believe in political appointees, political appointees are different from the Civil Service. The Civil Service have permanent positions, government jobs. There is simply no reason why a position in government, through the Civil Service Commission, that that position should be filled simply because of political patronage. They should be under qualifications and nothing else.

Over the past years we have had a situation where the majority of these jobs, I would say the majority of them, especially just before elections, the year of elections, if you want a job, go down and see Mr. Jones, Mr. Robertson. "Go down and see my friends." This is the attitude of the former ministers of government. "Go down and see my friends, the Civil Service Commission, they will look after you."

MR. NEARY: Now where is the character assassination?

MR. MORGAN: It is not character assassination. It is facts. Mr. Robertson was a defeated Liberal candidate. I am not charging he is partisan. I am saying he was a partisan politician.

MR. NEARY: Say it out. Say it out.

MR. MORGAN: I am saying it right now. He is a partisan politician. I will say it in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jones, the Chairman was a partisan politician. and the other member of the Civil Service Commission is a partisan politician.

What I am saying is that it is obvious to me, as a politician or as a member of the House of Assembly or as a man or the general public, that because we have this Civil Service Commission, which

consists of partisan politicians, that there obviously has to be some partisan views on their point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Clean.

MR. NEARY: Innuendoes.

MR. MORGAN: I am saying today that that partisan commission was there for the main reason of helping the Liberal Party,

and none but your Liberal Party followers to get jobs, and that to me is entirely wrong. The Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service itself should consist of individuals who are there because of their qualifications and there to do a job in a certain position, for no other reason.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a member when speaking to an amendment is required to be strictly relevant. Now, the amendment says that this House should request the Government to introduce legislation similar to the bill, an act by the Parliament of Canada. Now, what the honourable member is going on about now has no relevancy whatsoever to that amendment.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking, showing the relationship of patronage and the results of people making and helping in regards of donations to political campaigns.

MR. NEARY: May I speak on that point of order, Sir? The honourable member, in my opinion, Sir, is not relevant to the amendment that is being proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and it is the worse example of character assassination that I have ever seen in this House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

As I mentioned earlier today, I think the rule of relevancy is perhaps a little difficult to rule on. I feel the honourable member for Bonavista South perhaps was strained a little from the relevant part of this amendment. I would advise him to be a little more cautious in the future.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That kind of patronage, Mr. Speaker, is going to end. It has already ended because this Government has brought in legislation. For a public service commission is going to consist of not politicians, not partisan individuals.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Maybe the honourable

member does not understand Your Honour's ruling or something. The amendment before the House, Sir, concerns the introduction by this Government of legislation similar to that enacted in the House of Commons in Ottawa. It has nothing to do with Civil Service Commissions. It has nothing to do with political appointments, Mr. Speaker. The member is not being relevant. Now, when Your Honour drew me to order for not being relevant, I clued up what I had to say and went into relevant sections. I admit I was out of order but when I was drawn to order, I gave up that line of argument, Sir. Now, I ask that the same thing be done with the honourable member for Bonavista South.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I request the honourable member from Bonavista South to be a little more relevant in his debate.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am not just talking about the relevance between the legislation that we are talking about proposing in this House of Assembly and what has already been passed in Ottawa, I am talking about the governing and controlling financing of election campaigns and election expenses. That is the amendment. The amendment reads - Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from White Bay South apparently is so stupid he cannot understand the amendment. I will read it for him, Mr. Speaker: "This House urges and requests the Government to implement its off repeated promises to the public by introducing legislation within thirty days to govern and control the financing of election expenses." That is part of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if I am going to speak about election expenses, we have to talk about the different donations and different support given to different parties. I am talking about the support that was given to the previous government, to the previous Liberal Party, I say previous Liberal Party because I am doubtful today whether there is one existing; that these donations that were made and contributions, there had to be some kind of a payoff and the payoff was made in the past by means of

getting jobs for them in government, by means of getting cost-plus contracts, and that is the kind of thing that we have got to end in this Province. We have got to end that.

We have now got a Public Service Commission that will end one source of patronage. We have now got a public tendering system which is going to end the cost-plus contracts. That is this Government doing this. It was not done by the previous Government. All we hear from the Opposition is the height of hypocrisy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The honourable member for Hermitage - he knows what it is like to campaign, especially slanderous campaigns on open lines. He has not spoken in the House yet.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable the Leader of the Opposition introduced the amendment, he talked about Hermitage. He talked about Hermitage for a full hour in the House of Assembly, all was Hermitage, nothing passed Hermitage. You know, I listened to an open line programme this morning and apparently talking about election campaign expenses and apparently this one fellow down in Hermitage, he was quite upset because the bill left with him from the Liberal Party in the last campaign in Hermitage, in the by-election, was not being paid and he could not get any results in the Liberal Party so he made his issue public. He brought the issue forward on an open line show

and then one honourable gentleman on the opposite side of the House of Assembly, the Hon. Member for Bell Island, he gave the impression why pay this chap Mr. Godwin, why pay him, he is a Tory? So what? We owe the Bill, why pay him? He is a Tory, he supported the Tory Party.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Liberal Party, oh, forget the bills, we will not pay the Tories, we will pay our own friends. Oh! Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The Hon. the Member for White Bay North mentioned when he spoke in this debate, he did not know what went on in his party in the past. He did not know. In fact I think I will quote him verbatim.

He did not know what went on in the past. "I know no more about the activities of the past than any member of this House of Assembly or any member of the public." If honourable members opposite wish to bring up, Sir, they could probably although they would not embarrass me, not embarrass anyone of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, this kind of sanctimonious attitude is not going to, "I do not know anything about the past." That same honourable gentleman was appointed in 1964 as a parliamentary assistant to the Premier for the Province. In 1966 he became a member of this Assembly. He went on from there to become a minister of the Crown. He sat there from 1964 to 1974 and he did not know what went on in his party. He did not know what went on. He did not know anything about these slush funds. He did not know anything about those large donations coming in from those companies around St. John's, those Liberal Party supporters who were getting rich fast by the government giving them cost-plus contracts. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, he was there in government but he did not know this was going on.

What kind of a sanctimonious attitude is that?

Mr. Speaker, maybe it is bad to go back into the past, maybe it is but if we are going to go back so far in the past let us go back far enough to make the points relevant. Then, Mr. Speaker, when we heard from the honourable the Member for White Bay South, the same honourable gentleman

who in 1969 at a convention, I think it was the Liberal Leadership Convention, that same honourable gentleman on the floor of the Assembly quoted by the "Evening Telegram" Monday, November 3, 1969; "The Hon. William Rowe, Minister of Community and Social Development said, 'It is political naivety to divulge information concerning the funds of private organizations, such as the Liberal Party, especially to the public and to the Opposition Party.' "

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: That was in 1969, Mr. Speaker. The hypocrisy of the individual to stand in this Assembly and to say, "We want action in thirty days." Oh, the hypocrisy!

Mr. Speaker, we are a government that takes the action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy is the height of hypocrisy the way these members are demanding the government to take action on this legislation. I know as a government member, as a government backbencher, that this government is going to consider taking action this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: It is going to take action. The fact that a private member for St. John's North brought the resolution to the floor is a good example that backbenchers in this government are taking part in government. It is a good example. Not like the past, Mr. Speaker, when a backbencher would be told to shut up and sit down.

MR. MORGAN: Shut up and sit down! Oh no, we have a different government today, Mr. Speaker.

Getting on to the aspect of that amendment asking that the legislation be similar to the - along the lines of the federal government legislation, I think it is Bill C-202. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the opening of my remarks, we cannot control and regulate radio broadcasting, television broadcasting in this province. I certainly think we should because we have situations today in this province where we have the media being abused. Abused! That is right, because we have a partisan programme, for example, on radio station C.J.O.N. known as "John Nolan's Hotline." It is a partisan programme, it is partisan day in and day out.

MR. NEARY: Character assassination.

MR. MORGAN: It is not character - it is facts. It is facts.

MR. NEARY: Is this relevant, Mr. Speaerk, or is this character assassination by the civil rights fighter of this province? Supposedly.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am showing the relevance with regard to controlling the broadcasting and free political broadcasting with regard to election campaigns etc. in the province.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Stagg): I think the honourable member is in order.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could control the media, if we could direct the media to; "Look, you do not broadcast that kind of a programme, public affairs - " It is called a public affairs programme. We have one in Central Newfoundland called; "Mike's Openline Show" and that programme is continuously attacking the Progressive Conservative Party. Not the government, the party. The party. There is a difference in having the media attacking government because normally the media wants to attack the establishment. That is normal. That is normal. That is normal.

MR. WOODWARD: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: If the honourable member for Labrador North wants to

get into debate let him stand when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to - if we can regulate the media we should do it now, because I am sick and tired of these openline show programmes being used as a source of - being vindictive toward the government and where we have a former minister of the previous administration...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! The honourable member should not be interrupting. When the honourable member is speaking he has quite often asked for the protection of the House to prevent other members from interrupting him. I ask that he observe that rule himself.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the point I am getting at I will get back to it again is that if we are going to have these continuous campaigns going on in the province week after week, month after month - what we really have, we have the Liberals campaigning through the media each and every day. I would still have the same point of view if there were a programme on V.O.C.M. or C.B.C. or any other media in the province campaigning for our party continuously. It would still be wrong. It would be wrong.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MORGAN: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, while these programmes are continuously used to assassinate the Progressive Conservative Party, to assassinate the members of this Assembly, and the honourable member for Hermitage can laugh and well laugh, when he himself took part in the same kind of a programme last week, Mr. Speaker. Trying to assassinate members of the House of Assembly in public. He has not spoken in the House yet, Mr. Speaker, but he prefers to go on with his Liberal colleague and assassinate members of the House of Assembly on the government side. That is his style, Mr. Speaker. That is his style. That is his style. A very poor example of a new member of this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. A very poor example. I would like to -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order please! Honourable members on both sides are drawn to the rule that when one honourable member is speaking, they must not interrupt. This rule applies to both the honourable member's colleagues as well as honourable members opposite.

MR. MORGAN: I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, although the amendment was brought in by the opposition, it cannot be done because we cannot regulate the media. It cannot be done but I would like to see it done. Right now we have the Canadian Radio and Television Commission. Because the federal government are in control of the commission, they can, if they wanted to, control the partisan broadcasts we are having in this province. They can monitor the broadcasts or the programmes. That is one thing I intend to do if it continues the way it has been going for the past two months, I, as a member of the House of Assembly, will request the C.R.T.C. to monitor at least two programmes in this province, the two I have mentioned, to monitor the programmes and let them determine whether these programmes are partisan or not and whether the views of the moderator are expounded as being partisan. In my view they are.

The resolution and the amendment: I intend to speak again on the resolution. I am speaking today on the amendment. But what I am saying is that if the honourable members on the opposite side had any clues as to what the issue was about, they would not have introduced this kind of an amendment because they know that we cannot introduce legislation like that which has been introduced in Ottawa. We cannot do it.

Bill C - 203, Mr. Speaker, has been passed by the federal government in the House of Commons. Bill C -203 gives the House of Commons control over the media, over partisan broadcasts, over free-time political broadcasts. We cannot do that! It gives

the federal government the right to deduct donations paid to political parties. We cannot do that. Mr. Speaker, surely the members of the opposition knew that. They must have known that. Of course, maybe because of ignorance of the facts, they did not know it.

Mr. Speaker, the question is an important question and an important issue. There is no way this House of Assembly can bring in legislation and control the financing of election expenses. It cannot be done. There is no way we can bring in legislation for the public financing of election expenses, to control the private financing of election expenses, to control and make sure that there would be disclosure of contributions made public. The question is how much do we limit? Do we limit the donations? These are very, very important questions. It is going to have an effect in this province on the up coming years, ten or fifteen years from now. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the opposition members of the House of Assembly want action taken on the matter within thirty days! Thirty days, Mr. Speaker! It is a typical example of the attitude they had toward government in the past. Let us get down and do something but they do not care what kind of legislation it is. Forget it. We will just do it.

The important question is what is the cost to the taxpayers in public financing? Should we finance all parties, irrespective of how valid they are? For example in election campaign expenses, should we have three or four parties running? We could have the New Democratic Party, the Progressive Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the New Labrador Party, splinter parties. Independent candidates is another question. How are we going to finance independent candidates. Are we going to allow for example in the next election maybe fifty-one independent candidates, one in

each district? Are we going to have two in each district? These are very important questions.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: These questions all come back to one big question. What is it going to cost the taxpayers of this province? I have grave reservations about

the public financing of election expenses, grave reservations. But I do firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot continue as we have in the past, where patronage was so blatant, the political pay-offs, were so blatant, that cannot continue. We must put a stop to that and we will put a stop to that, Mr. Speaker. This government intends to put a stop to that.

With regards to limiting the costs of campaigns, should we allow for example, one dollar per name on the voters' list in the next election, the average voters will be 10,000 per candidate, say fifty-one seats, will have 10,000 or 11,000 voters, maybe less than that.

MR. WM. ROWE: 5,000.

MR. MORGAN: Okay 5,000 voters, 10,000 people, I am sorry. So, Mr. Speaker, should we allow \$1 per name on the voters' list? Should we allow \$2? Is the cost going to escalate? Most likely it will escalate in the next coming years, the cost of election expenses. These are the kinds of questions. Are we going to pay the postage cost for example, mailing out literature?

These are very important questions. But yet the opposition want all these questions answered in thirty days and legislation brought before the Assembly and passed and made law. Oh, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous. It is stupidity. I would go so far as to say it is naivety on the part of the opposition. They know it cannot be done. It just cannot be done.

I think the resolution as brought in by the honourable member for St. John's North is a good resolution. I intend to speak on the resolution but with regards to the amendment, the amendment itself is redundant. It also portrays like I said when I started my few words, it portrays that the opposition members are clueless with regard to the issue but yet they want action taken within thirty days. Action cannot be taken in thirty days and therefore I intend to vote against the amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! If the honourable member will permit, it is customary that the member who stands first is recognized first and the honourable member for Labrador South stood first.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you Mr. Speaker, with apologies to the honourable member from Bell Island, I will be very brief and surrender the floor to him in a moment. A little practical joke is a lot of fun but when it proceeds to waste the time of the House it has gone too far. I despair of ever having, ever seeing any kind of good government come out from the other side of the House as long as the honourable members on the other side continue to allow themselves to be so used by the opposition. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is a master at throwing out bait.

MR. WM. ROWE: And the member for Bonavista South is a cod.

MR. MARTIN: The resolution before the House, and I speak now on the amendment to the resolution very briefly because I intend to address the main body of the resolution at a later date, but the amendment as it was put forward by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was worded in such a way as to draw this very kind of comments from the honourable members on the other side of the House and it is a wonder that somebody up to this time has not twigged because what we are really doing is wasting the time of the House and this very good debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Well one might say, Sir, that in the first instance he was trying to put one over on the government members but having allowed it to go on so far, one would have to then question his motives in wording this amendment in antagonistic words in the first place and whether or not he also wishes to impede passage of this Bill, if it ever does become a Bill.

MR. NEARY: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Well, Sir, first of all I might say that I am inclined to agree with the member for Labrador South that the House has taken much too much time to settle this matter of election expenses

Sir, the people of this province are thoroughly disgusted with what has transpired in this House over the last thirteen days. We had matters before the House, Sir, like this amendment that could have been disposed of in a half an hour, yet, Sir, here we are debating the matter on the third Wednesday in a row. The people of this province, Sir, are getting to look at the members of the House of Assembly as just individuals who like to hear themselves talk.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order, please! I must ask honourable members to my left before the Hon. the Member for Bell Island gets very far into his speech that he does have the right to be heard in silence. He has been brought to order himself on numerous occasions. I will ask honourable members to observe the rules of the House and that the honourable the member be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: People are beginning to ask some very serious questions, Sir, about what is happening in this honourable House. They are beginning to wonder why we are not dealing with the serious problem of housing in this province instead of wasting all the time talking about election expenses.

People want to know, Sir, why we have not raised the matter so far of the high cost of living.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are not debating the high cost of living. We are not debating the housing problems. We are only debating the election campaign expenses resolution. Keep it in order.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): As the Hon. the Member for Bonavista South, his point is well taken and I was about to rise to bring the Hon. the Member for Bell Island back to the topic that is suppose to be under discussion. I am sure he will do that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, So I do not intend to delay the progress of the House very long on this very important matter as far as I am concerned it is something that could have been disposed of in a half an hour. As a matter of fact, Sir, there is not a resolution on the Order Paper by private members that could not have been disposed of

in an hour or two. Yet here we are, Mr. Speaker, into our third Wednesday on a matter, Sir, that should get the agreement of all members on either side of this honourable House in a matter of a half an hour. We have had red herring dragged across the issue, Sir, we had whales dragged across the issue. God only know, Mr. Speaker, how long more this debate is going to last.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, and from the remarks from the Minister of Justice today in reply to a question that I put to the minister that they want to keep this debate going because there are certain members on the government side of the House who do not want to stand in their places when a vote is taken.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member is insisting on speaking on matters that are not pertinent to the amendment. I will ask the honourable member to do so.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this amendment put at the earliest date as possible, so that we can get on with the other business of the House and have a vote on the Saunders resolution and let the members stand up and be counted.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, the Minister Without Portfolio, the Member for St. John's East, when he spoke in this debate, Sir, on the amendment, he bitterly complained about having to pay more to the media during an election.

Well my only comment on that, Mr. Speaker, that if one were working in the a makeup department of any of the television stations in this province, Sir, it would make no wonder they would charge the honourable gentleman more to put his physiog on television. Make no wonder, Sir, you have to pay more for the media during an election in this province. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, just imagine the makeup job that you have to do on some of the

the honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House. I heard today -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! I think what the honourable member is saying may be somewhat humorous and certainly we can do with some levity in the House but I ask the honourable member to keep his remarks within the bounds of good taste.

MR. NEARY: I am not disputing Your Honour's ruling, but Your Honour, the matter was raised by the Minister without Portfolio, I think, when Your Honour was not sitting in the Chair. I think I have the right to comment on some of the things that were raised by the honourable gentleman. Sir, I will try to restrain myself and I will try to refrain from talking about the reasons why we have to pay more for the media during an election campaign, especially in the makeup department.

Now, Sir, we have heard a lot of discussion about how this administration, and this was raised by the honourable Minister without Portfolio, Sir, and I think I have the right to answer it, about the steps that have been taken by this government to improve the tendering system in this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was raised by the Minister without Portfolio, Sir.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what the Auditor General has to say about that. The Auditor General, Sir, who is the watchdog of the Treasury, the Auditor General who is the servant of this House. The impartial servant of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Remember when he was in here one time?

MR. NEARY: Never brought before the Bar, Sir. He came up, Mr. Speaker, came in on the floor of the House and sat down and was cross-examined by members on either side of the House. Let us see, Mr. Speaker, let us see what the Auditor General says about this matter of tendering.

Page (56) of the Report of the Auditor General, Sir, tabled a few days ago in this honourable House - Department of Education and Youth, (45) subhead 615-03-02; instruction equipment and general supplies, films, negative stock and film strips, \$244,760.

The expenditure recorded under this subhead includes payments totalling \$24,000 which were made to a company and that company is George McLean, Sir. We have heard quite a bit about George McLean in this debate so far, both on the amendment and on the resolution. \$24,000 paid to a company for the production of slide presentations for six government departments. The bills submitted by the company to the Department of Education and Youth were approved for payment by the minister.

"In conducting our audit" the Auditor General, says "In conducting our audit of these expenditures we were unable to determine (1) whether or not there was a contract with the company to produce these slides at an agreed price. (2) What were the slides used for? (3) Where are the slides at the present time? Maybe the minister can enlighten us in this debate, Sir. Where are the slides at the present time? (4) Why the cost of producing slides for other government departments was charged against the appropriation of the Department of Education and Youth? Why did the Minister of Transportation and Communications charge his slides up to the Department of Education? (5) Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Listen to this, Sir. (5), No. (5). Mr. Speaker, (5) "Whether in fact the slides were ever received by the government." This is the crowd that tells us how they have tightened up public tendering.

"With regard to the foregoing, in my opinion," so says the Auditor General, "There should have been a written contract between the government and the company for the production of

slide presentations. The Department of Education and Youth - " if the minister does not like it, Sir, he can go back down to his office where he has been all afternoon.

Now then, Sir, let us turn over to page seventy-two of the same report of the Auditor General just tabled in this honourable House. The Minister without Portfolio stood in this honourable House this afternoon and told us all about how they have tightened up on their public tendering system. What a fraud, Mr. Speaker! What a fraud!

Listen to this, Sir, page seventy-two: "An examination of thirty capital projects with a total expenditure of \$12,414,939 at March 31, 1973, which were either in progress or completed during 1973-1973 disclosed the following: (Now, Sir, this is the crowd who call public tenders on everything. - the honourable crowd, pardon me, Sir.) (1) No public tenders or formal contracts on eight projects, amounting to \$1,120,577. If I were the Member for Carbonear, the Minister of Health, I would get away from that honourable crowd as fast as I could and come rushing across the House, before they get him in trouble.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh, hold on now, just a minute now, just a minute, Mr. Speaker. The best has yet to come, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Two contracts but no public tenders, six projects, \$3,882,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: What department are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: The old Department of Highways, the Department of Transportation and Communications. The Auditor General has given us the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Stagg): Order please! Would the honourable member resume his place? I suggest to all honourable members that the House is proceeding to get somewhat unruly and I ask that the honourable member makes his points and go on. If honourable members to my left wish to make points, they may ask the honourable member

to yield the floor but if he does not choose to do so, they have no status to have the floor. If they choose to rise on a point of order, they may do so but I fail to see that there is any reason for a point of order at this time.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is this a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKEY: Sit down! Yes, it is a point of order. I have the right to stand up on a point of order. Does the honourable member know the rules of the House? Why do you not read them?

MR. NEARY: State the point of order. State the point of order.

MR. HICKEY: When I am ready.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to carry on my speech, Sir?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to make a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! Maybe this is a very serious matter but honourable members are not conducting it in a very serious way. The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications rose on a point of order and I will clear that.

MR. HICKEY: My Speaker, my point of order is that it is pure conjecture on the part of the member for Bell Island that there were no tenders called for projects in my department. Let me categorically state right now that I will provide detailed information in this House when the opportune time arrives and that he is certainly incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): One of the rules of the House is that an honourable member may get the floor by arriving on a point of order. I suggest that the honourable minister's information was truly not a point of order and accordingly I rule it out of order. He has however, made his point.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out for the benefit of honourable members of the House that I am quoting directly from the Auditor's Report. These are not my views, Sir, not my observation. The minister hates me so much, Sir, that he thinks that these are opinions that I am expressing myself but I am quoting, Sir, directly from the Auditor General's Report and for the benefit of the honourable the minister, the Auditor General is an impartial servant of this honourable House, the watch dog of the treasury.

MR. HICKEY: The Auditor General is wrong.

MR. WM. ROWE: Bring him before the Bar of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you talk -

MR. HICKEY: I do not have to bring anyone before the Bar of the House. I am not going to sit here and have an insinuation that there has been contracts awarded without tenders.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): This matter has gone beyond the stage that it is somewhat amusing and the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications, while he may have in his own mind reason for standing and protesting as he does, certainly has been out of order on two occasions now and I ask him if he would restrain himself. I also ask the honourable member for Bell Island if he is going to quote from the Auditor General's Report do so because he has been putting in a great deal of embellishments in it that are certainly by their nature provocative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if it will please honourable members on the opposite side, Sir, I will try to be a little more sober and straight-laced, straight-faced, poker-faced, however they want me, but Sir, the last paragraph of page 72 is really a gem, Sir, really a gem.

The honourable minister has not heard anything yet. Here is the opinion of the Auditor General. "Therefore the opinion expressed in my 1971 -1972 report remains unchanged and for the 1972 -1973 year, I repeat that the information cited above indicates that the systems and procedures in effect in the Department of Highways for controlling and completing capitol projects have failed to maintain a consistent system of planning, of competitive bidding," Of competitive bidding, Sir!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs:

MR. DAWE: Is this not ranging far from the amendment to the resolution, Your Honour? Neither the amendment nor the resolution say anything at all about the working procedures of any of the government departments. It has nothing to do with it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Ordinarily, perhaps, the honourable member's point might be in order. I do not know, but one of the points raised in the remarks of the House Leader when he was making his speech, was that there was no need for the amendment before the House, there was no need for the motion before the House at the present time, because this government has instituted such tight controls on tendering, public tenders and controls of the departments generally.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island is merely refuting that argument.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I think that we have had the problem sufficiently put by both honourable members. I do believe that the honourable member for Bell Island, while at the beginning was relevant, that his remarks did pertain somewhat to the amendment. I doubt very much if he may quote in its entirety the Auditor General's Report and suggest that that would be in order. I ask the honourable member to make his point with regard to the Auditor General's Report and move on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that I have sufficiently exploded the points made by the member for St. John's East, the Minister without Portfolio and there is no need of my quoting further.

from the Report of the Auditor General to the House of Assembly.

Sir, I would like to point out while I am on the subject of tendering that apart from what I quoted from the Auditor General's Report, I would like for the minister who raised this matter in this debate on the amendment, I would like for the honourable minister to tell us, to tell this honourable House what steps his government have taken to ensure that Scrivener (Nfld.) Limited

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is not the question period, Mr. Speaker, this is a debating period and the honourable gentleman from Bell Island is asking questions of the minister. This is not the question period. We are debating a resolution and the amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon you to keep the honourable member in order.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member has consistently now, since he began his speech approximately twenty-five minutes ago, been called to order on a number of occasions and while the honourable Minister without Portfolio may have been out of order when he made his remarks, certainly there was no objection from the other side that I know of and certainly the fact that he may have been out of order is certainly no reason that the comments were out of order then in turn commented upon by the honourable member if he is brought to order. This is so much a circuitous argument but I do believe that the honourable member from Bonavista South has a good point and I ask the honourable member to be relevant. If the honourable member has run out of relevant points, I ask the honourable member to yield the floor to the members who have relevant points.

MR. NEARY: Thank you Mr. Speaker, for your very impartial ruling, Sir. Now then, Mr. Speaker, may I -

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir, Mr. Speaker, now I have heard these snide remarks from the honourable gentleman a couple of times this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: What snide remarks?

MR. DAWE: On page 10 of The Standing Orders it says; "The Speaker is the official mouthpiece of the House and entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual members." Now I submit, Sir, that the honourable gentleman across the way is not being respectful to the Chair.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. I am being most respectful to Your Honour when I thank Your Honour for his impartial ruling. How could you be more respectful, Mr. Speaker? How could you?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is the honourable minister's dirty mind, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! While honourable members to my left may wish to come to the aid of the Speaker and I certainly appreciate these endeavours on their part, I do think that at the present time at least, that the Chair is capable of handling the remarks of the honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am in favour of this amendment, Sir. As it was indicated by a number of other speakers on either side of the House, Sir, I do not think that the amendment goes far enough. I feel, Mr. Speaker, my own personal opinion on this matter of campaign expenses and controlling election expenses is that we should go all the way, Sir, go one hundred per cent of the way. Do not be chicken about this.

Mr. Speaker, if we did adopt the reform that was brought in in the House of Commons by a Liberal Government in Ottawa,

In my opinion it still would not go far enough, Sir. I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that a number of honourable members have tried to claim credit in this honourable House for this matter being debated on the floor of the House today. Sir, Joey Smallwood may be absent from the House but his presence is still felt here Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: His presence is still felt, Sir, because last fall -

MR. DOODY: His shadow is behind the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: The shadow knows: Last fall, Sir, Mr. Smallwood, former Premier, maligned so badly by the other side was the first one in this province who very seriously raised this matter. He was the first one and everybody began to tremble and shake and shiver in their shoes, Sir. "Mr. Smallwood is going to make a come-back."

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring him back.

MR. NEARY: One of the things, one of the reforms, on of the planks in his platform, there were two or three, one of the planks in his platform, Sir, was that he was going to reform campaign and election expenses in this province. The question has been raised many times in this debate, Sir. Why do we hear now, after the former Premier is gone, why do we hear this matter raised?

Well, Sir, I put the same question to Mr. Smallwood and I got an honest and frank answer from the gentleman. An honest and frank answer. The former Premier told me that he was in the same position when he was Premier and Leader of the Liberal Party of this province, as that honourable crowd are over there right now, that you have to depend on handouts, you have to depend on your friends, you have to depend on corporations and businesses and you have to depend on individuals to get money to run your campaign. What other way could you survive? What other way, Mr. Speaker, will this honourable crowd over here survive, if we do not reform the system?

Mr. Smallwood admitted to me quite frankly and openly that it was the only way.

AN HON. MEMBER: We know that "Steve."

MR. NEARY: The only way that any political party, any political party under the system could survive. So Mr. Smallwood stated publicly in about, I think it was probably July or August of last year, that he was still interested in political matters in this province and that if he did come back, and he did not say that he would, if he did, there would be two or three major reforms that would take place.

in the two year period that he specified that he would be willing to carry on if he ever became Premier in this province again:

(1) Priorities, Sir, election expenses reformed!

They started to shiver and shake. Oh, everybody started speculating. That crowd over there got frightened stiff. They figured the handwriting was on the wall, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are not debating whether the former Premier Smallwood is going to come back in politics or not. We are debating a resolution, an amendment to the resolution with regard to election expenses. It is not relevant to this debate whether former Premier Smallwood is coming back into politics or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It appears as if the word "relevancy" will appear quite often in the transcript of today's remarks. I would caution the Hon. Member for Bell Island that he is perhaps not relevant to the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour for the ruling. Sir, in answer to points that were raised by certain honourable members of who is responsible for this resolution and the amendment being on the floor of the House today, I think we have to give credit where credit is due. I give all the credit in the world to the Hon. Member for St. John's North, Sir. I admire, Sir, his initiative. I am not one of these members of this honourable House, Sir, who is so naive as to think that the honourable member had prior consultation with his caucus before he introduced this resolution on the floor of this honourable House. I think it came like a bolt out of the blue, Sir. It came as a complete surprise to the government. It scared them to death. It was a shocker, Sir. It came as a complete surprise to the Hon. the Premier. No wonder he has been ill ever since. I admire the honourable member for bringing it in.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the honourable member, Sir, that only two or three weeks before that, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised the matter out on the West Coast, when he spoke

to the Rotary Club, I think, in Corner Brook. It is not an original idea, Mr. Speaker, although we are all for it. We are all for it, Sir. As I said in the beginning that if we do not go all the way, Mr. Speaker, then the whole thing in my opinion will be self-defeating.

MR. HICKEY: Tell about the -

MR. NEARY: The half million dollars, Sir, I was just as surprised

I would like to hear about that as anybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about \$1.5 million all right but not the \$1.5 million debt that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition spoke about. Sir, I do not know how to put this and get away with it, Mr. Speaker, let me just concentrate for a moment, Sir, let me concentrate for a moment. We heard the Minister Without Portfolio who is an artist, a master at innuendoes. He is a master at it, snide remarks and the daddy of the witch hunts in this province, Sir, get up this afternoon in this honourable House and in his sly, cute way cast asperations on the former administration and the people who had anything to do with this administration, Sir, cast asperations. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, they have me so rattled over there that I cannot think straight. Cast asperations, Sir, the minister is a master at it.

I am going to say to this honourable House right now, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a complete exposé of the past that Mr. Vardy would look like an angel compared to some of the honourable crowd on that side of the House, Sir. He would look like an angel. He would look like the Gabriel Angel, Sir, compared to some of the honourable crowd that are sitting over there. If we are going to have dirt, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: What does the honourable member mean?

MR. NEARY: If we are going to have the kind of low debate, the kind of sneaky remarks that we heard from the Minister Without Portfolio today, Sir, let us have it out now. I am prepared to fight it out. Because I can stand in this honourable House, Sir, and look the Minister Without Portfolio straight in the eye and say; "By God I am innocent," but that is more, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is debatable.

MR. NEARY: That is not debatable, Sir, that is not debatable. God only knows, Mr. Speaker, there have been enough witch hunts and enough enquiries in my past and I would come up snow-white, snow-white, Sir.

I am prepared to stake my reputation for the length of time that I have been in politics in this province, I am prepared to stake my reputation

against the honourable ministers anytime and I can name a few of his colleagues over there and I would put my reputation on the line anytime, anytime, that anybody on that honourable side of the House wants to challenge it. Let us do it and if we are going to have a row, Sir, and if we are going to bring in dirt and filth, well, let us have it out, never mind beating around the bush.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: charges.

MR. NEARY: I am not making any charges.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Let us have it out, Sir. Let us have it out, Mr. Speaker, during this debate. During this debate, Sir, the ugly matter of the desolution of the thirty- fifth General Assembly of this honourable House was brought up and then the Minister of Finance, Sir, when he was speaking on this amendment said; "Well if we are going to have it let us bring in Burgess and Shea", and we said okay, let us bring in Burgess and Shea. Is that the deal? Is that what honourable members want, a complete investigation of the whole affair that took place at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shea has sense, came out and said that he would not fear an investigation. Now, what excuses does the Minister of Finance have, Sir, for not supporting this idea of a Commission of Enquiry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is a cover up on their part.

MR. NEARY: It is a cover up, Sir, and we all know what happened in the United States when the President of the United States attempted to cover up and the same thing will happen here, Sir. It is bound to come out, bound to, Sir. The Minister of Justice, Sir, who has the responsibility for appointing commissions of enquiry, only recently appointed an enquiry on the supply of building material to a poor, old, welfare recipient on the Bauline Line.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice acting on a request made by me in this honourable House appointed a commission of enquiry to look into certain matters relating to the dispensing of building material for welfare recipients on Bell Island, poor, old, welfare recipients and every time, Sir, every time the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The request came from this side of the House, Sir. The request came from me, Mr. Speaker on this side of the House and Hansard will show that. Every time, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Social Services rises to speak in this House, he talks about welfare recipients getting washing machines

and bed clothes and mattresses, trying to fling a bit of filth and dirt, trying to inject a bit of filth and dirt, Sir. Mr.

Speaker, when that enquiry was set up the minister dragged into that enquiry the disposal of the DOSCO assets a matter that was never raised in this honourable House, a matter, Sir, that was never questioned. Never, never questioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. HICKEY: Your honour has ruled, already, in this House in the debate between, or some cross fire between the honourable gentleman from Bell Island and myself that this matter is not to be debated until the report is passed in and tabled in the House. Are we going to go by that ruling or are we going to have a debate? If we are going to have a debate, Your Honour, I sure would like to be in on this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The point raised by the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications is well taken. I recall make a ruling in the last session, I guess, it was about the same matter and I said then that it should not be referred to in the debate until such time as the enquiry was completed and the report made. I request the honourable member from Bell Island not to refer to it any more.

MR. NEARY: You are absolutely right, Your Honour, and I have no intention of going into the details of it, Sir, but my point is this. This government, the Minister of Justice had no right in this world to decide to lay down the ground rules for appointing a commission of enquiries in this province. They cannot just investigate things that will embarrass the former administration. British fair play and justice in this province must prevail and the Minister of Justice who is always professing to be so clean has no choice in my opinion but to appoint a commission of enquiry to look into this scandal, this Saunders scandal. If he does not, Mr. Speaker, every commission of enquiry that will be appointed in this province in the future will be looked upon with suspicion. Will be looked upon

with suspicion, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: This is relevant. We are talking about bribery and corruption in politics in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are talking about the amendment.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the amendment. If the Minister of Justice tries to cover it up, Sir, it will be the biggest mistake that ever he made in his life. It will be a sorry day for this province and a sorry day for this House. It will, Mr. Speaker, and they can laugh and jeer all they like. What are they afraid of, Sir? What are they afraid of?

Mr. Speaker, this will reflect on politics

in general in this province. It will reflect on the integrity of politicians and members of this House forever, Sir, the scar will be there forever, unless it is investigated and the air is cleared. It has to be done and the Minister of Justice knows that. Why is he not doing it? What do they have to hide, Mr. Speaker, what do they have to hide? I ask him.

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's South is a man, a gentleman, a learned gentleman in this honourable House that I have a great deal of respect for, Sir. Now, Sir, we have had our disagreements in the past.

MR. MORGAN: What are you saying now anyway?

MR. NEARY: We are talking about bribery and corruption in politics in this province at election time.

MR. HICKEY: And the need for reform.

MR. WM. ROWE: We are talking about the bribes and Saunders.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. NEARY: Go and look after your little contracting firm. I am too busy trying to debate the issues in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the honourable member at one minute from six o'clock refers to me and then he carries on referring to bribery and corruption at election times -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: That may be, Mr. Speaker, but on my point, the House will now adjourn for the night in one minute's time, I mean what is the idea? What is to be left? This debate will not resume until next week.

MR. NEARY: Let me make it perfectly clear to the honourable member, Sir, and I am sorry that that happened because that is the last thing in the world I wanted to happen, I was trying to soften the honourable gentleman up a little if anything, I was going to appeal to his honour and decency because I do not think the honourable member was involved in this affair in any way, shape or form.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not want to be part of a cover up.

MR. NEARY: I am sure that the honourable member does not want to be a part of a cover up, Sir, and I did not in any way try to link the honourable member with bribery and corruption. On the contrary, Sir, the honourable gentleman in my opinion is so pure and clean and so honest, Sir, that I would expect and I would be very disappointed if the member for St. John's South did not stand in this honourable House and demand a commission of enquiry to look into this Saunders scandal.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 6:00 P.M., I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M., tomorrow Thursday.