



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 61

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 1:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

It is a distinct pleasure for me today to welcome to the galleries from Mushwau-Innu, Davis Inlet, nineteen Grades V, VI and VII students with their teachers, Mr. Leo Hanranhan and Sister Martha Gratton.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

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

HON. H. R. V. FARLE (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr.

Speaker, I have here a statement on subsidized rentals. In the light of questions asked in the House a few days ago, and in relation to my recent meeting with the members of the Fishermen's Food and Allied Workers Group, I should like to make the following statement:

In the light of current subsidized rent adjustments I wish to make a statement concerning subsidized rental units and the basis upon which they are rented and how rents are adjusted. First of all I should point out that the rentals charged in subsidized rental accommodation are related to the income of the family occupying the unit rather than to the home itself.

The first aim of subsidized rental is to provide accommodation to persons of lower income based upon their ability to pay. The scale is therefore so designed as to bear as lightly as possible on very low incomes and the percentage of income charged for rents is as low as sixteen point seven per cent at the bottom of the rental scale.

As incomes rise the percentage of income also increases until at the \$404 a month family income level and above it it calls for twenty-five per cent to be paid in rent. This is for serviced accommodation including heat, hot water, stove and refrigerator. In any case where one or more of these are not supplied appropriate reductions are made.

Taking an example; a family consisting of a man, his wife and two children

with an income of \$300 a month would pay \$63.00 a month for a serviced unit.

In order to determine rental levels to be charged there is an annual review of income carried out by the Housing Management Authorities. Increases or decreases as the case may be are made on a rate change based on the income reviews. It is important to note, however, that if a family find the rate increases on the basis of the annual review and then finds that the income being earned is less than the income review of base, they can apply for a monthly adjustment.

The scale is a national one with small variations in its application in different provinces. While from time to time the scale became a matter of controversy, no fair way has yet been found to apply such a scale during the many years over which it has been enforced, fundamentally in its present form. We must never lose sight of the fact that in considering subsidized rental rates these are primarily intended for low income families.

Currently an income review has been carried out and adjustments in the rate of rent have been made on the basis of 1973 incomes and thus substantial increases in income occurred for a large number of families occupying the units.

Recently I met with a delegation from the Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union and tenants particularly concerning the increases in communities where fish plants are operating. The three main points discussed were: The possibility of restricting increases to the economy rental rate was discussed. If such a course were adopted then it would be necessary for the province to assume the federal share of loss of revenue on this account, since the federal-provincial agreement on subsidy binds the province to use the rent scale and federal subsidies would only be paid on that basis.

In other words, in cases where rents calculated on the rental scale exceed the economic rent the province would have to bear the difference when settling with the federal government on the share of subsidy.

The second point discussed was that of finding alternative

accommodation. This was discussed within the framework of plans available to assist in home ownership. The third point discussed was the possibility of selling the units to the tenants.

On the first point there is levelling off of the rents at the economic. This has been discussed with my officials and it appears feasible to recommend to government that this be done. I should point out, however, that when I speak of levelling off at economic rentals, I am speaking of substantial rents. Economic rentals for the subsidized rental units we now have would vary depending upon how long ago they were constructed, variations in size of the units and so on. To use a general figure is difficult and I do not wish to be bound to a specific rate. I can say, however, that when I speak about newer homes, I refer to rentals of up to \$200 a month. This can vary depending upon the cost of construction, interest rates and so on which would determine economic rental rates in specific cases.

On the second point, I am happy to say that the new Federal-Provincial Agreement for the construction of 700 units for home ownership in small communities should be of considerable help. This plan includes subsidy of mortgage payments on the basis of income. We shall make sure that the benefits of this plan are fully explained to the people involved in rental increases, with a view to their using it to secure alternative accommodation on a home ownership basis.

The third point, the matter of sale, presents great difficulties. First of all, many subsidized units are built in multiforms which would make sale somewhat difficult and might involve the use of condominium forms of ownership. More important than this, however, is the continuing need for subsidized rental units. It would be obviously unsound for government to sell units built at a lower cost some years ago and have to replace them with new units which would cost very substantially more than the existing ones.

It is not considered, therefore, that this is a practical course to follow. Looking at the general matter of building new subsidized rental housing, I shall point out that at today's cost the federal and

provincial government are faced with subsidies of over \$250 per family per month. This poses a serious problem as to how much can be done to increase the supply of this kind of accommodation in the light of the very high construction and operating costs prevailing today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the information in the statement just read by the honourable minister, I will assume it will be welcome news for the fish plant workers, the dragger workers in Trepassey and Marystown and in the other parts of Newfoundland where there are subsidized rental units.

A lot of the minister's statement was just window dressing, Sir. There were a lot of ifs, ands and buts in the statement, things that probably the minister just threw in there to make it look like the government they were pretty good fellows but in actual fact, Sir, all these people are interested in is pegging the rental.

Now the minister pointed out in his statement that there were substantial increases in rents this year due to the increase in income based on last year's earning and this was the main complaint of the fish plant workers and the dragger crews down in the Member for Placentia West's District and down in the Member of Ferryland's District. I am not quite clear but I understood from the minister that they would now provide what he called I think economic rents. In other words, I presume that the minister is going to do the same thing that the former administration did at Buckmaster's Circle when the matter rose over there that the government would have to put in a larger share of the subsidy. Is this what the minister said in effect? That the rents will be paid up to a certain point depending on the size of the family and the income in the family and that the province would put in a larger share of the subsidy? That is not what the minister said? Would the minister clarify that? That is the impression I got from his statement? I mean just what help is going to be given to these people, if any? Is there any assistance in there for these people? Would the minister just clarify that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DAVE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well just one second now, I am trying to get -

MR. DAVE: This is not the question period, Mr. Speaker. An honourable member from the opposition side can I understand have a few brief remarks to a ministerial statement but I do not think we are suppose to enter into a question period at this time.

MR. NEARY: Sit down boy, and do not be so stunned and making such a -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It has been a general custom that a spokesman or the Leader of the Opposition or, if not, a spokesman with a shadow portfolio to make a few comments in reply to a ministerial statement, but this should be confined in particular to the statement. Questions are allowed for clarification.

MR. NEARY: Merely for clarification purposes, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want to misinterpret what the minister said: I would like to have a copy of his statement, as a matter of fact, as the minister has copies to circulate to members of the House. I want to be perfectly clear on that point because this is the important thing as far as these workers are concerned. Will the rents now be frozen or will there still be a review or will the province put in a larger share of the subsidy? Just what aid is going to be given to these people that approached the minister there a couple of weeks ago, or a week or so ago?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification, when I say economic rental and as I pointed out in the statement, of which I will have a copy to give to the members of the opposite side, economic rentals today, based on present costs and even on some of the homes presently there, are not cheap rentals. There will be some that will benefit by an adjustment to an economic rent but there will be others who will suffer because if we stick to an economic basis there is bound to be in some cases an increase in rent and in some a lowering.

But I might say that this will not affect a large proportion of the people occupying these houses. I have gone down through every place where we have subsidized rentals and by far the great majority of people occupying these homes are in the lower brackets. For instance, in St.

May 1, 1974

Tape 1437

PK - 6

John's, just to give an example, there are 419 of these occupied by
people who are paying from \$17 to

4879

to \$75 a month and 118 of them where they are paying up to \$76 a month. Now when one gets down to the \$196 to \$ 215 a month rent and the \$216 to \$235 rent, this in total, out of something like 700, only affects about 200 people, about 200 families out of 700. All the way along - in some cases it varies. In Marystown it is even better than that. This is St. John's but I have it here for each district and each place.

AN HON MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EARLE: Well, Marystown, for instance, where the bulk of the delegation came from to see me; There are seventy-nine there with a rental of \$17 to \$75 a month. There are thirty-five families with a rent from \$76 to \$95 a month. There are only two families with \$163 a month, one family at \$183; one family at \$208 and one family at \$220. It can be easily seen that by far the greater percentage of these are in the low rental brackets.

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister, Mr. Speaker. I must say that in the light of his supplementary remarks here that the statement then is a gross disappointment indeed to say the least. I think what the fish plants fear in these communities, Sir, is that a lot of their workers, their key workers who own homes in other parts of Newfoundland may quit because of these high rentals and go back to their own homes. I am wondering if the minister approached the fish plant owners to see if they would be prepared to throw in a few dollars to help the workers offset the increases in rents. There is a danger there, Sir, that these people may quit and go back home and thus lower the productivity of the fish plant, both at Marystown and Trespassey. This would be unfortunate right at a time, Sir, when they need the productivity and they are just starting to build up a good industry there.

MR. EARLE: The honourable member's question as to whether we approached plant owners, this would have a very unsatisfactory result because if the plants were to contribute towards this, this would be regarded as income and the subsidies would be cut by the federal authorities.

PETITIONS:

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some fifty or more residents of New Penneywell Road, situated in St. John's North.

The prayer of the petition is brief. It says: "In the matter of expropriation, we the undersigned want a house for a house."

Mr. Speaker, in that brief heading, I think that contains all the hopes and fears of all those who live in older homes all over Newfoundland and especially in urban renewal areas. When we speak of a house for a house we mean (the petitioners mean) that if a person through no fault of his own has to give up his house to the government that that government will fairly see that the family is lodged in at least an equivalent house and if, because of the age of the house that was expropriated, no such equivalent house can be found, then at least the cheapest good, new house that is available within reasonable distance of the original domicile.

Mr. Speaker, you may have a situation where a house is extremely old and dilapidated and to offer say \$7,000 or \$8,000 would be a very, very fair market value but what would happen to that person when he sought a new house or any other house? That would merely be the downpayment and the family would find themselves saddled with a monthly mortgage payment, possibly as high or even higher than a steep rental.

Now this present situation arose largely, as I understand it, because the federal government was not willing to go along with a house for a house legislation in urban renewal areas. They felt that it would cost too much. I think that this shows a very unfeeling streak on the part of the federal government because it is tantamount to asking the poor souls who are being expropriated to subsidize this urban renewal. They are the last people who should be asked to subsidize that kind of a development. I say that if one cannot pay a decent price

for a house to enable the people to go into another home, then leave them alone. I would say further that if one could guarantee our people freedom from the fear of expropriation, the fear that expropriation is going to set them back financially, ten years, then I say that this government could do nothing greater during its term of office .

Now most property transfers are the result of private negotiation. The person who negotiates willingly and freely cannot complain legitimately about the price he has received. In fact the percentage of those homes that are taken by outright expropriation in any one year must be very, very small. We are not talking about a massive infusion of money but we are talking about legislation that will guarantee fair play to all people, all over Newfoundland. In my view a fair price can only be full replacement value. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge and I implore the government to set the public mind at rest, to do a great right and to right a great wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, at long last the Member for St. John's North has come up with a matter that we are in complete agreement with on this side of the House, Sir, we support the prayer of the petition presented by the Member for St. John's North on behalf of his constituents who live on the New Penneywell Road Area.

We subscribe to the principle, Sir, of a house for a house in cases where the government expropriates the property or the people are forced out of their property for some reason or other. We have had a number of examples here in St. John's, Sir, where people were forced out of their homes, right down in the heart of St. John's, right down where City Hall is now. Now the Trizec people are wheeling and dealing with the government to try to get a deal whereby they can come in and put up a big skyscraper down there. That land one time was privately owned. It belonged to homeowners, The people were driven out of their homes, Sir, and are probably involved today in heavy mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Member for St. John's North that you have a number of innocent people in urban renewal projects that are carried out who are senior citizens, who are retired and who are living on fixed incomes in a lot of cases in the low income bracket. They are forced out of their homes, they have to go out and commit themselves to mortgages and high interest rates that they can ill-afford, Sir. The member did not mention the fact that his colleague, the Member for St. John's South, has a resolution on the Order Paper dealing with this very matter of a house for a house.

The Premier, Sir, and the administration, when they were campaigning in two provincial general elections, made a solemn commitment to the people of this province that they were going to implement the principle of a home for a home. The Premier is nodding, yes. I hope that the government will see to it that they keep this promise. Sir, this is a part of our philosophy on this side of the House, it is a part of our policy and a part of our platform.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: We have not had a chance yet to form the administration. We have a new leader and a new party.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition just reminded me, we did want to do it but the Minister of Finance disbarred it.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I intend to wind up my remarks now, Sir, but I want to say that it is a part of our philosophy over here on this side of the House, a part of our policy and will be a part of our platform, if that honourable crowd over there do not bring in this programme of a home for a home.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my few words of support for the petition presented by the Hon. Member for St. John's North, on behalf of those residents on New Penneywell Road who are now facing

expropriation. I think it is something that is long overdue, as the Member for Bell Island has said. I do not think that this government could do anything better than to adopt as one of its

principles the provision of a home for a home when government has to take away from an individual or a group of individuals what in many cases is a lifetime investment. To simply take the market value of any particular house and give them that in compensation for taking their home away is never enough because one can never buy a replacement home for the market value that is being put on it by assessors. I certainly, Sir, have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting this petition.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two brief comments only in this regard because I hope that we may begin the debate on the resolution that I have brought before this House on the house for house principle. I would say this; there is no question about it, the Family Homes Expropriation Act of 1964 was an excellent piece of legislation. It was fought for - it was passed, of course, by this House but was fought for more than anyone else, I suppose, by the honourable member for St. John's Center who is ill at this moment but I think everybody recognizes that it was he would fought long and hard for that particular piece of legislation.

Now, it was changed in 1966-1967 by the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. WELLS: I know all about that. Relax. I will tell the honourable member about it. It was changed, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, have I the right even in a few brief comments to be heard in silence?

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

MR. WELLS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, it had to be changed as I understand it, because the federal government of the day would not, in these cost-shared programmes, go along with the principle as expressed in the Family Homes Expropriation Act. My understanding was - I was not in the House at the time - that that is what compelled the change, so that in order to participate in these cost-shared programmes the provincial government of the day had to make that amendment.

Now, the amendment is still on the books. It only, of course, refers to areas covered by urban renewal schemes. In other areas of the province the Family Homes Expropriation Act is still in effect. At least that is how I read the law. I hope to have more to say on this in the debate. Certainly I support the principle of this petition. I agree that the time has come to do something about this, to reverse that which was forced upon the government of the day by the federal government. I have no hesitation in supporting the petition as presented by the member, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Somehow or other I get the feeling that these few brief remarks on the presentation of a petition have been drawn into an overall debate. I hope that it does not continue to do so.

The Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment and I notice the Minister of Finance wanted to say a few words about it. In all fairness I think I shall permit these two gentlemen to have a few brief remarks and then I feel that we should get on with other business of the day.

MR. W.G. DAVE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition because at the present time in the district of Harbour Main on the site of the Manuels Bridge we have several homes which are being expropriated for the purpose of replacing the old bridge which should have been done many years ago but was totally ignored despite the pleadings of the people in the area to the then Liberal members.

We have people there who are not living in modern bungalows. They are living in homes which were constructed some years ago but they are clean. They are comfortable, They are debt free and in my opinion these people should not now be subjected to ten or fifteen or twenty years mortgage because the government of this province decides to replace a bridge. It is progress that we are getting the new bridge but history has proven that progress must pay its own way.

I would like also to see a programme brought in whereby

in such cases and instances a family man would receive a house for the house which he has lost because of the implementation of some government programme.

It amazes me also, Mr. Speaker, that while in opposition, the Liberals can come out and support all sorts of programmes that while they were in power they totally ignored.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We brought the policy in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE: They did not bring any policy in. Do not be talking foolishness.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, sit down and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, these people should not be subjected to indebtedness which is not of their own making.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the honourable Minister of Finance if he wish to have the floor.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to engage in a debate on this petition. Of course everybody has every sympathy and sense of support for the petition. I do want to correct a misstatement, a deliberate misstatement of fact in connection with this matter. As I understand the position, Mr. Speaker, there already is a Family Homes Expropriation Act which provides, in rough terms, a home for a home, if a family home should be expropriated. This is all going to be debated later on this afternoon or else next Wednesday in greater detail.

In 1967, Mr. Speaker, when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in the late, lamented Smallwood Administration, I was told by my officials in the Department of Municipal Affairs that the Government of Canada would not proceed with any expenditure on the Blackhead Road scheme, now in the district of the member for St. John's South, unless the Family Homes Expropriation Act were changed so that it did not apply to the Blackhead Road area or to any urban renewal area. They would not proceed, they would not share in the cost of the expropriation of land and so on necessary up there if the Family Homes Expropriation Act applied to it. That

was duly reported to the cabinet of the day and the cabinet of the day decided that there would therefore have to be an amendment to the Family Homes Expropriation Act so that it would not apply in areas where there was an urban renewal scheme and where people were being given an opportunity to go into public housing or subsidized rental or other things of that nature. Now, that will all be gone into in more detail later.

That was a policy of the Smallwood Government. It has not been changed to this date. It may very well be changed by the present administration. That is the sequence of events, Mr. Speaker. It was a Liberal Government at Ottawa and a Liberal Administration of the day of which I was a member and which policy was not changed up until January 18, 1972. That was in effect then. That applied to the Blackhead Road, to the Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Area and to the Corner Brook Urban Renewal Area, the only three areas in this province.

So, I am sure that we are going to have an interesting debate on this when the member's resolution gets up, and it is a policy that doubtlessly will be receiving close scrutiny and change. I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that the change was supported by the member for Bell Island, the member for White Bay South, the member for White Bay North and the member for Fogo and all of the gentlemen opposite who were in the House in 1967. In fact one might call it really the "Neary amendment". He was very vocal in his support of that concept at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall recognize the honourable Leader of the Opposition and then we shall continue with other business.

MR. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to say just a word or two in support of the petition because as my colleague from Bell Island has said, "We support the policy." I find the Minister of Finance to be tender on the subject. There will be opportunity to debate that later this day.

I merely want to repeat to the House that we do support the policy, that we shall support the motion of the gentleman from

St. John's South which is very much to the point in this respect. I say, Sir, that it will be a test of the government's sincerity whether or not they support this motion by the gentleman from St. John's South and whether or not they act on it because this administration, Sir, in the first Throne Speech they prepared or the first one they delivered - the gentleman from St. John's South was not in the House at that time because he had suffered an unfortunate circumstance in Bonavista North.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A temporary reversal.

MR. ROBERTS: A temporary reversal and I give him full credit for fighting the valiant battle in St. John's South and coming back to the House or coming into the House where he adds considerably to it.

The first Throne Speech of the administration, Sir, on March 1, 1972, committed this government

firmly and unmistakeably to repealing the Family Homes Expropriation Act Amendment. This is now, Sir, the fourth session, the third substantial session. Today is the forty-ninth sitting day of this session and no motion to repeal that act, change that act, has been brought in by any member of the administration. So we say, Sir, we shall support the petition gladly and quite sincerely. We shall support the motion equally gladly and equally sincerely. Now, Sir, the test will be on the administration to do what they promised to do two and one-half years ago.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

HON. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to two questions, Question no. 30, Question no. 31 on the Order Paper, by the honourable member for Bonavista North.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the Gross Morne National Park. Over the weekend the minister announced a \$15 million allocation over a three year period for the Gross Morne National Park for infrastructure work providing improved roads, pavement, water and sewerage and other support systems, Sir. In the article in the newspaper I get the distinct feeling that this \$15 million is coming wholly and solely from the Provincial Government. I was wondering if the minister could clarify that and indicate what the federal and provincial breakdown is as far as this \$15 million expenditure is concerned.

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that it was expected there would be expenditures in that approximate amount for water, sewer system, roads and so on in the Gross Morne area. I indicated that that would be over and above the expenditures by the federal parks people. I did not indicate whether the funds would be provincial or federal for that specific thing. As yet I do not know what the breakdown would be, the exact percentage.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is this \$15 million over three years all provincial money then?

MR. MAYNARD: No.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the minister undertake, Mr. Speaker, to provide the House at some later date with the Federal Provincial breakdown of that \$15 million allocation? Does the minister know at the present time, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MAYNARD: No. As soon as I am able to indicate to the House I will do so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had a definite indication from Ottawa, an approval from Ottawa that money will be forthcoming for the Gross Morne National Park to take up part of this \$15 million? Has the minister received approval from Ottawa, a definite commitment from Ottawa for any expenditure over the next three years for the Gross Morne National Park?

MR. MAYNARD: So far we have received a verbal commitment only, Mr. Speaker. There has been no national agreement signed up to this time.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that such a large announcement could be made without a definite agreement having been signed between Ottawa and the Provincial Government. It sounds like another "if" announcement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The minister took as notice some weeks ago a question I asked concerning a proposed road through the district of St. Barbe North. I was wondering if the minister now has the answer to that question. Do the officials in his department have in fact an engineering design or a plan or a plot plan and description for any section of a proposed new road through the district of St. Barbe North.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. T.P. HICKEY: My information, Mr. Speaker, is that my staff have a partial plan. Some survey work and engineering work has been done. It is incomplete. I do not have the areas. I have not been given any detailed report as yet. So I do not have the particular area in question that it covers and neither do I have a time limit or a schedule as to when it will be completed but I am waiting for the detailed information. As soon as I

have it I will be glad to let the honourable member know.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of any new proposed road plan from the Roddickton Junction up as far as Forresters Point in the district of St. Barbe North that was completed in the year of 1972?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that under advisement. I can find out for the honourable member.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister made any specific proposals to Ottawa for road construction in the district of St. Barbe North, based on what information I indicated that I feel I have some knowledge of, for road construction during the coming year under DREE or any other federal money?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say at this time with regards to the proposals that were forwarded to Ottawa. We discussed with DREE as to whether or not sections, what sections were within the boundaries of the honourable member's district. It is a bit difficult for me from memory, to pin this kind of thing down. I do know there were a number of proposals that would not necessarily be included in the final agreement. There are a number of alternatives too, whatever agreement is signed. I am unable to give him that information at this time.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to address a question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries, when the minister is ready, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the attention of the Minister of Fisheries. I have a question for the honourable the Minister of Fisheries. Okay. While on a recent visit to the district, Mr. Speaker, a number of people were indicating that a fish handling facility was to be established in Brig Bay presumably using the Plum Point vegetable storage materials on site. The frame is constructed. Presumably they will dismantle it and move it out to Brig Bay. The word floating around is that \$180 million is to be spent for this facility this year - \$180,000 is to be spent this year.

I was wondering if the minister could indicate to the House, Mr.

Speaker, what exactly the status of this construction of a fish handling facility in Brig Bay is and what plans the minister's department has for a similiar structure in the northern part of St. Barbe North.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, let me recall it. I might be wrong in some areas but as I recall it there has been a considerable amount of work done down there to determine what is necessary in terms of a water supply, bearing in mind the federal requirements for water for a fish plant. Tenders would have to be called. I am not sure that a price has been established, and a price will not be established until tenders are called and bids are received to indicate to us what the cost would be.

With regard to the northern part of that coast and a fish processing facility, I indicated to the honourable member some time ago that private enterprise, some sections of private enterprise were interested in going in there. Until a decision is made in that regard, of course, we will not know what we might be required to do. I would certainly be willing to discuss it with the member outside but I would not like to mention the names of the firms which are interested in going there. Mr. Speaker, with \$180 million, we would have no problem.

MR. F. ROWE: It is \$180,000, Mr. Speaker? It certainly was not \$180 million.

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Hon. the Premier: In view of the fact that the Premier did make a commitment during the March election campaign for a fish plant, no less, in St. Barbe North and in view of the fact that during the consideration of fisheries estimates last year the Premier did say that a fish plant will be established in St. Barbe North this year - The Premier said that last year and now the year has run out - would the Premier use his good offices to put some pressure on his cabinet or on the Minister of Fisheries to fulfill the commitment that the Premier himself made during election campaigns and during the consideration of the estimates last year for the Department of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F.D. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I could very easily say the Order Paper

for something like that. The honourable member has waited for a year to ask the question, he can certainly wait some time to get the answer. The fact is that we are interested in trying to get as much development as we can in areas like St. Barbe North where there is not very much industrialization and certainly we are making every effort to do all we can to bring that about.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation, the gentleman whom I indicated to the House I would thank when he got back in the House. I already thanked the Minister of Municipal Affairs the other night and I promised a bouquet for the Minister of Transportation which he deserves for his help last week in connection with the delegation from Gaultois.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Sir, to the question: I have them all wondering, Mr. Speaker, what I got that the backbenchers over there did not get.

Mr. Speaker, I figured if the Member for Bell Island could have a kissing-cousin relationship with him, I certainly would not go wrong -

AN HON. MEMBER: Carrying on a love affair ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct, the minister is waiting with bated breath, I want him to hear the question. The first question of two or three that I want to put to him perhaps is whether he has received some representation from the Town Council at St. Alban's concerning the maintenance of roads in the area and the proposal to establish a maintenance depot in the area?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, all was calm before the storm. I think that should cover the relationship that exists at the moment. So I am not under any illusions.

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. NICKFY: In answer to the honourable member's question, may I say that of recent date I have not had representation. I am familiar with the problem. There were some discussions held approximately six months ago and my understanding was at that time that we would attempt to do something on a trial basis. I am purely speaking from memory of back something like four or five months -

MR. SIMMONS: A maintenance depot now.

MR. HICKEY: Right! To the best of my knowledge we indicated to our staff that they should try a number of things which were suggested, which may improve the overall situation. I cannot, as the honourable member can appreciate, comment at this time as to whether what was done was successful or how it might have been, if in fact, there was anything done.

I will attempt to get the information and give him the detail. To my knowledge, I personally have not had representation within the last number of months.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, they made reference to representation. I was thinking perhaps that by now the minister would

have received a telegram which was on the way to him last night. He will probably get it today sometime. The issue had been discussed with him earlier. Perhaps, could the minister indicate whether he foresees the establishment of such a maintenance in the Bay D'Esnoir Area in the foreseeable future?

MR. HICKEY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is conceivable that the telegram has arrived by now. I had meetings all before noon and I came directly to the House, so I am unaware of any telegram that might have arrived today.

With regards to whether or not a permanent maintenance depot would be set up in that particular area, it would be purely speculation on my part to give a positive answer or a negative answer at this particular point in time. I think it is a matter which I should look into in all fairness and give the honourable member the detailed information.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. As the minister is aware of course, this matter of maintenance or lack thereof is particularly aggravating at this time of the year, the spring of the year, and it has mushroomed again as witnessed again by the petition presented yesterday by me on behalf of hundreds of people of the area. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House what has been done subsequent to my having raised the matter or during the past few weeks - what has been done to cure the pretty serious problem which was existing then at Grand Falls because of the shortage of mechanics and the large numbers of pieces of equipment which were in disrepair because of that shortage? Can he indicate what steps have been taken in recent weeks to accommodate, to cure this situation?

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the mechanic problem is certainly not an easy one to come up with. To my knowledge there has been no appreciable change in the situation at Grand Falls. We have experienced difficulty for the last year or so. It is just one of those things that we cannot cure. It seems that it is possibly just coincidental that we are finding difficulty in keeping mechanics in that area because other opportunities have presented themselves and the gentlemen in question take those opportunities. It leaves vacancies. We attempt to fill them as

quickly as we can. It is just one of those things, I am afraid we do not have an answer now. We are having difficulties all over the province. At the moment we are looking at the rate of pay and the overall structure of the depots with regards to the mechanical situation. What the future holds I hope will be an improvement. Certainly we have not resolved it yet. We are afraid there is little if anything we can do.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Could he indicate please what steps if any the government have taken to in any way accommodate the wishes of the group of people, some of them in Clarendville, some of them located throughout the province who wish at the very least to have the proposed sale of Reid lots, I think it is 242 and 104, held up until such time as the government can decide in consultation with the people involved whether or not the proposed sale of such lots is in the best interest of the province?

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

MR. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the proposed sale of the lots is not in the best interest of the province. We have been in contact verbally and by letter with Mr. Reid. He has refused to give us the information we requested. We are now looking at other ways and means of controlling the land and possibly will have a further statement on it tomorrow or Friday.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I find the minister's answer unsatisfactory and I give notice that I will invoke the provision of Standing Order 31 (g) which means -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is the rule of the House which means that the matter will be debated at 5:30 tomorrow afternoon. That is all 31(g) means that it will be debated at 5:30 tomorrow afternoon.

MR. M. MARTIN: A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, a question for

the honourable minister, of course, in agriculture. Has the minister made any effort or perhaps does he already know the identity of the parties to whom this sale is being made? The other party who are now negotiating with -

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the only source of the information we know of would be Mr. Reid himself and he has refused to give us that information.

MR. MARTIN: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Hon. the Premier. I am wondering if the Premier could tell us whether or not he is aware that the delay in presenting the Report of the Royal Commission on Labrador is holding up several important projects including upgrading of the telephone system along the Labrador Coast and the Federal Rural and Native Housing Programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, regarding the Labrador Commission Report that, as I advised the member, I think out of the House, we are getting a précis done of the report. I think it is six or seven volumes, yes thick, and to read it in detail would take a considerable length of time. It is now being précised and a summary of each department, where it relates to them in the report will be identifying with them. I hope to be able to table the report next week. Certainly there is no intention whatsoever of any programmes in Labrador being delayed and if there have been we apologize but it was not certainly the intent, if there has been. If the honourable member will let me know specifically we will certainly do what we can about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate whether this summary will be translated into the Eskimo language or not?

MR. MOOPFS: Well not only will the summary be translated into the native languages, Mr. Speaker, but as will the whole report eventually.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. NEARY: I am sorry.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I would like to direct towards the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It has something to do with this matter of the delay in the commission's report. I am wondering, in connection with this federal programme on rural and native housing, whether or not the minister's department has already undertaken liaison with the federal government in this respect. The reason I ask this question is that there are a number of groups, including the Native Association, who have held preliminary discussions with the federal government but the federal government again say that they cannot do anything until the commission's report is made known. I am wondering if the minister has done anything in the interim.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Hon. Member for Labrador South that about a week ago I met with a delegation from the native people and discussed this. In the meantime officials of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation have been in touch with Mr. Basford's department in Ottawa to try to get clarification of his statement on native and rural housing programmes.

I further understand that it is Mr. Basford's intention to come here sometime during the month of May, when he wishes to discuss this with us. In preparation for that we have already met with officials from C.M.H. C. and are drafting programmes, which we want to suggest, to Mr. Basford, should tie in very well with our own programmes which I have already announced. It is my feeling that the programmes that we already have can be extended most certainly to native people, as they are Newfoundlanders. If there is to be any enlargement on these, particularly for the native people, I wish to discuss it with Mr. Basford. I think he is anxious to discuss it with me.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Having full consideration for his vocal capacity, the answer will require just a yes or a no, I am wondering if the minister would look into the condition of disrepair of the equipment on both New World Island and Twillingate Island. I still use it as island, although they are connected. I understand that they have but one truck

to take care of all of New World Island at the moment and the roads are in a very bad condition. Perhaps if the minister would be kind enough, would he see into this and see if he can get the repairs effected a little more rapidly and the roads put in better condition please?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we are already aware of the situation. We do have some problems there. I can assure the honourable member that it is already under consideration. Some action has been taken.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Now that the foregoing \$4.7 million has been announced, the federal funding, DREE, for the Bay d'Espoir Highway, I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House whether his department is taking under consideration the possibility of upgrading the remaining eight miles of highway, this is the eight miles which would be in addition to the twenty miles on which tenders have been called and the eight miles would mean that the whole highway would then be upgraded or under contract?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Industrial Development has told us what he knows, I will get on with the question. Now that a substantial amount of money has been announced by Mr. Jamieson for the Bay d'Espoir Highway, \$4.7 million or some amount less, (I stand to be educated on the point) my question still stands, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the minister would indicate to the House if his department has any plans to proceed with the upgrading of the remaining eight miles in the present fiscal year?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it would be discourteous indeed of me to give any detail of the DREE Agreement which is about to be signed in terms of particular projects or indeed what is to be done with

the money that is involved. May I just say that as soon as I can I will provide what details I can with regard to the DREE Agreement pertaining to highways. May I also say that we are very much aware of the most difficult situation on the Bay d'Espoir Highway. I think our efforts to do this road indicates our concern, our recognition of this. May I also add that I have held a number of discussions with regard to the overall situation, the remaining miles, the pavement of existing road that has been upgraded and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the honourable member that that particular road has received a great deal of consideration from this government, particularly my department. I can assure him also that it will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Member for Hermitage asks a supplementary questions, I would wish to advise members that there are five minutes left in the question period.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I can appreciate the minister not wanting to be discourteous on the point. I do not know how he gives that with the announcement of the twenty miles before the agreement was announced. Be that as it may, that is a matter for another time.

All I have asked and perhaps I should not have tied my question to a reference to the Minister of DREE'S announcement but without the reference, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate whether his department has plans, with or without federal funding, to undertake the upgrading of the road this year?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier in this session that I was not in a position, I felt that it was improper to give this kind of detailed information at this point in time. I am certainly not in a position to answer that question to the honourable member's satisfaction because the answer he wants is, "Yes, we are going to do that road," I cannot say that. If I were reasonably sure that we were going

to do the road, I still would, in my opinion, be unable to give such a commitment. I can say that we have intentions of paving every road in the province but when I cannot say.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we still have three or four minutes left. I wonder if I could return to the Reid land controversy, Sir, and ask the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry if his department has sought a legal opinion from the Justice Department as to whether or not the Reid Company had to fence their property at least once a year the same as every other private citizen has to do in order to protect their rights to the land under, I understand, British common law?

Could the minister give us an answer?

MR. MAYNARD: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is any requirement for fencing land in order to protect property in Newfoundland. Probably my colleague, the Minister of Justice, could tell me whether there is such a law or not?

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to answer the question?

MR. MAYNARD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice care to answer the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us then, while the Minister of Justice is thinking about an answer to that question, because everybody else has to do it in this province, if he has taken any steps to bill the Reid Company, to charge them for services rendered over the past forty or fifty years in connection with building forest access roads, spraying, fire protection, fish and game protection services and so on?

MR. MAYNARD: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. There have not been any invoices submitted to the Reid Company for any of those services. I am not aware at all that very many services have been rendered to the Reid Newfoundland people.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister looking into this to see if it is possible to charge the Reid Company for these services? They were supplied at the expense of the taxpayers. Why should we not recover the money?

MR. MAYNARD: Forest access roads are not built on private land in any case so we cannot very well charge them for forest access roads that have been built. Any that have been built on the Reid property have been built by Bowaters or Price under their tenure agreements with the Reid people.

As far as forest protection is concerned, the Reid people have very, very little left. Bowaters and Price again have the rights to most of that. So, I am sure that there is not much that we can charge them for in forest protection and access roads.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice care to answer the question pawned off on him by his colleague? Is the Reid Company compelled to fence the land the same as every other private citizen in Newfoundland has to do in order to protect their rights to that property?

MR. HICKMAN: I share the amusement of the honourable House Leader over there at that question. I am not aware of any law that requires that. I think the honourable gentleman is confused with another doctrine of law where in certain jurisdiction - any court that is comprised of judges that know the law will agree, I am sure, with what I am saying, that it is only in cases where there has been constant use of the public, such as a right-of-way where the owners fence once a year. I am sure that all Newfoundlanders who have unfenced land going back for generations would be most apprehensive over any suggestion by the honourable gentleman that they had to fence it every year to maintain their rights. That is not so.

MR. SPEAKER: The question period has now expired.

MR. NEARY: Just a quickie off to the Premier there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I wonder could the Premier give us a -

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

The question period has expired and the question of the honourable member for Bell Island is not recognized.

It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries from St. George's a council delegation consisting of the Mayor, Mayor Kevin Hynes, councillors, Goodyear, Cutler, Skinner and Carroll. I would certainly like to welcome these gentlemen to the galleries today.

This being Private Members' Day we shall continue with motion number 13.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before we get to that, Sir, I think Your Honour has to call Orders of the day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 23, Sir, I have a motion that I want to make. I think this is the time to do it, is it not?

Under Standing Order 23, Sir, I ask leave of the honourable House to adjourn this House, Sir, to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the desirability and the need for the government of the province to take immediate steps to bar all increases in gasoline and heating oil prices proposed by the oil companies and that legislation be enacted immediately to grant the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities the right to regulate the prices of heating oil and gasoline in this province. I have copies for Your Honour and the clerk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! While this matter is certainly of great interest to all consumers in this province and indeed I suppose throughout the country, I do not feel that it is important enough to dispense with the regular private members business of today to discuss the matter in question.

Motion number 13, as I recall correctly, last day just before six o'clock the opposition indicated that it was ready to vote on the amendment. The Government House Leader indicated that the government perhaps was not quite ready as other members might wish to speak to this amendment. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak to this amendment? Otherwise I shall put same.

I put the amendment: It was moved by the honourable member from White Bay North, seconded by the honourable member from White Bay South, that all the words after that be deleted and the following words substituted therefore - everybody, I think, is familiar with the wording of the amendment.

All those persons in favor of the amendment, "Aye".

Those against the amendment, "Nay". In my opinion the "Nay's" have it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division. The honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, I am now speaking on the main motion. It is not our intention, anyway I do not think, to go on for a long period of time because most of the matters relating to this motion have now been discussed and we have learned a lot from it over the past few weeks. Certainly one of the most startling things that we have learned about over the past few weeks that this has been debated is the \$500,000 debt that is still owed by the Liberal Party to some people in and around and about all over Newfoundland. Some people are unkind enough to suggest that this has something to do with their sudden desire after such a long period of time to have the election expenses paid by the people of Newfoundland so that they can then be at least getting funds for the purpose of running the next election if not for the purpose of using some of it to repay past debts.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution certainly of some substance. It is a three-pronged motion brought forth by the member for St. John's North. As has already been indicated in the debate, some people agree with all of it. Others agree with portions of it and I think, generally speaking, everybody in the House agrees with the dire necessity of having regulation of expenses during election campaigns. The extent and how this is to be brought about is something really that government will have to consider. Government is considering it now and eventually, in the not too distant future, as has already been indicated before the next election, reasonable, rational measures will be brought before the House with respect of same.

There appears to be a divergence of opinion with respect to the use of public money for the purpose of financing election campaigns. While speaking on the amendment that has just immediately, a few moments ago been voted down, I had indicated my own personal feeling on the matter in that, although some do not

agree, some do agree that public money ought not to be used in the circumstances here in Newfoundland, in order to protect the integrity of our own political institutions. I do not think the people of Newfoundland can afford it. Other people feel differently with respect to it, as I say.

Amongst those people who propose that the monies be paid with a degree of sincerity, and that is not for the purpose of previous debts but they talk about the fact that it will eliminate the degree and the intensity of patronage that has been practiced over a period of years. The views of others are that there are other means of doing that, such as public tendering, a bill that is now before the House, and other measures. Certainly the public should not be expected, as I say, to pay for the purpose of eliminating patronage. Due to the base type of patronage to which this province has been subjected to in the past and the past few years, not only in the past few years but in our history prior to Commission of Government days, this province has been ranked with patronage as probably no other jurisdiction in the English speaking world. The public should not be expected to bring about the Union, as it were, or any type of change by paying more for their political institutions.

There is also argument which is appealing to a lot of persons and a lot of persons here on this side as well, who have gone through previous days and known previous situations, that is that the payment of public money gives everybody a better chance than they had before. This is certainly a very valid observation as many people on this side can testify. We have in this province today and we have had for quite some period of time a situation where the economic power in this province is supporting a certain political power in consideration of getting certain economic advances, the people on the other side then, namely, the Progressive Conservative Party at the time. The same holds true with the New Democratic Party or any of the rest of them who found themselves very sore put to find funds.

There are other areas as well, Mr. Speaker, with respect

to this matter, giving everybody a fair chance, that could also be implemented. It is a very complex problem. For example, I wonder

whether or not government ought to give attention in the near future to enacting a provincial bill of rights, a bill of rights which would complement the Federal Bill of Rights that has been brought in, because the Federal Bill of Rights, of course, only applies to federal legislation. The reason I say this is for this reason: This is why it brings to mind, we are talking about political parties, financing campaigns and everybody having an equal chance. I can remember not too long ago and it was not too long ago when other members here were members of a government. I am not saying they participated in it directly themselves but certainly the climate was this way, asking individuals who expressed a sympathy with respect to having a change in the government, asking them to work in election campaigns for the party then in opposition, and having been told by some of these people and one or two of them specifically worked for a national company, having been told directly myself by the manager of that company that it was the policy of that company not to allow their employees at any given time to enter into political activity. This is absolutely untenable, I think, in any society and it ought not to exist. It does not exist now in our present climate but one of these days she is going to blow the other way again. It is going to be a long time. It is going to be perhaps a decade, maybe two decades away but one of these days they or their replacements are going to be back in over here so perhaps it would be better to have, perhaps there might be some validity in having a provincial Bill of Rights to enshrine once and for all as much as we possibly can and to protect the rights of the ordinary individual.

This has been a consistent policy of supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party because as everybody knows we would not have a Canadian Bill of Rights if it were not for the initiative and the direction of the former Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, in this area and he has become well-known for it.

This does not, of course, apply and I think it is necessary to point this out. The Canadian Bill of Rights does not really apply to laws that are administered, to matters that come under jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. So therefore to have full and complete protection, perhaps

as I say it is necessary for a government to give consideration to this so that individuals will not be ballyragged in the future, that they will have freedom of expression, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom to join whatever political party they wish regardless of the way in which the party in power at the particular time may be exercising its judgment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say this resolution is many pronged. It requires good and serious consideration. The member for St. John's North is certainly to be complimented on his foresight in bringing in this resolution which has done exactly that which I know that he intended to be done, that is for the matter to be debated. Now obviously it has been debated for some period of time and there is no need to repeat many of the things that happened, that have transpired and been said over the past three weeks.

However, there is one thing about the resolution that we have discussed, the honourable member for St. John's North and myself and the rest of our colleagues together have discussed. It is just merely a technicality really in the wording. It does not really change the resolution to any great degree but the way the resolution is worded and the honourable member for St. John's North has given his assent to this and he would probably be doing it himself but as everyone knows one cannot amend one's own resolution. It reads that this House requests the government to introduce legislation to govern and control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am shortly going to propose an amendment to the resolution which is going to read then, to omit the word "introduce" and insert in its place the words, "consider the introduction of". This will give the government the opportunity without feeling any great degree of compulsion but certainly an intention to examine particularly the regularity parts of the thing very closely, to assure that it complies with modern-day thinking and to discuss as we do openly in this party more fully and firmly the business with respect to public financing. There is another, the disclosure contribution of course is the third prong

with respect to it. Obviously there are some divergence, marked divergence of opinion with respect to the former but certainly with respect to financing of public funds, through public funds for elections. Certainly there can be no doubt that it is necessary to bring in strong and firm measures to limit the amount spent in election campaigns and nothing can be more evident of that than the huge and gigantic debt which still hovers over the party to which the members on the opposite side, with the exception of the honourable member for Labrador South, adhere.

So we can go that far, Mr. Speaker, for sure, and protect the people from themselves as it were. I feel and I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, that the resolution be amended to allow the government to continue its sincere enquiries into these items and to come in with legislation, which it has undertaken to do, touching upon these matters but in order to do this I think the best way to frame the resolution is to put in the words "consider the introduction of".

So I now move it and I trust that we would be able to dispose in this manner of this very valuable resolution after hearing what the mover of it wishes to say with respect to it, so we can move on to other business.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment appears to be in order.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to yield my place to the honourable member for Hermitage if he wish to -

MR. R. SIMMONS: On the amendment.

MR. CARTER: On the amendment, yes. I am not concluding the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly comply with the amendment as moved by the honourable House Leader. In fact, were I not barred from making the amendment myself because I am the mover of the main motion, I would have been inclined to make such a motion myself because since listening to all of the debate and since doing further research I have found that this is a matter that is extremely complex and will need a great deal of consideration. In fact any legislation that is brought in is bound to be,

can only be of an interim measure.

Now I realize that all legislation has a certain impermanence about it in that it can and always is superseded. Nevertheless, I feel that even with the best will in the world this administration can only bring in something, some sort of stopgap measure until the years have gone by and greater wisdom has prevailed. I say this particularly because we are all aware, in fact we are made aware every day in the press, TV and radio, of the celebrated and notorious Watergate Affair. If a country as populace, as sophisticated and as long established as the United States of America can get into the kind of trouble they have gotten into in spite of legislation that they have on their books and legislation that they have been passing since the 1968 election, presidential election and the 1972 presidential election, if they can get into the kind of trouble they have obviously gotten into then certainly it is most necessary to consider not only the type of legislation we will bring in ourselves but also to consider it in the light of legislation that has been brought in by other countries and chiefly by the United States.

Now it is in this connection that I wish to speak. I was going to save this material for summing up and closing the debate. However it will not take me too long to go through it. Any time I use now, I will naturally use less time when I sum up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the member would speak up. We cannot hear him over here.

MR. CARTER: Sorry!

Sir, certainly. The microphone is on.

MR. NEARY: We want to hang on to every word.

MR. CARTER: Good! Good! I approve of the honourable member for Bell Island's what?

MR. MARSHALL: We would invite him over only we would be afraid he would sit.

MR. CARTER: Yes, if the honourable member for Bell Island would like to sit here, we would be more than happy. I will speak right into his ear.

MR. NEARY: I will sit in the Minister of Finance's seat.

MR. CARTER: Proper thing. Now I do not even have to speak up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Now, heave it out.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, this must be a new -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Just do not turn back on to him that is all.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead. Carry on now.

MR. CARTER: So, the act that I wish to speak about is the Kennedy, Scott Act that was brought in to the United States and made law on February 7, 1972. Now, it is called the Kennedy, Scott Act. The Kennedy of course is the well known Senator Kennedy, the brother of President Kennedy. He is a Senator. Scott would be congressman Scott who was the person who steered this act through the lower House or the House of Congress.

Now, this legislation is America's response, their legislative response to the Watergate type situation. Now, the Watergate break-in had not happened when this legislation was first conceived and debated and brought into law. Yet, I think that if this legislation had been on the books or had been longer established and had been adhered to during the 1972 Presidential Election a great deal of the trouble that President Nixon got into, he would have avoided.

When we speak of Watergate, what we are really speaking about is not the break-in of the Watergate building but really the unbridled use of government power to get re-elected. Now, the former administration was past master at this particular activity.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How come we are over here?

MR. CARTER: Well, they shot their bolt and then people got sick of them. It happens. It is a great danger. One can get away with it. As President Lincoln said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: "But only some of the people all of the time."

MR. CARTER: Right. So, I will very quickly go through this legislation and the implications. It starts out, as every bit of legislation does, with definitions. The communications media is first to find and it is given a very broad interpretation. It includes not only radio and television, newspapers, magazines and billboards - of course, billboards are much more common in the United States than they are here - it even includes telephones if they are used for canvassing. Now, this is not telephones for communication between headquarters but telephones when used in telephone canvassing.

The offices that this legislation is concerned with is the federal elective office of president, vice-president, senator or congressman. Of course, all residents eighteen years or over are eligible to vote. I do not know if I need to go over some of the differences between the cabinet and the American system for this House but there are some fundamental differences. If anyone has any questions, I would be more than happy to say what I understand to be the difference between the cabinet and the American system.

One of the chief differences - I will not go over all the differences but one of the chief differences is in their use of primaries. These are really like very elaborate nominating conventions. Of course, voters in the United States usually register their party affiliation. Now, this may seem curious. I would suggest that perhaps we could take a leaf out of their book. It might be better if supporters of a various party wore a badge or perhaps were branded or perhaps wore a ring in their nose to signify their erstwhile facility. This might be a useful device for knowing who is who and what is what.

In any event, I have spoken with a couple of congressmen in the United States and they assured me that it always was a much more arduous task to get nominated than to get elected. In fact, they spent much more of their own funds getting nominated. This is an election within their own party, among their own party supporters where only a registered democrat or a registered republican may vote. Of course, they would not have official status until they had won the primary or the nomination if you like. Of course once they win the primary and are the official candidate, then a great deal of the expense is borne by the official party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Delighted to have him so close.

Now, one leaf that we could take out of this legislation is that all communications media must charge the same rates that they would use for normal advertising. Now it has been my experience that newspapers, particularly here in Newfoundland, have a special political rate. Now whether or not this is a rate for politicians or just the highest applicable rate, I do not know. I do know that political advertising is extremely expensive when compared with ordinary advertising. I do not know what the large chain stores pay for a page but I would suggest that they must pay considerably less than a political party has to pay for a full page. I do not see how a person could afford to use the newspapers on any wide basis.

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

MR. CARTER: Certainly, yes.

MR. W. ROWE: The honourable member is being inordinately eloquent today compared to his former speeches in the House. Could his eloquence be stimulated in any way by this political inspiration that sits immediately in front of him? Is that the reason why he is so eloquent today?

MR. CARTER: Well, there is a certain aura coming from the honourable gentleman. Since the olfactory area of the brain is a very large one -

MR. NEARY: I have my underarm deodorant on.

MR. CARTER: There is a certain stimulation obviously.

MR. NEARY: I was in the hen house this morning. I do not know if the honourable member is getting the whiff of that or not.

MR. CARTER: Now, another interesting facet of this legislation is that while we have talked about general overall limitation of expenses, that is to say, during the course of this debate -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Coming events. In the course of this debate, the point has been made that a politician or a political party should be limited in the funds that they spend on a given campaign.

Well, now in this Kennedy-Scott legislation they do discuss limitation but they discuss limitation under various headings. The first heading is there is a limitation of expenditures for the media. In other words, there is a limit to how much a candidate or a party may spend on the media. Of course the media is defined. It is given a broad definition, as I said earlier - radio, television, newspapers, magazines, billboards and telephones used for canvassing. The act itself goes into even greater detail but I need not bother the House with all the details. Again the act sets forth when a person is considered to be a candidate; a person becomes a candidate as of a certain date.

The definition they use is either January 1 of the year in which he runs for the election or when he first extensively spends money on a campaign, be it a campaign for congressman, senator, vice-president or president. Now, furthermore, not only is any money that the candidate spends considered money spent on his campaign but any money spent on behalf of the candidate. If a candidate has some friends who put up some money for him and run a mini-campaign for his benefit, yet the candidate may know nothing about it, then surely this is beyond the control of any legislation.

This particular act - I have not got the regulations with me and I do not know what regulations have been proposed under this

act but nevertheless they set out to try to place some control and limitation upon the amount of money that is spent on behalf of the candidate. I think that honourable members might consider this later on when the government undertakes to set forth proper legislation. The regulations themselves will be sent for and gone over in minute detail.

The legislation also sets out that any charges that are made, any money that is obviously in a political campaign - one does not pay cash for everything, one has to charge some things if only for administrative convenience

and the charges will not be recognized or will not be recognized in law unless they are authorized in writing by the candidate. Now I think that this gives the suppliers of political paraphernalia and political services great protection because all too often election bills do not get paid. Very often they are the type of bills that are uncollectable. "Oh, so and so said, 'they would pay me for driving.' I drove all election day and I did not get any money for it." Well under this type of legislation the person would not be able to even present such a bill without proper authorization. There would be no argument. There would be no argument in law. I think it regularizes the business of campaign funding, financing and spending much better than we do here.

The person who is responsible for drawing up regulations to see that this act is enforced, is the Comptroller General and this presumably is one of the president's secretariat and of course the president chooses his cabinet not from among elected officials but from the general public. I presume they have to be United States citizens, although I am not even sure on that point.

Then, of course, the legislation naturally by its very nature by prescribing penalties amends the Criminal Code of the United States to that extent. Again, this part of the act sets out definitions. It defines what is an election. Who is a candidate. What is a federal office. Then it goes on to define something that we are not probably familiar with, namely, a political committee.

If I might just quote or paraphrase from this act. A political committee means any individual committee, association, organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures during the calendar year in an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,000. So therefore, any group or person or persons who undertake to spend an amount in excess of \$1,000 in any one year for political purposes are considered to be a political committee. These political committees are given the status of a complete entity and are forced to make the same kind of declaration that a candidate is expected to make. This is only right and proper, I would suggest.

We do not have too much experience with political committees as such here in Newfoundland or in Canada. I suppose it is because of the

greater population density and the very size of the constituencies. Since there are only 100 senators in all of the United States, a simple process of division can give you some idea of the enormous numbers of persons in any one constituency, it would be in the millions. It could be two million, three million, four million or even five million in a constituency. So it is obviously necessary to delegate a great deal of authority and power. You know to go at an election for a senator I would think or a congressman in the United States would be almost similar to one of our provincial elections and would require just as much organization and just as much delegation.

So political committees are much more common in the United States than they are in Canada. It has been found desirable and necessary to discuss them in law.

Now here is something that I think is the next stage - here is something quite unusual but worth considering perhaps. There is in law, under this act, a limitation on the contribution and/or expenditure that a candidate may make from his own personal funds to his own campaign. Now this sounds crazy at first sight. The candidate for the Presidency of the United States may only contribute from his personal funds \$50,000. That is the maximum that he may spend of his own money. Now how you could go about finding out how much a candidate had spent of his own money, I do not know. I would very much like to see the regulations and how they -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Oh, I think it is seeping in by osmosis. But nevertheless the act sets out and tries to limit the amount of money that a candidate may spend. A presidential candidate is \$50,000 or vice-president, a senator or congressman \$35,000. That is the maximum that he may spend from his own resources.

Contributions from contractors who do business with the United States Government are illegal. Under this act the contractor or a firm doing business directly with the United States Government, it may not contribute to a political party.

A third part of this act calls for disclosure. Of course this is a federal act, it does not control the various states. It is still restricted to the senator or the president, vice-president, senator and congressman. But it calls for the disclosure of the names and the addresses of all contributors. Now all contributors over \$100 that is, Obviously people who make contributions of less than \$100 would either be too numerous or could not expect or would not try to get any political favours for small contributions. I think for the sake of administrative efficiency having a limit like \$100 makes good sense.

Furthermore, the candidate or the political committee must declare the amount of cash on hand that they have in the beginning of a campaign. So it is just like a business, they have to submit to a proper audit. Also they must declare the total of contributions. Now the total of contributions would obviously be greater than the total of declared contributions because of this \$100 clause.

Furthermore, the names and addresses of all political committees and all people on such a committee have to be given. Each loan that is given to a candidate has to be declared. So if a candidate should go out and borrow money except from a bank or a proper lending institution, that is his own business obviously, but any loan that is made to the candidate has to be declared.

Furthermore, all the proceeds from fund-raising campaigns, this would be fund-raising dinners, dances, various possibly sweets and tickets, all the various fund-raising activities that a political party engages in, the contributions of the proceeds from such campaigns have to be declared, disclosed.

Furthermore the grand total of all such contributions, personal and otherwise, and proceeds must be declared. Furthermore the names and addresses of all recipients of an expenditure over \$100 must be declared, that is to say, all the people who have supplied paraphernalia, provided a service for which they were supposed to be paid.

The names and addresses of all paid campaign workers must be declared, no matter how little they are, they do receive. Furthermore the total of all such expenditures must be declared. Also the total of all debts incurred and the amount and their nature and the person to whom all

debts are incurred and the amount and their nature and the person to whom they are owed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: What it was for, you know. Was it for signs? This, that or the other?

Furthermore all such information which may be required by any authorized officer under this act. This became law on February 7, 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: Before Watergate.

MR. CARTER: It would be before Watergate but it would be after, no it would be before Nixon became President.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Well it does not work very well, obviously. You know, what man can do, it can also be undone.

It also sets forth when reports must be filed. How many copies. Whether it is to be lodged. Now also, much the same and I will not quote.

MR. CARTER: I will not bore the members of the House by going into it in detail but much the same kind of declaration disclosure and limitation applies to conventions. Now, of course, the United States has many, many conventions. They have a convention to choose their president and they have various what they call primary conventions in order to pick the delegates to go to the national convention, who will choose the party's candidate for president and vice-president. Political parties in the United States are active probably all the time, when one considers that congressional elections take place every two years and one third of the senators are elected every two years and when one adds to that the state and municipal elections. A political party or a branch of a political party in the United States must be constantly active. In fact this is one of the tragedies of political parties in Canada and in Newfoundland and that is that we are not required to be active all the time. There is a burst of activity and we either elect or fail to elect a government. After that we tend to go into the doldrums. This is a pity but, of course, it is the nature of our political system I suppose. There will be shortly, I would gather, a flurry of activity when the federal election is called. The federal election tends to be run along different lines than provincial elections. The outcome is not as vital to the immediate interests of the province, although I would argue otherwise. I would agree that the outcome is not felt to be as urgent as the outcome of a political provincial campaign.

That is the act. There are further acts, one for incentives for contributions for candidates to public office. Now these are very minor but in other words it does not look like a lot but what it is, it is a tax credit and not a taxable deduction. In other words, one may give twelve dollars and fifty cents a year to a political party but that comes right off one's tax. Now that is the same as in our terms if a person donated a hundred dollars, so tax credit means considerably more than a taxable deduction.

In effect what they are saying is that one may direct a certain proportion of ones taxes towards the political party of ones choice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CARTER: This is something we do, although we do not control all the income tax. We do control some of the provincial income tax and this might be a device that we could look into too.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like giving to a church.

MR. CARTER: Yes, like giving to a church. Well some persons pray to the politicians and some politicians prey on the public.

So, I will just very briefly, very quickly run through this.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: We wish to give the honourable gentlemen an opportunity to speak on this amendment and then we get back to the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: While here in this province members have certain mailing rights, the opposition office has certain mailing rights, a certain amount of their vote may go to secretaries and privileges of sending out mail and circulars and while members and ministers may have the same privilege, both the Federal Government in Canada and the State Government in the United States have considerably greater mailing privileges and, of course, the term they use is the "franking" of mail. Obviously, the officers of the president and the vice-president may send out as much mail as they wish, I presume, to anyone, anywhere, in the world.

There are some controls put in. Very briefly, it goes over public documents, congressional records under frank, members of the Congress, that is to say, any member of congress may send out, free of

charge any part of the congressional record and I presume the speeches he made himself or the speeches that would interest his particular constituents.

It discusses here the lending or permitting, the use of the frank unlawfully and, of course, the use of the frank can certainly be open to some abuse.

Surviving spouses of members of congress are given certain franking privileges. I think this is only fair because the members of Congress and Senate of the United States do use their mails a great deal more than we do. The common cry of writing your member - people write in their opinions on every major bit of legislation and in fact I think the congressmen and senators judge their legislative response to a particular act largely on the basis of the volume of mail that they received. Of course, under the American system the party disciplines are not so strict and the congressman or senator may and frequently does vote as his conscience or more often his district dictates. Whereas here under the cabinet system, we tend to adhere more to party loyalty. Of course, the opposition feels it incumbent upon itself to criticize everything the government does and the government feels it incumbent to praise everything the government does. It does, unfortunately, in my view, bring a certain note of insincerity into our deliberations. It is as if the whole thing were being elaborately staged.

Mr Chairman, I would suggest that this is why the galleries are more often empty than full. I do not think we are as relevant as we could be or as relevant as we should be. I think it is partly the fault of our political system. I do not have any suggestions for remedying this but I do see it as a genuine criticism.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island has suggested, sotto voce, that we bring in television cameras.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Yes, yes, very sotto.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: I have a few more points, some general comments, just other related acts.

It is illegal in the United States to bring troops to the polls.

MR. NEARY: Could the honourable gentleman elaborate?

MR. CARTER: This may seem obvious but it is unlawful for the army or the armed forces to overawe the voters at the polls.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Newfoundland?

MR. CARTER: No, in the United States. Anything goes in Newfoundland, I think. Quoting from memory, I recall a particular election in Gander where the entry to the polling station in Glenwood was barred from public use by a ditch something like ten feet in depth and the only access to the poll was over a slenger piece of 2" x 4" and since most of the voters in that area were elderly, very few of them had the courage to cross over on this shakey piece of 2" x 4". Fortunately our then Leader of the Opposition was equal to the task and he forced the contractor -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: It was a Tory victory at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the day they stopped the paving down there.

MR. CARTER: Yes, that is the day they stopped the paving down in Peterview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CARTER: As a result of the activity of our then Leader of the Opposition the ditch was filled in and the voting continued uninterruptedly.

MR. NEARY: Was that Noel Murphy or..?

MR. CARTER: No, no, it was Gerry Ottenheimer, for the information of the Hon. Member for Bell Island who again inquired.

Interference by the armed forces is quite illegal in the United States election. Although it is apparently in the campaign to have Negro voters registered in the south, and troops were often required to give them free passage but this was voter registration.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same thing on Bell Island.

MR. CARTER: Intimidation of voters is also considered to be improper, quite improper. Interference by civil servants is not allowed. There are also special regulations

for the polling of armed forces and also there are some regulations to control the misuse of welfare and misuse of the enforcement of the welfare vote.

MR. NEARY: How about the DOSCO assets?

MR. CARTER: That would cover the honourable member for Bell Island quite adequately. I think it is not proper to suggest, in fact I will try and locate the relevant passage because this might be of particular relevance for the honourable member.

Whoever uses any part of any appropriation made by Congress for work relief, relief or for increasing employment by providing loans and grants for public works projects or exercises or administers any authority incurred by any appropriation act for the purpose of interfering with, restraining or coercing any individual in the exercise of his right to vote at any election, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year or both. So it is not looked upon very kindly.

They also discuss in legislation the promise of an appointment by candidate. In other words if a candidate should secure electoral support by promising jobs, this is looked after and there is a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years or both. Promise of employment or other benefit for political activities and/or deprivation of employment or other benefit for political activity is similarly illegal. The solicitation of political contributions is regulated and again if I might read part of the relevant act, "Whoever being a senator or representative in or delegate or resident commissioner to or candidate for congress or individual elected as senator, representative delegate or resident commissioner or any officer or employee of the United States or any department or any agency thereof, or the person receiving any salary or compensation etc. directly or indirectly solicits, receives or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving any assessments, subscription or contribution for any political purpose

whatever and any other such officer, employee or person shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than three years or both." Not more than three years and not more than \$5,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: So there it is, Mr. Speaker. I would be more than happy to make this particular legislation available to the government for consideration in making or bringing forth any bill to control or limit or contribute towards the election of any candidate or political party. When speaking to wind up the debate I shall have some further comments to make. I believe the honourable member for Hermitage or perhaps even the honourable member for Bell Island wish to have something to say on the amendment so I give notice to him now over the microphone, presumably he is in the Opposition Common Room and if he should wish to come out and speak on this debate, I am about to sit down and I will be more than happy to yield the floor to him.

So there it is, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to having a little more to say on this before the debate is concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments with respect to the amendment on this motion, the amendment put by the honourable the Minister Without Portfolio, I understand it is to ask leave to introduce and consider the introduction of. Consider the introduction of: First of all it was certainly revealing, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Minister Without Portfolio. Anything he says is worth listening to, if for no other reason that he so rarely says anything in this House. He manages to say a fair amount outside the House, indeed he seems to spend most of the weekend on the radio telling the people how it is in his version insofar as what goes on in the House is concerned. The people of Newfoundland are learning very quickly of course that what goes on in this House is not necessarily the minister's version of what goes on.

Concerning the subject at hand, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that it is revealing to listen to the member for St. John's East and anybody who has listened to him just for so brief a period as I have during this present session must have come to realize that if anybody be the master of sanctimony he be and if anybody be the master of insinuation and innuendo, he is as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Chair certainly fails to see the relevancy of the comments by the member for Hermitage to the amendment as proposed.

MR. SIMMONS: I was just about to seek to show that relevancy. I was going to wonder out loud as to whether the insertion of the new phrase, "consider the introduction of," was an attempt at innuendo, insinuation, sanctimony. What? It could not have been done with a straight face, Mr. Speaker. It could not have been done with a straight face, no way. There is only one other possible reason other than those I have wondered at and that is the one that I believe is really the case, I believe it is just another attempt by the Minister Without Portfolio to filibuster on this particular motion. It is becoming pretty obvious now to anybody watching the proceedings that the name of the game insofar as the government is concerned is to stay on motion number thirteen as long as possible.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is appropriate we have a quorum call. I would like at least to have a quorum to hear the world shaking stuff I have got to say on this subject.

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

We have a quorum.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the real reason for the member for St. John's East, the Minister without Portfolio, introducing this amendment is the one that is so obvious in the whole debate on this motion and that is the government's continuing tactic of filibustering on this matter. The game is pretty clear, pretty obvious. The longer we talk on this one the longer it will be before we come to the housing resolution number (14) I believe on the Order Paper, the one that follows the one we are discussing. That is one thing that government does not want to have to address itself to.

So the game is clear. Stay on this one if necessary the rest of this session by whatever method. Let us look at the present method. Let us look at the amendment which has just been introduced this afternoon. We take out the word "introduce" and we put in the words "consider the introduction of". Well one could assign all kinds of motives but let us be overly kind about it. "Consider the introduction of", the effect of that particular wording of course is to allow any person on the government side, once the amendment is carried to allow anybody on the government side to rave on on the then amended motion without once committing himself to anything in the main motion. So it manages, after some embarrassment, after a week, I am sorry, a month or two of embarrassment on the part of the government being caught unawares by the introduction of the motion by the member for St. John's North, a matter that he must have gotten some disciplining on after the fact, a matter that he must have been told about in no uncertain terms once he had pulled his "boo boo", not a "boo boo" as far as he is concerned, Mr. Speaker nor as far as I am concerned. I think it took courage to introduce this but courage so often does not get rewarded as courage should.

I would suggest that the reward of the member for St. John's North on this matter was something less than he deserved under the circumstances. He did exercise courage and he was taken to task for it privately, I am sure, and after that was dealt with, after the matter of

disciplining him was dealt with for doing such an unheard of thing as introducing this without consulting his colleagues, having done that, having exercised his prerogative as a member in a democratic way and having done that and having been chastised for it, the next game of course, the next onus on the part of the Minister without Portfolio was to find some way around it.

Now it took him a couple of months but he finally found it. First they talked as long as they could, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment introduced by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. When they could carry that through no further they said, "Well, let us let this come to a question" Then we have another one which will do exactly what we would have liked to do, namely, put some wording in there that avoids the question completely. Because now the amendment when passed as I have no doubt it will be, when passed the operative wording will be, "consider the introduction of". The door is completely open. It is a completely wide open discussion as to what should go into that legislation. All it will then say is "consider the introduction of legislation".

It is a pretty neat game, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose there is no way really to avoid it. We on this side will in the course of the debate still say what we feel about election financing. We are under no illusions that the government is going to rush out and do this. Anyway we had hoped that since one of the government's members had introduced it they would at least stand by their colleague, they would at least have a look at it and see if there was some legislation, however weak, but something along the lines that their colleague had been looking for.

With their amendment they are going to destroy even that possibility now. "Consider the introduction of." When? Next year? Five years from now? Ten years from now? If one had listened, Mr. Speaker, to the speakers on the government side thus far, one would have been lead to believe that they thought about nothing else for the last two years. God knows that has been enough considering, or do they want to buy some more time? How much more time?

Where now is that, the knight in shining armour, the Minister of Finance, who felt so strongly about this two, three, four years ago that he was not only prepared to call on the government to introduce or call on the government to consider the introduction of this? No, he was so entranced about the need for this kind of legislation that he went off himself and had a bill drafted and brought it in as a private members bill.

Now I agree, Mr. Speaker, that times have gone by, three or four years have gone by and perhaps there is time now for some ideas, ideas for some alteration in the wording of the private member's bill. I do not know exactly what the overall wording was at that time but I certainly know the overall intent of it. That was the Minister of Finance when he was in opposition, Mr. Speaker, rearing to go, had the bill all ready, brought it in as a private members bill, stood here and defended it and spoke long and hard on it as did his colleagues then in opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are in government. Now the most they can do in the name of controlling election expenses, the most they can do is play with the wording, find any delaying tactic at all, find any way possible to delay this so it never comes to the crunch, so it never comes to the point where they on that side have to take a stand on the subject, "Consider the introduction of", they are playing with the member for St. John's North. They are teasing him. They are making fun of him in front of the House and in front of the public.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well I am glad that the Minister of Energy has learned one lesson since he is in this House. He is too big to tease and I advise the Minister of Energy not to tease him. Notice I have not teased him. I do not intend to tease him. I look up to him, believe me. Every time he stands near me in the elevator, every time he gets in the elevator he wants to vote, he wants to vote because he knows he and I agree on most things and he thinks I would add his vote on the subject, or he would have mine on the subject. When he gets in this House of course it is a different matter. All his colleagues are watching how he votes

and so I have a feeling he votes differently here than he had voted in the elevator or in the privacy of his own conscience.

MR. EVANS: One does not vote in the elevators.

MR. SIMMONS: Who told the honourable member?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, now! That is so low.

MR. SIMMONS: Tell us about what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The \$500,000. How despicable!

MR. SIMMONS: I do not know much about, Mr. Speaker, I do not know much about the \$500,000. I have heard the Minister without Portfolio -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I see. Well now that would certainly be a consideration, Mr. Speaker. I would have to take into account, I would certainly have to take into account but in the meantime I do appreciate the concern

of the temporary Member for Placentia West on the subject, the man who I indeed may take on in the next provincial election.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that? What is that?

MR. SIMMONS: Well I have had an invitation from the Member for Placentia West, you see, in this House, Mr. Sneaker, and I have been looking into the possibilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Does he mean that? I am looking into it, really looking into it.

But about the \$500,000, Mr. Sneaker, let us talk about that. If they want to talk about it, let us talk about that for a little while. Parks, that is very relevant, we are talking about election financing. Explain it to him, "Leo".

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, no that was only \$4.7 million, ninety per cent of \$4.7 million.

MR. DOODY: Well, almost one half million.

MR. SIMMONS: God, he is learning! He is learning, that fellow. It is amazing Sir. Mr. Sneaker, when you move out of a little supermarket to a big office, what you can learn.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Sneaker, we lost some of our liabilities. I have proof that the liabilities exist but we have lost some liabilities. I still have the membership card showing that we had liabilities like the Member for Placentia West. We lost that kind of a liability, and the Member for Port au Port, who normally sits over there when he is not sitting elsewhere and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Member for Green Bay, the Member for Placentia East, who is sliding further down in his seat hoping I will not see him, we lost all of these liabilities, Mr. Speaker, every last one of them.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Worth \$500,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: We will at that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: We will at that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He did. Good, was it not, eh? The same wording I used for his that time. The same wording, let us hope it is more successful. A lot depends on the candidate, of course. You have to work with what you have, Mr. Speaker. You have to work with what you have.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Having just assumed the Chair and acquainted myself with the subject matter that is supposed to be under discussion, I now ascertain that honourable members are all irrelevant or are speaking irrelevantly and I suggest that the Member for Hermitage might direct himself to the amendment.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Of course that little exchange we had with the Minister of Justice should never be misinterpreted by him. If so, I should have a private conversation with him at some time on the subject. I may need him to go to Seal Cove for me one of those days, Mr. Speaker, judging by the favours he did me the last time he went to Seal Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course, he had the problem of having the company of the Minister of Fisheries at the time, and that was a real problem.

Mr. Speaker, to the subject at hand, I was asked to comment on the \$500,000. You since ruled that out of order, so I shall not do that but I will look to the first possible opportunity to talk about it. Certainly one part of it that must certainly be relevant, one part of that \$500,000, I believe it is relevant to the debate, Mr. Speaker will hear me out and he can decide in a moment or two, but I believe one part of it that is certainly relevant is the \$14,000 or \$15,000 or \$18,000 or \$20,000 we incurred in Hermitage. There is \$1,000 or a few hundred of that not paid, so that is in the \$500,000. To that extent I can talk about \$500,000 because certainly that is an example that bears pretty closely on the need

for public financing of election expenses.

The Hermitage by-election I believe proved to all the people of Newfoundland, it certainly proved to the Tory Party, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot buy votes any more. You can try pretty hard and you can lavout some pretty big prices for them but you cannot buy them. We did spend, the Liberals had spent \$15,000 or \$20,000, was it?

MR. F. R. HOWE: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Twenty thousand in the Hermitage by-election, money that would have been subject to proper controls if we had those proper controls, but we did not have them at the time. But I do hope that we have them by the next general election. Sir, where we spent the \$20,000, of course, it is a well known fact that the P.C.'s spent an unlimited amount. I have heard guesses from the Leader of the Opposition which approach \$100,000. He was not in the district during the whole election as I was, so I had a better opportunity to see what was going on there. My guess approaches closer to \$160,000 to \$180,000 spent by the P.C.'s in that election. I am not talking about any government aircraft that might have been used, at public expense or I am not talking about the minister who announced after the election on the radio and on "Open Line Programme" that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: A responsible caller. Yes, indeed he was in Hermitage for seven or eight days during the by-election. The caller said, "Well when are you coming down to visit? You were down in Hermitage for seven or eight days." The minister said, "Yes, that is true, I was down there. But you know, it is not like you think, you may think I was down there in connection with the by-election." Of course, no way, he was only down there eight days, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how many days that minister has spent down there since the by-election? A couple of weeks I suppose, a month or two no doubt. They are writing me these days, Mr. Speaker, asking me what a cabinet minister looks like; they have not seen one since November. Then again, I do not think they are particularly anxious to

know what one looks like, but that is certainly another subject.

MR. ROWE, F. B. An awful sight!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it depends of course on what part of the public the Member for Green Bay is talking about. The constituents in my district know full well what I look like and they are pretty handy about what they see by the way.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest as the Member for St. John's North spoke following the tremendous speech, the real oration given by the Member for St. John's East. The Member for St. John's North said that, and I really was disappointed at him for this, he said, that he agreed with the amendment. I am sorry the government House Leader, he is going to be the Opposition House Leader perhaps, if they do not get rid of him altogether.

What the government House Leader did in introducing the amendment was to cut the legs completely under the Member for St. John's North, take away completely from the effect of what would have been a pretty good motion. We tried to amend it to make it even better but even without our amendment it was not a bad motion. It at least called on the government to introduce some legislation to govern and to control election expenses.

Then the Member for St. John's West comes in with a motion, an amendment, the net effect of which is to cut the legs completely under the Member for St. John's North because the motion as it will stand when amended will not mean a row of beans. It will mean nothing. It will just ask the government to go back in the backroom and think about it, to consider it. Think about it and at some future time, there is no onus, there is no obligation in the amended motion, when amended. There is no obligation whatsoever except to think. We have been waiting for two years, Mr. Speaker, and we have not had very much proof that that crowd are thinking yet. How will a motion like this change things?

They are going to think about it, if the motion should carry. If the amendment should carry, they are going to go back in the backrooms and do some thinking. How will the House know the result of the thinking. Does it mean at some time, some time hence they are going to come in here with

the results of their thinking? It seems to me from listening to the Member for St. John's North that he has had his thinking done. He had his homework done and if his colleague had not nulled the rug from under him, it seems to me from the raft of information that he read from today, albeit read perhaps for another reason, to carry on part of the filibuster, shows how well that member can play the party game but how it is not being reciprocated in his favour. How he can play the party game but his buddies over there will not play it with him. Just when he gets up to carry out the old party game of filibustering, of talking this one out so that we can never get on to the housing resolution introduced by the Member for St. John's South, if he plays the party game of filibuster with that, reading ad nauseam of what went on in the States so unsuccessfully in terms of legislation. It is while he is playing the party game, as best he can, his own colleague from St. John's East gets up and pulls the rug under him and brings in a resolution that destroys the whole affect of his amendment completely, so it will never see the light of day, so that what the Member for St. John's North calls for, namely: legislation to control this situation and

if that amendment pass, that kind of legislation will never see the light of day, if his colleagues have their way and they will as long as they are in office.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the member for St. John's North had to get sucked in on this one. The member for St. John's East was most anxious to get him on his feet before he had a chance to think about it so he could get him sucked in completely and get him to jump up and in good party loyalty and say, "Yes, I agree with it whatever it was". So, he got up, agreed with it and in so doing destroyed the complete affect of the resolution that was a good resolution. He destroyed it himself by becoming party to that game of the member for St. John's East. Too bad because he had a resolution that certainly we on this side could support. He got sucked in, Mr. Speaker, and that is to he regreted because he was about to make a contribution to the House with a very worth-while resolution and one that I had looked forward with some enthusiasm to voting on.

Mr. Speaker, up until this time I have not said exactly where I stand on this resolution except by inference. The resolution as unamended - when we get to it I may have a few words - is a good resolution. It is one that I could wholeheartedly vote for, the idea of having legislation to govern, to control public financing of election expenses. It is a good idea.

The second idea in the member for St. John's North's motion, the idea of having controls over the private financing of elections, is even more to the point and it is one that I could support. That, Mr. Speaker, is going to be all by the way if this resolution pass because the net effect of this amendment will be to destroy completely that resolution, to render it null and void, just as well as if it had never came in here.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I do not use big words like that. That has something to do with eviscerated chicken was it or emasculated chicken? Eviscerated chicken in the supermarkets. Emasculated

chicken on the government side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the member for St. John's North did get dragged into this one because he had done his homework. Indeed if his colleagues had only managed to talk to him half as much outside the House as they do inside the House when they want him to tow the line, they would have found out that he did have his homework done. They would have found out that he had done some thinking on this and that when he introduced this motion it was not just a fly-by-night type action where he scribbled something out and brought it in. It was a well thought out thing, a well thought out procedure. He had come in, having done his homework, having researched what goes on in the United States and across Canada and having said to himself, "Controls in this area would be a good thing."

So, he comes in in good faith, his homework done, moves his resolution, sits there for eight or ten weeks while his colleagues filibuster, waiting with his speech all ready to clue up the debate, as he told us himself today. As he stood today, he almost cried because he had to read his little speech prematurely. So, he finally gets up and he says, "I was going to do it and close the debate but it is so good I will let you have the whole load now." So, he gets up and believe me he gave us the whole load.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh my, the honourable member is a nasty man.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, it was a good load. I am not at all begging that question.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: So young and ambitious and gets up there.

MR. SIMMONS: Shocking, is it not?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Terrible.

MR. SIMMONS: Shocking.

Mr. Speaker, one of the few good reasons to come to this House is the Minister of Industrial Development.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister without Portfolio, thank God, had only talked to the member for St. John's North he would have found out that this fellow had his homework done, that he knew

exactly what kind of legislation he had in mind. Indeed the kinds of things that the member for St. John's North referred to this afternoon were not that much at variance with the kinds of legislation we had proposed with respect to bill (c) (203), the same spirit, the same sort of thing. The wording was different. It was a different country involved, the United States as opposed to Canada. The overall spirit, the overall intent was the same, would have served the same purpose.

First of all they vote against that because the boys up in Ottawa, be they Progressive Conservative, Liberal or New Democratic Party, obviously in their opinion do not know how to put together an election bill, not good enough for Newfoundland anyway, Mr. Speaker, not good enough. Indeed I think the reason put forward earlier was not that only was it not good enough but that there would be a problem changing the wording because we do not have control over communications and that kind of thing. That was a bothersome thing so rather than have to change the wording, they flung it out. Lo and behold! One of their own men comes in almost the following day with something all the more far removed geographically, not Ottawa mind you but Washington.

But that aside, Mr. Speaker, the same spirit to be served, the same overall intent would be served whether we use the Washington legislation or the Ottawa legislation and as the member for St. John's North has conceded earlier, no legislation is going to cure, going to end, going to terminate permanently all the abuses. As long as we have men of evil minds we are going to have evils perpetrated on other people. That is understood. One can at least bring in the kind of legislation which will minimize the evils being perpetrated.

Mr. Speaker, what I would really like to know on this subject and I wish somebody on the other side would tell me when they continue their filibuster, if it must be a filibuster, it must be a filibuster, let it at least be an enlightened filibuster, let us at least learn a few things while we suffer. One of the things

I would certainly like to learn, as I sit here and suffer, is what the government is afraid of on this. What are they scared of? Are they scared that bill (c) (203) in Ottawa or the Washington legislation or some legislation to control election expenses would work against them? Is that what they are afraid of? Are they afraid that if they have that kind of legislation that they will be unable to have everything their way? Is that what they are afraid of?

Mr. Speaker, not only is there fear on this subject on the part of the government, fear of the very thought of introducing the very kind of legislation that their present Minister of Finance was all in favor of, not only is there fear on that subject but they have no intention of doing it anyway, no intention, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever. It has become obvious in this session -
It is what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is cynical.

MR. SIMMONS: Not only cynical, it is true. Is the honourable member going to speak on this one? Is the honourable member going to speak after? I want to hear the honourable member. I really want to hear the honourable member. I am looking forward to it. I believe the honourable member might vote with us.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member for Bell Island made the first move today.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for Bell Island was only over warming the seat of the -

MR. W. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a real improvement.

MR. NEARY: If I made up with the Minister of Transportation and Communications, I could make up with anyone.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. I must say I had not thought of it that way. The member for White Bay South, he has a perspective that many of us lack, Mr. Speaker. He can see the good points in anything. He could even see the good of the Minister of Finance being Premier. He could even see that. Now, that escapes me completely. I can

see no good into it at all, none. Now the other half I can see, the idea of the member for Bell Island being the Minister of Finance. That would be a distinct improvement over the present situation.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, he might as well be. He is responsible for all the tax increases.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, he is still shooting that line and he is getting to the place, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is getting to the place where he is beginning to believe himself and that is what is most dangerous about it. I am worried for him. He is actually beginning to believe himself on that nonsense, that tripe.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Dirty today, are they not, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable member scuffered the NGA and now he is scuffering the House.

MR. SIMMONS: What does scuffer mean?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Scuffered the poor Minister of Justice in the leadership.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: So, we have been talking about this on the side. Is that not shocking?

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, when I realize the tremendous contribution that the Minister of Justice and I made to Newfoundland by seeing to it that he did not become Premier, I can take all the criticism from the other side on this subject, all of it, the whole works.

MR. W. ROWE: Who scuffered the Minister of Finance?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, a number actually. The member for Green Bay, the member for Port au Port who is

not in his seat now for some reason. The member for Placentia East, a number of - Oh! and the member for St. Georges, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: At least, the district he represents.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Your Honour, one can only speak from one's own seat in this honourable House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): That point is certainly well taken.

Consequently, I do not have to consider the point of order raised by the honourable gentleman. The honourable gentleman must have made a brief slip. He knows full well he can only speak from his assigned place.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, The member from St. Georges wants me to be relevant. That I can do and just for him I will be, Sir, I believe the overall game here has nothing to do with this legislation, this election expenses control, nothing to do with it whatsoever. The game is how to avoid this subject. They struggled for a couple of months. They finally found the tactic. The tactic is the amendment. They will bring in the amendment. They will shove the amendment through because they have the power to make the majority. Then what happens on the amended motion will not mean a row of beans, because nobody will have to take a stand. There is the issue, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment as proposed means that once passed nobody on the government side will have to take a stand on where they stand on this resolution and where they stand on the unamended resolution, where they stand on the business of governing and controlling public and private financing of election expenses. That is the issue. Nonsense!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, some of them spoke without checking with those who matter on that side and said things they are going to be rapped for privately. Guess work indeed, Mr. Speaker, but some pretty well researched guess work on this particular item. We will see that, Mr. Speaker. Time will prove that. If I am wrong, prove me wrong by having every member and you cannot have everyone because one man has said otherwise already but have every other man except the Minister without Portfolio stand up and say

they are for the public financing of election expenses. I distinctly heard him say that he was "agin" it. Now let everybody else stand up and say that they are for the public financing of election expenses. I say they will not, Mr. Speaker, because they are divided on this one. They have not made up their minds. They are buying time, a lot of time, several years at my prediction before one will see anything on this particular subject again, several.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, two, two; a couple, couple.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, but I forgot the shortage of time the administration had in power at the time. I meant a couple, at most a year or so unless they make the mistake, so far as they are concerned, the mistake of calling an election before then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at best this amendment is a clever little trick to take the heat off of the government on this subject. It has done that. It will do that. The amendment will pass but what saddens me about the whole matter is that we will never get the discussion that the member from St. John's North wanted. We will never know in this House, in this session where the members in this House stand on this subject because his colleague, the Minister without Portfolio, has found a clever device to see to it that this subject never really sees the light of day and that the people of Newfoundland never really know where this government stands on the subject of election financing, the same government -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Speak down in your own place, boy, and see if it is more intelligent than what you are saying now, eh!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: There he is again, breaking the rules, the Deputy Chairman breaking the rules.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: If it be a relative thing and the member for St. John's East should get a buck, I will be a millionaire for what I said this afternoon, a millionaire. Mr. Speaker, still talking, could not wait for the member for Placentia West to come back.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Outrageous!

MR. SIMMONS: Count them, count them. Three, five seven, nine, twelve.

Assuming each of them on the other side is one, we have a quorum.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does the honourable member want me to go?

MR. SIMMONS: No, the honourable member counts, he really counts.

Mr. Speaker, at best that clever little trick so that this never sees the light of day, that is the game I invite the Minister without Portfolio to stop playing with the House, to withdraw this amendment and let us have the discussion on the unamended motion that the member for St. John's North wanted to see in the first place and that we wanted to see. I invite him when I sit down to stand up and withdraw the amendment and let us get on with the discussion on the main motion.

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

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disappointed to see this kind of an amendment brought in on this particular resolution. I was under the impression that we were all of a mind here, that this was an important resolution that should be discussed fully and then at the end of it that we should do something about it. I fail to see the reason for changing two words or changing one word to two, I think that is the way it was, because if the government had no intention of taking action upon the resolution in the first place they simply had to vote it down when the vote comes for the resolution, without making the changes.

I am not going to waste the time of the House in recapitulating all that has been said. There have been some very good points made. I can go through the time and give somebody else a chance to get up and carry her on next week.

The concept of governing and controlling election expenses I think is a noble one. It is one which anybody would be a fool to disagree with. That is all the more reason why I cannot understand why the present amendment is before the floor, because it has all of the appearances of being foolish. Surely what we should attempt to do in this session of the legislature is to make sure that by the time the House is dissolved that we will bring before the public some semblance of protection in that they will not be gerrymandered or fooled again as they have been in past elections. It is a very difficult thing to come to grips with. There are certain inherent pitfalls in trying to put together legislation for the control and governing of election expenses.

I will touch on very briefly the various sections, the public financing of election expenses and the private financing of election expenses. It seems to me that the public are not getting a very good deal as it is right now because where it may not be a direct involvement in the end it is the public who pay anyway. It is not the kind of a thing that one could point a finger and say, "That amount of money was taken out of the public treasury and went into that party or that candidate's campaign." One way or another it is possible to do that; and I am certain that we all know of various ways and various means whereby it has been done.

If we were to pass a law that the public would have to pay for the campaign expenses of candidates in a general election or by-election for that matter, in the first place it will merely protect the rich because not only would they then have their own resources but they would have the public resources in addition to fall back upon. That is bad enough as it is. Secondly, if we are going to get into the public financing of election candidates we are going to be inviting any fool off of the streets who wants to to run for electoral office, and God knows there are enough fools of us here now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is he speaking for himself?

May 1, 1974.

Tape 1452

RH - 5

MR. MARTIN: I am speaking for all of us, everyone of us, because if we were not fools we would not be here wasting the public's time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I shall read that poem now if he keeps that up.

MR. MARTIN: Let the honourable member go right ahead.

MR. MARTIN:

These two points have been dealt with at great length. There is no point in going into it. I just want to leave it on the record that this is my stand. We are all going to be proud to account for this in the next election, one way or the other.

Secondly, disclosure of contributions, a most difficult thing to deal with. It is a good idea, I agree, if we were to be able to devise a way in which contributions would have to be disclosed. Sure and I am all for bringing in whatever legislation we can to minimize the negative effects of large contributions. But there are many various and devious ways of making contributions to political campaigns. It is not simply a matter of passing over a large sum of money. There are indirect ways both financially and otherwise. For instance if an individual wanted to make a contribution to make sure that his favourite candidate won an election; he could be assured of some nondemanding job or nondemanding government contract which would be paid for out of the public purse. It would be possible in a roundabout way to make sure that he acquired money out of the public treasury for ostensibly doing some work for the government. It could be, and there are instances of inflated contracts being given to party backers for doing a minimum amount of work for a maximum amount of pay.

Secondly, limiting the amount of money which is allowed to be paid by candidates for election expenses is a good idea also, but practically impossible to police. Let me give you one or two examples of what happened in my own political campaign. When I was required to total up the amount of money which I had spent in making my return after elections, I found that with all the receipts that I put together and with all the cash that I knew I had on hand to spend, a total of something like \$488 for a campaign, I am certain that if there were any more than \$100 cash spent that we missed, that is all it was in that first campaign, but obviously the campaign cost much more than that, quite obviously. Of course what happened was that when it came to the normal sort of expenses associated with

campaigning, transportation, hiring of halls, literature and this kind of thing, these were to be picked up by party supporters. They had to be. I had no resource of my own, nor did the party at that time but some individual supporter of the party would come along and say, "Never mind the hall, I will take care of that."

In one instance I was taken by boat from one community to another and told that they were making the trip anyway, I did not have to pay for it. This was done I think more or less not to embarrass me than anything. I had no sooner arrived on the wharf than another longliner came into the harbour and asked me if I were going further north and stayed with me for the next three days, also saying that he had to go north anyway. This is the kind of thing that can happen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not in Labrador North.

MR. MARTIN: In Labrador North it is even easier. It can happen. Rather than having to spend several thousand dollars on an aircraft to take someone from point "a" to point "b" for a week, it is quite easy for a party member to charter that aircraft to go on a fishing trip and then have that aircraft used throughout the week transporting a favourite candidate around and to come back and pick up that party at the fishing camp at the end of the week. I think most people know the incident to which I refer.

These are the kinds of things that can be done, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that are being done. It is virtually impossible to control or limit the amount of campaign spending.

AN HON. MEMBER: Booze.

MR. MARTIN: Well booze is a most difficult thing to control since under the act we are not allowed to pass out booze to try to gain favour and votes. There is no law that says we cannot throw parties or that our friends cannot throw parties. The whole idea, Mr. Speaker, is preposterous. We cannot nor will we, no matter what legislation we bring in of this nature, ever control or limit the amount of electoral spending.

There is one and only one way in which we can do that, and it

goes against every principle of democracy I think. The only way that we can control candidates spending, the only way we can make sure that every candidate in an election has a fair and equal chance, the only way that we can make sure that the voting public is getting the fair story from each candidate is to have a total control not only on his spending but on his campaign activities. The only way obviously in which that can be achieved is to create an electoral commission, an electoral commission that would take charge of the whole conduct of the election campaign, registering of candidates, setting up of schedules for meetings, paying for public halls, paying for transportation, limiting the kind of literature which can be produced, designating how it can be distributed, designating air time for commercials on television, page space in newspapers, the whole bit and to take the candidates by the hand and lead them into halls and make them speak for thirty minutes or fifteen minutes or whatever, allow them no more and no less and not allow anybody else to sneak on their behalf. This is the only way we are ever going to control and govern election expenses, and I find that somewhat distasteful. Without that we are going halfway. Like the current legislation governing conflict of interest, the creation of any kind of election controls other than an electoral commission will only mean that we are creating loopholes through which the knowledgeable and the rich can crawl, and make it even more difficult for someone who has not the resources to get involved in politics.

Rather than making an amendment of this nature which will merely allow the whole question to sit for another two years and be lost when the next campaign comes, and I might say on the amendment that went before, rather than trying to hurry the thing through in a time period which would not allow for proper legislation, I should think that we should look at what it is going to take to set up an electoral commission. Between now and what is it? August 1975. How is that for a good date. That is all right, after the good fishing

season. Better get your fisheries in order. We should take a look at what it is going to involve in legislating an electoral commission, take six or eight months to put the legislation together. Before the end of this session, pass that legislation so that the commission could then get down to work, draw up its plans, its strategy, and its programme for the conduct of the next campaign. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if that were done that we would see far better candidates running, we would see far better candidates elected and we would see a far better conduct of the public business of the House of Assembly than we are seeing now.

MR. WM. ROWE: Better than this crowd here?

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely, without question.

MR. WM. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: But to set up an electoral commission without giving it total control, absolutely total control, would be a farce. I am not certain that to have an electoral commission with total control would be democratic, I am not sure, I have not figured that out yet. But as far as I am concerned, the only one way to control and govern election campaigning and election expenses is to have some public body do the controlling and not leave it to legislation which will obviously be fraught with loopholes. I will sit down now and let somebody else close the debate today.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to kill the next two or three minutes -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the clerk of the House can tell us the amount of time we have spent on this motion during this session of the House. I see today that an amendment was brought in by the House Leader, the Minister without Portfolio, to completely destroy and to say in the first instance what we have said in the beginning that the government side of the House would not vote for this motion. We have seen evidence of it here by the amendment that the Minister without Portfolio has brought in to the House. Again it shows that it is a complete waste of time of this House. Maybe at this particular time we would have been halfway through the estimates, as we are not. The problem is that the motion, as we supported it, as the Hon. Member for Hermitage said that we did support the motion. I think that everyone on this side of the House is in favour of some type of public financing of election expenses.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: We want it done in thirty days. The motion was defeated and now we will probably see it done in the next, as the member for Hermitage has said, five, ten, twenty or thirty years after the Tories get back in power again. What do we have? Twenty-three? Two years to go, twenty-five. It is going to be a long, long time, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if we are going to keep abreast of what is taking place in the rest of this nation. We saw an elaborate display of some documentary proof of what is taking place in the United States by the proposer of the motion, the Member for St. John's North, North. There is a need as my colleague, the Member for Labrador South, has said, there is definitely a need in this province for some type of legislation to control the extravagance and the inadequacies which exist in election financing in this province. The member said that it is only

the rich who can do this sort of a thing and then if we bring in public financing the rich get the public money and in turn they, themselves will spend their own money in an underhanded sort of a way to get themselves elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: I am of the same mind. In my elections, I helped support the public treasury because, as I have said, we bought a considerable amount of booze for my friends. This in a way, I suppose, is helping the government in some instance. I am sure if I asked the Minister of Finance if he would refund me the government portion of the booze that is spent that he would gracefully do it.

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

It is now approaching six o'clock. Does the honourable member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. WOODWARD: I wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): It is moved and seconded that this debate do now adjourn. Those in favour "aye." Those against, "nay." Carried.

It now being six o'clock, I do leave the Chair until three o'clock, tomorrow Thursday, May 2, 1974.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 1, 1974.

4955

(31) —MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

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

(a) Nil

(b) \$18.48

(c) Nil

(30) —MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

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

(a) Nil

(b) Nil

(c) \$10.00