



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 81

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

HON. J. G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): I have a couple of answers here, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the honourable Member for Fogo asked me about the sanding on Fogo and I undertook to get the answer for him today. I have just one copy of it. I will read the answer for the record although the honourable member is not in his seat and will send him a copy of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh! So I will send him a copy of this any way when I get it. The Fogo Island Road situation of sand. The report I have is that there is no sand available to this department on Fogo Island. We have searched very extensively for sources on the island but have not yet been successful. We have carried out our winter maintenance for the past two year specifically without the benefit of sand on gravel roads because we do not sand the roads. The implications are that vehicles such as school buses may be required to use tire chains on occasions.

The problem of icing is caused by drainage problems. We have started this year in an attempt to remove these problems. We are also investigating methods of importing sand to the island. The problem, of course, with importing sand to the island is that it is a very expensive proposition, the transporting of sand to the island by conventional means, costs approximately \$50.00 per ton and that is the estimate of the department.

There was another question, Mr. Speaker, that I was given notice of yesterday regarding the snow clearing equipment in Labrador South by the honourable Member for Labrador South. The answer to that question, I will get a copy of this for the honourable member. The following departmental equipment is stationed in Labrador South, one grader, two front end loaders, two bulldozers and two sand trucks. All the equipment is in good operating condition with the exception of one sand truck which is down for minor repairs. We have a new grader on order that will replace the existing grader some time

before next spring, as soon as it is received.

In the event that our equipment breaks down or the conditions are such that our equipment cannot handle the snow clearing problem, there are several machines in Labrador South that can be rented.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing or Public Works or is the Premier going to be in his seat this afternoon?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he will be out.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Okay, well whichever minister would like to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any truth to the possibility that the government have turned from Trizec to going to Mr. Craig Dobbin for additional office space for the Confederation Building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

HON. DR. T. FARRELL (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES): I would like to answer that question for the Member for St. Barbe North. The Trizec negotiations have not been terminated, number one. They are still on-going. No agreements have been reached but they are still on-going. We asked for proposals for space because we are desperate for space at the present time, even the Opposition needs space very badly. We are trying to do our best to facilitate everybody.

We have government departments, and partial departments all over the City. We need some space, a block of space as soon as possible. We asked for proposals on this from many people, of course, we like to give a chance to everybody to have an opportunity to bid on this. We did receive a proposal from Mr. Dobbin for up to 100,000 square feet of office space. It is estimated by our space consultant that we will need approximately 400,000 square feet by 1980. We received proposals as I said and the one which looked the best in the sight of my officials was this proposal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

DR. FARRELL: The Dobbin proposal - to have this immediate space which is

December 3, 1974

Tape 1832

PK - 3

available or should be available in nine months or twelve months because we are actually in very, very bad condition as far as space is concerned. That is where it is at this time,

7435

Mr. Speaker, so the government has entered into an agreement with Dobbin interest. An agreement has been signed?

DR. FARRELL: No, subject to approval of building plans and the lease agreement, Your Honour.

MR. ROWE: Is the government still negotiating with Trizec than, Mr. Speaker?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Does the honourable Leader of the Opposition want to carry on?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I have a further supplementary: Could the minister indicate to the House please when the tenders were called? I am not sure if tender is the word. When were the approaches made, to whom they were made and when the responses were received and when award of the contract to whatever extent a contract now exists, whenever that was made? Would he also undertake to table the relevant correspondence?

DR. FARRELL: Sir, I cannot, Your Honour, answer all of these at the present moment but I will certainly obtain this information for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think he dealt with the second part of my question. Would the minister undertake to table the letters that went out or copies of them and the copies of the letters, to whom, well, when we see them then we will know to whom they went and copies of the proposals? There is a lot of quite genuine concern and I am not trying to make politics out of it, a lot of genuine concern about the finagling over Trizec and over Dobbin and the whole business and a lot of people would have their minds set at rest if the correspondence could be tabled and looked at.

DR. FARRELL: Well, I can answer the second one because I took over this. The second part of the honourable member's question was it went to Atlantic Place, Mr. Dobbin, Lundrigan's and Seaboard. Now, the exact date I do not know because I do not have it on hand right now.

Secondly, I do not like the word finagling. There is no finagling going on. This is quite a common practice. The Federal Government has rented space all over this city in a similiar manner. These were proposals

which went out and were received, it was the best, it was looked at because of the urgency of getting some immediate space. That is exactly where it is.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister table the correspondence because our people think there is something wrong with this.

DR. FARRELL: Oh, yes, we would be delighted. The proposal, the actual letter of proposal?

MR. ROBERTS: Four proposals.

DR. FARRELL: Three were received. One did not bother to accept the proposal. Yes, Sir?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I would like to address a question to the honourable the House Leader. A couple of days ago the Premier said that there were a tremendous number of protest sayings with respect to redistribution on the second and final report: Would the House Leader be prepared to table all the letters and communications of protest against the last report of the commission on redistribution?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that should properly be addressed to the Hon. the Premier. I think he said many of the proposal protests were verbal and I am quite sure the honourable Premier today is incapacitated. He is home with the flu and a cold and I am quite sure that when he gets back the honourable member can address his question to him. They do not happen to be in my files so I cannot give the answer to the honourable member.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the honourable the Minister of Education. How will the threat of the serving of an injunction against the Regional College in Corner Brook affect the completion date for the building of that college?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I understood the question correctly: How will the serving of a writ of injunction affect the completion date of the college? It should not affect it at all. The people who are at the contract are bound to have it completed by a certain date and it should not affect that date at all.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: When is the date of completion for the Regional College?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is sometime in August, 1975, some date in August of 1975.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question to the Minister of Education: Is there any truth to the rumor that there is difficulty in finding teaching staff for the Regional College in Corner Brook?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable gentleman knows,

the government does not recruit a staff for the Regional College, they are members of the Faculty of Memorial. They do the recruiting. We are really not involved at all. Our involvement naturally is in the House's vote. The operating grant to the University but the recruitment of staff, as a government or as a department are not involved. I personally am not involved with the recruiting of staff for the University either at Corner Brook or elsewhere but I do understand from general conversation that one of the problems has been, I think this is the essential problem, housing for staff.

MR. F. ROWE: So there is a problem.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, I would say it was a problem or not a problem as I am saying the government does not recruit for the University. We do not advertise for posts. We do not interview applicants. We do not appoint. We do not assign at the University in this respect, and this is an academic area of recruitment of staff, works autonomously under the law which creates the Memorial University Act and under the Board of Regents. So as I say, basically it is a question which should be directed to the University. I do know this that the University has experienced to date some difficulty in getting housing for staff.

MR. F. ROWE: Another question for the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Has the government decided the nature of that college, is it to be an arm of the University or a community college or what? As far as I can understand now, Mr. Speaker, it is simply going to be an arm of the University whereas I understood it is going to be more of a community college type of an institution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman is suffering under that impression then he is quite wrong. I will repeat again what the general purpose and mandate of the Regional College at Corner Brook will be. I am not putting these in any order of priority or order of hierarchy, just in order. They will provide the first two years of degree programmes for those who wish - they will provide the first year obviously for those who wish. They will in all probability provide a terminal two year programme for those who wish - quite apart from that they will have an arrangement of

extension courses, some of them geared to employment, some of them geared to cultural matters, some of them geared to a wide variety of areas. They will also be involved in what is generally taken under the general topic of community development. They will also be having a wide variety of various adult programmes. The University has also been discussing with the College of Trades and Technology and the College of Fisheries the various avenues of mutual co-operation there whereby students who will be seeking accreditation or a certificate or a diploma from one of those colleges, of Trades and Technology, from the College of Fisheries may do some of their work at the Regional College in Corner Brook. So the Regional College will therefore be serving a broad spectrum not only of educational needs but of social economic needs as well.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I will ask a question of the honourable the House Leader. In view of the fact that there was an hour long programme last night on CJON, I think the honourable member recognizes the programme that I am referring to. There were no credits or acknowledgements given to that particular programme. Is this a public affairs programme or who finances it? Does the government finance it? Does the party finance it or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: What is wrong? Do not be so touchy. Answer the question. Hiding something, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, you know I am sincere when I ask this question. There were no credits, no acknowledgements given at the beginning nor the end of this particular programme. Who paid for this, the government? Did the government pay for it? Did the P.C. Party pay for it? Was it out of the education budget? Out of the transportation budget or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Liberals will pay for it

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am not so sure that the question is in order. I think it is one that the information could be obtained from outside of the

December 3, 1974

Tape 1834

PK - 3

legislature, namely; to the station concerned.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the

honourable the House Leader undertake to table the information.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Someone over there must know.

MR. MARSHALL: How am I supposed to know where CJON get payment of their accounts. I am not a partner of CJON.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable the Minister of Transportation of Communications. With regard to the information he just gave regarding the complement of equipment at the depot at L'Anse-au-Loup, I wonder if he could tell the House how it is that on the first snowfall of the season which occurred last week, which was a relatively minor snowfall at that, that certain schools had to be closed because the highways equipment was not ready to clear the roads.

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

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: The honourable minister cannot give him the answer to the question. I will have to check that out. I was out of town. The only thing I could think was that it was a heavy snowfall and of course the equipment might have been taxed. I do not know but I certainly will undertake to check out the answer and give the honourable member a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing could explain to the House what procedure one has to go through to obtain a NIP project in his community?

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

MR. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement entered into each year with CMHC and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing whereby an allotment of money is transferred from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to the Province. After that allotment of money has been made it is incumbent on the municipality or local government agency to apply to obtain some of that allotment. Then after they apply for some of that allotment of money they have to supply the details, surveys and so on of the specific area within the jurisdiction of that council and when those

specifications are submitted to CMHC they approve or reject them and if they approve them the project proceeds. If they reject them of course the project does not. Immediately upon the approval of such a NIP programme the municipality automatically qualifies for the RAP programme which simultaneously goes along with the NIP programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I assume then in the case of the City of St. John's the initiative would have to be taken by the City of St. John's and if so, would the minister inform the House if the City of St. John's has undertaken to make an application for a NIP project.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think this year the application for NIP funds from the city council was made for the completion of the Urban Renewal Scheme at Mundy Pond. To my knowledge which is not all that extensive in this field as yet, no other application besides that one was forthcoming. This could primarily be due to the fact that most of the funds had been expended from that agreement upon the allocation to the Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Scheme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the City of St. John's has employed the services of community planners to put together a NIP project and are in the process of doing so at the present time?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that they are in the process of preparing anything for allocation of funds from NIP. I hope and trust that they are so that when our agreement which we are now negotiating this hour, I would say, and for the next several days with CMHC towards a programme for next year that they will be ready to take advantage of all of the funds that can be given to the city.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the initiative has to be taken by the municipality, would the minister tell the House what this meeting tonight is in aid of? Is it a P.C. Party meeting? Just what is the purpose of the meeting?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, it is an attempt by the honourable member for St. John's East to fully inform, as he should and as is his responsibility as a member for that area, of the various programmes

December 3, 1974.

Tape 1835

RH - 3

that are available to individuals and constituents of his so that

7444

They would be better informed to agitate for sufficient funds to assist them in improving their housing conditions in the area in which they live.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is this an informational meeting or does the minister, who is sponsoring this meeting, expect to see a community group formed to make an application for a NIP project?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the meeting is intended strictly to inform his constituents of the various programmes that are available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware, if it is purely just to inform his constituents, that St. John's East, M. P., James McGrath, will be in attendance and officials of the provincial government and CMHC will be in attendance? If so, is the minister aware of this, Sir? Is the minister also aware that the sponsoring body, the municipality, the City of St. John's, has not been invited to attend that meeting?

MR. PECKFORD: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of who is invited or who is not invited. I am only aware that a meeting is taking place to inform the constituents of St. John's East of what programmes are available and what programmes they can avail of in the coming year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would assume then from the minister's answers, that no matter what happens, it is the City of St. John's who has to make the application to take advantage of the NIP programme, the City of St. John's, not the Minister without Portfolio?

MR. PECKFORD: I do not think there was ever any intention to indicate or to imply or to deduce from any comments made or advertisements in the paper that it would be the member in a given area who would apply for NIP funds. It is true that the municipality has to apply after the allotment from the federal to the provincial government.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir. You just shot down the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Tourism could inform the House how many thousand Silver Anniversary Confederation Calenders were dumped in Robin Hood Bay?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism is not in.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the Hon. Member for Bell Island that the Hon. Minister of Tourism, I do not think, is in his place.

MR. NEARY: "Stomping Tom" is not here today, is he?

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: There is a job to keep up with them these days, Sir.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: "Morgan is publicity hungry," says Young. We will not ask any questions on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are so few ministers in their seats today -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Just a second now, Sir, I am coming - do not lose your patience - I am coming to my old buddy there, who is going to travel across the Tickle with me tonight to Bell Island.

MR. ROBERT: He does not mind bringing him over but it is bringing him back that will get the objections.

MR. NEARY: He will not be going on the new ferry tonight, I can tell you that, Sir.

Sir, we hear reports these days that the gasoline market in Eastern Canada is glutted and there is a little bit of -

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: This is just ridiculous. This is not a question. The honourable gentleman hears reports that the market is getting glutted! That is not a question. It just shows the honourable gentleman's confusion.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of disorder, thrown in by the gentleman from St. John's West, all that my - boy, he just does not like being number two. He has been number two all his life and he will go on

being number two. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the alleged point of order, raised by the alleged gentleman from St. John's West, all that my colleague is doing -

MR. CROSBIE: Withdraw!

MR. ROBERTS: Withdraw what?

MR. CROSBIE: Whatever he said.

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable gentleman does not allege he is a gentleman, then I, Sir, will not allege it. If I am not allowed to call the honourable gentleman a (blank), I do not call him a (blank). That is simple.

Now the point of order made by the gentleman from St. John's West had no validity as he full well knew. All that my colleague is doing is merely prefacing his remarks with a very brief prefatory introduction so that the honourable gentleman from Placentia West, the Minister of Mines and Energy, will be able to comprehend the question and possibly, hopefully, even to answer. That may be too much to expect.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I have to agree that I do not think it is really a point of order. I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island is aware that he should not have any long preambles to his questions.

MR. NEARY: It was not very long. All I said that the gasoline market is glutted, Sir. That is not very long.

Could the minister tell us, in his opinion, if there will be a reduction in gasoline prices in

Newfoundland as the result of the gasoline market being glutted in Eastern Canada as reported in the press in the last couple of days.

HON. I. D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I am glutted with remarks such as that made by the honourable member from Bonavista North there a moment ago.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Take the candy out of your mouth so we can understand you.

MR. BARRY: My honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, gave me an opportunity to finish my peppermint knob before answering the question.

Mr. Speaker, it is very dangerous to proceed making a comment on a rumour with respect to a glut in the gasoline market. We have been, ever since approximately a year ago, Mr. Speaker - the Department of Mines and Energy has been receiving reports every month or so with respect to the supply and demand situation as it exists in Canada generally and Eastern Canada in particular.

The latest information that I have shows that in some areas there are temporary or maybe longer term excesses of supply over demand. Mr. Speaker, this is where the normal market forces come into play. This is where the consumer is in a position to do some shopping around.

At the height of the energy crisis, Mr. Speaker, when we were seeing gas stations closed in the United States, when we were seeing prices escalating generally in Eastern Canada, even then, Mr. Speaker, there were still variances and differences in the price of gasoline at various pumps around the City of St. John's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we will see happen is that if any company gets in the position where it has excessive inventory and cannot get rid of it, has no place to store it, then it is going to drop the price of that product. I ask the consumers in Newfoundland to do as they will be doing elsewhere, namely to shop around and give their business to the place where they are going to get the lower prices. This is how the consumer is going to have an effect on the supply of gasoline and any other product in Eastern Canada.

MR. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Could the minister

indicate the position of the government with respect to the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency. Specifically are the government of Newfoundland contemplating doing the same as the government of British Columbia have done, namely giving notice that they will be withdrawing this province from the - I do not know what it is officially called - the National Egg Marketing Scheme and I think CEMA or one of those terrible acronyms is the - but anyway the National Egg Marketing Monopoly.

HON. H.W. COLLINS (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY): Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give is that the matter is under advisement and really we are watching the situation as it develops and looking forward to the report which comes from the House of Commons Committee. We are just now studying the issue.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the opinion expressed by Mr. Fred Wells of, I believe, Robinsons or somewhere on the West Coast, does that represent the opinion of the government at this time?

MR. COLLINS: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wells appeared before the House of Commons Committee representing the Newfoundland Egg Marketing Board, the producers. Mr. Wells is entitled, I suppose, to his own opinion. I presume that is what he gave.

MR. ROBERTS: So, he is not speaking for the government, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker. Is the winter maintenance formula for incorporated communities \$800 per mile at the present time? Is there any special consideration being given to communities in Northern Regions of the province? If I can just give an example, Mr. Speaker - in Cooks Harbour last year the snow clearing cost \$5,000 and according to the new formula, they will be only getting \$1,700 this year. So I ask the minister is there any special consideration being given to communities in Northern Regions.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):
The question to which you refer, the broader question, is now being clarified with respect to the Department of Transportation and Communications, as I understand it, and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. A letter will be going out to all town councils hopefully within the next

few days, if not already, to explain the exact position to them.
The town councils have always been responsible for the snow clearing
in their communities. This year we have come up with a new programme
both for summer and winter maintenance whereby \$800 a mile for the

first five miles, six hundred for each additional mile is given to the community for winter snow clearing and for summer maintenance. There are two grants as such.

The communities during the wintertime may do one of two things. They may take the money and provide their own snow clearing, that is their option, or they may elicit to request the Department of Transportation and Communications to do the snow clearing in which instance the Department of Transportation and Communications will do the snow clearing. It will do it after other roads are done, the main arteries which is, I think, is going to be a problem. We agree with that. The money is then retained, as I understand it, by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing for the account of the community in question to be paid to the Department of Transportation and Communications.

All I can say is that we certainly will try to get every community that requests the snow clearing, done as quickly as we can. We have to, of course, provide for main roads where there are situations of hospitals or other situations and we certainly will take that into consideration and try to keep the roads open as much as possible. A prime consideration certainly has to go to the main roads. As soon as they are done and where we are requested by the town councils and while the equipment is there we will certainly try to do the other roads.

MR. ROBERTS: When the minister speaks of the main roads does he mean the main roads through the community as well as the highways between communities?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I guess the main road would be first, the main road on the highway, then the main road through the community and then the other roads after that.

MR. ROBERTS: I think the minister had better look at that because it is no good to open between communities if people cannot get out of the communities.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right, but the question would be of school routes, for

example, is that had to be an early morning

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: No I am just saying where there are school bus routes and that sort of thing we will have to give every consideration to them and try to do it as soon as we can.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Provincial Affairs who is quoted in the "Evening Telegram" of November 15, "Dawe Seeking Action For IOCC Oil Spill" tell us what action is being taken against IOCC for that oil spill?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to interrupt the mode of asking questions of the honourable member but it is clear in Beaulieu that one is not allowed to ask questions which enquire whether statements made in the newspapers are true. The honourable member has been doing that, in effect, all the time and now he is asking, really, a direct one of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and he is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman's reference is correct but my colleague was not asking whether the statement was correct or not. What he was asking - one could put it directly if one wished; what are the government doing about the reported oil spill at IOCC at Labrador City.

MR. NEARY: Has any legal action been taken against IOC?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Let him answer it.

MR. NEARY: I got you on your NIP meeting now, you are browned off!

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the honourable Minister without Portfolio is well taken. I am sure the honourable Member for Bell Island is well aware of that and I think he could also rephrase his question and suggest what he wants to find out.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister then inform the House if any legal action has been taken against IOC for the recent oil spill in Labrador City?

HON. W.G. DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment): No, Your Honour, no action has been taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Twillingate:

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: This concerns the ferry terminal at Indian Cove. In view of the decision made by his department, I am wondering if the minister can inform the House whether it is the intention of the government to buy back the ferry that was formerly used there or replace it with another ferry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Transportation and Communications:

MR. ROUSSEAU: I shall have to check that out. I shall take it as notice and give an answer on it tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House in accordance with Standing Order No. 23, that the regular business of the House be adjourned to debate a definite matter of grave public importance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Urgent public importance.

MR. NEARY: Grave, urgent public importance, namely, the increasing slaughter on our highways and streets caused by drivers under the influence of alcoholic beverages.

While we are rolling our eyeballs heavenward, Sir, in pious prayer over Safe Driving Week, we tolerate increasingly motor murder.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order!

MR. NEARY: What order?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: He is allowed to make a brief.

MR. NEARY: I am making a motion

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Aw, keep quiet! What about the resolution you brought in the other day?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: While we are rolling our eyeballs, Sir, heavenward we tolerate increasingly motor murder and do

and do our very best to provide convenient, attractive outlets whereby the immature of all ages may purchase their means of escape from reality and from responsibility I might say, assured, Sir, that the tolerant society and a yaffle of psychiatrists will get them a ninety per cent discount on any legal penalty for crimes while under the unfluence of government vended mind poison.

Mr. Speaker, we can all take part in the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation. They showed a magnificent profit.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable member is entitled to bring up a motion of urgent public importance if the House be, if the regular business of the House be adjourned to consider a matter of urgent public importance. The authorities declare on the matter that he has to state briefly the nature of the matter concerned which he has already done and then Your Honour decides on whether or not it warrants the adjournment of the regular business of the House. The honourable member while he is very amusing, is going on and giving his complete argument which is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, if I might, Mr. Speaker. Once again the House Leader has given the rule correctly but willingly or no is misapplying it. All that my colleague is doing is making a brief statement of the matter so that Your Honour may then decide whether the matter is of sufficient urgency of debate so that the procedures set forth in Standing Order (23) shall be followed. I submit that my colleague should be allowed to go on and finish his brief statement of the matter of which he is moving the adjournment of the House and then Your Honour can decide and the rules will take over the procedures set forth.

MR. J. CROSSBIE: To that point of order. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, it is not of urgent public importance whether or not the honourable gentleman's eyeballs were all upward or downward and I therefore submit it should be ruled out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. Until Your Honour hears the full statement, Sir, and until the members of the House hear the

statement, I do not think they should judge whether or not it is a matter of urgent public importance.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I happen to think it is, Sir, but that is a matter for Your Honour to decide. I happen to think it is because of the slaughter, the murder on our highways, Sir, but it is a matter of opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member for Bell Island in speaking to that point of order is also expressing his opinion with regards to the motion that he is proposing.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: I find the wording of the member's motion rather entertaining but I think he is debating the motion and he is taking a little too long in making the motion and adding a few words to it. I shall let him continue but if he proceeds in the manner as he was I shall have to ask him to take his seat.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the wording of my motion is not very entertaining. If members are listening they would just think the contrary. Sir, that is a serious matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while we perhaps do not wish to interfere with the device of alcoholism for people who make their escape from reality and get in this alcoholic haze, Sir, it would appear only reasonable that a percentage of the take from the traffic in intoxicating beverages should be set aside to protect both the sober and drunken victims of excessive drinking. For example, Sir, we might make it a requirement of every licensed establishment to have breathalyzer test equipment installed on their premises at the liquor corporations expense and make it obligatory, Sir, for every patron to pass his .08 test before being permitted to operate a motor vehicle and failing such ability, Sir, that the proprietor of the licensed establishment provide transportation for his clients.

Now, Sir, if that is not a serious matter than I do not know what is.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They can laugh at it all they like, Sir. We are having accidents every day on the highway and on the streets and if somebody's little child

is killed on that side of the House, Sir, they will soon take it serious.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member for Bell Island has finished his statement and he has not been recognized to speak further.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: If he continues to interrupt the Chair when it is speaking he shall be named.

The matter raised by the honourable member for Bell Island I am sure is of concern to us all but it is not a matter that I think we should adjourn the business of this House to debate at this time.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate the last day.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we arose yesterday, I finished a few preliminary remarks on the gerrymandering motion, which the government had brought in. I regret that the Premier is not with us today. I thought I heard the House Leader say that the Premier was incapacitated. Well, there are those of us, about 300,000 of us in Newfoundland, who believe that the Premier is incapacitated most of the time, judging from his performances as Premier. I am sorry that he is ill and not with us today. I see that the Minister of Justice, that paragon of principle, that pillar of rectitude and that great believer in ending the gerrymandering system, is once again not present. I do not know if he is in St. John's or whether he is in Grand Bank or whether he is betwixt and between but it is much to be - I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is hiding away.

MR. ROBERTS: Wherever he is, he is hiding away. It is much to be regretted that he is not here.

The bill, under which was set up the commission, whose report was gerrymandered by the Tories, was, of course, introduced by the Minister of Justice who did so with pride and glorying in his achievements. How the mightier are fallen.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned, in a little detail, not overly great detail, three points. I showed how the Tories had thrown out that great principle, that was allegedly enshrined in the legislation, that was certainly enshrined in their minds and in their hearts, unless they were lying to the House and to the people of Newfoundland two or three years ago, in the spring of 1973, when the Redistribution Act, as we call it, came before the House. Either they were lying then, and I do not believe they were, either they were misleading the people in the House then, and I do not believe they were, or they have jettisoned

that principle; they have thrown it aside; they have sacrificed it. I think that is what has happened. I do hope that before this debate ends, every honourable member on the other side will rise in his place and will speak. They can talk about what they wish, subject, of course, to the rules. They can talk about, I suppose it is in order, the alleged gerrymandering which may or may not have gone on in the past. If it did go on in the past, that is only the more reason not to have it go on today. They may try to talk about that or they may try another red herring ractic. They may talk about individual seats. Am I against this or am I for that because I have said that or I have said something else. If they wish, subject, of course, to Your Honour and to the rules, they can talk about that sort of thing.

I hope that they will address themselves as well to two points because I think the people of Newfoundland have a right to know where the government stand and where the members of the House stand. The government, we can assume, stand by the bill. Not one of them has left the cabinet over it. Under the principle of collective responsibility, the Minister of Health, i.e., is part of the gerrymandering. He is part of the jettisoning of the principle. He took part in the great change which led from the speech of the Minister of Justice that we never again would be guilty of that sort of thing, that led from that to the Redistribution Bill we have before us, the resolution we have before us. The Minister of Health is as much part and parcel of that as is, i.e., the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. Neither of those gentleman may have had the least hand in drawing the map which we see before us. That I do not know. They are all equally responsible and I venture to say, equally guilty. So I do not think they will have to stand. They have taken their stand. Not one of them has spoken in the ministry against it. Therefore, they must be taken to agree and they do agree. The people of Newfoundland will judge them accordingly.

I hope that all the backbenchers will stand and will say where they stand on two questions: Whether they think this House should have

fifty-one members or forty-two? The resolution before us now calls for fifty-one members. I think every backbencher is expected to stand. It is one of these debates where matters of grave principle, not the usual matters of government

usual matters of government policy as a grave constitutional principle are being debated. If they do not stand, of course, then they will be taken to a degree. It is not guilt by association. It is not guilt by silence. Their silence will be clearly and unmistakably acquiescent in what is going on in this House at this time with this motion and this bill.

Equally I would hope each of the honourable gentlemen opposite take my learned friend, the gentleman for Placentia East. A man who time and time again has spoken in this House and outside, of principle. A man who believes in principle. A man who stands on principle. A man who would not be part of any dirty gerrymandering. A man who would not want to see the work of the late Mr. Justice Higgins and Dr. Summers and the Reverend Mr. Webber and Magistrate Seabright thrown out without reason, and no reason has been given. There is a reason and I will come back to it but no reason has been given. The Premier in his speech gave no reason. None at all for casting aside the work of that commission, casting aside the principle which the Minister of Justice with such eloquence and the sort of feeling that only the Minister of Justice can muster, as I know my friend will agree.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice will answer when he gets back. I hope he will. I hope the Minister of Fisheries who used to believe in principle as well will take a stand on this. How does the Minister of Fisheries, the learned and honourable and self-confessed principled Minister of Fisheries tell us that the Redistribution Bill and all this procedure that flows from that bill, Mr. Speaker, will take out of the hands of the government the responsibility for setting the boundaries of the population of the various electoral districts in the province. How does he square that with a resolution that has in it thirty-one districts boundaries changed from the report? More than half. Fifty-one seats recommended by the commission. They were not recommended, they were told to bring in fifty-one and they divided the province into fifty-one areas. Thirty-one of them on this map are different from the report which Mr. Justice Higgins and his colleagues filed one year ago. There are over half. I hope that all the honourable gentlemen will tell us about their stand on principle and will explain that, not try and camouflage it or hide it away or evade the point. Let them make whatever points they wish but let them confront that issue squarely. Do

they believe in an independent redistribution or do they not? And if they do how do they square that belief with supporting this?

That is the stand. That is the question. That is the question that will be asked. Equally then do they think this House should have forty-two or fifty-one members? We think forty-two is enough. One can differ. It is a different -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. Yes, I am differing from myself. Unfortunately, the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, has never differed with himself. He, for example, based on his past history in this House would never countenance to deal with John Shaheen. Not him. He left the cabinet over a deal with John Shaheen. He would never have any part of John Shaheen. Oh, no, he has never in his life changed his mind. Never! Mr. Speaker, has the Hon. Minister of Fisheries ever changed his mind? Never! Not ever! And Your Honour I am being perfectly in line - Your Honour is gridding himself to enter into the fray.

MR. NEARY: We had a grove in the floor here, so he must have changed his mind three or four times.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, is no man - of all the men in this House, he is the least ever to talk about changing his mind. His mind is like a weather vane, it blows with the wind. I venture to suggest so were his principles judging from his political performance the last four or five years.

Let him say what he believes in this debate. Let him explain. He is an honourable and learned member. Let him tell why a report that Jim Higgins and three other men spent a year on that turned out nearly the last year of Mr. Justice Higgins's life. He spent a year on a report and in it comes and it might as well have been written on sand for all the attention that the honourable gentlemen opposite paid to it. Let them square that. Let us hear the Member for Bay de Verde talk and the Member for

Bonavista South, that paragon of human rights who is forever telling us how pure he is, and the gentleman from Harbour Grace who is forever telling us how bad the member from Bonavista South is, and the gentleman from Port de Grave, let him make his maiden address in the House, tell us what he thinks. The gentleman from St. John's North who, to give the man his due - maybe as he said publicly the other day that is why he is where he is now - to give that man his due, he does speak out. He and I do not always agree heavens knows.

The gentleman from Grand Falls, let him speak out. The gentleman from Trinity North, the gentleman from St. John's South, from Placentia East, from St. George's, from Port au Port - none of these men is a member of the ministry. Most of them would like to be. One or two of them have been. One or two of them have rejected invitations if one can believe common report.

Each of these men sit here as private members. Let them speak. If not, let them be judged on supporting this because they will be judged, they will be taken to have supported it. The ministry have spoken. They have spoken through their collective spokesman, their collective mouthpiece, the Premier, who spoke for all of them, just as the Minister of Justice two years ago spoke for all of them. The only thing is the Minister of Justice says one thing and the Premier says another but that is because governments change their minds.

I hope they change their minds on the principle of fifty-one or forty-two because forty-two is enough, Sir. Redistribution, yes, but forty-two members are enough members.

Now, Sir, I find it interesting by the way, the same Tory Party here that is talking of increasing the House, in Ottawa they are talking against increasing it, a move which will have the effect of depriving the people of this province of one seat. Because if the size of the House of Commons at Ottawa is not increased, if that motion which the government at Ottawa have put down is not carried and does not become law, Newfoundland will lose one of her seven seats. We will have only six. The same Tory Party here is talking of increasing it, why

then is Ottawa, their blood brothers, talking against it?

Well, Sir, I have made those preliminary points and I talked about what I felt were some very unfortunate matters of detail to come down from the plateau of principle and to try to engage the government on their own level, considerably below the level of principle. I referred specifically to two or three seats which, I suggest, are badly drawn. If we are going to have fifty-one - I do not agree with it - but if we are going to and if we are going to have the government drawing their own boundaries - I do not agree with that - but if we are going to do that, then let them divide Labrador properly and appropriately.

Here they have gone back to what the commission said in their preliminary report which the commission changed after hearings. The government have not given a word of explanation. The Premier, in attempting to explain this, showed his abysmal ignorance of Labrador. He had Rigolet on the south side of Lake Melville. Ever since the Hudson Bay Company founded Rigolet 140 or 150 years ago, it has been on the north side of Lake Melville. The Premier did not even know where it is. It is in Labrador South. That may have confused him.

Then he went on about the distances and the coastal boats. What he did not point out was the flow of - he could have talked to the gentleman from Labrador West who would have told him about the flow of commerce and the flow of traffic and the flow of travel and the flow of everything which, in both parts of Labrador, the South Coast and the North Coast, runs into Happy Valley, Goose Bay. That is becoming the centre. If ever the government can be persuaded to move and to set up the crown corporation which Don Snowden's commission recommended and which we have been advocating for two or three years, the headquarters for that will be in Goose Bay, Happy Valley. That is the natural, logical place for it. That is the place where the communications go.

Yet the government insists upon ignoring that and leaving that seat there. It is wrong, Sir - 700 miles of coast line, 4,300 people. There is no man alive - it does not matter what party he belongs

to - there is no man alive as a member who would be able to serve those people adequately. It just cannot be done. There is no way it can be done.

The same government that proposes this, proposes to carve out 8,000 people in Grand Falls and you could walk from one side to another of it inside of half an hour. It is just not consistent and it is wrong.

I do not care about the politics of it. I have no idea whether those changes would make any difference politically one way or another. What I am concerned about are the people there. I do not think they are going to get as good a break under that map, that drawing, the drawing in this schedule, as they would otherwise.

I cannot see any reason why the government should have changed it. The Premier gave no reasons. The commission originally recommended that and the commission changed it after hearing briefs and after further consideration. How can the government have the gall to change it back? It just makes no sense. Maybe they figure it will help them politically, I do not know. That at least would be a comprehensible reason even if it is not an acceptable one.

I spoke as well about the Northern Peninsula seats.

It is interesting that the government propose to have 24,000 people on the Northern Peninsula represented by two M.H.A.'s and down on the Southern Avalon they propose to have 16,000 represented by two M.H.A.'s. It is a pretty telling comment on the Tory idea of equity, the Tory idea of fairness.

I will tell you why that is: Because the gentleman from Ferryland and the gentleman from St. Mary's are desperately anxious to try to protect a seat. That is why 16,000 people here are going to be asked to elect two M.H.A.'s and 24,000 people on the Northern Peninsula are going to be asked to elect two. That is why a man in LaScie who wants to see his member will have to drive forty miles to Baie Verte, fifty miles to the Trans Canada Highway, one hundred miles over to Deer Lake, two hundred miles down north to Plum Point and fifty miles across to Roddickton if his member happens to be in Roddickton. That is equity! That is justice! That is concern for the people! That is the one man one vote principle with a vengeance! It is gerrymandering of one of the lowest most contemptible forms I have ever seen.

They believe in a one man one vote and if they do not want to accept even the idea of tolerances then let them make them even. No, Sir, they stand for tolerances and so do we but what way do those tolerances work? They do not work to benefit the people in rural areas, the people who need help. No. It is sheer coincidence, Sir, that in areas where the change came happened to have voted for opposition members. That is sheer coincidence. I am sure that has nothing at all to do with it. That is why 24,000 people on the

Northern Peninsula, stretched over four or five hundred miles of coast line, without paved roads, in small communities - the largest community on the entire Northern Peninsula is St. Anthony with 3,000 people - that is why they are going to be given the right to send two men to the House of Assembly, to look after them and to speak for them.

Down here in Ferryland and in the St. Mary's-The Capes Districts 16,000 people have the same right. That is the Tory justice. That is the Tory equity. That is a devotion to principle. That is the sort of thing the gentleman from St. John's South, the gentleman from Placentia East and other honourable gentlemen have made their career on. That sort of decency, that sort of honourable treatment. That is the sort of thing that a man can be proud of.

What did you do today? Well, boy, we put the shaft to the Northern Peninsula and 24,000 of them now can send in two members and down in Ferryland and St. Mary's Districts, 16,000. It is not that I am against St. Mary's or Ferryland, somebody opposite will probably say that either here or outside, but I am against this sort of departure from principle, this low, scurvy - and I do expect the gentleman from St. John's South to speak out against this. If I do not hear him do that he will go down greatly in my estimation and I have a great estimation of him.

I do expect the gentleman from Placentia East to speak out against this. These honourable gentlemen are not in the employ of any ministry. These honourable gentlemen stand as private members. They do not happen to support my party but that is fine. In a free society we have differences and they can be honestly and honourably held. This is not a matter of party difference.

Whether or not one accepts this report is not a matter of party difference, it is a clear-cut issue of principle. As clear-cut an issue of principle, Mr. Speaker, as has come before this House in the last ten years. Do we accept the independent report of Mr. Justice Higgins and his colleagues or do we not. I say we do. I say we should. Every honourable member opposite will have to decide what

December 3, 1974, Tape 1888, Page 3 -- aob

he is to do. My colleagues and I have decided what we are going to do.

So we saw the changes, Sir. Thirty-one districts changed. An extra six had only their names changed so that does not really count. Fourteen; there were neither changes in boundaries affecting residents nor names of districts. Let me just read the list of honour,

the districts that the Tories gerrymander, the districts where Mr. Justice Higgins report was not followed, Naskaupi, Eagle River, Straits of Bell Isle, St. Barbe, Baie Verte, Placentia, Salmonier-Conception, Ferryland, Avalon North. These are all districts recommended in the final report of the commission, districts that have been now sacrificed to the Tory lack of principle. Portugal Cove-Bell Island, Port de Grave, Harbour Grace, Trinity, Clarenville, Bonavista South, Terra Nova, Bonavista North, Fogo, Twillingate, Lewisporte -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Bonavista North is not the same as the commission's report. It is a minor change but it is a change. I remind the honourable gentleman one cannot be a little bit pregnant. The boundary that the commission recommended took in Deadman's Bay and Lumsden into the district of Bonavista North and out of the district of Fogo. The boundary the Tory government have drawn in their gerrymandering leaves the line running out to Cape Freels. It is a minor change but it is a change.

The honourable gentleman I think will agree with me because the facts agree with me, the facts support me, to continue the role of honour, the role of Tory dishonour.

Fogo, Twillingate, Lewisporte, Exploits, Grand Falls, Windsor, Green Bay, Mount Pearl, Mount Scio, Pleasantville, St. John's West, Waterford-Kenmount, in each of these districts, Sir, the politicians have drawn the lines of the districts, not the commission. There is not necessarily anything wrong with that if one wants to accept that system. Apparently, it is hearsay to my knowledge but I will accept it as correct. Apparently that is what went on for 150 years in Newfoundland. The politicians drew the boundaries. But two years ago we entered the new Jerusalem and the Minister of Justice stood in his place and announced that we had come to that green and pleasant land and he and his fellow white knights in shining armour were going to end that system, never again, never again would we have the dirty, scummy politicians drawing the boundary lines, no, Sir. We would have an independent commission and we would ask the Speaker to name three men to it and we would ask the Chief Justice of Newfoundland to name a man to be Chairman. The Speaker did name his men and fine men they were. The

Chief Justice named his man and a fine man he was and in they come. They bring a preliminary report and then they have hearings at eighteen or twenty places throughout the Province. People present briefs, MHAs present briefs, members on both sides present briefs. The gentleman from Ferryland presented a brief. The gentleman from Port au Port presented a brief. Any other honourable gentlemen opposite sending briefs? The gentlemen on this side are the member for Labrador South, Labrador North, myself, a number of others presented briefs and in the commission bring their final report a year ago, last December, December 14.

What did the Tory government do? They jettison it. They throw it aside. They just scuttle their principles. "Away with them and out, principles be damned. We are going to gerrymander our boys. We have to protect our crowd. We have to protect the member for Ferryland, protect the member for St. Mary's. We have to do something about that poor, pathetic man who sits for Bay de Verde. We have to protect the member for Trinity South. We have to find them seats boys. We have to try to save Aubrey in Grand Falls. He is down the drain. Let us try to carve him out a seat. That is what we will do. We will get to work and while we are at it we will scuttle Neary boys and we will scuttle Roberts and Rowe." That is the thinking of these men of principle in Cabinet. That is exactly what went on, exactly and precisely and I say that with as much certainty as if I were there or if I had tapes of it and I have neither. Well I say that with absolute moral certainty. That is what went on and that is why thirty-one of the fifty-one districts recommended by the Higgins commission were changed, not one, not two, not a name but thirty-one out of fifty-one districts changed and this from the Tories who talked of an end to gerrymandering.

If it was not so pathetic and if it was not so serious I would have to laugh. I do not think there has ever been a group of men other than this Cabinet who have ever so openly and brazenly divorced themselves from principles as the honourable gentlemen opposite have done

in respect of this redistribution. The Minister of Transportation and Communications, a man of honour, has got to look at himself in the mirror when he shaves in the morning and say, "Joe, boy, you were part of it. You set up that commission. You voted to set it up and now, boy, you are voting to throw out that principle." Maybe he can square it with his conscience. I hope he can because he will have to. Maybe it does not bother him. Maybe he thinks, " Ah, it is a great thing, boy. We will put the blocks to the "Libs". We will show them." Maybe that is the thinking. If so, my respect for the honourable gentleman goes down.

I respect him as a political foe and as a man concerned with this province. If he stands for this sort of nonsense and this sort of abandonment of principle - no reason given. The Premier did not give one single reason of substance. The Premier spoke of hundreds of protests. We have not seen one. There may be some - I will deal with that later - but we have not seen one, not one substantive reason is given for these changes.

Honourable gentlemen opposite may not have any trouble squaring that with their consciences. I venture to say most of them will not. I say more power to them. I know thousands of people in Newfoundland who do have trouble squaring that with their consciences, who do feel that if you say you believe in a principle, that you will stand by it. It is not a very costly stand to take. It does not mean that any man is going to have to give up his life. It does not mean that anybody is going to have to give up his fortune. All they have to give up - they do not have to give up anything to stand on this principle. It is not a very tough stand to have to take. It is not as if one had committed a crime and had to decide whether one would confess it or not. It is not the stand of a man like Richard Nixon who knows that he has committed a crime and has to decide whether he will own up to it or not.

It is not the tradition of a man like John Dean trying to decide whether he will do what he knows to be right or whether he will continue to take part in the cover up. There is none of that. This is

not that sort of case. All that is needed is for a man to say, "Boys, we have stood by a principle two years ago. We stand by it now. If we cannot win an election without gerrymandering, then we are not going to win it."

I would say for my party that if we cannot win an election without gerrymandering, then we will not win it. Nothing could bother me less. Victory at any price is not worth it. I would not want to be sitting anywhere today because of a man like Bill Saunders. It is not on my conscience but it is on other peoples.

I would say to the gentleman from Labrador West, let him think about it. Maybe he has resolved it in his own mind. Let him think about it. Let the gentleman from St. Mary's think about it. Let the gentleman from Placentia West think about it. Let the gentleman from Fortune Bay think about it - all men who time and time again tell us they stand on principle. I take them at their word. Let them think about what I am saying because I mean it. I mean it as sincerely and as dramatically and as deeply as any man can mean anything.

There was a principle enshrined in legislation, clearly stated, clearly understood and that principle has now been abandoned. It has been abandoned with as much shame as a harlot abandoning her lover. That is very little. It has been abandoned completely and utterly and for no reason, no stated reason. I know what the reason is. The reason is partisan expediency. That is why it has been abandoned. But there was no reason stated. The Premier did not have the face or the gall or the courage to stand and state the truth. Give Joe Smallwood his due, at least when he did it, he stood and he said, "We believe that a man in the outharbour should have a greater voting power than a man in St. John's." Whether he agreed with that or not is another thing but he said it man fashion. He stood in the House and he said it. People could judge for or against as they wished.

Not this crowd here, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to pretend community of interest. They are trying to pretend growth. Let us talk about growth. We are told Grand Falls is to get a whole seat because

of growth. The Premier said it in his very own little voice, in his very own little House, a couple of days ago, on Friday afternoon. He had to say something because it is proposed to give the Town of Grand Falls, with 8,077 people according to the government's figures, a seat.

Growth, maybe there are some areas where we do not expect rapid population change in the next few years. I am prepared to accept the fact that in the Straits Area there will not be rapid population changes or at least not rapid population growth, in the next few years. There are a number of others. How does the gentleman from Grand Falls square that with giving the 12,600 people in the proposed District of Topsail

District of Topsail, one member. If we are going to get growth anywhere in the Avalon Area, then we are going to get it in the Avalon Area. The Minister of Fisheries told us the other day that there are going to be 400,000 people in St. John's by the end of this century or fifty years on, 2025. There is going to be growth in the next ten years in Topsail and yet that is the largest seat we have in population.

Harbour Main, Bell Island - the get Nearv Movement. There is going to be growth up in the head of that bay, yet they have been given a seat with 12,000, half as many again as Grand Falls which once again has been given a seat for reasons of growth.

Pleasantville with 12,000. The growth principle does not apply there apparently. One would judge, it does not apply. Nor equally does it apply in St. John's East Extern.

MR. NEAPY: What happens if the federal government stores oil in the mines at Bell Island?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, lots of things will happen if they take up the honourable gentleman's suggestion to store oil on Bell Island.

Humber Past is not going to have any growth apparently, if one judges from what the Premier said, because they have 11,573 people according to these figures and they are being given a seat. You know it makes - but on the other hand we do expect vast growth on the Southern Shore because they have only got 8,049 people, the smallest seat barring only the Labrador seats. So obviously if we are going to get vast growth between Cappahayden the last community on south and Bay Bulls. Why else are they given a seat with 8,000 people? That is what happened in the case of Grand Falls. They are going to have rapid growth in Grand Falls. So they are given a seat. The same in the District of the Capes with 8,400 people. We are going to have rapid growth there. Along the Cape Shore here there are going to be new metropolises springing up and up here in Branch. Branch is going to have maybe 8,000 or 10,000 people in the next few years according to this.

Mr. Speaker, the growth principle which the Premier announced is not even a weak reason. It is not even an iota of a justification. It is a pathetic example. You would think that Mr. Korhai being paid his

big fat salary down there and all the rest of them down on the eighth floor with their big fat salaries could come up with a better line of argument for their man than that. I mean that is like sending him into the fray with one hand tied behind his back. I mean he has got enough troubles speaking in the House anyway without not having some ammunition.

MR. NEARY: Putting the spy glass up to his blind eyes.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, both his blind eyes.

Then we talked about the community of interest. That was the other reason given. Let us talk about community of interest. Let us talk about the community of interest between Roddickton and Baie Verte. Vast community of interest. Why every day they get up in Roddickton and they drive the fifty miles to Plum Point and they drive the 200 miles to Deer Lake and they drive the 100 miles back to the Baie Verte Junction and they drive the fifty miles down to Baie Verte every day, Sir. They are such a community of interest. Every day they drive it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is forty miles to Baie Verte.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, it is ten miles because of the bad roads that the Tories have not straightened up yet. We paved the road to Baie Verte. We paved it. As a matter of fact, every cent that has been spent on LaScie Road, we paved. That is the vast community of interest. All right we will come to Englee where it is sixty miles across to Plum Point. That is the community of interest, Sir. That is what the Minister of Transportation is voting for, this man, this principle, that great community of interest principle.

Let us talk about the community of interest here in Mary's Harbour and how much they have in common with Nain. Why, Sir, they visit back and forth for tea parties. It is only 700 miles. They meet practically every day. Say the Coishes in Mary's Harbour, Mr. and Mrs. Bert Coish practically every day they just drop down to Nain or Makkovik or Postville for tea. You know, they have a great community of interest. I mean it is outrageous. Outrageous! Not that they should do it, that is bad enough, the Tories should do it but that they should try and put this patron on it, try and explain it in this way.

December 3, 1974

Tape 1846

PK - 3

Tell us again about the great community of interest between the Cape Shore and Trepassev. Again, Sir, a very deep community of interest. My friend for Bell Island knows a fair bit about that shore and I think that he would agree with me -- is there not a great community of interest between the Cape Shore and Trepassev? Say Angel's Cove and Cuslett and they come across all of the time from Ferryland.

7475

You could almost say that they go over to mass there. There are only about five parishes in between.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is right. The people in Branch, I am told, wanted to stay in St. Mary's District because they hoped that the road will be built from North Harbour up to Branch, indeed it is half done. It has been half done for about five or ten years, an old ADB project that got started and never got finished. It should be finished.

I have not heard anybody from St. Bride's or Patrick's Cove or Big Barasway or Ship Cove, say that they want to be in with Trepassey and St. Shott. What have they got in common? They go to Placentia as the nearest large community. That is their hospital. I mean it is an insult to the intelligence of the people of Newfoundland.

Tell me again, Sir, because I did not hear it on the first time through, what the people of Bell Island have in common with the people of Harbour Main. The commission recommended in both reports that the district should be Harbour Main-Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I am sorry. Bell Island-Portugal Cove. I thank my honourable friend. Indeed they wanted to call it Bell Island and The Coves, with Horse Cove, Goat Cove and Broad Cove, which is now St. Phillips and Portugal Cove itself. That is a natural community of interest. What do they have in common with Harbour Main. Even in the old days, the boats used to go to Carbonear. Did they go up to the head of the bay as well? It is rampant, rank gerrymandering. If anybody over there should have any political conscience left, he will have to show it on this. It is a terrible, terrible thing. It is bad enough they do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are really interested in -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes, so are their priorities. The people of Newfoundland are listening. They might not be listening to every word I say but they are judging this crowd.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a quorum call please? There are only thirteen in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Has the honourable gentleman finished?

MR. ROBERTS: No! I have not finished. I am just getting warmed up.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: I am grateful, Your Honour.

I mean if we are talking of adding nine members to the House, the least we can do is to try to maintain a quorum with forty-two. Are we adding the nine so we got a better chance of keeping fourteen in the House? Is that it?

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, the giant, the intellectual main-spring behind the Tory Administration; namely, the Member for Green Bay, has tipped it of, the real reason we are having nine.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: It may be a compliment to the honourable gentleman that he is the intellectual main-spring of the Tory Government, it is no compliment to the government. I can assure the honourable gentleman it is no compliment to the government. It may be a compliment to the honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: The poster snatcher.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the poster snatcher. That is where he made his mark in political history. He was not very good at snatching votes but he was pretty good at brow-beating little children with money to say, "Give us your posters little fellow." Anytime he would like an investigation of that,

I am sure my colleague from Hermitage would be delighted to trot out the relevant files and the affidavits and everything else.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! Would the honourable gentleman like to set up a judicial inquiry into it? Say who was in the car with him? Say who was in the car with him?

MR. PECKFORD: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am just asking the honourable gentleman if he would like - The honourable gentleman returned the posters.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the honourable gentleman was involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! You are just returning to the fray but I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not being relevant to the resolution that is now being debated.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Your Honour. I find it very hard to be relevant to the gentleman from Green Bay and nothing that is parliamentary is relevant to him.

Now, as I was saying, maybe the reason we are having nine extra men in the House is so we can maintain a quorum. Maybe that is it. An easier answer would be to buy fourteen seat belts for gentlemen on the other side. Strap them in at three o'clock and leave them there until six.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go on to one or two other points let me deal with one point which again shows the hypocrisy of the Tory government with respect to this. There is one seat in this proposal before the House now which is clearly illegal under the legislation passed in 1973 and I invite honourable gentlemen opposite who are learned in the law to deal with this argument. I realize that the legislature is not bound by any legislation which has been passed and that if we pass a bill setting up a seat that is law. But I will point out that the commission were directed to bring in a seat that was one-half in Labrador and one-half on the Island of Newfoundland. This provision was not in the bill as it was brought to the House by the Minister of Justice when he gave us his Magna Carta speech before he lost and abandoned his principles. It was added as a result of the debate. A number of honourable members spoke.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am talking about the Straits of Bell Isle seat and I am talking about Section 16(c) of the Act, section 16(c) of the Act as it now is and it will be found on page 470 of the statutes for 1973, volume (1). Section 16(c) makes it mandatory upon the commission, not the government and this seat is perfectly lawful. I am not suggesting it is not and if this bill becomes law, of course it will be lawful. But under the act as the House passed it was an amendment moved by no less a gentleman than the Premier. As I recall it he was the one who put those words in. It was not just some ordinary, common, milksop cabinet minister. This was the Premier in all his majesty and glory, added what has now become Section 16(c) which reads, "In preparing a report under Section (15)," and that is the report which was laid before the House and which the Tories threw in the ash can. "In preparing a report under Section (15) with respect to Labrador comprised with the Coast of Labrador within the meaning of the Labrador Act together with the islands adjacent to the said coast of Labrador, the commission shall proceed subject to such adjustments as are necessary to give effect to the population of Labrador being entitled to at least: (1) Being apportioned among three districts, all of which are completely in Labrador, plus (2) An equal entitlement in conjunction with the population of some part of the Province outside Labrador to another district in the Province."

Labrador in this section was entitled to three and one half seats and indeed down below the commission were given the specific authority to depart from the principal of twenty-five per cent above or below the norms to give effect to that section 16(c).

Mr. Justice Higgins, the point was raised before him and the commission as to whether equal meant equal

in area or equal in population. He, of course, said that it had to mean equal in people. The section seems to indicate that but he gave it as his opinion and when the commission filed their final report, the one which the Tories scuttled, it said and I quote from page (3): "In the case of Labrador provision was made (referring to the legislation now) for the creation of at least three districts all of which were to be situated completely in Labrador plus a district in which a portion of Labrador was to be joined with a portion of the Island of Newfoundland to form a new district in which the two portions would contain an equal number of people."

That is the commission's report. That is the commission's report. It was the principle that the government on the floor of the House put into the act. What do they do when they come in with their gerrymandering? They have a district that is partially in Labrador and partially on the island. It has, according to the government's figures, 11,600 people in it. It is the seventh or eighth largest district in the province in population.

How many people live in Labrador? Now remember the legislation said half-and-half. That was the principle that the Premier spoke up for. A great man the Premier. Stands by his word though the heavens fall! A great man. A man of honour and integrity.

The communities along the Straits, according to the census had 1,886 people in them. Thirty-five in Henley Harbour, fifty-five in Capstan Island, twenty-seven in L'Anse-Amour, one hundred and eighty-six in Pinware, L'Anse-au-Clair two hundred and thirty-three, West St. Modeste two hundred and ninety-four, Red Bay two hundred and ninety-six, Forteau three hundred and twelve, L'Anse-au-Loup four hundred and forty-eight - total 1,886 out of 11,617 in the constituency. This is the government.

They were up on their feet the other day. The Premier was on his feet talking about Labrador and giving it some concern in of all the hypocritical nonsense that even the Premier has ever got off. 1,800 people along the Straits are lumped in with 9,800 on the island. That is giving Labrador fair representation. Here we are, all of us concerned about the growth of separatist feeling in Labrador with

ensuring that that feeling be given no fuel on which to feed. We are playing into their hands. The Tories are doing their best to divide this province by this sort of tactic. Playing right into their hands, giving them ammunition. Less than 2,000 people on the Straits, 9,500 people on the Island one district. One district.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost criminal. It is infamous. I am surprised the gentleman from Labrador West can even be part of the cabinet that does that. I really am. I thought he has the courage to speak out for what he believed in. I am coming to the conclusion that he has not if he tolerates this. If he tolerates this.

The commission came up with a seat that was roughly the present St. Barbe North which is a small constituency and should not continue to exist under the principle of one man one vote, and lumped it in with the other side of the Straits. They said it had 7,000 people. Even that is an imbalance and a serious enough one. Even that is disservice enough to the cause. The government have compounded that and added insult to injury. 2,000 people in the Straits now are going to have to make out with 9,500 people from the Island. Not the sort of thing, Sir, that we should be doing if we are concerned about the future of this province and the two geographical portions of it.

There are people in Labrador who are separatists. The gentleman from Labrador South has run into them. Others of us have. The gentleman from Labrador West I venture to say has run into that feeling. It is there. It is real. It must be and it should be the proper concern of anybody in public life in this province today because none of us wants to see the province divided in any way.

This sort of tactic is bad in itself but heavens above, Mr. Speaker, it goes against the very legislation which the Premier himself did. Now how far can a man descend from principle? Just how low can a man's politics take him? Just how absolutely, to what degradation, what depths can a man descend politically? Just how low can a man go?

We have a debate in the House, a lot of talk on a point about Labrador. The Premier himself - I do not know if he actually

moved the amendment - but he certainly came up with the idea and the government put it in. Then in comes the report and they throw that out. They throw out the idea of giving Labrador three and one-half seats. Labrador has about 3.12 seats now. It is infamous and I expect fully that the gentleman from Labrador West will stand in this debate and denounce this and will say that he will not stand for it, that he will not be part of it.

Better to give Labrador to which she is entitled to strictly on the basis of population. If we consider only population Labrador is entitled to three seats. We do not believe that. We argued in this House for four. The government gave three and a-half and now three and a-half has become three and a-tenth or three and an eighth. I really expect the gentleman from Labrador West - we shall get the measure of his political courage now. He is a man of principle. He will have to stand and show us, denounce this and get it changed.

The commission heard arguments on it and the commission changed their minds. Four independent people. Four men of probity and integrity who have no partisan axe to grind. Only one of the members sought election, Mr. Justice Higgins and he was out of politics ten years gone when he came on to the commission. Magistrate Seabright, Mr. Webber, Dr. Summers, to my knowledge none of those men has ever sought even a nomination. None has ever sat in this House as a member. I do not know their political ambitions but I have no indication any of them ever wants to be a member. They are generally non-partisan, as good choices as could be made and the Tories trampled on that principle. The dishonour and the lack of decency.

It will just add further fuel now to the separatist flames. I can hear it now. I can hear them at their meetings saying: "That shows what they think of us. Bad enough we had the Royal Commission a year ago and not a thing has been done on it since except study. Ah! we are getting ready for the election. We will have a great flurry of reports before the election and activity but nothing has been done. Nothing! Absolutely nothing!"

Now the final indignity: What little they were given by the Premier's grace has been taken away from them. Why? I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, and I wish it were not me because I do not like speaking about myself in this way but it is done to try to shaft me. That is the only reason they did it. That is all. I am not complaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Bonavista South will get the measure of his principles and we know the principles of the gentleman from Placentia West. We have taken care of those over the years.

MR. BARRY: Go on down to Placentia West. Go on down.

MR. ROBERTS: I well may. Nothing would cause the honourable gentleman a greater tightening of the sphincter muscle than that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the gentleman from Labrador West who is the only member from Labrador sitting on the government side and also sits in the cabinet. Upon him there rests a very heavy burden in this respect. A very heavy burden. I did not put it there and I am not seeking to make it any heavier but I say to him that he more than any other individual in this House has a responsibility on this issue.

The facts are clear. It was his own Premier who put that section in the legislation. You cannot even blame it, Mr. Speaker, on some legislative draftsman. It was a government bill. The Premier came up with this idea. Now the Premier, his own Premier has put the shaft to that idea and to Labrador. The gentleman from Labrador West, who sits in the cabinet, if he does not speak out on this is part and parcel of it. That is the way the collective cabinet responsibility system works. It is the only way it can work. He will have to square that with his conscience. I am not worried about his electors nor is he. I know he will do what he believes right and he will face his electorate and he will take whatever their verdict is. That is what any of us should do.

That is not what I am suggesting. I am saying; in his own mind, in the dark of the night when a man comes to grips with his own

conscience - when a man knows what is right he can rationalize it, he can vary it, he can push it aside, he can prevaricate but there comes a time, there comes a time when there comes an issue when a man must come square on. I would suggest to the honourable gentleman from Labrador West, Sir, that this is such a time for him and this is such an issue.

He speaks for Labrador, Sir, and I believe quite genuinely he has done his best for Labrador. It is not his fault that the cabinet have done so little, that the government have done so little for Labrador. Indeed, less might have been done if the honourable gentleman had not been in the cabinet.

This, Sir, is not an issue that he can sweep aside. He will have to confront it. It may well be that he will say that he accepts this. I doubt that he has thought about it in the way that I am putting it to him. I really doubt if he has but I am putting it to him quite genuinely and quite openly. This cannot be swept aside. It is an issue on which the people of Labrador will expect the honourable gentleman to take his stand. Either he accepts that or he does not.

If he accepts it he accepts what is in that resolution and he is going against what his own Premier said in this House two years ago. I do not mind the Premier changing his mind, we are quite used to the Premier's flip flops, bad days and everything else but I have not found that in my friend from Labrador West. The time has come for him and the issue has come. Whether he speaks in the debate or not, Sir, is up to him but he will have to deal with this issue whether he speaks in the House or not.

If he says nothing then he has dealt with it. He has agreed with it by saying nothing and I put the challenge to him man-fashion across the House, looking him straight in the eye. Section (16)c is there. The Hansards are clear. The Premier spoke on Friday March 23. I think I have the dates correct. Yes, the Premier spoke on Friday March 23, second reading debate. I do not have the committee references here but I am sure they are here and I can find them for

December 3, 1974, Tape 1849, Page 6 -- apb

the honourable gentleman. He spoke and the references will be found on page 2592 of Hansard. If the honourable gentleman does not have his copy to hand I will send him photostatic copies of this one.

The Premier said: "I think it is desirable to have the Straits of Belle Isle, the Labrador side and part of St. Barbe North to be one seat." There is no finer way,

way, Mr. Speaker, we can cement the provincial relationship and the differences that have arisen than to identify these two areas into one representative. I feel fairly strongly on this. I do not want to be parochial nor do I want anyone else to be blamed. I do not want to blame anyone else for being parochial or insolent in this regard.

In the remarks that the Member for Labrador South made the other day, he said that people across the Straits did not have as much in common as the people in Labrador South as it presently exists. I would disagree with that. I think the people in L'Anse-au-Clair would have as much in common with the people of Flower's Cove and probably a great deal more than the people of L'Anse-au-Clair would with the people of Rigolet.

I am trying to look at this objectively, Sir, from a government point of view but I think it makes a great deal of sense to try to get Labrador to feel that they are part of the province. I do not think that there is any better way than to have a mutual seat where one representative actually is representing a district in the province as opposed to two sections of the province. I am not sure whether the Premier actually moved the amendment in committee stage or not but it was moved on the government side and it became law. That was the Premier's feeling. The Premier apparently has abandoned principle. We are getting used to that in the Premier so we do not take as much heed to it.

That Strait of Belle Isle seat, Sir, as it is constituted, is overwhelmingly an island seat, a Northern Peninsula seat. That is where the balance of the people are and any member who serves in that area, whether it is me or anybody else, will of necessity have to spend a greater part of his time and a greater part of his efforts trying to help the people and to serve the needs of the people who live in the area from Plum Point around to Conche. The Member for Labrador South, I would suspect, would agree with that from his knowledge of the area. I challenge any member of the House to differ

with that statement. Furthermore, if there are 9,500 people on the island and 1,900 on the Labrador side of that district, there is no hope ever of the people from Labrador South, the Strait side, having a candidate from their area. There is no realistic hope at all. Indeed it would be probably best for them if it were an outsider, a man with no ties to any part of the district; whereas in a district that is half and half on each side of the Strait, they got a fifty-fifty chance of having one of their men. I know men down there who want to seek the Liberal nomination and there are men who want to seek other nominations. The present Member for Labrador South has indicated publicly that he does not intend to run again. I am sure he knows many men along that coast who want to seek the nomination for his party, directed to contest an election.

Well they will have no chance in the Strait of Belle Isle seat. None at all. It has got nothing to do with politics, it has got everything to do with people. So I leave it with the gentleman for Labrador West. He is going to have to go home tonight and think about it, whether he speaks or not it is up to him but if he does not speak I say now that the people in Labrador will have taken him to agree with this principle and to agree with what is being done in this redistribution. It is not a pleasant burden that I lay upon him but it is an open and an honourable one. I lay it upon him and he will have to deal with it. It might not matter a root or a hoot or a row of pins or a row of beans in the next few months but I say in the honourable gentleman's political career this could be one of the great turning points because here is a clear case for one of the principles for which he has fought. One of the basic principles, helping Labrador. One of those principles is being violated for no cause and no reason, without even the courtesy of an explanation. If the honourable gentleman is the man of integrity that I believe him to be and that people in his district believe him to be, that people elsewhere believe him to be, then he will speak out against this. He will act against it.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt I think with the, I exploded what little credibility there was in the Premier's arguments that the growth principle was what led the government to decide to throw out the report of Mr. Justice Higgins and the commission. I have dealt equally with the argument that exploded it, (It is not a difficult job,) of community of interests neither of these principles govern this government, Sir, neither of them are the standards by which that map was drawn. Neither of those is the reason for which thirty-one seats were changed from the fifty-one recommended by Mr. Justice Higgins, the late Mr. Justice Higgins. There is only one real explanation and I have touched on it time and time again, and that is to help the Tories to protect Bren Howard and to protect Jim Reid and to protect Gerry Ottenheimer and Tom Doyle and then to hurt Roberts and to hurt Fred Rowe and to hurt Steve Neary. That is the only principle. Let

them be man enough to come out and admit it. Let them be man enough. What other reasons have they given? What other reason can they give?

So I say to each member, Mr. Speaker, let him stand and make his stand on the question of forty-two versus fifty-one. Then on the greater question of an independent commission, either one believes in it or one does not. One cannot believe in it in half way. One cannot be a little bit pregnant. One either is or is not. One either believes in this principle or one does not. If one believes in it, it is all the way. If it is not, then so be it and let them stand exposed for what they are. Not only men who gerrymandered but men who have gone against their own stated principles to gerrymander. That adding the insult to the injury.

Then, Sir, the Premier has the gall, and I think I have his words correctly; Yes, he said, "The government had received, " and I quote him, "hundreds of protests." Again the report of the second commission. This is the final report. December 14, 1973 report. Well maybe he did but he has not given us evidence of one of them. So I challenge the Premier, and there are little people opposite who will scurry to him to carry the news, so he will hear about it, to produce those reports and to produce those protests.

He referred the other day to a number from the head of Harbour Main, or from the Head of the Bay from the present Harbour Main Area. I do not doubt though that he should table them.

MR. NEARY: Did you notice the Member for Harbour Main going around to try and solicit -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh that is what I was going to say now. The honourable gentleman for Bell Island has made the point. Then I invite the Premier and the junior Member for Harbour Main to say that those protests were not solicited. I invite him to say that.

AH HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, of course, there were. Of course, there were. Sure there where. I could have solicited several thousand as well. Just as there were some protests from Marystown and the Burin Area over the name of the constituency. Of course, there were protests. I invite the government to table those. Then I invite the government to table everything else,

which they received by way of protest and I say there were none. I would like them to table the requests that Bellevue seat be created other than Jim Reid coming whimpering in some day and saying, "Frank boy, I am up the creek anyway but you have to try and save me."

I invite the government to table any other correspondence or documentation in connection with the creation of the seat of Bellevue.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - need a bulldozer.

MR. ROBERTS: I invite them - Old conflict of interest. He has written a new book about how to benefit from his position in government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, sure, a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I mean the statement made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition who obviously got carried away is that the honourable Minister of Rural Development learned how to benefit from his position.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not. I said he has written a new book.

MR. MARSHALL: On how to benefit from his position in government. The innuendo is there and the obvious implication is there. Now the honourable Leader of the Opposition has a propensity to go off into personalities from time to time and we ignore it because we understand the reason for his - we understand his problem but there are certain statements that the man makes that we cannot ignore, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the honourable member to retract any imputation against the honourable Minister of Rural Development. There was an imputation definitely there.

MR. SPEAKER: There are a couple of points I would like to make. I think it is usually the custom that when one honourable member is referring to another that he does not refer to him by name but rather by the constituency which he represents. I think the point of order raised by the member was well taken. I think the Leader of the Opposition did infer that the honourable Minister of Rural Development who would seemingly gain as a result of his office and I think that is sort of questioning the integrity of the member. I would invite him to retract that particular statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, all I can do is as Your Honour requests and withdraw the

statement and we will let the people of Bellevue or Trinity South judge for themselves. I am only reflecting what hundreds of people out there are saying.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I invite the government as well to table all the correspondence they have had that said we should change the Labrador boundaries.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! The Premier said there were hundreds. He trotted this out to justify, to attempt to justify the gerrymandering. So, table them, produce them. There is nothing confidential or secret about them. Table them and I say they will not be tabled and I will say why they will not be tabled because there were none and there are none. Oral requests, I will bet there have not been fifty people other than Tory hacks and ward heelers say a word to the Premier about redistribution. I will bet there have not been twenty people other than Tory hacks and ward heelers make any representation, oral or written outside the Harbour Main area and the Burin-Marystown one subsequent to the report of the commission, the final report.

So I say to the government, I challenge them. The Premier has made the statement. Now let him prove it and if not we will know him for what he is and he will have been convicted by his own words. Then too, Sir, the Premier, that man of principle, told us that because of these protests and because there were no hearings on the report of December 14, 1973, no public hearings on that, the government were going to change it. That was their justification in part, no hearings on this, no select committee, no publication. The government gave notice in January last, eleven, ten months ago that there would be a redistribution bill and it is only now at the end of November that we see it. Why are there not hearings on this if the Premier is so concerned with public hearings?

I will tell you why there were no hearings on the report, the final report: because the legislation said you have a preliminary report, you have hearings and you make a final report. That is why Mr. Justice Higgins and he deserves better than to have the Premier attack by implication, him and the other members of that commission in connection with this report.

Of course there were no hearings on it. That is why the final report was the final report. The Premier then comes slipping and sliding in and says, "Well, we got protest." He does not produce a one. He refers to a few from Harbour Main district which I invite him to say, and were not solicited. I invite him to be wary and careful when he says that. Whatever the answer is I want to be assured they were not solicited. The ones from Burin and Marystown dealt with the question of name, not with the question of substance. I invite the gentleman from Placentia West to tell us about those and any others of which he may have knowledge.

Then, too, I invite all honourable gentlemen opposite whom have any letters about redistribution to table them. Let the people of Newfoundland see. I will predict, Sir, that there will not be twenty-three letters and telegrams tabled because there are not and there were not any. It is just an airy-fairy excuse that the Premier has brought up to attempt to justify the unjustifiable. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful.

Gerrymandering has been a fact of life in politics.

I thought we had ended that era in Newfoundland. Apparently, we have not. In this as in so many other fields, the Tories took the people up on the mountain and showed them the green and pleasant valleys below. When the people followed the Tories down from that mountain into the green and pleasant valleys, it turned out that they were filled with slag and dust heaps. The people of Newfoundland had been betrayed again by the Tories, misled, fooled, lied to, tricked, deceived. That is the way the Tories deal with the people of this province. They are convicted out of this one as if they pleaded guilty before the Supreme Court. It is a sad and a sordid performance.

I do not care, Mr. Speaker, how the Tories cut up the map. I really do not. If the people of Newfoundland decide to put the Tories out and put the Liberals in, it does not matter how the seats are carved out. It is just as when the people of Newfoundland, in their wisdom, decided that we will put the Liberals out and we will put the Tories in, it did not matter how those seats were decided and distributed. The will of the people will prevail and I do not care how the Tories do it. I do not care how the Tories carve it up or gerrymander it. I say now that unless my party gets the support, the plurality of the voters in the next election, then we do not deserve to be the government and we shall not be the government. This will not save the Tories, this mess of coloured potage. It will only hasten; it will only hasten

their decline because fair-minded people all over Newfoundland have looked at this. I would like to see the Minister of Health talk on it, a man of honour and integrity. How did he square it with his conscience? How did he square what the Minister of Justice said here two years ago with what is being done today? I would like to hear him because he is part and parcel of it and so is the Minister of Finance, a man who parades his principles like they were a preambulator before him. Let him stand and tell us how, when the Minister of Justice says, "Ah, we will have no more gerrymandering, we will have an independent commission" - The Minister of Energy, is he going to be a scurvy and hide or is he going to stand and say where he stands? Has he accepted this? He is still in the cabinet. He did not leave the cabinet before and he will not leave this one. Mr. Speaker, it is a shameful expedition by all of them. If they are going to gerrymander, let them at least come in and be straight about it and say, here is what we are doing, if you like it, fine and if you do not, that is fine too, but to pretend, to pretend to be men of principle.

The Minister of Health now will tell us; he is a man of principle. He will reveal himself. He will have to vote for or against this legislation. Let him square it now. Either he is part of it or he is not.

The gentleman from Grand Falls, let us hear him talk. He can talk about boundaries if he should want. He can accuse me of being against Grand Falls if he should want to. It is not true. If he should want to say it, he can. Let him then come square on to the principle, forty-two or fifty-one, an even greater principle, the infinitely greater principle. Independent commission or no, that is the issue we are deciding.

The gentleman from Bonavista South, a man who hopes to have a political future in this province and who works hard in the hope that he will achieve that, let him stand on principle. He is fond of telling us of his principles. Let him exhibit them; let him show a little courage, He has never hesitated to criticize his own party. He has even got his own party criticizing him now.

December 3, 1974

Tape no. 1853

Tape no. 3

The Member for Harbour Grace has been told off as the shadow member for Bonavista South, I guess, is the way to put it. Let him stand and say what he thinks of this.

I will not ask the Member for Bay de Verde. That would tax him too much, asking him to make a speech in the House.

The Member for Port de Grave, let him stand with his usual

eloquence and his force and his vigor and tell us whether he approves of this or not. I do not expect anything from the gentleman from Placentia West so I shall not bother asking him.

The gentleman from Trinity North, let him come to his feet, a man who has got a great concern, he tells us, with issues of principle and morality and the proper conduct in public life. How does he square what the Minister of Justice said with what is being done now. The Premier could not explain it.

In the course of my few brief remarks these two days, I have dealt with and exploded every single argument the Premier advanced. The growth principle - no more growth than a dwarf. The community of interest - the great community of interest between Harbour Main and Bell Island, between Nain and Mary's Harbour, between Englee and La Scie, the community of interest principle. There is no more principle than it is cheese.

The protests - I challenge the Premier. My friend from St. Barbe North asked the House Leader today and got a usual insolent, arrogant answer from that insolent and arrogant gentleman. There are no protests other than whatever has come in from the Head of the Bay and from Burin, Marystown and maybe the odd other one. I would like to see them tabled. It is easy enough to prove me wrong, Mr. Speaker. They have got them in their files. Let them haul them out and table the Redistribution File. They can show me wrong on that point quite easily.

I venture to say there will be no tabling of documents. There will be no tabling of letters. There were not twenty oral communications other than maybe the odd Tory ward heeler of one sort or another greasing in, looking for his rewards, just or otherwise. They cannot square it, Sir. It is an arrogant, rampant gerrymander by a group of men who held themselves out to the people of this province in election campaigns and in this House as being above that, as being men who would stand on principle, men who would fight for what they knew to be right.

It will not harm the chances of my party. That is not my concern. I am not the least bit concerned about that. It did not

harm us in Hermitage or it did not harm us in Gander, Twillingate or in Bonavista, Trinity, Conception or in Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador, all the other places which the Tories have lost since March, 1972. They even lost Labrador South. We did not win it. The gentleman from Labrador South was the electorate in opposition to a candidate from this party as well as a Tory. The Tory came third, six per cent. Sure Ed Kearsy paid more people than voted for him. There were more people on his payroll working for him than went to the polls and marked an 'x' for him, the Tory candidate, Mr. Kearsy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Tell what you did in the Leadership Convention.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, I do not have to. That is the Tory Leadership Convention that does that.

To have the honourable gentleman talk about principles, is a little like having an alcoholic talk about temperates, his acquaintance is somewhat limited.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you run any slates in the Leadership Convention?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course I ran slates, Sir, and I shall do it again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, for the honourable gentleman from Placentia West to talk about principles is like an alcoholic pleading for temperance. His acquaintance is nodding. He acquaintance is very nodding. If he wishes to speak in this debate, Sir, let him get to his feet and let him tell us, not his usual little legalistic whimperings and whinings and maneuverings, let him tell us, Mr. Speaker, how he squares with what his colleague and friend and mentor, the Minister of Justice, said. Maybe I should read it again for the honourable gentleman.

The honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, let him say how he explains this. Mr. Speaker, let him explain it. The honourable gentleman from Placentia West, Sir, has no concept for order or for principles. Let him, when he wants to speak in the House, speak. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, let him follow the rules of this House. He is forever telling us how good the rules are.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking on the topic, Sir. The honourable gentleman is intruding himself and thus I am forced to deal with him just as one

would deal with a particularly pesty black fly that is carrying all sort of odoriferous diseases. So, one in turn must deal with the honourable gentleman.

Let him tell us how he stands on the principle of this compared to the principle of the impartial commission. Let him tell us. I will be interested. Of all the tortuous wanderings of the honourable gentleman's mind, these will be a new high. I will listen with great interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude, if the honourable gentleman would allow. Then perhaps he will speak. We will have the pleasure of heading him. We will have the pleasure of hearing other honourable gentlemen. The Minister of Fisheries who has returned to the House after a brief absence - I hope he will speak. I want him to tell me how the principle of an independent commission is squared with this.

The gentleman for St. John's South has returned to the Chamber, perhaps momentarily. I hope he too will speak. They can twist and turn about boundaries here or boundaries there but the fact remains this commission followed the legislation to the letter and made their report and this government have chosen for no apparent reason to throw it out. There is a reason, of course, it is partisan and it is political and these are the men who would never descend to that.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is not with how the boundaries are drawn. We have no real say over that. The nine of us on this side of the House will not prevail against the thirty-two on that side. The faith of this redistribution measure will be determined in the Tory caucus and in the Tory cabinet. If they feel that they are going to put it through as they now feel, then they will put it through. If they decide to make the Funk Islands a district that will be so. They have the majority to their backs, they can do as they would but they do have the majority to their backs only until another election, then the people of Newfoundland will decide.

My concern is with the harm that is being done to public life by a group of men who stand for one thing, who stand for a great reform and march right up to the brink of it. Then when the time comes to implement that reform they back right off. They walk away from it. They turn their backs. They try to weasel out. That is what concerns me, Sir, I thought that we had come in Newfoundland to the day when there would be no more gerrymandering. We have not come to that day, Sir. We are back where we were ten years ago or twenty years ago or one hundred years ago. The Tories have brought us back there. The Tories have done it. It is no argument to say that the Liberals might have done it in the past. Sure. In the past the Tory Government in 1924 took the taxes, the import taxes and put them on butter, put a duty on butter. Then a member of that Tory Government started a butter factory. I mean that was - then they put the duties on cordage, and then the Prime Minister started a cordage factory or owned a cordage factory.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I remember it vividly, I was there. It was only 1924. I remember it vividly. Vividly. Just as the honourable gentleman holds me

responsible for everything this party did from 1949 on. I was eight years old when the first government of this province was formed after Confederation. I am personally responsible for everything it did. I am directly responsible for the fact that, should we say, that Mr. Ted Russell resigned in 1951. Full and complete responsibility for that.

The Tories, Sir, have taken this province back. I hope that honourable gentlemen opposite will speak out against this. I hope and expect the gentleman for St. John's South to do that, the gentleman for Placentia East to do it. I hope the gentleman for Labrador West will stand up for Labrador. Let them be men. This is not the normal partisan issue. It should not be. That is what we are ending in this province. Let us see if they have some courage. I hope the gentleman for Bonavista South will speak. Let us see if he has the courage, he tells us about so often, his willingness to stand and fight without regard to party line. Let us see what interest they put ahead - party or province.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to change this resolution, to send it back to the committee, to the commission with instructions to bring in forty-two seats. I ask the government to reaffirm their commitment, our commitment to the idea of an impartial commission setting those boundaries. Then when that is done, it can be done in six weeks or a month, lots of time for an election come spring, then let us have the general election and let the people of Newfoundland decide and whatever the result that will be the result that counts and that will be the result that should count. Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on this piece of legislation now before the House of Assembly. In listening to the rather eloquent speech of the Leader of the Opposition, I do agree on one point, I agree that all members of the legislature should have their say on this bill. Agree or disagree but in particular with the boundaries because the act to set up fifty-one seats in this province has already been dealt with by this legislature. It was dealt with in March, 1973. If my memory serves me correctly, it was voted on unanimously and accepted by this House of Assembly.

The fact now that the Opposition are coming back and saying, we do not want fifty-one seats, I agree, is a right of the Opposition to change their minds. In listening to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, I have not heard any argument as to why he will now refuse to accept fifty-one seats when he did in March.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: I have not yet heard an argument to the effect as to why in March the Opposition voted for fifty-one seats and now they only want fifty-one.

The cry that we have heard the last two days, is the cry that

the government are out to get me, is out to get the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his own district. Is out to get the party whip for Bell Island and others. That to me is a very, very limp argument.

The fact is that we did pass legislation Act No. 44, it was passed by this legislation back in March, 1973. We voted for fifty-one seats, fifty-one individual members in this legislature and we are standing by that law we passed. If we are going to make a law one month and change the law the next month, the same law, how are we going to look into the eyes of the people of this province. It is rather idiotic.

AM. PON. MEMBER: If we do it as it is here.

MR. MORGAN: We are changing legislation that was passed maybe ten years ago but not seven months ago. Seven months ago, we did not bring in legislation. Also the government would look rather silly in the eyes of the public if we brought in legislation one month and changed the same legislation the next month, after all members of the House of Assembly voting in favour of it. Unanimously voting in favour of it. How silly in the eyes of the public would they look, as potential or so-called leaders, in the public life of this province. We would look silly.

The fact is, we have a law that was passed in March and we are now dealing with the redistribution boundaries. The way the boundaries are drawn up. All we have heard are charges and charges and over charges of perjury. The government have made changes to the boundaries to get the opposition members.

I am not going to deal with the overall fifty-one districts but I am going to deal with districts that I am familiar with and that is the Bonavista Bay Area. Under the proposed electoral boundaries commission or the boundaries that were proposed by the commission report, they were talking about having three or two and a-half districts in Bonavista Bay. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned there were no objections to these boundaries. I have one in my hand right now. It is not even from my own district but it is from Bonavista Bay. It is from the residents on the Island of St. Brendan's, which is in Bonavista North. They were opposed to the idea of being included in the District of Bonavista North under the proposed boundaries as set down by the commission.

The reason why is because they are part and parcel of all the development that is taking place in the Eastport Peninsula . They are part of the Eastport Development Committee, with representation on that committee. Their only connection to the mainland of the province is into Brunside on the Eastport Peninsula. They have no connection whatsoever whether by development or community involvement with Bonavista North which would then according to the boundaries commission that went from Gambo north to Cape Freels.

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

MR. MORGAN: No, you will have your chance to speak after.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact that these people did not want to be part of that district, the fact is now in the proposed boundaries as we have before us in the House of Assembly that they will now be included in the District of Terra Nova, which will encompass the Eastport Peninsula, taking in all the communities on the Eastport Peninsula and rightly so. This is their request.

The fact is that now in Bonavista Bay, under the boundaries we have now before the House of Assembly, we will now have three members in the House of Assembly. I am not going to say whether I like the District of White Bay, Bale Verte or not or the District of Fortune or Hermitage because I am not too familiar with these areas. That is why.

I think the individual members of this House of Assembly who are familiar, whether it be on this side of the House of Assembly or on the other, should express their views with regards to areas that are well-known or the areas they well know themselves, that they are familiar with.

So, therefore, in Bonavista Bay, I am in full agreement with this redistribution boundaries now before the House of Assembly. For the main reason, it is going to give one of the larger bays and larger growth areas of the province, the Bay of Bonavista Bay, three members in this legislature. They will now have a man from the north side of the bay in this House of Assembly. There will be a man here from the central part of Bonavista Bay, known as Terra Nova and there will be a representative here from Bonavista South, the south side of Bonavista Bay whereas before, under the commission's report, we would have had a district to take in Bonavista North, basically the same as what it is now with one minor change. We would have a District of Terra Nova which would have encompassed the central part of Bonavista Bay but over half of Bonavista South which did not make sense.

If we are going to have three districts in Bonavista Bay, we could not have had them and three members in legislature for the area, under the old or the previous report. Now, with the changes, we are going to have three separate districts in that one bay.

As a man who is familiar with the Bonavista Bay Area, having grown up out there, I think I am in a position to speak with regard to these three districts. So, I am in full agreement with the present boundaries as they are now before the legislature with regard to the three districts in Bonavista Bay. I will vote accordingly.

I think it is the obligation and the duty of every member of this legislature, who has any reservations or any questions at all with

regards to the boundaries, to express his views on areas in which he is familiar with.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are my few remarks. I do take strong exception, again, before closing, to the remarks made by the Opposition Leader, that the proposed boundaries now before the legislature are only drawn up to get the opposition members. That is a stupid statement. The districts are based on even population and they are based on the fact that we have a law asking for fifty-one seats in this assembly. If that law was not passed before, maybe we could all get involved in debate whether we should have fifty-one seats or not. We should not change because the public seems to now indicate that maybe we should not have fifty-one seats.

The fact is we should have taken these points into consideration back in March when we all unanimously supported that bill then. The fact that we have a law asking for fifty-one seats and the fact that we now have the boundaries of these seats before us in the legislature, I think, we should all look at our respective areas and vote accordingly. That is what this member of the legislature is going to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few comments on this bill. First of all, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the few pathetic and pitiful comments of the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to ask where the Leader of the Opposition gets the entitlement to point over to this side of the House and start questioning the principles of honourable members on this side of the House. What makes the honourable Leader of the Opposition the great expert on principle?

We saw a circus, Mr. Speaker, recently, run off by the other party in attempting to select - not select a leader, Mr. Speaker, but select a loser, I think, is the common attitude that has gone around. They were trying to select a loser

out of the four that were running. Mr. Speaker, we had at the beginning of the circus, that roller derby, (I think one of my colleagues described it as a roller derby, with gargoyles as participants) - Mr. Speaker, we saw the executive of the members on the other side of the House, their executive, lay down certain rules as matters of principle that should be followed in running this circus, this leadership circus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: This is all very interesting, Sir, and I would like to hear what the minister has to say, but I am afraid, Sir, it is not relevant to the topic under discussion at all.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is crucial to this debate. We have sat for two days and have been subjected and berated by the honourable vandals opposite and now, Mr. Speaker -

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

The honourable member has seen the folly of his ways, the unfortunate choice of words and has withdrawn. I must say that the point of order raised by the Member for Bell Island is also correct. I was hoping that the honourable member would make his points relevant or draw them together but he seems to be straying further from that course. I have to call upon him to make relevant remarks.

MR. BARRY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that we have been berated for two days about the lack of principle involved in modifying the commission's report. I am just inquiring just where do we have the Leader of the Opposition being the great expert on matters of principle. I am giving an example, Mr. Speaker. I think the people of Newfoundland are entitled to have it put to them as to whether or not the Leader of the Opposition is the great expert on principle in this House or, in fact, in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out that in the very important episode, as far as these members on the other side of the House were concerned - they are not honourable vandals, Mr. Speaker - they had certain rules laid down, certain principles laid down for running off this circus that they had recently. Within a matter of days, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: We had -

MR. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down, while I am raising a point of order please. Learn the rules of the House, you ignoramus, ignorant of the rules of the House.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member who is speaking, Sir, is wandering again. He is not relevant to the matter under debate, Sir. He is ignoring a ruling that Your Honour gave there a few moments ago. I would suggest, Sir, that if the minister does not follow Your Honour's ruling that he be named.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

The honourable member is saying the same things he said before. I see no difference in them. If he is going to make a point, he will have to make it quite quickly and move on rather than having a long preamble to an irrelevant point, or having an irrelevant preamble to a relevant point.

MR. BARRY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think the point is made that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ignored the principles of his party and now looks over at this side of the House - Mr. Speaker, we have gone on for two days. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the P.C. ganders is it not? If it were relevant for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to discuss principle, then why is it not relevant for an honourable member on this side of the House to discuss principles?

December 3, 1974

Tape no. 1858

Page 3

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I will match my principles against those members on the other side of the House any day at all.

I do not have to sit here for two days and listen to a lecture by a pathetic and a pitiful Leader of Losers.

MR. NEARY: He can always leave and go to Ottawa, you know, and look for handouts.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we had the honourable crowd opposite voting for the principle, for the principle, Mr. Speaker, contained in the legislation passed by this honourable House that there should be increased representation, Mr. Speaker, that there should be an increase from forty-two to fifty-one members. A principle, Mr. Speaker. What do we have now? Not just the honourable Leader of the Opposition saying, "Oh, I have changed my mind." Where is his principle? Where is his principle gone now? But we do not only have the Leader of the Opposition, we have the rest following meekly and docilely along following after him like a crowd of sheep, Mr. Speaker, sheep. They have all changed their minds. What a coincidence! Suddenly! Instantaneously! Overnight! They have all changed their minds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask where are their principles now? Where are their principles now?

Mr. Speaker, I am nauseated after two days of garbage being spued on the floor of this honourable House, Mr. Speaker. I am nauseated.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I will be getting my Gravel before I am hitting the tickle tonight, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in standing up in this House and saying that I am for the principle of increased representation for additional members for this honourable House. I would ask the honourable members opposite, and I would ask the media because this is being raised and criticized somewhat in the media, and I would ask anybody who says that additional members are not - not a matter of them being necessary, Mr. Speaker, ask whether they are desirable.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask me?

MR. BARRY: Because on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, you have the honourable members opposite, you have members of the media saying that there should be

more contact with constituents. That there should be easier access by all the people of the province to the government. That, for example, there is a need for an ombudsman to ensure that the personal problems of constituents are looked after and the personal problems of the people of Newfoundland are looked after. Mr. Speaker, how can that be consistent with the honourable crowd opposite saying that it is not desirable to improve representation by increasing the number of MHAs.

You have at the present time forty-two members and a population of what? 549,000?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: What is the average number of people per MHA at forty-two members? It would be in excess of 10,000, it would be close to 15,000, 14,000 approximately. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you decrease the number of constituents per MHA that has to make the representation better. If the MHAs are going to do their jobs. I can understand the honourable members opposite not knowing what a member is suppose to be doing to look after his constituents. I can understand why they could say, no, it is not going to improve conditions for my constituents, if we have an increased number of MHAs. That is because, Mr. Speaker, they do not know what they are suppose to be doing as MHAs. If they knew, Mr. Speaker, they would realize that the MHA, I would submit, is the most important contact, the most important intermediary between the people of the province and this government of any single individual. If the honourable members opposite were doing their jobs, Mr. Speaker, they would realize that they have a responsibility to consider personal problems, for example, of their constituents. They have to enable the little guy when he gets caught in the red tape of the machinery of government and start getting hurt. They have to be able to step in, if they are doing their jobs as MHAs.

MR. NEARY: We get plenty of calls from -

MR. BARRY: They have the responsibility to step in and look after that little guy, Mr. Speaker who is getting squeezed by the big government machinery. They have the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to act as ombudsman

And what you are doing here, Mr. Speaker, and what we did when we voted for this bill that is before this honourable House and what we will be doing when we vote to support this resolution, is to increase the number of MHAs. We, Mr. Speaker, if the members do their jobs, will be creating nine additional ombudsman for this province. Nine, Mr. Speaker. Not just one. There will be a formal ombudsman post set up, Mr. Speaker, but by a single stroke in supporting this resolution there will be an additional nine ombudsman created. That is, Mr. Speaker, provided that people of Newfoundland do not make the mistake of electing individuals who do not know how to or who refuse to represent them the way they should as MHAs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend here for Bell Island who will be going across the tickle with me and I do not want him to throw me overboard on the way, maybe he has a bit of concern for the little man although, I think it is for the little man in abstraction rather than for the personal individual, I do not know. Maybe he does do his job. I have my doubts about him, Mr. Speaker, let me just put it that way. But let me say that the honourable members on the other side of the House if they say that this increase in the number of MHAs is not desirable then I submit that they better go back and reassess their role as MHAs. They better ask themselves - are they saying that they do not have anything to do with the present time? Are they saying that they can get down to cover every problem in their constituency at the present time? Are they saying that if they had fewer constituents that they would not be able to give better coverage to those constituents, better service to those constituents, that they would not be able to better look after the problems of their constituency. Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to submit, that it is not just the esoteric academic problems of government policy and so on that the MHA has to concern himself with. He has to concern himself with the personal problems of individuals who are, as I said, caught up in the red tape of government. They have to be able, Mr. Speaker, at times to assist individuals, to give representation to individuals if they are representing outlying areas, to assist them possibly in obtaining employment. Mr. Speaker, that is not a matter of throwing, strewing out patronage the way it has been done in the past. That, Mr. Speaker, is assisting individuals who because they are out

in an isolated area perhaps do not have the same opportunities to come in and make themselves known or to get their character, their references put across to a prospective employer. An MHA can help there, Mr. Speaker.

An MHA can help in many ways to assist individuals with their personal problems as well as with problems they encounter with government. I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge and defy any member here to say that these constituents will not have better representation, if there are additional MHAs in this House.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I think, Mr. Speaker, we can lay that one to rest. I do not think the honourable members now can stand on that principle - that all of a sudden they swung 180 degrees on. One minute they are saying, "Yes we support the idea of additional MHAs," and the next minute, in unison, Mr. Speaker, struck by a sudden revelation, a lightning bolt from above, in unison, they say, "No, we have enough members. It will not help constituents to increase the members." Mr. Speaker, let us have no more of that nonsense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could just refer briefly to my District of Placentia West and the changes that the present resolution will have for that district. The initial report brought in or laid down by the commission before they held their hearings around the province, one of which hearing was in

Marystown. Mr. Speaker, initially the commission had the smaller communities outside the Marystown area, they had them in with Fortune Bay, with other smaller communities in Fortune Bay. I just give this as an example of how members of a commission although well-meaning and although very capable and confident of doing the job for which they are assigned, that just because of the immense number of factors that influence this type of decision, they cannot be expected to become aware of them in the short time they have for their task and it is easier for them to assume that because there is a certain geographical affinity therefore there is an affinity in other ways, that therefore there is a community of interest.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to my own particular district, a good example is how these four communities, communities such as Brookside, Mr. Speaker, Boat Harbour, Parkers Cove, Bain Harbour, Rushoon, Red Harbour, to mention just a few of them, Mr. Speaker, that would have gone with the communities in Fortune Bay. Their entire life, Mr. Speaker, is directed towards the Marystown area. They have more to do with the Marystown area than they do with Fortune Bay.

Now, this was one example, Mr. Speaker, that was caught by my making and others making representation to the commission once this initial report was filed, making representation to them when they had their public hearings. Mr. Speaker, they subsequently changed and modified that.

Mr. Speaker, you had other situations where either they changed and deviated from the initial report because of some representation and this merely goes to show that they were listening to the representation made before them or, Mr. Speaker, for one reason or other the lack of community of interest was not caught prior to the hearing held by the commission.

Mr. Speaker, you have a situation where anybody who saw the initial report and was satisfied with it did not feel any obligation or any purpose in appearing for a hearing, in preparing a brief to present to the commission. Anybody who was satisfied with the reports stayed at home. It was individuals, Mr. Speaker, who were discontented with the original report who were publicized in the papers, who went and made representation.

But then what did you have happen? You had a final report that reflected the views of the individuals who had gone and appeared before the commission. Mr. Speaker, they had significant groups around the Province who said, "Look, I was satisfied with the initial report but the final report has deviated from this. When do I get my chance to have my say on the final report," and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that here is where they get their opportunity to have their say on the final report because as is clearly set out in the legislation -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shame!

MR. BARRY: As is clearly set out in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, this commission was bringing in recommendations to this honourable House, recommendations, Mr. Speaker. As is clearly set out in the legislation, it is within the confidence of this honourable House to modify those recommendations.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that the change in the final report with respect to my district, the change whereas the district that I now represent or a great part of it would end up in the final report as being named Burin, Mr. Speaker. I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the concern of the good people in Burin, wanting to see that historic name preserved in the name of the district. Still, Mr. Speaker, my principle that I put before the commission and which I submit is a proper one, is that, not just with respect to the district of Placentia West or Burin but with respect to every district in the Province, that the districts should not be named after a single town in that district because there is a danger appearing to give undue importance to that particular area of the

district. Now, Mr. Speaker, that principle -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: One second! One second! That principle, Mr. Speaker, was not accepted by the commission. I accept that. It was not accepted by the commission for the province as a whole. However, Mr. Speaker, I still believe in that principle and that is why I recommended to the honourable Minister of Justice, to my colleagues in cabinet, that the name of the district should be Burin-Placentia West. So that there is no particular part of the district that is being given undue importance we have the Town of Burin, the name of Burin contained in the name of the district. Still we have recognition of the smaller communities along the west shore of Placentia Bay. We have recognition that these are in the district and are every bit as important as the urban areas of the district such as Burin and Marystown.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no compunction, I have no hesitation. If the honourable members want to call that gerrymandering, Mr. Speaker, then I take the blame. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the people of the good district of Burin-Placentia West are going to hold it against me if I happen to run in that district next time around.

MR. THOMS: The honourable minister may take the blame but he will never take the district.

MR. BARRY: That I brought in a name for that district that was more representative of all the constituents in the district. So, Mr. Speaker, this nonsense that we have heard from the other side of the House for two days, let us put it out of our minds. It never happened.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: Let us try and forget about it. It is like a nightmare, it will keep recurring once in awhile but on the whole let us forget about it. Let us ignore it.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately because of the top population criteria laid down in the legislation, part of the existing District of Placentia West, namely the Swift Current, Garden Cove, North Harbour Area, that will go in with - is it Bellevue? The blue? I cannot see from here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: Yes, that is right. That is Bellevue.

MR. BARRY: In with the great and glorious District of Bellevue.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we could not retain all parts of the existing District of Placentia West but again, as I said, the population criteria laid down made this impossible. But, Mr. Speaker, as I say, we now have a district that any member in this honourable House would be proud to represent. At the present time I represent a goodly portion of it. I have listened to my constituents and their views as to the commission's report. The only objections that I got, Mr. Speaker, and they were not really objections, they were views that the name should be as representative as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my constituents, I have incorporated my views in the positions I presented to my colleagues in cabinet and I am presenting these views to this honourable House here today. If the honourable members want to call that gerrymandering I submit that they are like the little boy who called wolf, once too often. They turn from the sheep that they have shown themselves to be in swaying from the principles that they voted for when this legislation recently came before the House,

MR. DOODY: Sheep in sheep's clothing.

MR. BARRY: As the honourable Junior Member from Harbour Main pointed out they are sheeps in sheep's clothing.

MR. DOODY: I did not -

MR. BARRY: Sheep in sheep's clothing. Is that better?

MR. DOODY: That is better.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unparliamentary.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, briefly in summary I challenge the honourable members to explain how they can have their principles one day as represented in the bill that they voted for and then the next day they can say; "I have changed my mind. After voting for a bill in this honourable House I have changed my mind. I can no longer support the concept of expanding

the number of M.H.A.'s. Where are they retaining their principles there, Mr. Speaker? I have to challenge them, defy them, to explain why there would not be better representation if the number of M.H.A.'s were increased. Explain that for me will you in baby talk, if you would?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: The honourable member has coined that phrase.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable members of this House that the good constituents in the future District of Burin, Placentia West, will accept the recommendations contained in this resolution. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Thank you very much.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Would the minister permit a question before he sits down?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

Before going any further, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the very distinguished gathering in the Speaker's Gallery to the rear: the Ministers of Industrial Development from all the provinces of Canada, along with officials from their department.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the House of Assembly, I welcome you to the galleries and I trust that your visit here will be interesting and informative. By the look of the weather, it will probably be longer than you anticipated.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the minister was suggesting that adding on nine members should make for better representation in various districts throughout the province. I was wondering if the minister could suggest how this is going to happen in the Straits of Belle Isle District and the Baie Verte-White Bay District and the St. Barbe District that have been increased in size and they are rural districts?

MB. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I contend still that there are a fewer number of constituents per M.H.A. on the average throughout the province and this will mean that each constituent can get more individual attention. There will be more M.H.A.'s able to give greater, individual attention to the problems of their constituents.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true for all.

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

MR. CROSBIE: If there is nobody further speaking, Mr. Speaker, we may as well - I move that the vote be taken unless somebody else wants to speak.

MR. NEARY: Oh, sit down!

MR. CROSBIE: Are you going to speak?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Bully boy!

MR. CROSBIE: Come on tongue.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The honourable gentleman has now spoken in the debate, has he not? There are other speakers who want to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, do not do that to me.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean I want a ruling on it. I would rather hear a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: To that point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, nobody is rising to speak on the resolution and it should now be put to a vote.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: There is a point of order before the House first of all.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Is the House ready for the vote?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is a point of order before you.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I suggest that the honourable gentleman rose on a point of order.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour, I adjourn the debate, due to the lateness of the hour for continuity of speech. I rise to move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The motion is that this debate do now adjourn. Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." In my opinion the "nay's" have it.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation whatsoever in changing our mind with respect to the idea of not supporting this business of not having fifty-one seats in this Legislature. I would like to remind the honourable House, Sir, that it is not a crime to change one's mind. We did support the bill in order to set up a commission for drawing up the electoral boundaries in this province. We supported the concept of re-distribution.

SOME HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we did not support the concept of fifty-one seats, exactly, in this Legislature. As a matter of fact, in debate, we suggested that the commission be given some latitude with respect to the number of seats they should draw up when they made their report. We felt that the setting up or the naming or the

suggesting that there should be exactly fifty-one seats, confined and boxed in the commission in making up their report. Mr. Speaker, what we did support was the principle of fair and equitable and impartial distribution of seats in this Province based on a commission report. That is the key word based on the commission report. We supported the principle of setting up a commission and we supported the principle of one man, one vote with the tolerance of plus or minus twenty-five per cent which would have net an average population for a district of approximately 10,000 people, say we will round it off, 10,000 people with a lower tolerance of 7,500 and upper level of 12,500. We believe in that formula, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that rural parts of this Province deserve to have smaller districts so that they can be as fairly represented as the urban districts in our Province.

We believe in the principle, Mr. Speaker, where in this Province each district would have fair and equal representation and with the coloured mess that we have over there on that map at the present time, we simply do not have each district having equal representation in this House. My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, went on at some length and some detail to explain the gross unfairness of certain districts in this Province.

Sir, how can we have fairness of representation or equality of representation when you have a Baie Verte-White Bay District with a population of over 12,000 people and the Straits of Bell Isle District with a population of almost 12,000. The two most remote -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Any chance of being heard, Mr. Speaker?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to raise a point of order, we can contend with it. The point that I am trying to make, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since the member for St. Barbe North is challenging the comment just made by the junior member for

Harbour Main -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He was not standing up.

MR. CROSBIE: The point is that he has already spoken in this debate, Mr. Speaker. He spoke once when he moved that the debate be adjourned and then he sat down and collapsed. He sat down and collapsed and then he got up again two or three minutes later. There had been a vote on that motion. So he spoke and is now speaking twice which is not permitted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The matter referred to by the honourable Minister of Fisheries I think was dealt with while I was not in the Chair. I understand the Speaker at the time did recognize the honourable member for St. Barbe North. So I shall recognize him as well.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: He really had me worried, Mr. Speaker. The point you should have raised is that the honourable the Minister of Fisheries has been in this House long enough on both sides of the House, to realize that you should raise a point of order at the time it should have been raised to start off with, not fifteen minutes later.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am trying to make is that we supported the principle of setting up a commission based on approximately 10,000 population with a tolerance, with twenty-five per cent on either side. The more important thing is that we agree with the principle of equal representation, fair representation for every district in this Province. The only way that this can be achieved is that the more remote districts, the more isolated districts, the more rural districts should tend towards 7,500 population and the more urban districts and the districts closer to the capital should tend towards 12,500 in population. That is only reasonable and it is very sensible.

We have a situation here, Mr. Speaker, (while I was being interrupted I was

trying to make the point where the two most remote districts on the island part of our province, Baie Verte, White Bay with a population of over 12,000 and the Straits of Belle Isle District with a population of almost 12,000, compare with Grand Falls that has a town council and has a population of 8,000 people. Gander, a town with a concentrated population - twenty minutes from town, via EPA - 9,000 population. Mount Pearl, just across the way, 9,500 in population.

Now, how can anybody in their right mind suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this can give us equality of representation as far as these districts are concerned. Mr. Speaker, certain honourable members on the other side said that we changed our minds and they criticized us for changing our minds with respect to the fifty-one seats. Well, number one, there is no crime against changing your mind. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this was two sessions ago.

Two full sessions ago we debated the bill to set up the commission, two session ago. Mr. Speaker, we honestly and we were naive enough to believe on this side, naive enough to believe that the honourable crowd on the other side, Mr. Speaker, might do something in contending with and dealing with the major problems of this province. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the fact that this administration is completely incapable of dealing with the major problems of this province. There are more priorities and greater priorities to be dealt with at this time than dealing with this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, the priorities in this province are the high cost of living -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. THOMS: We are here until next year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: A point of order. The honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North is now dealing with the priorities of this government and I think we should be dealing with the Redistribution Bill alone and ask that he be relevant.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was simply pointing out the fact that the people of this province could not give a tinker's damn about this Redistribution Bill because there

are more important things to be dealt with than this Redistribution Bill at this time and it is the government that calls the order not members on this side. So, if I may be allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With regards to the point of order - the honourable member from Bonavista South rose on a point of order. The rule of relevancy is a rather difficult one for a Speaker to rule on. I feel that the honourable member for St. Barbe North was straying somewhat from the rule of relevancy. I would suggest perhaps, that with regards to this phrase, "Tinker's Damn" that perhaps he should be a little more cautious about his vocabulary as well.

MR. F. ROWE: I assume that was a colloquialism.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate to satisfy the honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the honourable member for St. Barbe North adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock in the afternoon and that the House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising now adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1974 at three of the clock.