

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, APRIL 2, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

I would like to welcome to the galleries this afternoon a delegation from the Glovertown Town Council. The delegation is made up of the Mayor, Mrs. Irene McGinn, two councillors, Mr. John Gardner and Mr. Gerald Hounsell, and the Town Manager, Mr. Avalon Sparkes. I know hon. members join me in welcoming this delegation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: a bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act" (Bill No.); a bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Court Act" (Bill No.); a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies In Provincial Legislation That May Be Construed As Discrimination" (Bill No.).

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a motion for "An Act Respecting The Garnishment Against Remuneration Of Public Officials Act" (Bill No. 22).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Amusement Rides."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And The Conservation And Use Of Ground-Water" (Bill No.).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province" (Bill No. 16).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public (Mr. Ottenheimer) Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Government Printing" (Bill No.).

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Premier.

During the Premier's leadership campaign there were certain statements made regarding Petrocan and its involvement in this Province. I have seen various published reports on what is going on there, what Petrocan is going to do, what the government policy seems to be, but it is not altogether clear. Would the hon.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

the Premier tell us exactly what is the situation with regard to Petrocan's involvement in the Province. - I understand that in 1980 they will be taking over Total Eastcan's position, for example - and what the Government's role was in Petrocan's coming into the Province has been? What Government policy generally is on Petrocan coming into the Province for exploration and perhaps operational purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the last three or four months the Total Company of France, which has a subsidiary in Canada, had indicated its agreement with somebody else moving into the consortium, the Eastcan consortium, to take over the operatorship - twenty-five, thirty per cent interest in the consortium.

Gulf Oil Canada and Petro-Canada both made a bid to buy the majority of shares. After consideration by the Board of the consortium, all the companies involved in the consortium agreed and passed a motion, minute, whatever, to accept the Petrocan proposal. Under the oil and gas regulations of Newfoundland there is a stipulation there that says that the Province, through the Minister of Mines and Energy, would have to agree to a change in operatorship of a consortium that was doing work off our shores before it could become law from where we sit. And after considering the matter with all the facts before me, it was clear to us that, number one, Petro-Canada agreed to abide by all the stipulations and regulations and more, and agreed to provide an exploration program next year as large as this year. And in reviewing the Gulf proposal for operatorship, which was turned down by the Board, we found, and in consultation with Gulf, that they had some problems with some of the regulations if they got into an operatorship situation and were not all together specific on whether they could handle or abide by all the regulations and they could not guarantee any exploration activity next year. Given those

April 2, 1979

Tape 634

SD - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: circumstances, one, that the
companies involved on the board all agreed with the Petro-Canada
application; two, that they had, Petro-Canada had agreed to abide by
all the regulations; three, that they would commit themselves to
an exploration program next year

PREMIER PECKFORD: as their share of the amount of money that would be allocated whereas - and all the other companies agreed to their share for next year, too - and Gulf did not, we accepted and agreed to the takeover and in the operator position of Petro-Canada in their application to the Board of the Consortium. That is our involvement, that is what has happened.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: So it would be fair - the Premier could indicate by a simple yes or no to this because it is just a preliminary to my main question - so it is fair to say that the government here, and reasonably so, welcomes Petrocan, which is owned by the Canadian Government, welcomes Petrocan's operations in this Province. The hon. Premier welcomes the operation of Petrocan in the Province; I mean that would be true and reasonable enough. Now the hon. Premier's colleague in Ottawa in the same party takes a position that Petrocan, and the party generally, federally, takes a position that Petrocan ought to be done away with or that Petrocan ought to be sold and become a private enterprise -

MR. S. NEARY: The only one to support him in the Province, by the way.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - right - the Petrocan operations should become either defunct, go out of operation and existence and let Exxon and other private operations assume the field occupied by Petrocan, or they take the position that it should be sold and become a private enterprise. It is very unclear what the federal party to which the hon. Premier belongs wants to do with Petrocan. Petrocan is being welcomed into this Province by the hon. Premier and the government and reasonably so. What difficulties does the Premier see if, for example, it should happen - heaven - Heaven forbid! - that his colleague in Ottawa Mr. Clark, should take over the Government of Canada? Does he see a

MR. W.N. ROWE: difficulty in policy positions with his own colleague with respect to Petrocan? Exactly what is the situation there? Would the Premier elucidate on that?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not involved in establishing policy for any party federally. I am concerned about this Province in the first instance, and I have welcomed Petro-Canada into the Province under the terms and conditions of an operation in a given consortium that are doing off-shore exploration. My position vis-a-vis the federal party, if and when they form the Government of Canada, is one that I will deal with as I find out that the party does become the government and find out what their policy is as it relates to Petro-Canada. I am not going to pre-judge the issue or pre-judge what position the party when it becomes the government will take. So it is an academic, hypothetical question to me to which I am not all concerned about addressing myself at the present moment.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE:

The Premier may characterize

it as academic but to the people of Canada and to the people of Newfoundland it is far from academic. We have a party, one of the major parties in Canada which could become the government, saying that Petrocan should be abolished. We have a Premier of our Province in the same party who welcomes Petrocan, and reasonably so, rightly so, welcomes Petrocan into this Province with open arms. Now if the government is formed and consists of the PC Party in Canada in the next election, we could find ourselves in a very difficult situation with regard to Petrocan. So the public should know now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this Province supports the Federal position of Mr. Clarke or not with regard to Petrocan. I put the question directly. Does the Premier support the position of Mr. Clarke to abolish, do away with in one form or another, Petro-Canada as a publicly owned corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am going

to deal with whatever company does the best for this Province under the terms and conditions. I am not taking any position as it relates to Petro-Canada. Petro-Canada has applied to a consortium that is doing work in this Province and I have reacted in the way that I think is in the best interest of the Province. The Petro-Canada National Oil Company, or the national this or the national that, is not going to get in my way philosophically or practically in providing and seeing that we get the best deal possible for the Province. So it is one that does not concern me all that much and I think the Leader of the Opposition agrees with the approach that the government has taken on this. I will wait and see just exactly what the policy is of the new government in Ottawa after May 22nd. After I am clear on what the policy is of whatever the government is in Ottawa as it relates to Petro-Canada, then I will take a position on it. I am not going to prejudge or conjecture

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 636

AH-2

PREMIER PECKFORD:

on what might or may happen.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

A supplementary. Leader of the Opposition,

MR. W. ROWE:

- final supplementary arising out

of the Premier's answer. By way of preliminary, Sir, I think the Premier should be very concerned about the policy enunciated by his colleague, Mr. Clarke, in Ottawa since we may say, with a fifty-fifty chance or better or less depending on one's point of view, that it is something that is going to have to be dealt with and I would submit, Sir - I ask this by way of a question - does the Premier not feel that he owes it to the people of this Province as Premier, as PC leader, as a man whom I would assume hopes to work along with a PC government in Ottawa should it be elected, the man who apparently supported the Premier in his leadership aspirations much to the chagrin of some other hon. gentlemen, and I mean that very sincerely -

MR. NEARY:

He was probably returning the

compliment because the hon. gentleman was the only one in the Province to support Mr. Clarke.

MR. W. ROWE:

The hon. gentleman supported Mr.

Clarke when Mr. Clarke ran for the leadership. So, Mr. Speaker, the question is far from academic, the question is of utmost importance to the people of this Province. We have divergent views by the Premier of this Province and his Federal leader or his Federal colleague. He is not a leader, he is his Federal

MR. W. ROWE: colleague in the party and
I would ask the Premier once more -

MR. NEARY: He is idle.

MR. W. ROWE: - if the Premier is willing
to indicate to the public of this Province whether he
supports the policies of the man he supported to become
leader and the man who apparently supported him behind
the scenes to become leader of his party and subsequently
Premier of this Province. Do they agree on the policies
enunciated by Mr. Clarke or do they disagree? The
public of this Province have an absolute right to know
that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with
changes in federal policy as it relates to Petro Canada
when those changes in federal policy are known to me, and
not before.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River
a supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: A question to the Premier. We
understand that the oil and gas-or oil is in the future-
and around the corner there may be an economic boom in
this Province, could the Premier not explain to us why Total,
who have the largest share holding, twenty-eight and a half
per cent, as I understand it, in Eastcan, have agreed to give
up their share holdings, also agreed therefore to allow
their acreage now to be turned, over over a period of
time as I understand it, to another company when they
expended most money in the drilling operation and have
therefore the biggest stake and we are lead to believe on
one hand that oil and gas is around the corner and yet

MR. STRACHAN: here on the other hand the company, which has been involved for the last five or six years has now decided to pull out and allow its acreage, most importantly its acreage rather than its share holding, its acreage to be turned over to a federal corporation?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the company referred to I think is still going to maintain an interest. It is not going to have the major single interest in the consortium. So it is not fair to say, as the hon. member has put it so simplistically, that one day they are in, the next day they are out; it is not as simple as that, they are still involved in the consortium. They are not involved as the single, major, the highest percentage of any individual company in the consortium. That is the position. That is the point.

Secondly, the reasons why Total decided upon reducing their interest in the consortium was one that you will have to ask Total. All I know is that they were willing to sell out to a number of other companies who were eager to get into the single most important company in the consortium. And the reasons are known best, I guess, to Total. They have not released them to me or to anybody in this Province to my knowledge. All I know is that there were a couple of other companies lined up by the door to move into that position when it became clear that Total wanted to move out. I also know of course, as perhaps the hon. member knows, that Total has got a fairly major interest in a number of oil fields around the world in which trouble has occurred over the last couple of years, not the least of which is the Frig-field in the North Sea on which the overrun on both

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 637

NM - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: construction and getting into production has been a couple of hundred per cent, as I understand it, and that they have had real problems there, I do not know if that is one of the reasons, but I am simply conjecturing, that is all. I do not know any

Premier Peckford: specific reasons and have not been given any by Total or anybody else in the consortium.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENEHIMER): A final supplementary, and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the Premier then, as he indicates I must ask Total the answer, could the Premier indicate exactly why Petrocan, a federal corporation, which is essentially set up to explore in peripheral areas, in areas which are largely regarded as being non-economic or very difficult to operate and high operating costs to the exploration company, why Petrocan was, in essence must have been, the largest bidder in this compared to all of the other companies who are lining up behind? I am very interested in the relationship as to why, if there was something there, as we are led to believe, around the corner, why some of the other companies would not be therefore be in a position to out bid a corporation which is essentially set up to explore in peripheral areas in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question at all. It is just totally impossible for me to answer a question like that. I mean, I have always considered the East Coast to be - I do not know if one could classify it in the terminology that the hon. member has, peripheral; but at least highly expensive, both at the exploration stage and its production stage. And if one accepts the mandate of Petrocan to go out and look for frontier areas surely this is a frontier area. So on those grounds I can say Petrocan is justified under its mandate given to it by the House of Commons and so doing moving into it. Why some of the other countries did not move in as aggressively as Petrocan I cannot answer. If Petrocan sees it as a better opportunity, it had the greater cash flow at the time, wanted to get a stake off the

Premier Peckford: East Coast, there are a whole bunch of reasons, in the same way as they do in the Mackenzie Delta or in Arctic Islands or wherever. The only thing I know is that there were two substantial bids at the time, one by Gulf, who was already involved in the consortium, by the way, and who wanted to move its interest higher, and Petrocan. And of the two that were offered at the time Petrocan's was better from where we sat as Newfoundlanders and as a government representing Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. gentleman for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions for the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, in connection with the Fishery Loan Board. I gave the minister five or ten minutes advance notice that I was going to ask the question, so I hope the hon. gentleman has the answer. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman, Sir, how many applications are outstanding now before the Fishery Loan Board? How many applications are on hand, either processed and the fishermen have not been notified, and the total number of applications on hand that have not been processed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not have that information now, I can tell the hon. member, by the way, that in the fiscal year just ended we did process something like 1,479 applications from fishermen which was an 84 per cent

MR. W. CARTER: approval rate. As to how many applications are on hand now, I cannot answer but I shall tomorrow when I get the information.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is great concern on the part of the fishermen, and indeed frustration on the part of a good many fishermen who are waiting to have their applications processed, would the minister indicate if they are still processing applications before the Fishery Loan Board or is there a freeze on applications?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: There is no freeze on it, they are still processing applications. In fact, I think there was a meeting held in the St. Barbe area last Thursday, meetings are being held regularly, applications are being approved. I do know there is a backlog as usually happens this time of the year, but as to exactly what extent I cannot answer that question right now.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, original questioner.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. gentleman could tell us out of the 1,479 that were processed in the last fiscal year if all the fishermen have been notified or is there also a backlog, apart from the backlog of applications that have not come before the board at all yet, is there a backlog of applications that have been processed but fishermen not notified yet, is there a backlog in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, the applications last year were approved, 474 for new vessels-I am sure they have all been notified-\$28.6 million; 404 applications were approved for the purchase of used vessels,\$6.1 million; 601 applications for miscellaneous

MR. W. CARTER: equipment for a total of \$3.1 million for a grand total of \$37,900,000 for the year. And that is close to a 400 per cent increase over the previous year. So all of these people have been advised and as soon as the loans are approved the fishermen are advised accordingly.

MR. S. NEARY: Final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman told us a year or so ago that the hon. gentleman was going to beef up the Fishery Loan Board but we seem to be getting just as many complaints and criticisms of the Fishery Loan Board as ever, even more so, the number of complaints that are reaching my desk and my colleagues' desks about applications that are outstanding for a year, going on two years. But I would like to find out from the hon. gentleman, and I do not wish to open up the area of licensing, but does the hon. gentleman's department, the Fishery Loan Board, hold prior consultation with the Federal Fisheries Department in connection with any of these applications regarding licensing before the application is approved? Is there any liaison, any communications between the hon. gentleman's department and the federal Department of Fisheries? And if there is, I would like the hon. gentleman also to tell me if licenses that, for instance, are withdrawn or cancelled in a certain part of the Province, and I will use my own district as an example, on the Southwest corner, say there is a license recalled or cancelled in Burnt Islands or Isle au Mort or Rose Blanche, does the hon. gentleman see to it that the licenses will remain in that area because if the hon.

Mr. Neary: gentleman does not there is going to be a reduction in the catching capability, in the number of boats in that particular area, that the licence will stay in that area rather than be put in another region of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, naturally there has got to be some communication between our department and the Federal Department of Fisheries concerning licencing. We do not normally give loans to fishermen to built expensive longliners without an assurance from that fisherman and from the Federal Department of Fisheries that a licence will be forthcoming. As to what happens to a licence, this is handled by the Federal Department of Fisheries. At least I do not believe licences are transferable. And as to what happens to a licence -

AN HON. MEMBER: In a family.

MR. W. CARTER: Within a family, yes. What happens to a licence that is being, for one reason or another, cancelled, as to where it goes is not my decision. Naturally I would want to see the licence stay in the area where it was being used, but again it is up to the Federal Department of Fisheries to make that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. Is the Grade XII programme still on schedule? And does he intend to start the phasing in of that programme in September, 1980, as was previously indicated in the Throne Speech?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The answer to that question is, yes, Mr. Speaker, and I defer it to the Minister of Education if he has additional information to provide. We have just finished, completed a meeting today, as a matter of fact, with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association when this matter was broached, and we will be consulting with other interested people around the Province. But it is in line with the announcements that have been made to date on it.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Would the Premier let us know what form, has the government or has the Department of Education decided what form the Grade XII programme will take?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of that question and defer to the Minister of Education if he wants to elaborate at the present moment on it.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: A note in the Throne Speech of December 4 said that the details would be provided to the House of Assembly in due course on the Grade XII programme. My question to the Premier is; are these details ready? And at what point will the public of the Province and special interest groups have some input into the type of Grade XII that we will be experiencing this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The detail is being prepared and as soon as it is ready it will be provided to the House and to all interest groups around the Province.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, followed by the hon. members for the Straits of Belle Isle and Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Premier's comments that the details will be prepared and provided to special interest groups around the Province. Will special interest groups and the general public have an input into what type of programme will be implemented as a Grade XII?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Of course, Mr. Speaker, they will.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the gentleman from Trinity North. If I may prefix it by a very brief statement: The minister and I, I believe, have both had representations from people in Southern Labrador today to the effect that either because of delays here in St. John's, and because of the admittedly bad mail service, people in that area have not received their renewals applications for their motor vehicles in sufficient time to enable them to get their 1979-1980 stickers by the deadline which of course was a day or so ago. Could the minister perhaps tell the House whether any steps have been taken, or whether he is prepared to give consideration to perhaps asking the RCMP Police in the area not to enforce the rules until a reasonable time, say a week or so has elapsed, so the people could get their stickers and get them on their cars? I gather the problem is quite widespread Sir.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I did have a call from a gentleman in Southern Labrador this morning indicating what the hon. member just said. I was in touch with the Director of Motor Registration and I asked him to get a report back to me. He had not up to this moment. I have not made any decision to extend the deadline nor to get in touch with the RCMP but I can assure the hon. member that I am looking into the matter and if he would like to contact me probably tomorrow morning we could possibly discuss the matter further. If I were sure that the fault was on the part of the registrar or the department then I could probably take some more definitive action. But I am not, so I would like to look into it a little bit further before making any further decisions.

MR. ROBERTS: A brief supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's position and I shall be in touch with him. Would he be willing to extend his beneficence even if it is no fault on the part of the Motor Registration Division? And I would not want to say there is fault on the part of the post office, but Southern Labrador's mail service, for reasons which I do not want to go into now, is even worse than that available in most parts of the rural areas of this Province, Would he be willing to extend it on the assumption that there is no fault on the part of the Motor Registration Division? I suspect it has treated Southern Labrador as anywhere else in this Province, but it has not taken into account the realities of the incredibly bad postal service, Might he consider that a reason to allow a week or ten days, a fortnight's extension?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, after I discuss the matter again with the Motor Registration Division I will make a definite decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. It relates to public statements made by the President of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro last week, Mr. Young. I wonder would the Premier indicate to the House whether he agrees with a statement made by Mr. Young that the

MR. SIMMONS:

main reason Gull Island has not been developed to date is because of the difficulty in obtaining the appropriate financing.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are many difficulties associated with development of hydro power in Labrador, One of them has to do with dollars, one of them has to do with access to markets, and one has to do with the whole industrial development strategy of the Province, and there are many, many factors which go to contribute towards trying to bring on stream in a reasonable period of time some development of hydro power in Labrador. One of the factors undoubtedly has to do with dollars.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly aware of the factors that the Premier has enumerated once again. The point of my question - I will rephrase it and ask it again - Mr. Young was quite specific, if he is quoted correctly in the press, that the main reason was the difficulty in obtaining financing. Indeed, he went so far as to say that if other hydro corporations in Canada had the hydro potential within their jurisdictions, the facility would long since have been developed. He is quite specific, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the main reason is financing. And I am certainly aware of the other reasons, the other factors that the Premier has mentioned, but can we gather from Mr. Young's statement or is he correct in telling the public that the main reason, that in essence the pivotal reason why the development is not ongoing right now is a financial one?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that there are numerous reasons for the slowness in getting the hydro development of Labrador underway and one of them has to do with the financial reasons. The amount of importance you attach to the various factors will vary, I guess, from person to person, but I see it as being many, many factors involved and one of them happens to be dollars. Whether it is a pivotal reason, as the hon. member suggests that Mr. Young mentioned, or not I am not prepared to say at the present moment. I would have to look at all the factors and try to give weight to each one, but that dollars is one is unquestionable.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Premier is not prepared to answer this particular question. It is an important one. Let me try it another way. Mr. Young also states quite specifically that the reason we have not been able to get the financing for the Lower Churchill Development is because of our credit rating. He goes on to point out it is the lowest in Canada and so on.

MR. SIMMONS: Could the Premier indicate to the House whether the government is having difficulty getting the financing - I am sure it has not gone looking directly on this point-but has it had any indication that the problem in obtaining the financing is because of our present credit rating?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we have attempted to go to the marketplace as it relates to the power development in Labrador until we have all the pieces put together on a full package. The federal government and Quebec have effectively stymied us on a number of occasions and until we can put in place a developmental strategy which sees all the power being utilized at competitive rates, then of course there would be no point in going to the marketplace. There is no indication from anybody that I know, or any indication to this government that we would have any difficulty in raising the funds. The problem is with the project itself and ensuring that we have a proper and reasonable, viable markets for the power.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has indicated to us now that his position on the subject is quite different than Mr. Young's. Indeed, Mr. Young is telling us publicly that he knows that there has been difficulty and the Premier is saying that to his knowledge there has not been difficulty. I wonder in view of these divergent views or divergent experiences on the subject, could the Premier indicate whether he is concerned about the practice of the head of a corporation, essentially a public servant, making statements like this about the

MR. SIMMONS: credit rating of a province when in fact, if we are to accept the Premier's word of a moment ago, when in fact these statements are not based on any experience on the subject in that the approach has not been made to the money markets, according to what the Premier has told us a moment ago. Is the Premier concerned about this matter, the matter of public servants making statements like this, without foundation it would seem, and if he is concerned what does he propose doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes some very brilliant deductions and he is quite at liberty to put whatever opinion he would like on various statements that he hears from me or from members of the government or agencies of the government and I applaud him on his opinion and his deduction that he makes from various statements that are made by various people and I hope that in the future that he continues to make such deductions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 8, Bill No. 18.

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House Of Assembly." (Bill No. 18)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to be able to stand here and move second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House Of Assembly." As most hon. gentlemen know, over the last number of years, during Private Members' Days, during other debates on the Address-in-Reply, and the Budget Speech, and on particular legislation that has been brought before this House, many, many members have mentioned the importance of Labrador to our Province,

PREMIER PECKFORD: the importance to ensure that the Labrador people feel more a part of the mainstream of Newfoundland society and on it goes. Well, Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be able to indicate that through this Bill 18 the government is proposing to increase a number of seats in Labrador to four from what is now three and a half, to give some concrete evidence of this government's concern for Labrador and increasing the representation there.

The new district to be created, Mr. Speaker, is going to be called Torngat Mountains District, which of course reflects the mountains in that part of Labrador. Up to now the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) covers a very large, wide expanse of Labrador, all the way from Nain now, which I think is the Northernmost community that is inhabited, all the way down to the Southernmost community in Eagle River is -

MR. STRACHAN: Henley Harbour in the South.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Henley Harbour which in the Summertime - that is where most of the Stones used to live and now they are all moved out - Henley Harbour in the South, which is a Summer fishing village now, which covers hundreds of miles of coastline. Not only do we have the problem with the amount of coastline it covers, but it is the diversity of the peoples that is covered there as well. By now restricting the district to

PREMIER PECKFORD: only include from Nain to Rigolet, I think essentially is what the district will cover, you are dealing with all the Northern communities in one district. And then you have Naskaupi, which is represented by the hon. Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie), Happy Valley-Goose Bay-Northwest River area, and then you have another district South of there to take care of the Straits, Labrador section or the Southern Labrador section of Labrador. So here we have now a bill which will give tangible evidence of this House as a hopefully, if we give unanimous consent, agreement that additional representation is needed in Labrador, not because of the number of people there, I suppose. the total population of Labrador and all the districts would be somewhere between 30 and 40 thousand people, but the population does not tell the story. It is the broad expanse one has to cover in order to get in and out of the bays and in and out of the communities even in the middle of the Summer. So now we will have Menihek District, Naskaupi District, Torngat Mountains District and the Southern coast of Labrador will be called Eagle River where, of course, Eagle River is. So we have four new districts being created. There has been some discussion in the last week or so, as a result of the indication by Government that this kind of bill would be coming before the House, to review or look at many other districts in the Province. There has been - I think the former Premier has even gotten into the act, one of the former Premiers has gotten into the act as it relates to the business of boundaries, and I know of a number of districts around the Province, both represented by people opposite and people on this side, where there are some inequities and strange occurrences as it relates to boundaries. Well we are going to, Mr. Speaker, in this Act, not address ourselves to those problems because once you open the door to one or two districts there are going to be many and the whole point of this Act, of this Bill, is to increase representation in Labrador. Under the Act passed some years ago, three years from now there will be an opportunity for review of the present distribution

PREMIER PECKFORD: of districts and it is at that time that the whole question of inequities and various boundaries as it relates to various districts around the Province will be addressed. It will not be done in this Bill; this Bill is essentially to create an additional district in Labrador to give the people of Labrador more representation than they now have.

I think it is fair to say that when one looks at the new district now, the Torngat Mountains District, that we are dealing with some community of interest, there is some similarities, Main and Makkovic, for example and Hopedale have a lot of similar problems, whereas if you were dealing, as the present member does, with problems in Henley Harbour, if you will, or Port Hope Simpson or Mary's Harbour or Cape Charles or Lodge Bay or George's Cove or William's Harbour and Cartwright, that you are dealing with a different kind of problem very often, and here it is all in Northern Labrador, all the more Northern communities and they do have some community of interest. You have the Inuit Association and you have some of the Indian Associations and you can really spend a lot of time on the many, many problems that they have rather than have the diversity of community interest that they now have in the large, expansive district of Eagle River. So I think it is important to reflect that.

Now, there might be other problems in Labrador; this is not going to suddenly solve, Mr. Speaker, all the problems we have in Labrador. It will give another voice in this House solely on Labrador. There will be now four voices speaking for Labrador in this hon. House after the next election because this Bill will take effect when this House is dissolved and an election called and will not take effect until that time, so there is no problem with a vacant seat suddenly coming up. That seat will not become vacant really, and the district really does not exist until this House is dissolved and an election is underway, which might be tomorrow, which might be next week, which might be six or eight months from now or twelve months from now. I am under great pressure, Mr. Speaker, to

PREMIER PECKFORD: call an election immediately, great, great pressure by many people around the Province and my phone is, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if I had to bring the number of phone calls and letters right here in this file folder demanding an election immediately so that we could have forty seats rather than thirty seats it would be unbelievable, but I am going to resist that temptation,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am going to resist this temptation, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to try - the hon. gentleman sitting in the front benches and in the backbenches are going to try and demonstrate over the next couple of months the reforms that this administration would like to bring in, the approaches that we would like to take so that the people of the Province will be able to see just how reform minded, how progressive, how socially conscious we are as a Government so that instead of taking forty seats, Mr. Speaker, then we will take fifty seats. So I am not content with forty seats now I would rather see fifty seats down the road further. But in any case, this is the first piece

PREMIER PECKFORD:

legislation, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the desire of this government to make changes not only to political boundaries, but other major reform measures which will be brought in over the next several weeks as it relates to this government's priorities and the aims and objectives which we have - of course, additionally to that, our financial priorities as well, as will be demonstrated in the Budget if and when it is brought down in the next month or two months.

So here we have it, the Torngat Mountains district, a new district for Labrador, which will give them more representation and hopefully make them feel, because of the speed with which we have acted in the last number of weeks on this measure, to demonstrate to them some concern for Labrador and the people of Labrador and to recognize the diversity of peoples in Labrador, the diversity of the problems economically, socially and culturally in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) when he was in Labrador about a week ago also indicated that we are about to establish a regional office for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing in Labrador to give more concrete indication of our concern for Labrador - not just talk but positive action by way of a bill, by way of a regional office in Labrador. Right now, as I understand it, the Department of Municipal Affairs operates out of Corner Brook to cover all of Labrador. Well, we are going to change that now and have a regional office in Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

And an Appeal Board as well.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And an Appeal Board as well in

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

So we are getting there and we have to continue to do that with another member who can lobby, if you will, in this House, around this building, in the government offices, can get even more changes made in Labrador.

Last year, Mr. Speaker,

I travelled to Labrador and I was in most of the Northern communities that I had not been in before. I had been in most of them before. I was in the hon. member's community for a while last Summer, I think it was, and all the Northern communities. I had, of course, lived in Southern Labrador for two or three Summers back in the early 1960s, so I was familiar with Henley Harbour and Lodge Bay and Cape Charles and Port Hope Simpson, Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour area, but I had not been that familiar with the area North of Rigolet into the Hopedale/Davis Inlet area, Makkovik, Postville and Nain area.

In any case, this bill now, Bill No. 18, gives that additional representation for Labrador.

It could be argued, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that here we are again, here is this government or here is this House adding more seats, more money going out of the public chest - the number of the seats now in the House is going up to fifty-two - that this is a scandal because there are too many members in the House at the present moment. And I have seen that in print on a number of occasions and I have heard people say to me personally, 'You have too many people in the House.' Well, I reject that, Mr. Speaker, right out of hand. In the period that I have been in this House representing the district of Green Bay under the redistribution a number of years ago, as the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) could

PREMIER PECKFORD: attest, they changed the boundaries of Green Bay district and the community of interest business in Burlington, Smith's Harbour, Middle Arm area, Nipper's Harbour, Round Harbour, Snook's Arm, Tilt Cove, Shoe Cove were put into the Baie Verte - White Bay district and taken out of Green Bay district. And you know, there is no question about it that as a member, just as a member for Green Bay district, that I have been able to see more people and to respond to more problems in a more effective manner, because the district now has a community of interest, far better than I could in that larger, larger district. And whilst we are spending additional money for an additional person to be in this House, I think it is money well spent. I think that we must recognize the geographical factors, the community interest factors which give rise to the larger numbers. And I do not apologize at all as a member of the House, and now as Leader of the Government, for the number of members that are in this House. I think that they are absolutely necessary to really give voice to concerns and a community of interest that we have in many of the districts in the Province right now. It is still not perfect. There are districts which are widespread which have many, many communities, but there is some improvement, I think, because of the redistribution a number of years ago, and hopefully improvement in Labrador now as it relates to this additional district.

I will not hold up the House any longer, Mr. Speaker, only to say that I am extremely pleased and honoured to introduce this bill which makes four seats in Labrador and hopefully, in a small way, reflects this government's interest and concern for the

April 2, 1979

Tape 645

EC - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: people of Labrador and the fact
that they need an additional voice in this House to give voice
to many of the problems that they continue to have in
that very great part of our Province. I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Cross): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to say the former Premier, but perhaps in the interest of accuracy I should say the original former Premier of this Province, the hon. Mr. Smallwood, used often to preface his public addresses or in the course of his speeches to use a phrase which I believe is from an old Methodist hymn, and perhaps Your Honour having grown up and lived on the North side of Bonavista Bay, one of the strongholds of Methodism in this Province, would be familiar with it. I confess I am not. I think it is in the Sankey songbook. The gentleman for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) would have cut his teeth on the Sankey songbook. But the phrase I think it is well known to many members of this House and that is, "While the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinners may return." And in a very real sense this bill I think is an example of the government heeding that admonition. We, Sir, on this side intend to support the bill. And now that we are reunited and are one great Liberal family again with the return to our ranks of the gentleman for the district of Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe), who was temporarily among the separated brethren and is now returned to his first love, I can assure the Premier that this bill will be given unanimous support of everyone of the fifty-one members in this House. We on this side have caucused and have agreed to support it and I am sure the Premier speaks for all of the members sitting to Your Honour's left when he says that the bill is a government bill and has the support of all, not just all of the government, but all of those who support the government, including my friend for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) who is once again of the government but not in it. But I am told he does support it and I welcome that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wise measure. It is one which we on this side have advocated right from the start, if we refer back to the debates of 1974 when the most recent amendment to the House

Mr. Roberts: of Assembly Act was enacted, when the present fifty-one seats were created by the great gerrymandering of 1974.

AN HON. MEMBER: A shameful Act.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it was a shameful Act. And thank heavens today the new Premier is correcting it, and I think full measure, full credit should be given to the new Premier and to the new administration for doing that.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, this bill I would submit accomplishes two purposes, the Premier has touched upon them; it creates a fourth seat entirely within the boundaries of the Labrador portion of this Province. And I am sure that each of us who sits today in this House representing a district which is wholly or partially within the boundaries of the Labrador portion of this Province will welcome that. I see my friend for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) with us, I am sure that if he speaks, as I hope he will, he will support this measure, and support it not simply as a government measure but because he believes it is right. My friend for the present district of Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) will speak, and I know too that he will support this measure, not simply because the Opposition have decided as a body to support it but because he believes it is right and proper so to do. The gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), a member of the present administration, I know will support it, indeed I would hope he had, and I believe he did have, a hand in bringing this about. And I have said that I will support it, indeed I suppose I am the only member of the House of Assembly ever to campaign on a promise to abolish his seat if elected because in 1975, in the general election, I campaigned in the present Strait of Belle Isle district and one of the undertakings I gave to those whom I asked to vote for me, and those who subsequently became my constituents, was that I would do what I could to have their seat abolished and to have a scheme brought in exactly the same as the scheme embodied in the bill now before the House.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, as well as creating a fourth seat in Labrador also divides the Coast of Labrador, that long

Mr. Roberts: stretch of coastline between L'Anse-au-Clair, which is just over the Quebec Border in the South, and the community of Nain which, as the Premier says, is the most Northernly settled settlement in this Province to the North, it divides that coast into two constituencies

MR. E. ROBERTS:

and into two seats, In so doing, of course, it creates a fifty-second seat for this Chamber, which I believe will make us the largest Chamber. The members to be elected in the election very shortly, in this 38th. General Assembly there will be fifty-two men and women returned and that will be the largest number I believe ever returned in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, not just for the Province of course but of the Dominion and the Colony which preceded our present state.

Mr. Speaker, the present Strait of Belle Isle seat in many ways is an unnatural seat. Of course, that is why I opposed its creation in the House in 1974. If memory serves me, that was one of the times when I got myself the Royal Order of the Flick for having opposed it. My friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), again no stranger to the Royal Order of the Flick, has apparently got out the Hansard debates, and I was suspended, I forget the particular offence but the particular offence did not matter. The thrust of what I did was oppose as vigorously as I could, even to the point of being suspended from the House, the creation of not just the Strait of Belle Isle seat as we now know it, but the gerrymandering which went on. And the Premier adverted to this today when he spoke of the fact that there are many seats throughout this Province where there are inequities and where the present scheme of legislative distribution is unfair and unreasonable. But that is another story and I am not here today to condemn the Premier and his administration; in fact, as unlikely as it may sound, I am here to give him a measure of praise because I believe what they are doing is the right thing. I would say to the Premier that is not coming events casting their shadow, but where praise is deserved I would be the very first to give praise and I believe praise is merited here, Sir. This is a step forward.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

To speak solely the Strait of Belle Isle seat, Mr. Speaker, it is an unnatural seat, it is one of the largest seats in population in the Province. I do not have the figures for all of the seats here but according to the 1976 census, which I would suggest is both reliable and certainly the most recent evidence which we have - I wonder if the gentleman who are having a discussion outside the Chamber could probably keep it down a little? I have an excellent voice and I think I know how to use it, but I do not think it helps anybody to it. The Strait of Belle Isle seat, Mr. Speaker, according to the 1976 census figures has 12,908 people living in it in forty-eight separate identifiable communities. I do not know what the other seats were, but if you divide 51 into 570,000, which is approximately the population of this Province today - you have about a little over 11,000 as being the numerical mean, being the average, the numerical average, the mathematical average of the seat. So by that standard alone the Strait of Belle Isle seat is much on the larger side with roughly 13,000 people in it as opposed to 11,000 on a numerical average. Some seats have about 8,000 or 9,000. The district of Grand Falls has about 9,000 people in it. The district of St. Mary's - The Capes, represented so admirably by the gentleman who is the Minister of Fisheries, has about 8,200 or 8,300 people in it, as I recall. I have always thought it was unfair to have such a large seat, so many people in an area so spread out when you have much smaller numbers of people taken into a seat in a much more compact area, an area with far fewer of the problems that are brought to members. And let us be clear what happens in a gerrymandering. It does not affect election results; what it does affect is the quality of service which people get. The people who suffer are not the politicians: the people who suffer are the constituents whose needs cannot be met no matter how hard a man works or how much of his time and effort he devotes to serving the needs of his constituents. In any event, the Strait of Belle

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 647

DW - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS: Isle seat now, as it now stands and as
having been created in 1974, will soon be but a figment of history.
And I guess for whatever it is worth there is a very small

MR. ROBERTS: footnote that I would have been the only man elected to this House to represent both sides of the Straits of Belle Isle, the Labrador portion of this Province and the Newfoundland portion. I never really found out -

MR. NEARY: At the same time.

MR. ROBERTS: - at the same time. I am not sure anybody has ever been elected for both sides - of course the hon. doctor Fred Rowe sat for Labrador and subsequently sat for White Bay South. And my friend the member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) sat for Labrador North with great distinction and now with equally great distinction has represented Fogo. But I thank my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the only man ever to represent a seat that embraced both parts of this Province or portions of both parts of this Province, to be quite precise. I never quite found out why the former Premier, that is the second former Premier, not the original former Premier, the present gentleman from Humber West district (Mr. Moores), why he insisted upon a seat that was partially on the Island and partially in Labrador. He doubtless had his own reasons for it and I do not think malice was among them. I think it was probably just a mistake on his part. He would not listen in this House, or outside, I might add, to either argument or reason. Representations were made by people in Labrador, representations were made by any number of us to the effect that the seat should not be created. He insisted upon it in the 1973 Delimitation of Boundries Act, a seat one half in Labrador and one half on the Island, and then when the Higgins Commission, the commission under the late Mr. Justice Higgins brought in its report and reported on a seat half in Labrador and half on the Island, and a seat much like the former White Bay North seat, the gentleman from Humber West (Mr. Moores) and his administration insisted upon throwing out that report and creating the present Strait of Belle Isle seat which essentially embodied both the two seats recommended and replaced them with one. They were partially of course after some partisan advantage and

MR. ROBERTS: they got their answer because the Liberals held all the Northeast Coast seats, but partially it was a move to take one seat from the Northeast Coast of his Province which is what was done by the 1974 Redistribution Bill, the amendment to the House of Assembly Act. It is chapter 112 of the 1974 Statute. In any event, whatever the former Premier's reasons he carried the day. As the present Premier will agree, Premiers do have the ability to get their way. The House did vote it through and the people were asked to elect their members and in their wisdom they elected members. Be that as it may, the right steps are now being taken and I think the government should be congratulated for that.

I will touch very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and I should not need very long to outline our thinking on this, on some of the reasons why we think this is a wise move. The Premier has touched on some but he has not really gone into it in as much detail as I think the House should know. First of all, this bill will make the Strait of Belle Isle seat, the new Strait of Belle Isle seat, a much more logical and rational constituency. The seat will run from Blue Cove around to Conche.

AN HON. MEMBER: I left it to you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well my hon. friend left it to me. If he leaves other things to me he will be in better hands than he is in right now with some of his colleagues, I can assure him. But I want to thank him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Come on over, 'Ed'.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will be coming over but I do not expect the Premier to be there at the time I come over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Two thousand and thirteen.

MR. ROBERTS: Two thousand and - oh, the year. Well, that is more than 331, I would say. Mr. Speaker, it does make

MR. ROBERTS: the Strait of Belle Isle seat a much more logical and rational constituency. It removes from it communities that - and the figure values are all from the 1976 census - were inhabited by 2,141 people and that will bring the number of people living in the new Strait of Belle seat to about 10,800 and that is not too far off the provincial average. If you divide 570,000 by fifty-two, unless my arithmetic has completely escaped me, that is almost dead on 11,000 people. Not necessarily electors but 11,000 citizens, old and young alike, in each of the fifty-two seats. I think there is a community of interest between the people who live along the St. Barbe Coast, the people who live in the St. Anthony area, North to Cape Bauld and Cook's Harbour, and then the people who live in Main Brook and in Conche. I am not so sure about Main Brook and Conche. If this were a thorough redistribution I think their community of interest lies elsewhere, but there is a greater community of interest by far in this new seat than in the old seat because there are very real differences of opinion between the people who live on different sides of the Strait of Belle Isle. Now that is not to condemn anybody, it is simply to know their reality. There is a long history of tradition, a long history of

MR. ROBERTS: solidarity on each side but not community of links across the Straits. And I think that is true. The former Minister of Education I know will have had experience of the school board which crosses the Straits and I think that has had some difficulties. In fact there are two, the Vinland School Board and the Straits of Belle Isle School Board, both integrated; each crosses the Straits and I think each has had problems arising out of that quite unnatural division, quite unnatural arrangement.

The minister of course first drew breath, as I understand it, in Bellburns and he is therefore nearly blessed with the wisdom of having been born in the Straits and I think he would concur from his own knowledge, in addition to that which he learned in his professional capacity.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this new seat recognizes the geographic and social realities of Labrador. The Premier has spoken of this. I will endorse what he said. We have a relatively small population spread out over 800 miles of coastline from L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain. I do not have the precise figures but my guess is there are not 7,500 people living today between L'Anse-au-Clair and Nain. The House may be surprised to realize there are so few but by my guess there are about 5,000 in the new proposed Eagle River seat, the 2,141 between L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay, and then if you begin at Mary's Harbour, the most southerly winter or year round community, and go all the way to Rigolet - is Rigolet in the new Torngat or the new Eagle River?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Torngat.

MR. ROBERTS: Torngat. You go all the way then to Cartwright and Paradise River, the most Northerly communities on the Southern side of Lake Melville, the Southern side of Groswater Bay, you may have another 2,500 or 2,600 people. So it is about 5,000 people in that proposed Eagle River seat and I would think if there are 2,500 people from Rigolet to Nain that is all there are. Those are round figures but they are - And I see my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who knows the area very well, shakes his head in acquiescence.

It does not particularly bother me that so few people will elect a member because I think their needs are such, both in a social sense and in a geographic sense, that we in this House are warranted in taking special note and I think the way to take that special note is by a measure of the sort we have before us now.

Mr. Speaker, even more importantly that that, I think the Premier's measure, the government's measure recognizes not simply the social and geographic needs, which are real, but the cultural and political realities which are equally real and even more, to my way of thinking, Sir, of even more weight.

Now I have spoken often in this House of the feelings of Labradorians and by Labradorians, let me hasten to say, I mean anybody whose home is in Labrador. To me it is utterly irrelevant where one's mother happened to be at the moment when birth came. That does not make a person a Labradorian or not, anymore than if a cow has calves in a china shop that does not make them soup plates. It is where one makes one's home.

My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), who was born, I believe, in Aberdeen, somewhere in the Northeastern

MR. ROBERTS: part of Scotland, is as much a Labradorian as somebody who was born in L'Anse-au-Clair or in Rexons Cove or any other community on the Labrador. People who have gone there and made it their home are Labradorians. I have spoken often of their feelings and I think with a great deal of sympathy and I hope with a great measure of understanding. If I were living in Labrador, Sir, I think I would share those feelings in full measure and I might be even more outspoken than many of the people who have voiced their feelings to me or voiced them publicly in other ways.

I do not know if there is one common feeling in Labrador. There are really three or four Labradors. People who live on the Northern Coast have little in common with the people who live in Western Labrador in the district of Menihek. The people who live in Cartwright do not have a great deal in common with the people who live in Happy Valley. They are all Labradorians and that fact in their minds underlies everything else. So whatever differences there may be between Churchill or Wabush or Labrador City on the one hand, or L'Anse-au-Clair, Red Bay or L'Anse-Amour, or Postville on the other, but underlying it all is that common strata, "We are Labradorians" and that is seen I think by anybody who goes to the Labrador, Sir, by the Labrador flag which, by the way, is infinitely more attractive than any design I have ever seen proposed for a flag for this Province. The Labrador flag I think is a work of true beauty.

My friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) points to my Labrador twig. The badge, which I wear quite proudly, was given to me by constituents of mine in Labrador and I wear it. It is the twig of a spruce tree, if my knowledge

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 649

NM - 4

MR. ROBERTS: of forestry has not deserted
me, and it is part of the Labrador flag which is white,
blue and green in solid horizontal bands. The white for
the snow, and the

MR. ROBERTS:

blue for the sea and the green for the forest, with the spruce twig with five separate branches upon it representing the five peoples who together make up the people who now live on the Labrador, and I think it is a very real symbol of that part of this Province.

If we ever do adopt a provincial flag other than the Union Jack, and I put adopting a provincial flag as rather low on any list of priorities, but if we do we could do a lot worse than adopt the Labrador flag, though I am not sure the people in Labrador would like that. They might say, "You have taken everything we have and now, by blank, you are going to take our flag as well."

It is a very attractive symbol, it is seen everywhere. It is worn on jackets, it is flown from longliners, you see it on the dashboards of cars. The pin is widely worn. There is a very real feeling of a Labradorian identity. There is a feeling equally of a Newfoundland identity. I guess we all read the Weekend Magazine, a very eloquent piece by Al Pittman, who is a first-class poet. If only the government could be persuaded to buy some of the works published by Breakwater Press and distribute them around! Maybe the new Culture Minister will do better than the old Education Minister did in that. Mr. Pittman wrote in last Saturday's magazine of the new nationalism - maybe not the new nationalism; the nationalism which is arising in this Province which I am not sure we ever had before. What we had before was probably a defensive mechanism, a sort of an internal poor mouth. Now, by heavens, we are coming to realize that we can be proud of what we are, what we have, what we have been, and what we can be in this Province, and

MR. ROBERTS: that feeling, Sir, is particularly strong in the Labrador.

It is not a separatist feeling. It makes me very angry when I hear people who ought to know better speak of the separatist feelings in Labrador. They are not separatists. They want to be part of a united province, Sir, but they want to be part of a province in which they get their fair share.

There is a very real feeling today throughout Labrador, and the view is widespread, it is not a few isolated hotheads, it is not a few this or a few that, it is almost everybody of whatever age or whatever background or whatever they do in life or whatever their political philosophy or their anything, a very widespread feeling, and it runs deep, it is not a surface feeling, Mr. Speaker, it is a very deeply held, a very sincerely held feeling that Labrador is not getting its fair share, that Labrador is being treated as a colony by the rest of this Province.

How often have we heard it?

"They took our power, they took our iron ore, now they are taking our fish" I just made mention of the flag, but I have had people say that to me, "I suppose next you people will be taking our flag." The feeling is that Labrador is not just being developed, it is being exploited, exploited against the interests of the Labrador people and for the benefit of the people of the Island. And that is an unfortunate feeling. There is too much evidence to support it. I cannot say that it is an unwarranted feeling, but I will say that one of the tests of statesmanship in the new Premier, in his administration,

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, seem to be marching along this road, and if they are they will be doing a great service to this Province, a service which should be recognized for what it is. If they can help to bring into being measures which will lead the people of Labrador to conclude that they are getting their fair share, and that their resources are being developed, not exclusively for their benefit, nobody has ever said that, but for their reasonable and their fair benefit and not as they now perceive, and as too often is now the case, to their detriment. I think that that feeling, Sir, underlies much of the discontent which runs throughout the Labrador part of this Province today. And I think that if we in this Island, we who are concerned about the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador can put together and put into practice measures to make sure that every part of this Province has reasonable return from what we in this Province build, then, Sir, not only will we have served this Province well, but we will alleviate and in due course remove that feeling. The feeling is there simply because there is a need for it.

The New Labrador Party, to take one of its political expressions, came into being because there was a vacuum. Neither of the old line parties, we on this side or the Tories opposite, expressed the feelings of the people of Labrador. The New Labrador Party disappeared because, I think, a number of us on both sides were more responsive. But, Sir, that feeling could arise again should both parties not express, in the eyes of the people of Labrador, express their legitimate interests.

In that sense a very heavy burden lies on the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie)

MR. ROBERTS: who is in the Cabinet, the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) who, I understand, unfortunately will not run again, he decided his career lies elsewhere, but is his period yet to be in this House, and on the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and, I suppose, until the election the burden will continue in part to be shouldered by me because, of course, the people who live in the area between L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay are still my constituents and will be until the dissolution, whenever that comes.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk at some length but I will not about the legitimacy of the feelings of the people of Labrador that they are not being treated properly. You do not have to travel widely in Labrador - some of us have had that opportunity - but you do not have to travel widely to know the sorts of problems that are there.

MR. ROBERTS: I have had an opportunity over the years to travel in most parts of Labrador, but I have never been to Nain. I will get there yet. I once got as far as Otter Creek for four days in an aircraft, the old DMR, the old Twin Otter, but the fog held me. I have never been to Nain, I have never been to Postville, but I have been to every other community in Labrador, most of them many times.

But the lack of roads! Do you know there is not an inch of paved road on the Labrador side of the Strait of Belle Isle, not one inch? There is not an adequate water system in the eight communities between L'Anse au Clair and Red Bay. There are very few in the North, and what has been done in the North, I think it is fair to say, comes from the Government of Canada under the various federal/provincial agreements. What has been done in Western Labrador was done by the iron ore companies, and not from any charitable motives but from their own viewpoint they had to have the communities. The same with Churchill, They built the communities so that the people who worked for them could live and would live there and so that they could attract and then hopefully retain people to stay in these communities. Happy Valley - Goose Bay is a community that grew in too many ways despite the government, or it was confronted with government indifference. The social and infrastructure, to use that terrible word for which we have no adequate substitute, those needs, Sir, are incredibly large. And I think that having four members in the House to speak for them, four men or women as the case may be, to devote themselves to remedying them will be a large step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of very brief comments in closing. First of all, I do want to make

MR. ROBERTS: the point on behalf of all of us on this side that we do feel that fifty-two seats are too many. I am not suggesting the answer now is to reduce to fifty-one - we will go along with fifty-two until the election - but I do think the next redistribution should not be on the basis of fifty-two, maybe forty-two. I, for one, Sir, feel that forty-one or forty-two or forty-three seats, if we need an uneven number - and I am not sure we do, but some people sometimes say we do - but I think that forty-one or forty-two MHAs could adequately serve this Province. And I would raise their salary. I would make it a real, full-time job. There is no reason why a member of the House, for example, should not be paid, say, what a school superintendent gets. What is that? - \$25,000/\$28,000 now? We have fifty-odd school superintendents in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-seven.

MR. ROBERTS: - thirty-seven, all of them, of course, properly paid from the public war chest, the Public Treasury. You know, is not an MHA worth as much as a school superintendent? I think so. And I think if we want to attract the right calibre of people into public life we will have to be prepared to pay them adequately. This is not a debate about members' salaries but it is relevant. I know many men on this side, and I am sure there are men on the other, who have taken considerable financial sacrifices to serve in the House of Assembly. I am not saying a man or a woman should get wealthy from being in the House, but I am not so sure he should be asked to make his family suffer or to do without. I could look at some, and I will not name them, to whom even the

MR. ROBERTS: \$20,000 MHAs get is unheard of wealth, but the fact remains today in this Province that is not a lot of money. I do not think you have to be a very highly qualified teacher to qualify for that sort of money, given the salaries. I know that lawyers and doctors and dentists and professional people of that sort, you know, \$20,000 a year is hardly their income. In fact, I think Medicare - Who is Minister of Health? The hon. gentleman from Humber Valley (Mr. W. House) would confirm that Medicare does not count as working full time any doctor whose earnings from Medicare are less than \$20,000 in a year, unless they have changed that stand. That was seven or eight years ago when I was minister, in the deep, distant past when Medicare worked.

But, Mr. Speaker, fifty-two seats are too many. I do not want to belabour the point. I do feel that when we have the next redistribution we should ask the independent commission to divide the Province into substantially fewer than fifty-two seats.

I also think we should have an independent commission, but that is another story, another debate. There will be an opportunity for that.

I would, Mr. Speaker, ask the Premier to consider another point. The Premier spoke eloquently, and I know from his heart, both on the 27th, last Tuesday on opening day and earlier today when he spoke to introduce this bill for Second Reading, about retaining in this Province our cultural values. And I think that strikes a very responsive chord in many members, I know it strikes one on me. I feel very strongly that we should be proud to stand here. I have always been one of those who thinks that touches like hanging our Speakers.

Mr. Roberts: and in due course, Mr. Speaker, you too will hang, hopefully by your own choice, but in any event you will be hung, Sir, in this Chamber, as has each of your predecessors, or putting the heads of Premiers, and the Premier's head in due course will adorn the lobby downstairs. Many Premiers lose their heads, I would say to the gentleman for Green Bay (Premier Peckford), and in due course he will lose his.

But it is good to be surrounded by our history, it is good to remind ourselves of it. It is part of realizing the value of what we have and what we are. And in that light I would suggest to the Premier that perhaps we should not create a seat to be known as Eagle River. Eagle River has no history. Eagle River, I am told—well, it is on the map—was known really only because there is a fishing camp on it. The name I would suggest is a historic one, the Coast of Labrador, which is the name by which both the people of Labrador and the people of the Island always referred to all of the coast right to Nain, but, you know, including in particular that Southern coast. And it is not an important point but I think it will be a nice touch. The Coast of Labrador is the historic name. People now still talk of the coast, going down to the coast, or going out to the coast. Eagle River means nothing to anybody, nothing to anybody that I have ever heard. And I never knew first or last why that name was put on the seat three or four years ago.

I think the name of the Torngat Mountains does mean something because to the people of Nain, the people North of Makkovik, it is a prominent part of their physical surroundings, I understand we are to have a national park called Torngat Mountain National Park. I do not whether that means that we should or should not have a seat by the same name, but I do feel that Eagle River is not a particularly historic or attractive name. It is not a prominent - the Premier knows the coast - it is not a prominent geographical feature.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No.

MR. ROBERTS: It is nothing.

MR. STRACHAN: It was to the last Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. STRACHAN: It was to the last Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. My friend for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says that the attraction of the name may have been to the former Premier who, as we know, displayed piscatorial prowess on a number of rivers in this Province and the Eagle may doubtless have been blessed by his essays in the fine art of being the modern day Isaac Walton. But, you know, it is something that if the Premier and the government feel should be done, can be done in the House, in Committee. And I think it would be a nice touch to have a seat known as the Coast of Labrador and a member sitting in this House representing the Coast of Labrador.

My friend for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has gone out for a moment. Either my oratory has overwhelmed him or repelled him but I suspect that he, as a Labradorian, would agree that that is the historic name. And I think that name would be widely and readily acceptable to people who live in the Labrador part of this Province.

I would like to say a word of recognition and thanks to the Premier, I do not expect over the years to have too much opportunity to do so, but I do here, and I would certainly like to do it quite openly and quite wholeheartedly, and I speak for all on this side, but in particular for my friend, my absent friend for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). As the Premier mentioned his original announcement, his ministerial statement Tuesday past, the 27th, spoke of joining Roddickton, Bide Arm, and Englee into the proposed new Strait of Belle Isle seat. And I saw the Premier afterwards and said that, you know, I really thought that should be reconsidered and presented some evidence which I shall refer to in a moment. The Premier listened to that, he listened to my friend for Baie Verte-White Bay, who I believe saw him also, and I believe said essentially the same point. It has much to commend it, you know, bringing Roddickton, Bide Arm, and Englee back in

Mr. Roberts: to the Strait of Belle Isle, joining them as they were for so many years as part of the seat. In fact, they have always been in the seat which began at Cook's Harbour or latterly Ralieg and came South up along to White Bay, originally it was called White Bay, and then in 1956 it was divided into White Bay North and White Bay South. There is a community of interest. There is a long tradition. In 1974, for the reasons which I have adverted to, the previous administration, and we now have two previous administrations, you know, in this Province, the previous administration, the Moores Administration, ended that tradition quite arbitrarily. And I would think that when redistribution comes the independent committee may well recommend, as did the Higgins Commission, that the old White Bay North seat stay perhaps by another name, but the seat which began from Harbour Deep and ran down the coast to St. Anthony, down to Cape Bauid and around to Raleigh, the bottom of Pistolet Bay.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The French Shore seat or something like that it was called then.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, whatever name. I mean, you know, the French Shore seat might not be inappropriate.

But, Mr. Speaker, it would have been I think a mistake to do it now for two reasons. First of all, the Premier has spoken that if he opens Pandora's Box of changing boundaries of seats, forgetting the hon. Mr. Smallwood's legitimate and, you know, well-aided grievances; in fact, I think if the truth is known, Mr. Smallwood

MR. E. ROBERTS has been voting openly and honestly in the wrong district for twenty years. He always used to tell me that he lived in Port de Grave District. And I would bring out the Act and I would say, "You do not, Sir, with respect, The line is the Roache's Line and you live on the Eastern or Southern side of Roache's Line. And he would say, "Who is going to challenge me?" And I guess he had a good point, obviously nobody did, and I do not think it makes any difference because each man casts one vote. Mr. Smallwood, I am sure, cast only one vote, I can take a guess for whom he voted, I would hazzard that. But, you know, that was one example there would be many, many more and once Pandora's box was open we would be here from now to Doomsday. We would be doing the redistribution on the floor of the House and that is not what should be done. That is one reason against it. Another is that the proposed seat would be very, very large. There are about 2,600 people living in these three communities of Bide Arm, Englee and Roddickton. If you add that, Mr. Speaker, to the 10,800 people who will be in the Strait of Bell Isle seat as ammended, you have got about 13,400 people, which would make it one of the largest seats in the whole Province, forty-eight communities spread out over about two hundred miles of coastline, a very unmanageable seat.

The people who would suffer would not be the member who tries to get himself elected there, or the man or woman who is elected, but the people whom that member is trying to serve. Baie Verte-White Bay by that would be reduced to 9,500 people, so you would have one seat of 13,500 and next door to it a seat of 9,500, cheek by fowl, and that would not really achieve very much, if anything. And when those points were put to the Premier he was good enough to recognize them and the bill before the House today is a different one in that it does not propose any change in the boundary between the Strait of Bell Isle seat and the Bay Verte-White Bay seat; it proposes simply an alternation to diminish the Strait of Belle Isle seat and to increase the House by adding a

MR. E. ROBERTS: fourth seat entirely within Labrador, one of them from the border to Groswater Bay and the second from Groswater Bay to Nain or Cape Chidley. The third the Happy Valley-Goose Bay — Northwest River-Mud Lake area and the fourth Western Labrador. There are great inequities in those seats. There must be 30,000 people in Western Labrador?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but there is a lot more than 11,000 people.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, I agree a lot more than 11,000. Are there 25,000?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would say 15,000 or 16,000 people.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, my hon. friend would say 15,000 or 16,000, I would have put it higher than that. I had occasion the other day to be looking at the number of telephones in the area and, you know if that is a judge, there are close on 20,000 people in Churchill, Wabush and Labrador City.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Churchill is in Naskaupi.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Oh, I am sorry, Of course, Churchill, is in Naskaupi. Well, still 17,000 or 18,000 people in Wabush and Labrador City and there are 2,500 on the coast in a new seat. So there will be inequities but I think they are tolerable and I think that those inequities are less burdensome than the situation which we had before. So adding it together, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good Bill, I would ask the Premier and Government to give consideration to changing the name to the Coast of Labrador, that is hardly affecting a principle but I think it would be a nice touch certainly it would restore some historicity to the name of that seat. I regret that we are apparently going to have a fifty-second seat forever. I agree we have to have one in the next general election, in the Thirty-eighth General Assembly but I can argue that again, assuming that I am here after the election; if not those who are here can argue it. This House at fifty-two is too large. We do feel that way and we will certainly try to change it assuming, and I think it is reasonable to assume,

MR. E. ROBERTS: that we will get the opportunity to do so after the next general election.

But finally, Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that will benefit the people of the Island of Newfoundland and the people of the Labrador part of this Province, a measure which will benefit all those people who live in the present Strait of Belle Isle seat and the present Eagle River seat. The two seats are going to multiply and become three. It is a measure which should have been brought up some years ago but that is history now because while the light did hold out to burn the vilest sinners have returned and that being so, Sir, we shall support the measure and give it unanimous support and hopefully make it law this day. Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Menihak.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: I would like to make a few observations on the Bill. Certainly, I agree with the remarks made by my friend and colleague from the Strait's area of Labrador, and the Premier, of course, in introducing this Bill. I think an obvious mistake in distribution of the electoral seats in Labrador has been rectified as a result of this Bill.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have thought many times about the only possible benefit this bill could have been to the Province and that might be in the concept of a span of a seat between the Island part of the Province and the mainland part of the Province. There was no other reason that I could see where the seat was of any benefit to either of the Island part of the Province that 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the population who lived on the Northern Peninsula side of the seat, and the 20 per cent or 25 per cent who lived on the Labrador side of the seat. So I concur with this concept. I would like to say a few words, if I may. The last words first; the suggestion by the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) that Labrador not lose its cultural heritage, that names are important, I certainly would think that the concept of a seat for the Coast of Labrador, which is a minor point as the hon. member suggests, but it is an area where many of our contemporaries and many of our forefathers fished for many years and, of course, you went down on the Coast of Labrador. The name has much more historical significance perhaps to the people on the Island part of the Province than would have the concept of the name of Eagle River.

I might say one other thing, Mr. Speaker, in a few words. When the Premier introduced the bill, suggest the moving of some offices to Labrador, that would be very welcome by the people of Labrador. It has been spoken on many times by all members in this House for many years. I would like to say, and of course I have to speak as the people in my area feel, that we certainly feel there should be at least a mix of many offices that are governing Labrador between Western Labrador and Eastern Labrador, that all offices should not be put in one area. There is a crying need now for a number of offices in Western Labrador; in the Motor Vehicle Registration offices they say the numbers are not there, but it is one that creates a lot of frustration on the parts

MR. ROUSSEAU: of people in Labrador and many other things. And to remove this feeling-this bill is one small measure, as the Premier has indicated _ to remove the frustrations of these people you have to bring the services much closer to them, and I think that the concept of a fourth seat for Labrador, with a new administration and a new Premier, is one that I hope looms well for all of Labrador and for the feelings that this administration will have on behalf of Labrador. I think it is not unwise to say that there are still four members in this House, my hon. friend for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), who is a member of the government, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for the Straits of Belle Isle and, notwithstanding the fact that he is in government, I am sure that the hon. member for Naskaupi along with the three others in the House ensure always that in our opinion the best efforts of this government will be directed towards Labrador and that our first concern has to be to our district and to the region as a whole and of course to the Province as well. I might also suggest, Mr. Speaker, one very important point, and I cannot disagree with the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) nor with other hon. members in the House, nor with the press, nor with the people of this Province, that fifty two seats may well be too many seats. However, Mr. Speaker, in the creating of a full fourth seat for Labrador, I have to mention the point about Western Labrador, the district which is now Menihek, Labrador City and Wabush, which in 1974 the census, I believe, was 11,061 residents. I believe that number was not accurate. I must say that in speaking to the Premier of the time about it there was another hearing in Western Labrador and there were still not the required number to even look at a possibility of two seats there. I believe strongly, as do many people in Western Labrador believe, and maybe other people in Labrador hope that there are at least 15,000 people in Labrador West, that is Labrador City and Wabush, that it is a growing town. I think I would not want to defeat the good feeling that the people of the coast of Labrador have now in attaining their fourth seat, their full seat

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 654

DW - 3

MR. ROUSSEAU: now in inland Labrador, but I would say
that I hope that the next census evaluation that special emphasis be
made on the Western part of Labrador to attempt to get a more
concise reading of the total population

MR. ROUSSEAU: in Western Labrador so as to ascertain whether Labrador may not be worthy in numbers of five seats in the Legislature. Now that creates the problem the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) brought up, and, as I say, other hon. members and other people across this Province agree with, that there are too many seats in the House of Assembly. But certainly one has to give that consideration based on the numbers. If the average seat is going to be 8,000 or 9,000 or 10,000, a seat with 16,000 is at an obvious disadvantage, and I think certainly some consideration has to be given to that. I am sure that the people of Western Labrador, as the people of all of Labrador, rejoice at the fact that now there are four full-time seats in Labrador, but the hope is - of course, you do not stop - you keep trying to forge ahead and try to gain better representation in the area. I think the numbers on the Coast of Labrador are irrelevant really, the small numbers that were mentioned, because the distance that has to be covered is quite large and weather conditions and other climatic conditions make it very difficult to travel the Coast. I think this is a very good move. I certainly welcome the move, support it fully, and, as I say, we will continue in the years ahead, especially before the next census evaluation, to insure that if we do not receive an extra seat, especially in that part of Western Labrador, then the numbers will not be there for it. But I think that a real effort should be made to insure that the frustrations of the people of Labrador are lifted in these meaningful ways, small as they may be, but hopefully they will be followed by much bigger, much greater motivation on behalf of the people of Labrador so that they would much more feel a part of the whole Province. I think they want to, and I could not agree more with the hon. the member for

MR. ROUSSEAU: the Strait of Bella Isle (Mr. Roberts), they do not want to separate, but the frustration they feel at times leads them to various alternatives. That certainly is one, and I think by these meaningful gestures and other meaningful gestures on behalf of these people that we will see a decrease in the amount of ill-feeling and frustration that the people in Labrador feel. So I have no hesitation whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this bill fully. I am very happy for the people along the Southern Coast of Labrador, and also the rest of the people in the area, that better representation will be theirs and they certainly deserve it. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for (Mr. Ottenheimer) Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, three and one-half years ago I rather naively and rather idealistically got involved in politics. In the middle of a soccer game, the first time that we had ever managed to get together in Labrador and play soccer, I decided to enter into politics and very belatedly jumped in and ran in the district of Eagle River. It has been an experience which has been as frustrating for me as it has been for my constituents. I, of course, had certain ideas before that of how government was run and what a member's functions were, but in the last three and one-half years many of these have changed, some for the good and some for the worst.

The district that this bill refers to, this splitting splits essentially my district of Eagle River in half. I welcome that change. I have indicated that almost immediately when the Premier announced his decision to change it, a commitment, for whatever reason

MR. STRACHAN: he may have made the decision - that is immaterial, absolutely immaterial as far as I am concerned - the change was necessary; it was something that I had argued about, fought for and battled for, of course only in the last three years. People before me had done the same.

In the first year of my representing the district as the member for the district, as MHA, I remember that in November I travelled part of the Coast. In January, 1976, I decided to travel all of the Coast. I ended up not managing to cover all of the communities because of bad weather, being stuck in several of the communities a number of times, aircraft problems and so on. The trip, of which I paid the bill, cost me \$6,500. I have since then made a number of smaller trips - generally to one place for one meeting and back again, that is all - and when I review my travel expenses over the last three and one-half years, I find that I have spent on the Labrador Coast - that does not include EPA - in the region of a little over \$8,000. That does not include my present outstanding bill to Labrador Airways as of the

MR. STRACHAN: 31st of January of \$2,899. I decided, rightly or wrongly, to take no free trips. I paid my way all the way and I decided that that was the only way that I could remain free enough to criticize Labrador Airways or E.P.A. or whatever group it was. I felt that if I accepted free rides on their aircraft then pressure would be placed on me; and especially in a small area like that where transportation is so important, it is the direct key, so important, I felt that I could not therefore be in a position to fully take umbrage or argue with the companies who control the travel and transportation within Labrador.

So as I agree with this bill, I agree its introduction. I commend the Government for bringing it in. It will come in place at the next election on dissolution of this House. I think that there must be also another recognition of the fact that people who represent such remote areas must have additional funding and ability to travel. Since then I discussed it with Mike Martin, who once before represented part of the district that I represented, the southern part, and then prior to the last election the South and the North were put together into a district called Eagle River, a name which means absolutely nothing to the people on the Labrador coast. On discussing it with Mike Martin I found that he also had gone in debt and his word of advice to me was never get into the business of dipping into your own pocket, your own savings, and start taking money out in order to maintain your travel. If you consider that to go from Nain, my home, to St. John's eight times a year, then the cost of a return ticket, not including time that can take you anywhere from two days to my longest one was twenty-one days, not including time, the cost of that is more than going from Gander to London and return or certainly down to Florida or Los Angeles. So you find that the \$4,000 which I obtained and argued for two years ago, the \$4,000 virtually just covers the cost of

MR. STRACHAN: getting from Nain to Goose Bay, waiting overnight and getting E.P.A. to St. John's; and, of course, the reverse trip is the worst, from St. John's to Goose Bay and then sitting in Goose Bay for one day, three days, five days, ten days, fifteen days and, as I said on one occasion, twenty-one days before I could manage to make the trip home to Nain.

So, as you see, what I did at that time was I decided therefore that when my money was spent as a member of this House that that was it. I felt that when my money comes through at the end of this session, then I will pay off the \$2,899 to Labrador Airways and that will leave me square with them and that would be the end of my travel as far as that is concerned.

I believe also, as I said, that what should also be included or additionally considered, not for the benefit of the Opposition or Government or whatever it is but for the adequate representation of the Labrador M.H.A.'s of their constituents in Labrador, what should be considered and I am not too worried about the salary; I think the salary should be increased myself but that is not my biggest point or beef - what should be considered as well as this is adequate travelling funds so that no member in Labrador cannot get to a meeting, no member in Labrador cannot be able to travel. And you need to remember that to travel by passenger plane in Labrador means that you get to one community one day and sit for three or four days awaiting a plane to take you 85 miles down the coast to the next community, get off the plane there and you sit maybe for three or four or five days waiting for another plane - if the weather is good. If the weather is poor you can be sitting in one of the communities for seven days, ten days, eleven days, twelve days. So you can see that you could in essence, using the passenger flights only, which are only single-engine Otters, take anywhere up to - I counted

April 2, 1979

Tape No. 656

GH-3

MR. STRACHAN: it one time - almost three months,
three and a half months to travel the district. Therefore, it
means that one has to go into the business of chartering.

MR. STRACHAN: Under the current rates which are \$800, for instance, from Goose to Nain, for a single engine Otter, about \$300 - \$250 an hour for a Cessna, and even then you have problems with Cessnas, as we have all experienced. They are not a very safe aircraft for travelling the Labrador coast. Because of the high winds, the ski problems and the float problems there are some real difficulties in travelling this district.

I also found it very difficult to travel the district. Again, I welcome the bill, I do not want to take away from this bill, but I also found it difficult in travelling the district. But I found that a civil servant from the Department of Rural Development could come into Goose Bay and hire a helicopter and go to the coast of Labrador. Hydro hire helicopters and fly up and down the Labrador coast. The Manpower and Immigration people fly the Labrador Coast by helicopter. The Unemployment Insurance man comes into Labrador by helicopter or chartered aircraft, something which I could never compete with. It was an impossibility to try to compete with that kind of thing, and I mean by competition, to try to keep up. Because as they went along, problems were raised and, of course, we could never be there as an MHA. And you need to remember, representing something like Eagle River, a district like that, there are no offices handy as there are in the more urban centres so that you can drop into the Unemployment Insurance office and get your forms straightened out. There are often long waits on unemployment insurance, there are often long waits on other things.

MR. STRACHAN: So with the result that the demands on the MHA in the more rural district, there are more of the demands. He is similar in many, many ways to a welfare officer, he is similar in many, many ways to an ombudsman.

It is not too often, in many cases in rural districts, that people are tremendously interested in the political views of the person or the philosophy he expounds or the policies that he holds. He is generally regarded in many ways as a person who does things, who helps to cut the red tape, who gets through things with the result, of course, that the experience in this House and around the district has been extremely frustrating, especially in the last years. Also, extremely frustrating in as much as what we call special interest groups in Labrador - what they are termed here, they are not special interest groups in Labrador - but with the term used, the special interest groups also ended up having very large travel budgets so that they were, in essence, receiving from Ottawa or other areas very large sums of money to travel. So, of course, they could spend \$50,000 or \$60,000 for transportation alone on meetings. Of course, I often could not get to the meetings, could not even travel to be present.

What I say is, as well as creating these districts, I would like to commend to the government to consider either creating offices, constituency offices and allowing the MHA to travel and to submit his travel claims exactly the same as any other civil servant does. Have them scrutinized, have them examined, have reasons given for them to be approved; then it removes the burden from the member that

MR. STRACHAN: should he be required to be in a place, or be of assistance to the place, he can be present, that he does not have to consider the fact that he cannot get an aircraft to get him there. And remember that there are no roads. And to turn around and say that in Summer one can travel, you need to remember that in Summer all the communities disperse. So you might find, if you come in Summer to Nain, my home town which has a population of 900, you may meet 300 people; but all the key people in Nain will have gone, they will have dispersed from anywhere from Voisies Bay up to Hebron or Saglek Fiord with the result that it becomes extremely difficult in the Summer. Winter, of course, is the political time, the time for meetings, the time for getting together, when people have the time to discuss. And, of course, that becomes the expensive time to travel, when charter aircraft or helicopters are the only way.

So I welcome the splitting of the district. It is recognition, as I see it, by the government opposite that my district, the district that I represent, is too large. And there is recognition in the fact that it had to be split, a recognition,

MR. STRACHAN: which I may say, some of the special interest groups in Labrador do not also share. However, I feel that the change has been a good one, that being carried out so promptly is obviously a feather in the cap of the Premier. I have no argument with that whatsoever, but I would like to state again the same as my colleague that the name "Eagle River" as such is a name which is not familiar to people there. In the district in the North where I live, Rigolet to Nain and North to Chidley, is called Torngat Mountains. Torngat actually is an evil spirit who resides in the mountains. Torngat is a person who the Inuit people were awfully afraid of coming down from the mountains and the mountain range, the northernmost mountain range of the Torngats took the name from him. There are a number of mountain ranges actually north of Nain. There are Kiglapait Mountains which are the first group three thousand, three and a half thousand feet high. Then there are the Kaumajet Mountains, the Bishops Mitre, Saddle Back, and so on north of that, and then there are the Torngat Mountains.

It may be interesting to state here that in the Torngat Mountains, and this is the name of it, there is a point, right at the moment, of argument which may be interesting for the Government to clear up, because in the Torngat Mountains is the highest mountain east of the Rockies. It has been climbed on two occasions and hopefully, if I am lucky, I will be able to climb it myself this year. It is called, as we call it or it has been named in turn by the climbers, is called L-1, Labrador for L, 1 for highest. Quebec also claims it and calls it Mount d'Iberville after the French pirate of early days, although I do not think he was any more of a pirate than many of the other English pirates but we can call him a pirate. But the highest point, L-1, is definitely within Labrador, and I think that if we are going to name the district

MR. STRACHAN: Torngat Mountain then I think it should be an extremely good point, symbolic point for the Government to make sure that the name remains L-1 or, if not that name, a name which is distinctive to Labrador and this Province and not a name which is distinctive with Quebec.

I found that in representing the district, Mr. Speaker, of Eagle River that what I had in essence was two separate districts. There was Rigolet North, which this recognizes, which had cultural, geographic and political differences; and there was the Eagle River district, as this one creates it, hopefully the Coast of Labrador because that is a name which is used most often, which is another different culture, geographic and political distinction.

In the North we have - Rigolet North - we have mainly native or native and settler people, whereas in Cartwright South we have generally settler people of older extraction right down to Mary's Harbour and Port Hope Simpson. There were differences because the federal government and the provincial government recognize that people in the northern part, the district essentially is split in two, recognize that people in the northern half as native people and, therefore, put in large sums of money in the form of federal-provincial funding, whereas the people in the southern part of my district did not receive that kind of funding. So people in the North could obtain a home for a mortgage rate of \$40 a month whereas the people in the southern part of my district had to build their own homes, do their own work and so on, so with the result that there was a big distinction there. And this is only one of the distinctions; there are many, many distinctions. There is a time zone distinction. I imagine I was the only member who represented a district which had two different time zones. Part of my district was

MR. STRACHAN: on Newfoundland time. The other part of my district was on Labrador time, so I had two different time zones within it, which again augments the fact of this difference, the separation, the split in the district and similarities to it.

There was that geographical difference inasmuch as I do not think you would find people in Nain who have ever been to Mary's Harbour, and I doubt if you would find five or ten people, no more than that, of Mary's Harbour who have ever been to Nain, unless it has been in recent years. But, on the main, the North

MR. STRACHAN:

did not know the South and the South did not know the North. They commuted like the spokes of a wheel into Goose Bay but there was never any reason for somebody from Nain or Davis Inlet or Hopedale to go into Goose Bay and then go from Goose Bay South again. So as a result there were two separate districts as far as the geography was concerned, as far as travel was concerned.

There was a political difference, and I found that in my case this was the one in which I had very great difficulty rationalizing in my mind in the last three and a half years, because the North has been dependant on government, because the North, for instance when I first went to the North you ate, worked and slept government. Government provided food. Government provided housing. Government provided boats. Government provided nets. Government provided the fish plants. Government provided hydro. Government provided every service possible. In recent years, as I see the special interest groups become involved and as suspicion in private enterprise and private capital also increased, or with no knowledge of them at all whatsoever, the North has in some cases become, as far as I am concerned, in policy and viewpoints extremely socialist.

The Southern part of the district was the very opposite in many cases. They were free enterprise people, people who worked individually in that kind of sense. They had had also their bad experiences with operators who often left them hanging in the air. But there was a great degree of difficulty. People in the North had land claims which they wanted to settle. The people in the South felt that they were equally Labradorians but they did not understand and could not comprehend the idea of the land claims. The people in the North, through their associations and groups, had very strong socialist policies that they wanted to expound and expand and yet I found that the people in the South did not understand these socialist policies or it was in an entirely different viewpoint that they saw it. So that

MR. STRACHAN:

the district from a political sense became very difficult to represent; culturally different, geographically different and politically different. Compounded on top of that with its problems of travel, finances and so on, it becomes an extremely difficult district, I found anyway, to represent. And this bill to great measure separates it and creates two separate districts, districts which are now separate, and districts which have a cultural, geographic, political community of interest, the North and the South.

I would also like to add one other point here quite clearly, for I have read through this boundary description here and make another point to the government, or the government at present, that they should consider that in the establishment of the boundaries they should remember that we never, we do not have an established, surveyed boundary on the West of the coast that is the boundary between Labrador and Quebec. It is not surveyed. I would suggest very strongly to government that one of the considerations is not just going by the height of land measurement which everybody takes, but that the government should spend - and I would imagine it would cost \$1 million or \$1.5 million - but the government should spend that kind of money because it is necessary now to establish and survey the border all the way down with survey markers or monuments so that the district then becomes definite and not just a mere description in words with nothing on the land. As I said, the argument with L-1 is an argument which shows the case in point, in which it is claimed by one Province but it belongs to another province.

So what I say here, in this question here, is that there should be consideration. It would have to be done by helicopters, it would have to be done by ground crews, but the boundary all the way down on the Western side should be surveyed and has a great deal of political significance. I think it is also symbolic and it may be interesting to involve people from Labrador on the Coast in the establishment or working on that boundary from a point of view of symbolism

MR. I. STRACHAN:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome this bill. I would say that we should not think that this bill will be the panacea. The district of the Coast of Labrador, if I can say that rather than Eagle River, the district of the Coast of Labrador from Cartwright down to L'Anse-au-Clair is still a very long district, make no mistake about that. When one reaches the bottom of my present boundary, Henley Harbour, Mary's Harbour, Lodge Bay, Henley Harbour area, there is still a gap to the Red Bay and down through the bottom straits there. It is still a vast district in terms of travel and in terms of movement, and the member who represents that district is going to have a much more difficult job than the member who represents the North in which Rigolet to Nain is a considerably easier district to represent both in terms of travel and in terms of time that it would take.

So that district still has its problems; it is still a large district and there are great problems associated with it.

There was mention earlier on about the salary for the members who represent these kinds of districts and all members in fact, and I have felt for some time that I agree with the fact that the MHA or a member representing us should be a full-time job. It is a very difficult job to do it part-time; the salary is not sufficient in many cases to be able to do it part-time. I know full well that I could not have travelled and done the amount of travel, even the small amount that I have done in the last year, without having some additional way of maintaining my family. It is also a great expense on a member who has to maintain a home in Labrador and, of course, has to give it up or maintain it there and own a home in St. John's and try to remain in St. John's because

MR. I STRACHAN: of the difficulty in getting back home. It becomes extremely expensive, an extremely expensive operation, and we need to remember that the public have very little sympathy for us. The cynicism towards politicians, which is at a fair high at the present, means that they have very little sympathy. I can go and sit in front of groups who receive large sums of money to travel and when I explain my travel funds they just do not believe me, they do not accept it, it is totally unacceptable. So I say quite clearly that the salaries should be in line that if we are going to create a full-time job in this House, and not only the House because this is not the main part of our work, then we have to be paid a substantial salary and, as I stated quite clearly, there should be a more equitable way of arranging travel funds for the members and especially for the member of this new district on the Labrador Coast, both the Coast of Labrador and the Torngat Mountains as it comes in.

I want to discuss the idea, and there was some discussion, that Cartwright should be included in the North. There was some discussion that North West River should also be included in the Torngat Mountains seat. I want to discuss that because I think essentially the split as it is made now is a good one, a reasonable one, and it will give hopefully in the future better representation to the people there. It should mean that the person representing the North can advocate the policies hopefully of the people of the North without finding that he is in jeopardy of upsetting the people in the South, and vice versa of course, which is the problem in the position that I find that I am in. In many cases in the North if I was going to argue the policies which the people in the North and their groups and so on would ask me to argue in this House, I would

MR. I. STRACHAN: find it greatly difficult because I am not a socialist and I find it very difficult therefore to defend or to argue some of these policies. I see myself differently.

Hopefully then this change will make it easier and it will remove the frustration. It has been argued for many years and it certainly in the Strait of Belle Isle seat removes an inequity there which people have been complaining about that the election essentially was over before it ever came to Labrador. The seat was decided, the fate of the seat of the Strait of Belle Isle was decided long before the Labrador vote on the Labrador side of it the ballots were cast.

It must be pointed out too I think that we as members of the House, we have now four seats. We have, in essence, one in the Cabinet representing Labrador and he is therefore only one voice in a caucus of thirty and one voice is a Cabinet of seventeen for an area which is a very, very large area with a great deal of potential development. I, similarly, here now am one representing - although I had received tremendous support and of course here before was the member for the Strait of Belle Isle - but we essentially were one or two in a

MR. STRACHAN:

caucus group of twenty. So the voice in Labrador also through this increase has been increased substantially. Do not let us get the idea that the voice is anywhere close to equitable yet. Obviously what we have here, I think that in the North, the Torngat Mountains seat, we have a total of 1,000 voters in the new seat. Imagine, just 1,000 voters. That is all there is in the seat called the Torngat Mountains. So therefore it is obvious, and I commend the government, that it is done on geographic lines, on political and cultural lines because 1,000 people, 1,000 voters of course is a very small number and it cannot be used as a measurement to create other seats. But it is obvious therefore that the seats were done on a geographic basis and we welcome the decision to do it in that way.

The seat in the South has substantially more with inclusion of the Labrador side of the Straits, and also has a larger district. So in future that may be considered, certainly down the road in the future that may be considered a certain split there because it is a very difficult burden on the member who has to represent that. So I think therefore that the bill represents a good step forward. It represents something which was sadly needed being called for. It is something which is absolutely necessary and I welcome it. I hope also that the new seats, or the two they split in the Eagle River District, will encourage other people in Labrador to get involved in the political process, to become involved as elected members and I would encourage anyone there to think seriously on that now that the seats have become certainly easier to represent and certainly more appropriate.

I therefore support this bill, as all of us on this side will do, and would finish and conclude by congratulating the members opposite. It is not often as Opposition - an Opposition's job is not to praise; an Opposition's job is to criticize or to pick apart. It is to look for explanations. But I think on an occasion when things are done which are proper and commendable, then I think it would remiss on our part here on this side of the House, and I do not want to confuse it

MR. STRACHAN:

with other parts or thinking of reductions in the number of members in the House of Assembly or debates on that point - that can remain for other occasions - I think the main thing is to accept the fact that this extra seat which has been called for, looked for, argued and debated for has come about and as a result we welcome it and I welcome it personally.

Mr. Speaker, the change which will occur after the next election, be it next week, ten days or twelve days, two weeks or three weeks, three months or six months or a year maybe away, the change will be an excellent change. I think we will see the seats being contested more fiercely. It will also give possibilities that people who are not rich, people who are not well off can manage to get into the political process and can try to do it. Although, mind you, I still state quite clearly here that anyone who thinks he can represent the Labrador Coast without

MR. STRACHAN: substantial funds of his own unless some changes are made will, like I did, be given a rude awakening and find that the situation is not as easy or as straightforward or cleansailing as I thought it would be. So I commend the Government and ask them as a further point to consider the whole method of travel, expenses of travel, the cost of travel to members of the House. I will not be running in the district on the coast having run once in a district and having accepted the fact that it costs a great deal of money. I have lost my idealism. I have lost my naivete. I found that it costs heavy in the pocket and I, of course, will not be running in either of the two seats. But I state quite clearly that if we are going to involve in the political process, if we are going to involve the political process, people who know the area and are knowledgeable of the area and can represent the area, then there will have to be a better system of allowing them to move and travel and to maintain their families in an essentially remote part of the Province.

In closing then, I would like to state that I totally and thoroughly support the bill as presented in the House.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member care to tell the House which of the seats he is going to select? Has he decided yet?

MR. STRACHAN: I indicated, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly that I entered the politics three and a half years ago with naivete and idealism and a certain belief that things could be done and as I stated quite clearly I spent in the first year a considerable amount of money, that I have lost

MR. STRACHAN: all that naivete and idealism and I have made it quite clear, and maybe the member who asked the question, if he is interested, maybe he should take it and attempt to run on the coast and see exactly what the costs will be to him.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) The hon. Minister of Rural-Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. J. Goudie).

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Bill No. 18, "An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House Of Assembly" - an historic document, I think. At least in my opinion it is an historic document, one that is personally gratifying to me as a member of the House. Hon. members will remember that last year there was a private member's resolution on the order paper which, while time did not permit to call and debate so that we could encourage Government to create a fourth seat within Labrador, and that now obviously is about to become a reality. I am very grateful for that and there are a number of groups who have been mentioned by the previous speakers in this debate, groups like the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, the L.I.A., N.M.I.A., Combined Councils now from last week, the Labrador South Review and Reverend Frank Pry, the Women's Institute of the New Labrador Party, other groups in various parts of Labrador who have been writing not only to me but to the members for the Strait of Belle Isle, Eagle, Menihek and probably other members and ministers over the last couple of years suggesting and demanding in some cases that a fourth seat be created within Labrador. I commend the Premier and Government for very prompt action on this very important issue as it relates to the Labrador part of our Province.

MR. GOUDIE: A number of points have been mentioned by previous speakers. Just to relate to one which was raised by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), he mentioned problems in the Straits area with the present seat system, if I can use that terminology, in terms of administering travelling from the Island part of the Province to the Labrador part and vice versa during heavy ice in the wintertime and other factors which are considered. After moving in to the Department of Rural Development, I experienced the same type of difficulty and received representation from a number of groups in the Labrador South Development Association, and I might point out here, although it has been made public before this, that the Labrador South Development Association on the Labrador side of the Straits has now been moved under the auspices of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay office of this Department and we think it is going to mean a number of things

MR. GOUDIE:

in terms of representation in that area through a development association. On the point raised by the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) of a suggestion that that might possibly be looked at in future, I understand that there is sort of a natural review of seats in the House of Assembly, all seats in the House of Assembly, in something like three years from now. There is a considerable population in the Labrador City-Wabush area and some thought, I think, should be given to that particular area as well when the review does take place. Speaking of reviews, while the debate was taking place this afternoon I had a phone call from Mr. Bart Jack of North West River who at one time was chief of the Indian Band Council and presently is heading up their land claims effort of the NMIA. He thought that the community of North West River, and he did not specify the South or the North side, but the community of North West River should be included in the soon to be created Torngat Mountains district. That is his recommendation. He made that suggestion following statements by the Premier and myself that one of the reasons for creating a fourth district, the proposed Torngat Mountains district, was in relation to special interest groups which was in addition to the geographical factors as well. The special interest group exists on the southern side or the southern shore of the North West River and in the community of North West River in that about half the Indian population of Labrador lives in that area. So Mr. Jack asked that I make that point and I now make it. And perhaps, I would think, they will be submitting briefs in the future to that effect for consideration when the boundaries or districts come up for review again in the future.

I think, and I agree with the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), that the lines which are proposed to be drawn through this bill are adequate for this point in time, this point in our history. I think they are quite adequate for all of the reasons given, but that, of course, does not restrict other interest groups in Labrador from making their points known to government and to the House of Assembly.

MR. GOUDIE:

It is interesting to note - I just want to relate a little short story. The member for Eagle River, the present Eagle River district mentioned, L1, the highest peak in the Torngat Mountains area and actually the highest peak East of the Rockies. It brought to memory something that happened to me in the Northwest Territories in the community of Yellowknife this Summer. I attended a conference there as a representative of the Premier in relation to seal fishery and seal hunting and that industry, and encountered an Inuit person there who was wearing a chain around his neck and a little brown medallion with a letter and a number on it I asked him what it was because I had never seen this thing before. He told me it was his name. I did not know quite what he meant by it. And apparently when the federal government became actively involved in dealing directly with Inuit people in the North, they began a sort of a catalogue system, if you will, and this gentleman pointed out to me that the name from the federal government point of view, the name of the first Inuit or Eskimo person in the North was E1. I just wanted to relate that. I thought of that when under the heading of L1.

I think the suggestion by the member for the district of Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) in relation to a survey of the Quebec-Labrador boundary is very valid as well. I do not know how quickly that could take place but I think it would be sort of a restatement of the decisions of the Privy Council of 1927 and again of Confederation in 1949. I again can relate a very short story. My brother was one of two members of my family who trapped the heights of land area of Labrador in the early parts of this century. And he related a story to me one day that his trapping ground was so close to the border that he actually one morning left his cabin and walked into Quebec, had lunch and walked back again. And during that particular trip he found a tree which he assumed marked a part of the border between Labrador and Quebec. There was a little brass plaque on this tree which indicated that that indeed was one point of the boundary between the two parts of

MR. GOUDIE:

Canada. So perhaps a survey again might be a very appropriate thing to do at some point down the road.

I have very few other points to make, Mr. Speaker. The points have all been made and adequately - not adequately, well made by the previous speakers. I welcome this bill and the implications it has for Labrador, political implications in terms of an increase in the number of sitting Labrador members in the House of Assembly, political implications in terms of the

MR. GOUDIE: various interest groups in Labrador. And if it were possible for me to do it, it is not, but if it were possible for me to do it I would commend to the federal government of this country that they also take the initiative set by our present Premier and this hon. House of Assembly in general, that Labrador should be considered as a separate federal riding as well. Because when you look at the size of the Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador riding, and the problems that one member of this hon. House has in servicing his district, because it is not just the MHA who suffers in this, but also the constituents of that particular district in not having easier access to their elected representative, but when you consider the size of the federal riding, taking in almost half of this Province in some ways, more than half of this Province - not almost, but more than half of this Province, one federal riding - I think that the federal government of this country should make some effort in trying to relieve that situation as well, but that is a debate for a different forum than this.

I again commend the Premier and the Government and the House of Assembly for the prompt action taken on this bill and commend it as a job well done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much time on this bill, as important a piece of legislation as it is. My colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and my colleague the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan)

MR. W.N. ROWE: have very carefully, very comprehensively covered everything that has to do with this piece of legislation. Naturally they spoke first for our side of the House because they are the two members from this side of the House who are most directly affected and had a tremendous amount of experience in trying to represent districts in Labrador and on the Island part, as in the case of the Strait of Belle Isle member (Mr. Roberts), and they had some very enlightening remarks to say on it.

All I would like to say, Sir, is that I welcome this legislation. It is a good piece of legislation. It embodies what I for one, and my colleagues, tried to do back in 1974 when the redistribution bill was brought before this hon. House and the suggestion was very strongly made by us then that there should be a fourth seat in Labrador, and that we should have done it prior to the 1975 election. Unfortunately, that position was not accepted by the government side of the House at that time and we now have this piece of remedial legislation brought in in order to set the matter straight.

I am glad, Sir, that the government has decided to take the views of my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle and my colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) into account and not to change or tamper with otherwise in anyway the district of Strait of Belle Isle and the district of Baie Verte - White Bay. We should leave them as they are at the present time. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that in the near future, before the next election if possible, certainly very shortly thereafter, that does not mean that there is no need to have a completely new redistribution of the district

MR. W.N. ROWE: boundaries in this Province.

The arguments which apply to representation on the Labrador coast apply almost as greatly, if not completely as greatly, in some of our rural Newfoundland seats as they do in the Labrador area.

When that redistribution bill was brought in, it was undoubtedly noticed by Your Honour and other members of the House that there were some rural areas in Newfoundland which had very high populations compared to some of the more urban areas, some of the areas which were closer to the seat of government, some of the areas which were probably a little easier to represent in terms of access to the district, travel around the district.

In some of these rural areas which were remote from the capital, remote

MR. W. ROWE: from the seat of government, with as many as twenty-five or thirty separate, distinct communities were given very high populations and the voters' list was larger than some of the urban areas. I think that was wrong. We suggested then and we suggest now that within the margins that exist, the high and the low in terms of population, that wherever possible the more isolated areas, the more remote areas, the more rural areas, those areas which have smaller communities, wherever possible we should try to keep the population base, the number on the voting list down as far as possible, compared to districts whether urban or rural which are closer to the seat of government which have larger communities in them and which are much easier to represent. We should do that, Sir. Baie Verte-White Bay, for example, I believe is the second largest district in the Province in terms of population and also we have an area up in the White Bay North area as well as the Baie Verte Peninsula, very difficult to represent adequately and properly as far as the people themselves are concerned. For anybody, it is a super-human effort to represent that district properly, the travelling around, the distance from St. John's which is the seat of government. All of these things, Mr. Speaker, make it difficult, make it expensive for the member, make it expensive for the residents of the district when they are trying to come in to St. John's in order to have their needs placed before the Government, before this hon. House for that matter. So wherever possible, we should try to keep these rural areas a little smaller, a little more compact and allow them to have the kind of representation which is needed in rural areas. The diversity of interest, for example, which has been touched on here today; if you have thirty communities in a rural area very often there is no community of interest among all of the communities and we have diversity of interest and this again causes difficulties. So in the rural areas there should be

MR. W. ROWE: strictly relevant to the division of a Labrador seat. The reasons for dividing Eagle River into two seats apply just as strongly, or almost as strongly, to some other rural areas in the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we accept without hesitation the principle of this bill. I am not sure I go along with the remarks made by the Premier concerning the number of seats in the Province - 52 seats. I think we could save the population of the Province,

MR. W. ROWE: the public, the public treasury some money if we did not have so many seats. The difficulty, of course, results from the fact, which I have already mentioned, that in order to reduce the seats we would have to be very careful not to enlarge the seats in the remoter, more isolated, far-flung rural districts which are far from the seat of Government here. I realize that there is a difficulty involved. I would just as soon keep the number of seats that we have now if the alternative was to make any rural seats larger. I do not think that would necessarily have to be the case. I think that we could keep the rural seats smaller and also attain the desired end of reducing the number of seats altogether, but that is not a point which need preoccupy us here today. Suffice it to say that when redistribution takes place again we will have to get into that question and the Commission of Enquiry which was set up, the Boundaries Commission, will have to go into it as well.

Labrador of course needs much more than a division of one seat into two in order to give it four seats rather than $3\frac{1}{4}$ or $3\frac{1}{3}$.

I and a number of members of the House as well had the pleasure of attending a meeting in North West River of the combined community councils and town councils and city councils from Labrador - they were town councils although we have the term city used, we have what basically is a town council situation or a community council situation.

Mr. Speaker, the need to bring Labrador more fully, as the Premier indicated and as we have all said many times before, more fully into the political mainstream of our life in this Province was painfully evident at those meetings of the combined councils. A suggestion was made that a form of regional government should

MR. W. ROWE: be instituted in order to give Labrador a greater say in the political life of our Province. I think that this is probably a good idea. A form of government which could allow the people of Labrador and the various regions of Labrador to make decisions on a regional basis on matters affecting their own local destiny, their future as far as local matters are concerned, would go a long way to removing a great deal of the frustration which presently exists in Labrador vis-a-vis the Island part of the Province and vis-a-vis the Government of the Province which is perceived to be very, very remote from them. I think that we should move in that direction, Mr. Speaker, and do our best to allow two things at least to take place: local decisions to be made wherever possible in Labrador and to make sure that also as far as Provincial decisions are made affecting Labrador as a part of this Province, and the richest part of this Province perhaps, that Labradorians and all areas of Labrador feel that they will be in the mainstream of the political life and have a decision-making capacity as far as these future developments are concerned.

Four seats out of fifty-two is not very much. The population may be only thirty, thirty-five, forty thousand at the present time. The population is not the only criterion to go by in this particular case. We have to talk in terms as well of the frustrated feeling among people in Labrador concerning the Government of this Province. We have to take into consideration the diversity of interest, and interests in various regions of Labrador West, for example; the Coast of Labrador, both the North coast and the South coast and the Strait of Belle Isle area; and Central Labrador. These are basically - Anyone

MR. W. ROWE: who has travelled the area extensively would know that there is a diversity of interests in Labrador and that there is not only just one interest which is represented by Labrador.

 Therefore, Sir, four seats out of fifty-two in this honourable House will not be in my estimation enough to cause the people of Labrador to get rid of their feeling that they are outside the pale, that they are not involved in the decision making, decisions that go on affecting their own destiny and their developments; They feel there is a lack of consultation; they feel that much more needs to be done as far as involving them in the political and sociological life of our Province is concerned.

 So, Sir, we should look very seriously at increasing.

MR. W. ROWE:

in a sensible, rational, reasonable way increasing the participation of Labradorians in the political life of this Province. Whether we are talking in terms of more seats in Labrador, it is difficult to say because it may be difficult to justify in terms of pure population base although as I said that should not be the main consideration. There are other ways of doing it. Meetings of this House of Assembly, for example, in Labrador on a regular basis, in different areas of Labrador on a regular and frequent basis would certainly be a good, sound, sensible way of making sure that the people of Labrador feel and know on genuine grounds that they have access to the House of Assembly. Cabinet meetings, Mr. Speaker, by the government on a regular and frequent basis in various areas of Labrador and in other areas of the Island part of the Province as well, but we are talking about Labrador at the moment, should take place on a regular, as I say, and frequent basis in order to make sure that people with legitimate concerns can have access to the government as a whole, not merely some representative of a government department who may be in a part of Labrador from time to time. These are all ways and means and I mention them here now because I think that this bill symbolizes the need for greater representation in all ways on the part of Labrador and the need to bring Labrador more in the mainstream of our political life.

Decentralization of government departments is another method which can be used as well to allow, again, decision making to take place on the spot in various areas of Labrador so that people do not have to feel and know that they have to come to St. John's or send their documents, send their applications, do all this sort of thing, send it into St. John's and wait and not have a chance to represent themselves or make sure that their interests are put forward. There should be decentralization of government departments to allow as much decision making as possible in Labrador, especially in the areas that affect Labrador's development itself.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, without belabouring the issue let me say that we support this bill wholeheartedly. It is too bad it was not into effect before the last election as we would have another voice in Labrador now during this present session and the preceding three or four sessions that have gone already. It is late but we welcome it and in, I would suspect, unanimously passing this bill and turning it into law I believe that we are doing the right thing for this Province as long as we do not labour under the delusion that all is now solved with regards to Labrador, that many more things need to be done both in terms of development and in terms of bringing the people of the area into the mainstream of this Province because I believe that within another generation or so, or during the coming generation we will see the whole economic center of gravity, as my friend has said and as I have said and others have said many times, the whole economic center of gravity will move towards Labrador and perhaps even center in Labrador within a generation or so. And it is important at that time and during that process the increasing population of Labrador feels genuinely that it has been in a position to affect its own destiny, to make decisions about its future and its destiny was in its own hands, Mr. Speaker. We support this bill, Sir, without hesitation and we were very delighted that it was finally brought into the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): If the hon. Premier speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the bill we are now having a look at. First on the matter of the number of seats; I preambled by saying I believe most of the things that need to be said on this bill have been said. My colleague from the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) have had a fair amount to say on the subject. On the number of seats I too feel that

MR. SIMMONS: the direction to go in is not towards more seats, we ought to be looking at either trying to accommodate this new provision for Labrador within the existing number. This could be done by taking a seat elsewhere. There would need to be some rearrangement, obviously, and it is not for me to suggest how that would be done. Somebody would have to take a look at it and deal with the figures involved in some of the more urban parts of the Province.

I think it is a wrong step to be increasing the number of seats. I felt back in 1973 or 1974, when we debated this matter, that fifty-one was too many and I certainly feel that fifty-two are too many. I just wanted to be on the record on that particular subject.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that back in 1973 we had the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Then subsequently we had a bill brought into this House sponsored by the government to give effect to a redistribution of the seats and to add to the number of districts from forty-one, with forty-two members but forty-one districts, to fifty-one, with that particular redistribution.

I believe that most members of the House will recall that any similarity between the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission of 1973 and the bill brought into this House subsequently by the government was totally coincidental. Having gone through the expensive and protracted exercise of having an Electoral Boundaries Commission set up and giving it the mandate to do its works, and to sit around the Province and to receive submissions around this Province, having gone through that expense and that exercise, the

MR. SIMMONS: government then threw the report out the window, you remember, Mr. Speaker, and proceeded to gerrymander the seats in good old fashion. Indeed, so thoroughly were the seats gerrymandered that we even came up with a new word for it, as you remember, and the word comes to mind when you realize that one of the seats that were gerrymandered in real old-fashioned, Tammany Hall fashion was the seat called Salmonier - Conception. I think Salmonier - Conception. Yes, Salmonier - Conception in the Electoral Boundaries Commission report, the seat you will recall, Mr. Speaker, which would have taken in that bit of Conception Bay which is now in Harbour Main - Bell Island, the mainland part of the Harbour Main - Bell Island seat and then the St. Mary's Bay area. And there was a jib on the map somewhat like that taking in part of Conception Bay, just a small part of it, the part just to the west of Seal Cove and then most of St. Mary's Bay and it was in a seat to be called Salmonier - Conception. But, of course, we had a particular problem, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, in that we had two members who would have been vying for the one seat, the now Minister of Fisheries and the now Minister of Mines and Energy. So there had to be some fast footwork and that bit of gerrymandering was so obvious, so blatant, that it goes down in our records as Doodymandering. It was a special bit of exercise to cater to one particular individual and they came up with that monstrosity, electorally, called Harbour Main - Bell Island to satisfy the particular requirements of that gentleman the now Minister of Mines and Energy.

At the same time, of course, you will recall what they did to the Labrador seats, a problem that we are now beginning to correct with this

MR. SIMMONS: particular bill.

The Naskaupi seat as proposed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission would have involved the Goose Bay area plus the North coast which will now go into the proposed Torngat seat. The Commission did not propose at any time that we have a seat running the entire length of the coast of Labrador, the present Eagle River seat. That too went out the window when the politicians on the government side of the House got their hands on it.

You will also recall what happened to the Baie Verte - White Bay seat in that particular exercise too.

Mr. Speaker, I make those points as a preamble to a suggestion I would like to make to the House. I happen to think that the process of an Electoral Boundaries Commission is a good one and it is now embedded

MR. SIMMONS: in law, as the House will be aware. It is a good process. It is so good a process that it should be allowed to work. It was not in 1973 or 1974 allowed to work. It was allowed to go through the exercise, but its work was never embodied in the redistribution proposal which came before this House. Now we read in one of the proposals for change contained in this bill, Section 3, that there would be some changes to the Electoral Boundaries Limitation Act of 1973 to allow for a review by the commission in the year 1983. The 1983 exercise as provided for in this bill will be just as useless, just as completely useless and without effect as was the 1973 exercise by the commission, unless we give to the commission in law a mandate, a clear mandate, and this is my suggestion, that we give to the commission a mandate which cannot be tampered with by the government in power. I say the government in power because it is well known that under normal circumstances the government in power would have the majority in the House and if there is tampering to be done, it would naturally be the government power that would do the tampering. It is the government in power that prepares the legislation to come before this House. So, I suggest that in order to give this Electoral Boundaries Commission some teeth, some effect, some powers, some authority which cannot be tampered with by the politician, we ought to write it into the bill to allow, to provide that the Electoral Boundaries Commission in 1983 which is the next time it would sit barring some amendments or other instruction from this House, that that Electoral Boundaries Commission would be given the mandate to redraft, not for consideration but for implementation, to redraft the boundaries of the Province, of the electoral districts throughout the Province, so that once you have this

MR. SIMMONS: independent commission of three or five or whatever the numbers are-I have not read the detail today - once you have the Electoral Boundaries Commission doing its exercise in 1983, receiving briefs, otherwise having input, then it would come in with its report and that report would be the law of the land. That recommendation would then be ready for implementation as the new electoral boundaries of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken a look today at the 1973 report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission and, with the experience we have had since this report became available, I think most members of the House will agree that the report was not such a bad report after all. The commissioners did their work very well and had we been allowed to proceed after 1973 along the lines of the recommendations contained in this report, we would be much better off today in terms of the kind of representation we could give to the people of this Province. The commission in 1973 talked in terms of three seats and a part for Labrador. I am not suggesting that we ought to have subscribed to that part of the report, but, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: The Commission only did that

because the legislation -

MR. SIMMONS: That is my point. But, Mr. Speaker, the Electoral Boundaries Commission could only act within its terms of reference, within the parameters it was given and one of those parameters, one of those instructions was to gear its recommendations having in mind that Labrador should get three seats and a bit. Three and a half, I think, was the instruction to the Boundaries Commission. When the redistribution bill went through this

April 2, 1979

Tape 669

GH-3

MR. SIMMONS: House it did not give quite three and a half, as you know.

Mr. Speaker, if we gave through this legislation, through further changes in the Electoral Boundaries Limitation Act of 1973, if we gave

MR. SIMMONS:

an appropriate set of instructions to the Commission of 1983, the next one which will be struck or appointed, then we would not have this problem as politicians of engaging in an exercise which is loaded with possibilities for conflict of interest. I was very, very angered by the way the seats were gerrymandered in 1974.

MR. F. ROWE: Watch it.

MR. SIMMONS: The word 'gerry' predates the present occupant of the Chair. 'Gerrymandering', as Mr. Speaker will realize, is an honourable term and has no reflection on people present.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is not an honourable term, a dishonourable term. Elbridge Gerry was the man who first gerrymandered.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, honourable in our ranks. What I meant to say is it does no dishonour to persons present, to allay the fears of my colleague from Trinity-Bay de Verde. What was the guy's name?

MR. ROBERTS: Elbridge Gerry. He was the governor of Connecticut, I think.

MR. SIMMONS: Elbridge.

MR. ROBERTS: Elbridge Gerry.

MR. SIMMONS: His name was Mander or just Gerry?

MR. ROBERTS: Gerry.

MR. SIMMONS: All right. We are learning something over here.

MR. DOODY: You have to start sometime.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, you have to start sometime - which puts me well ahead of the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, who has not started.

Mr. Speaker, before I get away from that particular point, just let me reiterate that I feel pretty strongly that the matter of the redistribution of electoral boundaries is not something that should be left to the discretion of this House in particular terms. The overall, the umbrella provision has to be in the hands of this House, we are the legislative body for the Province. but that can be accomplished by giving the Electoral Boundaries Commission an overall mandate to bring in a report for implementation as to what the boundaries ought to be in future time.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I come now to another subject which was raised somewhat by my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and that is the matter of the expenses incurred by members of the House of Assembly. I believe this is particularly pertinent to the bill before us because the two members who will in future represent the Torngat and Eagle River, the new proposed Eagle River seat as spelled out in this bill, these two members in particular are going to have a very difficult time at once representing their people and on the other hand staying within the budget provided by the public treasury for the purpose. I represent a seat which is not nearly as inaccessible as either of the two seats we are talking about here in Labrador, and I find it quite impossible to be able to visit the district with any degree of regularity on the amount provided from the public treasury. The amount, I believe, in my case is \$3,000 per year. My annual expenses, documented, and I would be pleased to let the members of the House see them for the one or two years that I have actually documented them on paper, my expenses in the year 1974, the first full calendar year in which I served in this House, were \$5,700 in respect to work in the district, travelling to and from the district and within the district, \$5,700. I did document it for one other year. I forget the year, it is either 1976 or 1977. The amount was of the order of seventy-one hundred and something dollars, travel to and from the district.

You have to represent a rural district at some distance from St. John's to appreciate the costs involved. To attend, to accept an invitation, for example, to speak for twenty minutes at a graduation banquet in the town of Burgeo, to get from here to Burgeo and back again apart from involving three days of time involves about \$400 in expenditures.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The costs involved are astronomical. They are also very unfair, Mr. Speaker. I have seen occasions and I will just cite one to you from my own experience. I believe-while I am talking about my own district, I do it because that is the one I know about-but I believe similar examples could be given by members representing other districts somewhat distant from St. John's. I have had occasion to see an individual in the public service who has the capability to requisition a Government aircraft. I am not talking about a minister or a politician; I am talking about a person in one of the departments of Government. I saw him at the very last instant make a decision that although he had requisitioned the aircraft and the aircraft had come for him and was now sitting on the ground about 20 feet from him, he decided that, after all, perhaps he would take his car instead to travel from point A to point B because that way he could claim his mileage and he could also do some other things in the process.

The irony is that elected members of this House do not have that kind of option, even if it is a good one to have, I am not suggesting that. The point is that people in the public service who are employees of this House, employees of the people of the Province are in a much better position to perform their duties on behalf of the public than we are who are elected to guard the public purse. That is the irony of it. That is the irony.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) of the university, and the police, and everybody else living on the public purse.

MR. I. STRACHAN: I made more money when I was with the Extension Service at the University.

MR. R. SIMMONS: That is right. Those of us who have been in any other position other than the elected

MR. R. SIMMONS: position and a number of people
in this House -

MR. ROBERTS: And better pay in the bargain.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The hon. the Premier is a former teacher and many others are former teachers - the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. C. Brett) in his capacity with the school board - all of us are aware - the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. I. Strachan) with the University Extension - all of us who were in quasi public positions were able to perform our work knowing that we did not have to contribute to the cost of it. Knowing that if we had to go, as in the case of my colleague, my friend from Trinity North, knowing that if he had to travel from Clarenville out to Bonavista to look at a school, nobody called him in and said, "Now, Charlie, we want you to go to Bonavista and we are going to give you \$20 to do it and if it is any more than that you have to pay it." I mean, it just did not work that way. If the man's time was required in Bonavista on a given day then the sensible approach was taken. He was not allowed to rent a helicopter or charter a jet to go down there, but by conventional means he was allowed to get from point A to point B and was reimbursed for that. That makes a lot of sense it seems to me. And that is what applies throughout the public service but does not apply when it comes to elected people. And that is the only exception.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to compound the problem further - and here I may get in trouble with some of my friends in the house, but I will say it anyway - I happen to think that the expense money, whether it is three thousand, or two, or one, or whatever, ought to be for expenses. There are people in this House who in terms of expenses - I am not talking about entertainment;

MR. R. SIMMONS: I have always taken the view that any entertainment expenses I incur are my private responsibility; I do not think the public Treasury should be reimbursing me if I am entertaining somebody, I just do not believe it; but in terms of the normal expenses that I incur, travel, accommodation, and food while I am in my district, that is the kind of expenses I am talking about. There are, of course, people in this House-and I am not reflecting on them personally, I am reflecting on the system - there are people in this House who, I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, do not spend \$200 a year on expenses in respect to their district's responsibility. Not that they are stingy, Mr. Speaker. I am not suggesting that; I am suggesting that there is no need to. I am thinking particularly of a colleague such as mine from St. John's West (Dr. H. Kitchen). I mention him because he is the one on this side of the House in the category I am thinking about, but I am thinking about the St. John's seats generally where it is very difficult in the run of a year to spend any -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Batmobiles from Waterford-Kenmount are minimal.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I would think so.

There is something wrong with the way we are going about this business of reimbursing members of the House. I want to draw attention to what my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. I. Strachan) has said that he has decided that he just can not, not that he does not want to, he can not, he just can not afford to run in either one of these seats anymore. That is what he said to us this afternoon. He just can not afford -

MR. I. STRACHAN: Wiser in the head and poorer in the pocket.

MR. R. SIMMONS: He just can not afford to run there anymore. Now if that is the case with him, and I

April 2, 1979

Tape 671

RT-4

MR. R. SIMMONS: believe it to be the case because I happen to know the kinds of dollars he is talking - I was on one trip with him a couple of years ago when he visited a part of the district, just a part of it, and I remember the helicopter charter cost him about

MR. SIMMONS: \$3,500 for a four or five-day stint into about a third of the communities in his particular district. He spent more on one visit to a third of the district than is available to him, or about the same amount that is available to him, for the whole year's expenses in all of the district.

Mr. Speaker, I have cited on one end of the argument that there are members who are spending much more than they are getting from the public treasury for the purpose, and I have cited that there may be at the other end people who are not spending what they are getting.

MR. MARSHALL: Will the hon. member finish before six o'clock?

MR. ROBERTS: If not, we are back here tonight.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Very quickly, I will just make this one - I did not realize it was so near six, actually - just this one statement before adjourning the debate.

The way out of this particular dilemma, Mr. Speaker, is to do for the elected people what you are doing for the public service - allow them, within ground rules, within guidelines, to claim expenses when they travel within their jurisdiction. This reimbursement would be subject to proper scrutiny, of course. I am not suggesting that, but it seems to me that is the route to go and treat us as you treat the public servants - reimburse us for out-of-pocket expenses, and if we do not have expenses do not reimburse us.

Mr. Speaker, it being six o'clock I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. minister.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three o'clock and that this House is now adjourned.

April 2, 1979

Tape 672

GH-2

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) It is moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'. Carried. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow 3:00 p.m.