



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 89

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Sir, this morning outside of this honourable House I was viciously attacked, my character and my integrity was viciously attacked by a Mr. Purdy, project manager for Scrivener Products Limited over here at the Health Science Complex.

Your Honour, in this honourable House last week and yesterday, I called upon the Minister of Public Works to produce certain information concerning the calling of tenders and the awarding of contracts for the Health Science Complex at Memorial University. The Minister of Public Works, Sir, promised to get me the information on tomorrow. Today, Sir, outside of the House the manager, project manager for Scrivener Products viciously attacked my integrity.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have no choice in view of the vicious attack that was made on me, to either bring Mr. Purdy before the bar of this honourable House or send for the records, Sir or ask the Minister of Public Works -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a point of personal privilege.

MR. NEARY: What is not a point of personal privilege, Sir. Send for the records, Sir, from Scriveners of all details of advertisements published and the names of the publications involved in the effort on the part of Scrivener, Sir, to secure general trades and engineering contracts for work on the Health Science Complex.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Scrivener's projects manager should be anxious that all this information be made public so that it will be seen by all the people of this province the degree and the nature of their compliance with federal and provincial practices and methods and procedures of calling tenders and awarding contracts for the Health Science Project.

The minister or Mr. Purdy, Sir, before the bar of this House, should provide the House with all submissions, whether or not contracts have been reopened or renegotiated and the names and dates and fees where

continuance of work agreements have been reached. All documents, Mr. Speaker, because of the attack that has been made on me as a member of this honourable House, all documents in connection with the Health Science Complex, Sir, the calling of tenders and the awarding of contracts, should be brought before this honourable House if there is going to be any credibility at all to the press conference that Mr. Purdy elected to call outside of this House this morning and not give the Minister of Public Works an opportunity to make his statement in the House on Monday.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not get up on a point of order because a point of privilege supersedes a point of order. I get up so that the gentlemen of the press will know what our position is and they seem to be taking notes rather assiduously. That is not a point of personal privilege on the part of the honourable member for Bell Island. Statements made outside the House by somebody not connected with the House, are not something that somebody ought to get up in this House and raise as a matter of personal privilege. I would suggest that if the honourable the member for Bell Island got up in the House and raised a point of personal privilege every time somebody said something about him that he did not like outside, that is all we would be dealing with in the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. My comments were related to what was said in this honourable House, Sir, yesterday and last week. We have no recourse, Sir, but to ask to have the documents tabled in this honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is not for the Chair to rule on matters that take place outside the confines of this Chamber. It is not really a point of privilege raised by the honourable member. If he is not satisfied with the statements alleged to have been made by the gentleman referred to, then I am sure he has a recourse in the courts which has

no connection, in a sense, with this legislature.

So, it is not really a point of privilege.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is there any possibility of getting leave of the House to move the Question Period to say four thirty until we get some ministers in their seats in order that we may ask questions of the ministers? I have a number of important -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: I realize the reason, Mr. Speaker, I do not need any comments from the Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Could I have some order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Several of my colleagues and myself have some serious questions to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F.B. ROWE: And ministers are not in their seats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F.B. ROWE: So I ask leave of the House to move the Question Period to four thirty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Chair is not prepared to move the time of the Question Period ahead.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations? Would the minister care to indicate to the House precisely how the three and one-half million dollars that was made available by the Government of Canada for training and retraining the chronically unemployed in Newfoundland is going to be used? Could the minister give us some specific details on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations:

HON. E. MAYNARD:) (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any specific details at this time. As the honourable member is well aware, the three and a-half million dollars as provided by the Canada Department of Manpower, the details are being worked out by a federal-provincial committee and until such time as the exact details and specific uses of the three and a-half million dollars are worked out, then I cannot release any details.

I assume that in the not too distant future, maybe within the next two or three days, these details will be available and I will certainly make an announcement to the House at that time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the same minister would indicate to the House if he has yet received the report of the Commissioner of Human Rights on the dismissal of the heavy equipment operator in the Department of Highways on religious grounds?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received the report.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister going to table the report in the House? First of all, perhaps I should ask the minister what action the minister has taken on the report if any?

MR. MAYNARD: There has been no action taken on the report as yet, Mr. Speaker. I received the report yesterday afternoon just as I was leaving the office. I will decide what action I am going to take on it in due course.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Will the minister be tabling the report in the House?

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not be tabling the report of the Human Right's Commission in the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Acting Premier could indicate whether the lay-offs at the Labatts Breweries in Stephenville are permanent lay-offs, temporary lay-offs or does the Acting Premier know anything about the lay-offs out in Stephenville?

HON. T.A.HICKMAN (Acting Premier): I am not in a position to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the facts.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Acting Premier care to inform the House if the government intend to undertake the public relations programme to make the people of this province aware of the new hotline on the eighth floor by advertising in the newspapers and commercials on radio and television because the number is not listed in the telephone directory?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that would not be a matter of government policy, that would be a decision for the honourable the Premier. It is

his line but the indication that I believe the honourable the Premier has already received is proof positive that a large percentage of the people of the province are already aware of the number and that they are using it enthusiastically and getting the kind of results that they are delighted with.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable Acting Premier care to give us the number of the hotline in the House? Does the minister know what it is?

MR. HICKMAN: In view of the fact that I do not have to phone the Premier, he is so readily accessible to me, I have never bothered to check on any of his telephone numbers and I hope I will never have to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance, Sir, the President of the Treasury Board

would care to tell the House because this is probably the only opportunity I will have to ask this question, Sir, before we adjourn, before Christmas. What arrangements have been made for holidays in the public service, for the public service employees this year, for Christmas. What arrangements have been made for Christmas holidays?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, there was a release given the other day, in effect, that Christmas parties will be held only on and after four o'clock on Friday, the week before Christmas. As far as the time of the actual holidays as the House is concerned, as far as I know at the present time it is restricted to Christmas and Boxing Day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is not this a major departure from procedure in previous years to only allow civil service to have their Christmas party at four o'clock on Christmas Eve? Is that feasible? Is it workable? Is it practical?

MR. EARLE: Obviously the honourable gentleman asked the question after, we will see how it works but we think it is going to work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Santa Claus comes after twelve.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for my honourable and dear friend, the Minister of Social Services. I wonder if the Minister of Social Services -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not smiling today. You cannot get him to smile today.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Social Services, Sir, would indicate to the House how many over payments resulting from a breakdown in the computer equipment or faulty equipment, how many over payments were caused in this way that were detected a couple of months ago by the minister's department?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I did not even know the computer broke down. If the member wants it in a day, I will take notice of the question, if he wants me. Really this is the first information I have had of it.

MR. NEARY: Well then, Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware -

MR. MURPHY: He is Dick Tracey, not me.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware that a number of these cases dating back to August 1968 have been passed over to the Justice Department to take action against some of these people who are now old age pensioners. Is the minister aware of that? As the result of overpayments caused by the computers, a breakdown in the computers?

MR. MURPHY: Previous to 1968. He does not hold me responsible for that does he? I only came in office in December 1972. What do I know about 1968?

MR. NEARY: If the minister would allow me. These were passed over in 1973, I believe, the minister was there then, passed over to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

MR. MURPHY: Possibly there may be overpayments due, Sir, because of the fact when people are still receiving our cheques it is no problem to deduct the amounts from that but after they have passed from our rolls and go out into other areas then it is money owed to taxpayers not me, it is not a personal thing, Sir. This is owing to taxpayers of the province and it is the same as any other debt that is due. So if there are overpayments due government, perhaps our only recourse is to put it through the Department of Justice. I do not know how many but there is no trouble to find out if I had notice of the question. You know, we have numbers of officials down in the office, it is just a matter of phoning any number down there, we have twenty-three extensions, and we would give you all this information but possibly you do not want to do it that way, you just want to put it on the floor of the House. Is there any undertone in this like deep dark plots that were given out like contracts without calling tenders, would this be significant? I am just wondering what the reason is, Sir, but I will try and get the information when I read Hansard and find out what the question is.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. When the minister is getting the information I wonder if he would be kind enough and good

enough to let the House know whether he has gone over these lists that were passed over to the Justice Department with a fine tooth comb, to see if any hardship was created as a result of threatening to prosecute these people, especially the veterans and the old age pensioners and the widows? Could the minister undertake to let the House know whether any hardship is being created as a result of the action taken by the Justice Department?

MR. MURPHY: In view of the complexion of the question now, Sir, I would ask that it be placed on the Order Paper and I will get a suitable reply to it. It is getting a little bit deep for me from what I understand of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know what hardship is created by anybody, such a foolish question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable and jovial minister would care to tell the House what steps his department have taken to assist organizations and individuals who wish to establish day-care centres in the province?

MR. MURPHY: I saw a draft here of a very comprehensive document that has been prepared by an interdepartmental committee. (I think there are five departments.) on the whole question of day-care and homemaker services. This is the draft I saw today. We went over it down there. It is being prepared and this committee, which was appointed by the Executive Council, will be submitting a complete report before the end of the year and I certainly hope to have it in the hands of every member of this House. I think, Mr. Speaker, while I have a chance, that it does apply to every area of this province because of the fact that it is something new that has arisen in various provinces, day-care centres, and homemaker services. We have given a long, hard look at it. Just how far we can go - it is not too much of a problem as far as the Department of Social Services is concerned because we can get these programmes shared, if it is a part of our welfare programme. Other areas as well are quite interested.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are having a long, hard look at the needs, what areas of the province add the total cost of these projects to the government.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the minister has declared publicly that I am confused when I suggested that the school boards and the school tax authorities are being asked to contribute more than five per cent towards the operating and capital costs of education, would the minister deny or confirm the fact that the amount of \$1 million that has to be collected by the Avalon Consolidated School Board, compared to the \$1.4 million grant from the government, represents far in excess of five per cent of the local input and in fact represents closer to forty-one point six per cent local input?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not using the figures correctly. In his statement yesterday, he took two subheads, that of operation - Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is confused and I will endeavour to answer the question so that the matter will be clear. I either do that or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is what I am attempting to do.

There were two mistakes that the honourable gentleman made. He took two votes, the maintenance and operation and the capital, two particular ones, and isolated these as educational expenses. There are many other educational expenses in the elementary/secondary area. He did not take all of the mathematical data. He did not add up enough figures, plus he used \$8 million, which is the projected income for next year, not for the present budgetary year. In other words, we are talking now about the figures tabled last March in the estimates. That was a second mistake of using the amount of \$8 million which is anticipated for next year and endeavouring to get what proportion that is of educational expenses; whereas, the figure is between \$3.8 million or \$4 million. In terms of the estimates tabled last year and the amount collected locally last year, the amount collected locally comes to less than five per cent. It is approximately three per cent.

What you do is you take, rounding out the figures, the net expenditure on elementary and secondary, not the gross, but the net - (If you use the gross, obviously the figures are a bit different. The net seems to be the more accurate one.) is \$130 million. Then you divide \$4 million into that. It comes to about three per cent. Now in certain of those subheads, one can argue whether there is \$10,000 here that should be counted or should not be counted. Basically, it is the net expenditure minus the expenditure on post-secondary or vocational or university. It is the net expenditure in the elementary and secondary area.

Now there can be some argument you know in certain votes what would be a portion here or a portion there and that could be a difference of opinion. It is, in fact, for last year less than five per cent. Now we could not say what it will be this year. If we are judging about \$8 million collected locally, we could not really say what percentage it is until we have the estimates for the next year. We can really only talk about the fiscal year now in progress,

but for the fiscal year now in progress, it would be less than five per cent. It could be three, three point five or four depending on an argument of apportionment in certain votes.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister did not answer the question I asked him but since he got onto the \$130 million net, I wonder if the minister would be kind enough to table in this House an itemized list of the net expenditures or the contribution the government has made to the primary and elementary and secondary schools in this province, an itemized list of that \$130 million because I maintain it is not all going to primary, elementary and secondary schools.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it has been tabled, it is in the estimates. It is in the 1974-1975 estimates.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to know how you got \$130 million.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, if the honourable gentleman wants on Monday to come down to the office, we will go over the figures together.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, will the minister table the list?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there is no sense my - if the honourable gentleman wants another copy of the estimates tabled, here, if there is a page, you can have them.

MR. F. ROWE: You are evading the question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Here, give the honourable gentleman a copy.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister is evading the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am not evading the question. He wants the information tabled. It was tabled in the estimates. If he wants another copy, if he has mislaid it, since there are no pages around -

MR. F. ROWE: Completely inaccurate. That is not right, Mr. Speaker. I do not want the estimates. I want an itemized list.

The minister's figures are totally incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a question.

MR. F. ROWE: That is an accurate statement, that is what it is.

Would the minister indicate to the House, the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, the total debt of all the school boards in this province?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check to get that figure accurately because obviously it changes from the last time we have it in. I can undertake to get it for Monday.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It changes from day to day.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question. Could the minister break this down by each school board in the province as well, Mr. Speaker?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That I may not be able to do by Monday.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Education. Has the minister given any consideration to assisting the school boards in this province by liquidating the debts that they presently have in order that the capital operating grants to the school boards can be used for these purposes alone instead of servicing the debt?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think in general or at least I think the best way I could answer it would be - and I think the question means the same thing - how we examine various proposals for long term financing bearing in mind the debt and the financial difficulties of school boards. To that I can say that we are, the Department of Education and Treasury Board, are examining various possibilities for long term financing for school boards.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I asked a very specific question. I wonder if I could get a specific answer. Probably I could repeat the question to the minister. Is the minister and his department and/or the government considering the possibility of liquidating the school debts, the school board debts in order that the capital and operating grants to school boards can be used for those purposes alone instead of being used for servicing the debts which they have incurred over the years?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, myself, I would regard achieving either that objective or going quite some distance toward it or however one wants to put it, as an aspect of long term financing. I can say that we are examining various ways of allowing school boards to operate under a long term financing programme.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is he indicating that one of the possibilities is the assumption of the capital debts of the board by the government? Is that the option to be considered by government?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not making any assumptions there at all. I am merely informing the House that government is examining various ways and means of providing long term financing in the area of elementary and secondary education.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary. Obviously I am having difficulty phrasing my question for the minister too. I will try it again. I did not ask him if he was assuming something, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister and I will repeat, if one of the options that the government was considering was the assumption by government of the capital debts of the various school boards.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, no it is certainly not the intention of government to assume all capital debts of school boards or of municipalities or of any organization. What we are doing is studying various means whereby the financial difficulties which school boards and others are experiencing can be mitigated, minimized, not eliminated obviously, through a system of long term financing.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the

for the - he is gone again - when the Minister of Rural Development comes back as he does occasionally I will ask him a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Provincial Affairs: Would the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, indicate to the House if he has received a request from either an individual or a group of individuals to investigate the high price of cars in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment:

HON. W.G. DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment): Yes.

MR. NEARY: The minister answered "Yes", Sir.

A supplementary: I wonder if the minister would indicate what action has been taken on that request.

MR. DAWE: None.

MR. NEARY: None. Would the minister indicate to the House what action he proposes to take on that request?

MR. DAWE: Since this involves inter-provincial trade, it is primarily the responsibility of the federal government to investigate this matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House if it necessary now for car dealers in this province to -

MR. ROBERTS: All the car dealers are up on criminal charges are they not? Under the Combines Act?

MR. NEARY: Apply for a licence. Is it necessary for car dealers to apply for a licence in this province?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to help consumers in this province as much as possible along with the other acts and performances that we have done since taking office two years ago, yes we do have an Automobile Dealers Act which will be coming into effect early in the new year, perhaps the first of January. We are now drafting regulations in an effort to protect people from unscrupulous used car dealers and in some instances, new car dealers.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. DAWE: Aw, go lie down!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Education would

be good enough to inform the House of the location of the residences that were promised over at the College of Trades and Technology for the last two years?

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman presumably is speaking about the location of nonexistent residences. It would be very difficult for me to indicate the geographic location of that which is nonexistent. Now the honourable gentleman may be using this devious, and I do not say that unkindly, or roundabout manner of asking with respect to the location of residences to be constructed. I am sure that that is really what he is getting at. I could not say what particular place they are going to be. Obviously they are going to be conveniently located. As near by as possible but I could not say what specific square acre or acres.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to follow the minister's answer there, Sir, but I was distracted I am afraid. Did the minister indicate when construction of these residences would actually begin? Have tenders been called yet? When public tenders will be called, when the actual construction will get underway?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is the government's hope and intention that tenders will be called -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Construction would start next spring - summer. The next fiscal year.

MR. ROBERTS: I am only saying what is wrong with -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister, Sir, for the answer and we will look forward to the commencement of construction in the spring.

Sir, the Minister of Justice: I wonder if the minister could tell us what happened to his resolution to take the appointment of magistrates out of politics?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to indicate what procedure the minister used to appoint the last group of magistrates in this province?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to do it. During this session of the House on behalf of the administration I was very pleased to introduce into this House, which had unanimous support, the Provincial Courts Act which for the first time in the history of Newfoundland gave our magistrates security of tenure and set up a procedure for the appointment and for the selection of magistrates.

The law is very clear

on the creation of the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council is comprised of the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Vincent B. McCarthy, Q.C.; a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland in the person of Mr. Justice Nathanael F. Noel; a district court judge in the person of His Honour, Judge P. Lloyd Soper; a lawyer nominated by the benchers of the Law Society of Newfoundland and that gentleman is Mr. Noel Herbert Allan Goodridge, Q. C. There is another lawyer to be appointed by myself and that person is Mr. Geoffrey L. Steele, Q.C., the commissioner who brought in this magnificent Report of the Royal Commission To Examine Into The Magistracy.

When the vacancies had occurred, not only vacancies, it was decided that an additional magisterial post or two should be created. Of all the advertisements that came in, none came to me nor did I see any nor would I have been prepared to look at any if they had come in. They were taken and sent directly to the Judicial Council. The Judicial Council then met for one full day and examined all of the applications so I am told. Having examined them, there are obviously some applicants who did not qualify. One of the requirements was either a degree in law or a university degree. If you had an application from a person who did not possess these qualifications, there would be no point in pursuing that application any further.

Again there would be very little point, I suspect, in interviewing an applicant who is very close to the prescribed retirement age as set forth by law.

They met for a day and they sorted out the applications that should be interviewed. They then met I am told for two days at Holiday Inn in St. John's and they interviewed, personally, a list of applicants. Before doing that, they sent out a form to be completed by the applicant whom they would like to interview for additional information.

When these forms came back - I believe one or two were not responded to so they did not proceed with these any further. The others came to St. John's and for two days they then interviewed the applicants. When that was completed, about, I would say, three days before the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council appointed the four gentlemen to the magistracy, I was presented with the recommendation of the Judicial Council. I followed these recommendations very assiduously indeed. The day before, Mr. Speaker, I brought their names to cabinet, I asked that I meet the four gentlemen. I had wished to at least be in the position to say that I had seen them. I knew nothing about any of their background. I knew nothing about their political background. It certainly would not be of any concern to me. I only know that they were recommended. This is the first time in Newfoundland's history that that procedure has ever been followed by the Judicial Council of the Provincial Court of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to assure this House and the public of the very fair manner that was followed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the minister would inform the House whether or not the Judicial Council recommended more than four names on the list that came to the minister or was there just the four?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the Judicial Council recommended eight, I think.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, eight.

MR. HICKMAN: In order of merit. They were accepted by me in order of merit. One of the first four gentlemen had taken another position between the date of the recommendation and the day he was contacted. This is probably not a fair way to put it in response to those who have been appointed because they would be wondering who was number five and who was number six.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: Another gentleman who was number five, who was on the staff of one of our schools here, refused to accept it. They were taken in order of merit as recommended by the Judicial Council. My only regret was that the other three or four who were below that group recommended, we did not have posts for them too because they were all first-class men.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with

Orders of the Day. Yesterday during the late show or the debate on the adjournment whichever you want to call it there were some alleged remarks exchanged between the honourable Member for Bell Island and the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I did not hear any remarks made by the Minister of Social Services but I promised the Member for Bell Island I would listen to the tapes, if the Minister of Social Services had said anything that I considered to be unparliamentary I would ask him to retract the statement.

I wish to advise the legislature and the Member for Bell Island that I have listened to the tapes. There is no record whatsoever of any comments being made by the Hon. Minister of Social Services in an unparliamentary way. I am sure Hansard - if the honourable gentleman for Bell Island or any other honourable gentlemen wish to hear the tapes, then they are quite free to listen to them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity these remarks were not recorded for posterity, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I ask leave of the House in accordance with Standing Order No. 23 that the regular business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of public importance, namely; the serious problem of vandalism and destruction of property in this province.

The rising tide of vandalism and the growing disrespect for property and personal rights must be brought under control at once and new measures taken to apprehend and to punish suitably and to restore to some sense of social responsibilities the culprits. Not only is this situation demoralizing for the hard working conscientious law-abiding citizens, Sir, but it is a direct and major contributor to the inflationary pressures on his hard earned dollar.

Even the school boards today, Mr. Speaker, are complaining of the vicious vandalism of school property as a major factor in their demands for additional funds to carry on their responsibility for educating the children of our province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this

House is conscious of its only reason for existence, that of responding to the needs of citizens who elected them to office, Sir. It will interrupt the paper work agenda to concentrate all its brains and energy on measures aimed at rooting out a major cancer that poses a greater threat daily to both our society and our economy.

Mr. Speaker, only this House can take the necessary action to discover the factors behind the tremendous increase in vandalism, malicious theft and what amounts to industrial sabotage.

MR. BARRY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the honourable member opposite and others of his colleagues are making a mockery of this provision in the rules that provide for motions to put aside the normal business of the House in order to debate matters of urgent public importance.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, over the last week to two weeks every day the honourable members bringing in an item which they submit is of urgent public importance, so urgent that it requires the setting aside of the normal business of the House. When, Your Honour, as it is obvious it must be done, rules against this being of such urgency that it should require the setting aside of the business of the House, then the honourable members point out that in going to the normal order of business, the bill with respect to redistribution, that government are misplacing its priorities.

Your Honour, I submit, that this is a cynical and hypocritical and artificial political ploy of the basest sort, and I ask the press to take some note, to inform the public of the way the opposition are abusing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Abusing, Your Honour,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Abusing, Your Honour -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Abusing the rules of this House for their base political motives.

MR. MURPHY: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I assume, Your Honour, that I shall be granted exactly the same latitude in making my point of order, as was the honourable gentleman for Placentia West in making his vicious, low, vindictive, sly, cynical, nasty and altogether tynical -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. BARRY: On a point of order

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition

has risen on a point of order and I recognize the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the honourable the Member for Placentia West in making his vicious, low, sly -

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is either going to stop abusing -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Do I have the floor or not?

MR. BARRY: - Points of order -

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down! "Little Leo" -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! If honourable members to my left keep interrupting I shall have no choice but to name them. I am willing to hear the honourable Leader of the Opposition speak specifically to the point of order. If other members wish to speak to it I am willing to hear them but I think any member does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, with respect to the vicious low, sly, cynical and altogether typical intervention of the gentleman from Placentia West under the guise of a point of order.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor or does "little Leo" think that the rules do not apply to him?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Placentia West raised this point and spoke to it. I submit that any honourable member of this House, whether the gentleman from Placentia West may like it or not, and if he cannot stand the heat as Harry Truman said, he can get out of the kitchen, that any honourable gentleman has the right, Sir, to move at the appropriate time and the appropriate time is when Your Honour calls Orders of the Day, any

honourable gentleman has the right to stand in this House and to ask leave under the provisions of Standing Order (23) to adjourn the House, to adjourn the business of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance. Standing Order (23) then sets forth the procedure which is to be followed. A written statement is to be handed to Your Honour, Your Honour then makes a ruling as to whether or not in Your Honour's opinion the matter is of such urgency of debate that the business which is otherwise to come before the House be adjourned so the matter can be debated.

Your Honour makes a ruling, a member then has the normal right of appeal if a member chooses to exercise it. In our opinion any business is more important than the business the government have chosen to bring before the House but that, Sir, is a matter for our opinion. I submit that my colleague is perfectly in order in rising to propose the adjournment of the House, Your Honour will then as Your Honour has on a number of occasions during this session, Your Honour will rule upon it and the matter will follow according to the rules.

I resent and I regret the hectoring, bullying and altogether picayune tactics of the honourable gentleman from Placentia West who somehow feels that by abusing the device of a point of order he can score a point or two. I say, Sir, we are in order, we are exercising our rights under the rules and we intend to exercise them with or without the gentleman from Placentia West.

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is better! Now you have it!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that in bending over backwards in an attempt to be fair to the foulmouthed members opposite, specifically the Leader of the Opposition, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you are being unfair -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, is that parliamentary?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could finish my point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an honourable member in this House is not permitted under the guise of a point of order to get up and abuse, personally abuse any member in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: This is the point I was making when the foulmouthed loser leader, the leader of the losers opposite, the petty -

MR. NEARY: Is that parliamentary, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him! Name him!

MR. BARRY: Temporary leader, Mr. Speaker, that was the point that I was making when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I submit, Your Honour, that it should not be permitted for any member in this House to use the point of order so that he can abuse any member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the only alternative if this rule is not enforced, the only alternative of any honourable member here is to sit here to be abused, to have his reputation maligned or whatever, as I say, a foulmouthed member opposite wants to do. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no member should be subjected to this. My point of order did not deal with any personal imputation against any member opposite. It dealt with their political motives and I submit that the point was well made, Mr. Speaker, but you can rule on that.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that we should not have to be subjected to abuse. When Harry Truman said: "If you cannot stand the heat do not stay in the kitchen" he was not talking about a politician having to subject himself to the vilest type of slander and abuse as we have seen from the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak further to it, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Chair feels that this debate has gone on long enough and is not prepared to hear any other arguments re same.
First of all

remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy: I consider the phrase "foul mouth" to be certainly unparliamentary. I would ask him to withdraw that remark.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if you consider that unparliamentary, of course, I will withdraw it. However, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw it! Withdraw it!

MR. BARRY: However, Mr. Speaker, I should point out -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is in reference to the word; "sly" used several times, purposely, to abuse a point of order by the Leader of the Opposition. I ask that the honourable Leader of the Opposition be requested to withdraw and retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

It is basically a decision, I suppose, of the Chair to decide which phrases or words are unparliamentary. The Chair has said that it considers the words, "foul mouth" to be unparliamentary and has asked the minister to retract them. At this point, the Chair does not consider the word "sly" to be unparliamentary and is not prepared to ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that remark.

With regard to the motion made by the honourable Member for Bell Island, I am not prepared to accept it. I do not think the House should adjourn to do this debate at the present time. In future when such motions are made, the opposition and anybody for that matter has the right to make those motions, I may not be prepared to let anybody else speak to this until I have made a ruling on it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I on that point of order, Sir.

The honourable gentleman from Placentia West (I submit that if the tapes or the records are checked, this will be borne out) implied and indeed he said, Sir, that Your Honour was being unfair in rulings in this House. Sir, I doubt if the honourable gentleman meant it.

I think he just lost his temper over there and he has lost control of himself. I submit that that should not be allowed to stand. The matter should be set straight, Sir.

I think if the tapes are checked, you will find, Sir, that the words were used. I do not think the honourable gentleman meant to say that. He lost control of himself. I think he slipped into the allegation that Your Honour is being unfair in the Chair and I do not think any Member of the House should take that, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may just have a few words.

I do not really know how to express it but, you know, sauce for the goose or sauce for the gander.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking about an opposition which continually gets up in this House and says: If Your Honour will make the same ruling for us and give us the same courtesy as the other side but they are imputations.

I did not, myself, hear the Minister of Mines and Energy make that statement. I doubt very much whether he did make that statement. Even if he did, there is a rule. We cannot be, in this House, running to the tapes every single time when something occurs. The previous government used to run to somebody else. We cannot be running to tapes and listening to tapes all the time.

The fact of the matter is that the point of order is to be risen, is to be taken up immediately. Something like that should have been taken up immediately if it were to be pursued. I think, Your Honour, that perhaps we might now get on to the order of business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair considers that the whole matter has been adequately dealt with and we should move on to Orders of the Day.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Tourism, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973,"
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Mines and
Energy, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador
Hydro-Electric Corporation."

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1, I think the debate was adjourned last day by the honourable member for Labrador North if he wishes to continue.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last evening when the House adjourned I was referring to the district that we now have named to be Naskaupi. I was referring to some correspondence that I have received from a particular gentleman who has travelled widely coming from the Straits Area and has done missionary work along the Labrador Coast and spent a great amount of time in the Sandwich Bay Mission which is the Cartwright Area. He is very perturbed and concerned in his remarks to me. He sent a letter to "The Evening Telegram" so that the people in the whole of Labrador and indeed in the whole of the province would know what is going on.

He says, "I include a copy of a letter which I have just sent off to "The Evening Telegram" re this insane Redistribution Bill." I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that a number of people, not only in this particular area but also in the Straits Area, feel the same as that honourable gentleman does. The dividing up of the electoral boundaries in Labrador is considered to be insane.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: I would be very pleased to table the letter, Mr. Speaker, if I could have copies. I feel very free to mention the name of the person that wrote the letter and made the remarks. He is presently the Anglican Priest in Happy Valley and the rural dean for Labrador. His name is Reverend Francis Buckle whom I am sure that a number of citizens in St. John's are quite familiar with having served at the cathedral here for a number of years and on Bell Island as well.

These are his concerns which are my concerns. It is physically impossible for one particular person to service that area and do justice to it. Not only the geography, the distance that one would have to travel and the modes and types of transportation, Mr. Speaker, but it is also the varied problems that exist along the Labrador Coast.

I know that the member for Labrador South expressed this. The papers have been full of it ever since this bill was introduced into

the House. I regret the Premier not being in the House, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that we are very much afraid this bill will go through without the Premier of the province hearing what is going on and we will probably only read from Hansard what was debated in this House but there will not be any real feeling into the thing. I would personally like to see, as I am going to make later on, an amendment to change it back to the original submission that was presented to the Premier by the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

This area here, as I said before - I think that when I went through the different communities of interest that relate from Goose Bay, Happy Valley to both the north and south and the Labrador Coast, I feel this is enough in itself to support this particular area. We do have other great problems and electoral boundaries, if we are looking at community of interest, may help us in some ways - Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we being a part of the Mainland and not at all related in an economic sense to the island portion of the province, almost totally separated from it. What we want to do is to establish a distribution centre in the Goose Bay Area where we have a number of things meeting together in that particular area.

We have had direct shipping from Montreal to Goose Bay and then with the distribution going to

the coastal areas. In order for us, I will not go into that, Mr. Speaker, maybe that will delay the House too long but we feel this here should be developed as a distribution centre as it now relates directly and the community of interest do exist between Goose Bay and the coastal communities and we see that we have no difficulty in dividing the Communities of Goose Bay/Happy Valley and then making this into two seats rather than to have that big cumbersome seat from Pitt's Harbour to Nain in which is impossible for people to move.

I think I have said a great deal about this. I am very concerned. I would like to see the changes made. I have not get gotten down to the Straits of Belle Isle Area. Now in the Straits of Belle Isle Area whereas the direction given to the commission has stated that you would split the population on an almost fifty-fifty basis or as close as you possibly could between the Island portion and the Labrador portion. We have found that what has been recommended in the resolution is that the Straits of Belle Isle Area has got the total Straits of Belle Isle Area, the Labrador section with a population of 1,886 versus a population on the Island portion of 9,714 people. Now that is far from being a fifty-fifty basis.

Now I have been thinking back and looking at the Straits Area which I am very familiar with, in which is impossible for people have but I am not having anything to say. If this bill does go through the House, those people will be outvoted every time by the people over here. so they will have very little to say in what direction - over their economy because they will be largely dominated by the people on the Island portion.

This brings to mind, Mr. Speaker, after the number of elections in the last couple of years and by-elections that we have had in Labrador South. The Premier I would suspect is not trying to get back at the people in the Straits Area because we had a P.C. candidate who ran in a by-election there, who was picked by the Premier, his West Coast Executive Assistant and sent into the Straits of Belle Isle Area where he got a total of 133 votes out of that area and a very good friend of

mine who ran prior to that pulled a greater number of votes, I might add, pulled a total of 176 votes out of that district. So I suspect that is maybe why the Premier has changed his mind about not dividing this particular district on an even-even basis is the fact that he says, "Well we have no support in that particular any way and probably they deserve the treatment that they will get." I think this is very unfair. I think the people will no doubt when we bring up the separtist movement, separtism is not new to me and the New Labrador Party, if I may mention the New Labrador Party, it goes a little bit further than maybe politics in the minds of a lot of local people in Labrador. They feel that you will find if you are looking for the core or the essence of the party, you will find that the people who are really supporting that party are not people who have moved in from the Island of Newfoundland but people who have very little relationship with the Island of Newfoundland and possibly a number of the people who have never visited the Island of Newfoundland but have been locked into isolation in the small communities in Labrador for a number of years. They feel that they have had a pretty raw deal, if you want to call it that, over the years. They would rather support some of their own people like they have supported Mike Martin than to get involved and be deceived or some misconception by the people representing from other areas, such as the Island portion of the province.

This is a very genuine feeling. Now that feeling will probably grow to the extent that if we are going to sit here in this portion of the Straits and be forever and a day until the next redistribution bill goes through the House be dominated by a larger portion that has very little relationship, Mr. Speaker, when you think in terms of community interest. Community interest here is that those people are connected to supply points but in this area here, we have the worst road in the whole of the province, they have a better road than we have in Labrador North because we do not have any but that section of Labrador and we have experienced it in the House going from

the Quebec Border through to Red Bay possibly has the worst dirt road in the whole of the province.

Those people here is another extraction of a number of things and it went on, I think there have been a cordial relationship between the people in the Straits of Bell Isle. Having come from the Straits of Belle Isle myself I know a little of what I speak.

Most of the things that have been happening is people, the relationship flows in that direction and not in this direction. The community of interest is people going over to the Labrador Coast and bringing fish back to the Island portion of the Province for processing. This is basically what is done. My folks have done it. My inlaws are still doing it and a number of other people.

Now then, what do we see here? We have felt over a number of years that those people feel and rightfully so, they have to have fish processed. They do not do it in their own communities because there is not a fish plant along that portion of the coast. They have to go into the plant at Blanc Sablon which is in Quebec or when I visited over there a couple of years ago there were collectors over there waiting to collect fish for the processing plant in Port Au Choix. There were also trucks coming up as far as Flowers Cove and collecting fish and hauling it in to the Community of St. Anthony for processing.

So when you see the exploitations going on and then when you are locked into a situation where you are going to have very little control or no say into because those people over here are going to direct their lives from a political point of view, whatever goes on the member will no doubt pay greater attention to getting something for this part of his district then he would for that part of his district because if you look at it, less than ten per cent of the voters are here and the other ninety per cent lay in this particular area. I mean it is very unfair and unjust and I suspect that the Premier should indeed, I sympathize with the people in that area, they are good people, they have real feelings and I suspect that the Premier will see fit to change that redistribution.

When we go on to the Island portion of the Province, Mr. Speaker, I think when we look at the resolution that was introduced into the House to set up an electoral boundaries commission and now when we look in terms at what has been suggested by the government or by the Premier as to the way he would like to see the Province divided up and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should do something about this here too. When we look at the scale, a small scale map, a large Island portion, I was told a couple of days ago by a geography teacher that a lot of the children in the Province

feel that Labrador is totally small and it sits on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. Now this is a misconception and maybe the government should take it under advisement even if we are taking a large amount of wealth and we have 112,000 square miles of land mass in this area, we should put it in proportion to what is going on in the Province. Let us show how that little Island looks sitting off the South Coast of Newfoundland as compared to those 142,000 square miles of land mass and mineral wealth on the mainland portion.

Looking at the direction that was given to the electoral boundaries commission, maybe one of the wrong things that was done was done when the commission was set up. When we look at the quotient, Mr. Speaker, a total population of the Province was to be divided by 51. The population of the Province was declared to be, the figure shown in the latest census taken by Statistics Canada in the current year, the latest figures were found to be in the census taken in 1971. Okay. The quotient for each of the proposed districts was thus established as being 10,238 and the act also set out in detail

the rules to be followed by the commission in preparing its report whilst the quotient of ideal figures for each proposed district was set at 10,238. Provision was made whereby the commission could under certain circumstances set up in Section (16) of the Act depart from this figure which meant the Labrador section here which did not go into the Straits of Bell Isle area, it went into the now-called Naskaupi area. This deviation was not to be greater than twenty-five per cent or twenty-five per cent less than the quotient. So what can you have? You can have twenty-five per cent of the population of 10,000.

So the final summation here, when we looked at it we discovered that rural Newfoundland had districts of 12,000, 10,000 and then we looked at the urban Newfoundland and we end up with most of the urban districts having a population of 9,000 or less than 9,000 in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, this direction given to the commission as I see it now and when you look upon the map was totally wrong. What should have happened in this respect here, the direction should have been given in the light that urban Newfoundland should have been set with no deviation from the quotient. Each seat should have been divided on an equal figure, if you want to take a population of 12,000 you would have taken the seats in St. John's and the urban area and 12,000 in those seats. In Corner Brook and Grand Falls, when we look at the Grand Falls seat which includes only the Town of Grand Falls, population 8,077 and then we look at St. Barbe North, population 10,140, we look at Baie Verte, population 12,088, now if this is not a means of gerrymandering I do not know what you would call it. When a person can get in his car in St. John's and drive around and service that population, or in Grand Falls, in a matter of two hours, whereas a person along the Labrador Coast literally must spend at least a month in that particular district to do justice to his constituents, if this is not a means of gerrymandering - So what should have been done, Mr. Speaker? They should not have been allowed to deviate from a particular figure in the urban areas and then you would have gone into the rural areas and the rural areas would have been divided up with the quotient in mind and we would indeed have had a fair and a more equitable distribution of the electoral seats in this Province.

It is sad and you can only now see it when you look at what has been done. If the St. John's seat were taken and they said, "Okay, you are allowed 12,000 people, you can get it within a particular boundary, take those 12,000 people and put them into an electoral district," which could have easily been done but they worked on the quotient and they allowed deviation and the deviation was not up from the 12,000 in the urban seats. It went down. It was less and not more.

MR. NEARY: With all respect to my honourable colleague, Sir, there are only four, six, seven on the other side. They are asking to get nine more members into this House. They cannot even keep the members they have now over there Sir. So I call a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Looking at them initially the rules that were set down in the act to set up an electoral boundaries commission, I suspect this is the first form of gerrymandering, it was set about before even any recommendations were made as to how the Province should have been divided up because this piece here, Mr. Speaker, allows the flexibility of twenty-five per cent in the urban areas as well as in the rural areas which indeed allowed the rural areas to be divided up in the greater land mass and difficult areas for a particular member to service.

So this possibly is where the gerrymandering started rather than taking St. John's and saying, "Look, take your quotient or your 12,000, divide it into "x" number of seats, you have a population and then we will accept that." So in the urban centres it is quite obvious that most of the seats are divided up into populations less than the quotient of 10,328 and the rural seats are divided up into more than the quotient.

So rural Newfoundland is no doubt, has been, I will not say the word, Mr. Speaker - So, Mr. Speaker, looking at this particular map here we find that Labrador is no doubt getting nothing if anything at all and that rural Newfoundland is getting less seats and urban Newfoundland, the cities are getting more seats, greater representation whereby I suspect we would possibly have to refer to the Moores administration, the Moores government as maybe an urban government rather than paying attention to the rural areas that have been neglected so much over the years in this Province and especially when I take into consideration my own district and my own home land of Labrador.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all satisfied with this particular resolution. I do not support the resolution. I feel that there are a number of ways that this Province can be divided up into electoral boundaries that would be more acceptable to the people in this Province and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment seconded by my colleague, the Member for Hermitage, and the amendment to the resolution reads as follows: "That the schedule to the resolution be amended as follows: (a) by deleting the words 'Eagle River' and the description number ten and replacing it with the words 'Coast of Labrador' (this area here I would like to call the Labrador Coast and not

December 13, 1974.

Tape 2121

RH - 2

Eagle River. It does not relate to it) shall consist of and include all that part of Labrador bounded as follows beginning at the point of intersection of the parallel of fifty-two degrees north latitude with the coast line of Labrador thence running along the said coastline in a generally

8160

northwesterly direction to Hamilton Inlet thence running along the southerly shoreline of the said Hamilton Inlet to Lester Point, thence running along the centre of the narrows west of Hamilton Island and the centre of Lake Melville to Sandy Point, thence crossing Goose Bay to the mouth of Goose River, thence running south sixty-four degrees east to the southerly shores of Goose Bay, thence running in a southwesterly direction to the points of intersection of the centre line of Churchill River with the centre line of the road leading to the power house, thence turning and running south to the parallel of fifty-two degrees north latitude then running along the said parallel of fifty-two north latitude to the point of beginning together with all the islands adjacent thereto, all being astronomic. (b) Deleting the word "Naskaupi" for this particular district here, deleting that word and replacing it with "The Lake Melville/Churchill River District" which it will encompass. The District of Lake Melville/Churchill River shall consist of and include all that part of Labrador bounded as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of the boundaries extending between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland with the Meridian of sixty-two degrees West longitude north near Lake Fleur-de-May; thence running north along the said Meridian of sixty-five degrees West longitude to a point in the aforesaid boundary extending between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland; thence following the said boundary in a general easterly and northerly direction to Cape Chidley; thence running in a general southeasterly direction along the Coastline of Labrador to Hamilton Inlet; thence running along the northerly shores of the said Hamilton Inlet to Ticoralak Head; thence running along the centre of the narrows west of Henrietta Island and the centre of Lake Melville to Sandy Point; thence crossing Goose Bay to the mouth of Goose River; thence running south sixty-four degrees east to the southerly shores of Goose Bay; thence running in a southwesterly direction to the points of intersection of the centre line of Churchill River with the

centre line of the road leading to the power house; thence turning and running south to a parallel of fifty-two degrees north latitude; thence running along the said parallel of fifty-two degrees north latitude to the easterly banks of the Romaine River; thence running along the aforesaid Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland boundary in a generally northèrly direction and a southwesterly direction to the point of beginning together with all the islands adjacent thereto, all bearings being astronomic."

That is the amendment that I would propose, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of copies here.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: Before the amendment is put, Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to rise on a point of order on it. These boundaries that have been read out are the boundaries of the commission's recommendation to government. In order to discuss this matter we would be considering a matter that is substantially the same as another motion that was put before this House, namely; the omnibus motion yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition or the opposition proposed and debated upon to incorporate in its entirety the recommendations of the commission. The Honourable Member for Labrador North has made a motion now that is going to incorporate a part of the commission's recommendations to amend the main resolution.

Now I refer Your Honour to page 172 of Beauchesne, because this has been a matter that has been determined for quite a long period of time, a number of years and it says "Mr. Speaker Sproule on the 13th February, 1913" (and that is over sixty years ago) "Decided that a proposed amendment which was substantially the same motion as the member had moved on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, was not in order because "a motion must not"(This is a very important quote) "Must not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has already given a decision in the same session".

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a rule which I suggest is a rule of great reason because it prevents a House or a Legislature from having to unnecessarily reconsider motions that had been brought before it before in that same session. It has not always been raised in this

particular House but it certainly is a rule that governs the House of Assembly here, particularly in view of the fact that last year we brought in the rule with respect to individual members to prevent needless repetition. Certainly this rule here is for the purpose of preventing needless repetition of motions that have been made.

So my contention is; that the honourable member has brought in a motion which is, substantially, really identical to the motion that was considered yesterday because when we considered yesterday and the days before that, the amendment which was brought in, it was to consider the report and adopt the report of the commission. That was rejected. Now in effect what the Member for Labrador North wants is a part of the report but if you reject the whole you reject the part. The fact of the matter is; the matter I contend, Mr. Speaker, has already been decided and he cannot raise it now because it has been - you know, he is raising a question as I say, exactly identical, repetition of debate and reconsideration of a matter already considered by this House and as recently as yesterday.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I take a contrary position with respect to the amendment which my colleague, the gentleman for Labrador North proposes to move. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the motion which was disposed of yesterday, the amendment which the House did not adopt was to create fifty-one districts as set forth in the report of Mr. Justice Higgins in his commission. The House considered that and in due course rejected it.

The House has not considered, Sir, and I invite Your Honour to think of the debate. The debate on the amendment dealt in the main with the question of whether the fifty-one should follow a given pattern as proposed by Mr. Justice Higgins or whether the fifty-one should follow the pattern as proposed by the Premier when he moved a motion in behalf of the government.

The issue which this amendment raises, I submit, has not been ruled upon by the House in this debate or in this session or, in fact, at all, that is, how one particular section of this province namely; the Labrador Area is to be divided for the purpose of returning

members to the House of Assembly.

May I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that this matter raises a very important principle, I think it can be and should be maintained that the question of the division of the Labrador portion of the province into electoral districts is different in a very substantial way than the question dividing the remainder of the province. There are very real reasons. We put forth this amendment in the quite genuine hope that it will be accepted. I must confess that when my colleague put forth the other amendment we had no real hope that we would persuade honourable gentlemen opposite to accept it. This one we do put forward, Sir, because I think it has been well established in the debate and outside that the question of dividing Labrador, we are not proposing to change the entire scheme of seats, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing to change only one area instead of dividing it up and down, dividing it across, if one wished, you know, to state the matter simply. That issue has not been ruled upon by this House and I submit the amendment is in order. Debate should be allowed to proceed on it and then the House can resolve of it. We put it forward in the hope that it will be accepted because as the debate, I think, has made clear that is a very genuine matter and a matter different, I submit, in nature than the matters that have been decided by the House.

I submit the amendment as moved

by my colleague is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Is there any further argument? I will take a short adjournment to consider the arguments as well as the authorities.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! I have considered the authorities, consulted with my authorities at the table and have decided that the proposed amendment will be rejected, it is not in order basically on the grounds of section 204 (7) of Beuchesne. It is not in order because it is a motion which raises a question substantially identical with one on which the House has given a decision in the same session.

MR. ROBERTS: 203 (7).

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): 203 (7), I am sorry. This matter is substantially the same amendment as that which was rejected in the House of Assembly yesterday, on purely technical grounds, although this is not the point on which this matter is being decided, when the honourable member for Labrador North moved this amendment alleging the member for Hermitage as the person seconding it, the member for Hermitage was not in his seat.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we must appeal the ruling and I would ask that the House divide on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld, all those in favour aye, those against nay, in my opinion the aye's have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues would stand they would divide the House please.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): I do detect comments from the honourable gentlemen to my right, if they refer in any way to the impartiality or integrity of the Chair then action will be taken.

Is the House ready for the question? All those who maintain that the Speaker's ruling be upheld please rise.

The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, the honourable Minister of Social Services, the honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs

and Environment, the honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the honourable Minister of Justice, the honourable Mr. Marshall, the honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the honourable the Minister of Finance, the honourable the Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Wells, Mr. Brett, the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Senior, Mr. Carter, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Young, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Howard.

Those opposed please rise.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gillett, Mr. Woodward, Captain Winsor, Mr. Neary, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Rowe and Mr. Simmons.

I declare the Speaker's ruling upheld.

MR. WOODWARD: MR. Speaker, would you mind -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): I think the honourable member has -

MR. NEARY: Forty-five minutes, Sir, on the same resolution.

MR. WOODWARD: How many minutes, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Five minutes left, according to this.

MR. WOODWARD: Five minutes left, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the general attitudes today are definitely the same with redistribution as other aspects of government and the government's attitude toward Labrador. They have not changed and looking at what is happening now and the injustice that will be done to that portion of our province, the mainland portion. We, I suspect, cannot expect much in the future, because the people from the mainland portions of the island, will control what happens in Southern Labrador, in the Straits area and those people over there will have little to say about their fears from a political point of view and in the north, stretching off the coast, then this area here, we will hear very little from it anyway because of the fact that it is unserviceable and one member cannot service it

properly. Therefore Labrador will be left the same as this amendment was left. So it goes back -

MR. ROBERTS: I hope the government will rectify it.

MR. WOODWARD: Well someone must rectify it, Mr. Speaker. We have looked at a number of things and we have looked at areas and in the Premier's opening remarks on the resolution, he stated a number of things that would happen. This Province largely depends for its economic growth on what happens to the mineral wealth and the power resource that is in Labrador. Then again when we look at a government that does not see fit, that does not see fit to change the electoral boundaries to give the people in that portion of the Province fair and just representation and they will not get it if the bill goes through the House under the same as is recommended in this resolution. If I care to repeat again what I felt and our people feel and I will speak now on behalf of all the people that exist in that portion of the Province, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen over the years repeatedly, rape of our resources flowing down to bring in government services on the Island and we see very little benefit from it.

I am sorry today that the Minister of Transportation and Communications is not in his seat to see that amendment rejected so that he can go back and justify his doings to the people of Labrador. I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the people would feel that he is not indeed paying the attention that one would expect of him - The Premier when he talked of community of interest and related the facts that there was a big community of interest between the north and the south areas of Lake Melville, then I went to some great extent to explain that no community of interest exists.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable member has a minute left.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks I will repeatedly say that the House of Assembly and the government here today have done another injustice to the people of Labrador. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I sat here the past number of days, I do not know how many, a number of hours, and listened to such a pile of tripe and guff as was never heard before in any constituted House of Assembly. I wondered where I was, Korea,

Viet Nam, Northern Ireland, the people on this side of the strait do not want the people on that side, the people in St. Phillips are all upset because you are not in with me. Do you know what they have done? They have actually divided Bonaventure Avenue in the City of St. John's. Now what a crime! Number one is in St. John's West and number two is in St. John's Centre. Did you ever see anything, Sir, anything as unjust, illegal as anything else.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Garbage!

MR. MURPHY: Garbage, the gentleman says. That is what he has been talking the past two days. Redistribution, perhaps the greatest joke that I have ever heard. In 1962 when I came into this honourable House of Assembly -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! I detected a remark from an honourable gentleman to my right referring to an honourable member to my left by his first name. Honourable members are reminded that this is improper and if honourable members are to be addressed they are to be addressed by the constituency they represent or the position they might hold.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Go easy on him, he is running for rookie of the year.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, in 1962 we came into this House. I spoke the very first chance I did get to speak and I was highly honoured to speak on behalf of the District of St. John's Centre. 24.4 per cent of the voters of this Province resided within the six St. John's districts, 24.4. The great architect himself sat down at his drawing board and he drew these famous districts. The member for St. John's North has already said there are 22,000

people in his district. I think there were something like 17,000 voters at that time in the District of St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: It was 22,000 voters. We are talking about voters.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, the population. It was voters at that time. It is hard for me to reconcile the figures now with the numbers that we did use at that time. I spoke against it at that time. I thought it was very unjust and asked that some look be taken, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that redistribution or distribution or assigning of districts, whatever you may call it, is designed for one purpose only, to serve the people of this province, to serve the people, not the number of stumps, not the number of rocks, not the number of lakes, not the number of ponds, not the number of anything but we are designed, Sir, here in this House to serve people.

Now, we are all very considerate to those people who represent outlying districts, the rural areas but let us look at facts. The most maligned members of this House particularly, are the people of St. John's, the members for St. John's because of the fact that we reside here, no sweat. Now, I do not know and I do not want to be like other members of this House, Sir, to make charges or anything else, but let me take the member for St. Barbe North, just let me take that member and figures have been mentioned to me, rightly or wrongly, that he visited the district last year or this year six times for a total of nineteen days. Now, whether that is true or false I do not know but I just want to say that this has been intimated, Sir. Now true or false, the member can correct it but this is the story, that the average member and I heard the member for Bell Island say, Sir -

MR. F. ROWE: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, go ahead.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the minister mind indicating the source of that information?

MR. MURPHY: Many dozens speak. Now, to carry on, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Like who for instance? Like who? Because they are totally incorrect.

MR. MURPHY: I would like to know. I was coming to the fact, Sir, of this, that we are speaking on redistribution -

MR. F. ROWE: Well, use correct information.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Seven times.

MR. F. ROWE: Use correct information.

MR. MURPHY: Well, perhaps it was twenty days, not nineteen.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, you are way off, "Ank", way off.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, as I say, what we are speaking on now is the redistribution, the redrawing, if you like, of boundaries. I can tie with that, Sir, tie in with that, ease the thought behind it, that we arranged districts so that the people can be served by their member. Basically I think this is it.

Now, let us look at the whole story. We receive a sessional pay to do one job, not to sit in the opposition office or any other office to clip news items out of the papers to be used to stand up and ask questions in this House, not to reply to letters that come in the mail, but to see the people in the districts. I have maintained, Mr. Speaker, since I have been in this House, that no member can serve his district effectively unless he lives in that district.

MR. F. ROWE: What about the Minister of Justice?

MR. MURPHY: Now, there are exceptions. A cabinet minister cannot be expected to live in an outside district as he has different other functions.

MR. SIMMONS: Everybody on your side, everybody is in the cabinet or an assistant over there.

MR. MURPHY: Well, the cabinet ministers are usually in government. Have you learned anything about what is happening here at all?

MR. SIMMONS: What you are saying is that the exception is all the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: I am worse to be talking to him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to remind honourable members to my right that when a member is speaking, he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MURPHY: I was saying there are exceptions. The exception would have

to be of course a member of cabinet who must be present within this House of Assembly, within Confederation Building to serve. There is the Speaker of the House who naturally has to be here in Confederation Building. Other people who are paid and it has been pointed out by the member for Bell Island, who are being vastly overpaid according to him, according to the member, according to other provinces - is this money being paid in accordance with what is earned, Sir? I am still trying to stick to the matter of redistribution and what it means. Should we now bring in something? I do not know if I could move an amendment to this, Sir, that in addition to all these districts that it be compulsory that a member reside in the district he represents. I do not know if I can do that.

If we are to serve the people properly, Sir, that is the only way it can be done. Now, everybody, I think, has a great amount of sympathy for the member for Labrador North. He has got a fairly difficult district to look after, not as difficult as it was four or five or six years ago because, Mr. Speaker, because he has got a vast

urban area, if you like, and I refer to Happy Valley-Goose Bay. We call it an urban area, I think it is one of the most or just as sophisticated as other areas. There are I think five or six areas north that he does have to go to.

People may not be aware of what has happened in Labrador the past few years. He talks about chartering a plane. Good enough! He can charter a plane, you can charter a yacht, you can charter an ocean-liner. There are two flights per week, two recognized airlines north and south. The member says that he spent four thousand dollars and I can believe him if he is going around chartering planes, and I give him the benefit of the doubt that he does not do any business at that particular time, that is purely to see his constituents. I will give him that benefit. Sir. But, to fly -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Buying hockey sweeps I spend more than you do travelling Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Well, that is it. If anybody wants an amendment I am quite prepared -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, look the brilliant leader is trying to get in on the act.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get nasty now, boy.

MR. MURPHY: I am not getting nasty. I am the nicest fellow in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about transportation in Labrador, particularly Labrador North and also south. I hear so much about separatism: "They are going to leave us." Where in God's Name are they going to go? Where are they going to go? I was Minister of Labrador Affairs for about three or four months. I was Minister of Labrador Affairs and I will say this; the amount spent per capita on the residents of Labrador as against St. John's Centre, there is no comparison whatever, and the district I represent contained people.

People, human beings who have needs, Sir.

We know the problems. The problems in Labrador, Sir, are social. Social problems and I lay it at the feet of the government that went out of power two years ago because they neglected Labrador unmercifully. To try to atone for it what did they do? They created a Department of Labrador Affairs. Of Labrador Affairs. I have heard so many things about Labrador from these members -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. WOODWARD: Is that relative to the debate, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MURPHY: The members spent a great many minutes talking about Labrador. I am talking about Labrador and redistribution and all I am trying to tie in is the purpose of redistribution as representation in a fair way, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then get to the point.

MR. MURPHY: Districts are represented not by a map but by people, Members. I would like to see, Sir, following redistribution to give the people representation that travelling expenses including my own be paid on the receipt of a voucher. I would like to see that. I would like to see that, Sir.

With all this great cry I saw more people last Sunday morning in the Basilica yard - than some of these saw for the past two years - my constituents. I say that. It is perfectly, perfectly honest and feel free to say it. We represent people, Sir, people. Someone complained that it is four hundred miles from "A" to "B" and I say: "So what?" You can get in your motor car today and you can drive four hundred miles in five or six hours. But do we do it?

My wife often says to me how lucky the members are representing an outport district where the phone is not going every lunch hour, every night. Twenty-five and thirty calls a day. You answer a few letters and you are all overworked. I look back here at some of our backbenchers who drive every day to their districts but the members on the other side represent isolated and neglected districts. Why are they isolated and neglected? Because these are

the people they elected. Is there an answer to that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourist members! Tourist members!

MR. MURPHY: My district, Sir, and I want to thank the people, four times, four times they have elected Ank Murphy in St. John's Centre and God willing and if my age does not come against me, I may run the next time when the election is called on February 30. Any doubt about it? There is some doubt. I have been invited to the Senate.

When I listened to the member for Bell Island in his usual broad minded way and he talked about the historical, the historical things that happened. There should be an R.C. here and someone there and this type of stuff and I looked at the man and I said that should be orange and green, so many oranges and so many greens and I looked back, Mr. Speaker, and I look around this House. This party, this government that is now in power did away with that kind of stupidity. We did away with it all. Look around this Council Chamber tonight, look around it. There is living proof of what I am saying. St. John's South, Sir, the first time, and it is not too old a district, anybody but a Roman Catholic was elected there and I just want to reply to what is happening: St. John's East, what is the story? The same thing. All I am trying to put across, Sir, is the fact that you can draw all the red herring you like and they smell to the high heavens, all the red herring you like but this is a party that is dedicated to serving the people, Sir, notwithstanding where you were baptized or whether you have a minister or a priest.

I get sick to my stomach when I read the headline in the paper 'Labrador', and I am paraphrasing, "alienated by politicians" God help us Almighty! Who are the politicians? Who are the politicians that stand in this House and say, "How unfair you are." The people on this side of the Straits and the people on this side. Are they South Korean, North Korean, North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese?

The arguments, Mr. Speaker, have been so silly, so stupid and the same group of honourable gentlemen say, "Let us get on with the business of the House." Amendments, if there had to be an amendment accepted today, I could see fifty-one others, Sir, to amend it because you can put the line here and put the line there. "Mrs. Murphy is not in my district. She should be. She is a good friend of mine." What kind of guff in God's name, and we have so-called intelligent people over there, Sir. I believe two of them were actually school teachers. I believe they were. They talk about these foolish stupid things.

Whatever, I do not know, only yesterday I discovered that my district was changed, radically changed. Do you know the Cabot Street hockey team were all up in arms because some of them now are not in St. John's Centre, some of them

are in St. John's East. Is that not a travesty of justice to have that happen? Is that not terrible, Sir? I do not know how this government can ever excuse themselves for such a drastic thing. This is the first time, Sir, that something has been done to try to set up, I am not saying it is perfect. I said in 1962 when we went to forty-two, I said thirty members were enough but if the members did the job but we discovered since then that the majority of members are not doing the job. The member for Bell Island said, I think it was only one member or something, I do not know what he was, half of the time I do not listen to him anyway, but he pointed out so many things that were wrong with representation, not with this but with representation. Do we as members of the House of Assembly feel guilty? What percentage of our constituents do we see, eh? Do we see the people, that is who we represent, the people of this Province, wherever the boundary is drawn.

It is like the school bus racket we went into a few

years ago. The Liberal Government said in their day "You can live one mile outside of St. John's you can be bussed but inside of that you cannot." So we received numerous petitions, Sir, "I only live one hundred yards inside of that line." But we had to turn them down, Sir, because if you gave the hundred yards, what about the guy two hundred yards. So these boundaries, Sir, are the same thing. I would say this, this hysteria is created through politics, the same as the hysteria, if I may use a comparison, the same hysteria here in the City of St. John's about the school tax. With all the great unroar with all the great fuss, everybody is against it. They hardly got enough at City Hall on Monday night for two tables of bridge. Sixty people turned up - forty and half of these had to be there. The Member for St. Barbe North is so upset about the school tax in St. John's. God help us, Almighty, I am crying about it. I am talking about representation. Present a few petitions on behalf of your district, for a change. That is who you are paid to represent. I will represent the people of St. John's with the five other members of this House. We will look after them. Do not worry about St. John's. Do not worry.

Mr. Speaker, we can go on with this for perhaps another six weeks, and someone made the great statement, "No matter what we say the government will put it through." Now this has got to be a first time in the world that the government put something through by voting for it. Some members on our own side are very moralistic about this thing. Dare to cut a community in half. What about a council here and a council there? My darlin' fella, almighty I never saw such a momentous decision to be made by people in all my life time. There are so many other things. There are so many other things that are far greater at the moment that we could be talking about.

The main thing is, Sir, that in the wisdom of this House now, the wisdom of this government to give the representation that is needed we must have fifty-one members. This is what has been approved by everybody in this House but me, and I was not here to vote for it.

I was in hospital at the time. This is all finished with, Sir. Let us say, yes, that all the members of this House said, that there are going to be fifty-one. Thou art the districts. Now it is up to the individual member who dares to run or wants to run in a district, for him to do his job.

We had perhaps taken the first step of destroying what was created by the previous administration when they said, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was the first decisive step that was taken, not the first but it certainly encouraged the people of Labrador to feel that they were not Newfoundlanders. We fought it, Sir! We fought it! The vote was, that great democratic government, thirty-nine over here. What was the vote? Thirty-nine to three, because we maintained that Labrador was as much a part of Newfoundland as was St. John's Centre.

Actually at the time, I proposed that instead of calling it the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, we call it the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and Bell Island and Humber East and Humber West and St. John's Centre and St. John's North, and we would have gotten everybody in the act. Everybody would have been pretty happy. But, Sir, there you are! There it is! This government have discussed this thing on many occasions. Some are for it. Some are against it, absolutely. Opposite members, government members, or anybody who does not want the government to do this here, they know what they can do. They know what they can do. I know what I could do. If I were against this thing I know what I would do.

I am either for or against something. So, if you are for the government or against it it is up to yourselves. Absolutely up to yourselves. In the wisdom of this government we feel this is the way it is going to be done. This is the way it is going to be done. Trial or error! Trial or error! But in my opinion following this then there should be a hard look taken at the neglected people in different parts of this province, Sir. We will see then if it is the boundary or the member is the trouble. Do not let us talk about an imaginary line or so-called lines set down. Do not blame the woes

of this province on that. Do not let us do that. Do not let us
wallow out on the thing. Let us be responsible members of this
House of Assembly, Sir, whether you are on that side or whether you
are on this side, we all have obligations. Obligations to the people
who elected us not to my leader, not to any other leader, my first
obligation is to the people of St. John's Centre.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. MURPHY: If I do not like what my leader wants and I do
want to be a member of the P.C. Party I will get a chair in the middle
of this floor. There is no one tying anybody down. There are no
names on any these chairs in this House. No one has named them.

This government brought in for the first time in twenty-
three years free speech, a member could speak out but unfortunately

some of the members took the gun, they loaded it and pointed it at the Premier. That is what is happening to this. Do not let's talk about license or free speech. It is no trouble to get on television. It is no trouble to get on all these programmes. All I have to say now is that I am against this thing. I think it should be done away with. I would be the host of the press, the media for the next week. Every programme, that is what turns my stomach. Honest to God. I listen to some news bulletins.

We had a debate here last week, Sir, if I may about a resolution against my department. I spoke on it for a few minutes. I think I made half decent sense. I listened to the windup news and review on Sunday on one of the stations. The member for Bell Island got about five minutes. The people did not even know if Ank Murphy was in the House. He was not mentioned. But, you accept these things.

The same way with all this hysteria here, drawing the boundaries, drawing the this, drawing the that - how darn stupid and this poor little province wallowing in the condition, Sir, that everyone of us has got to work together for. Whether it is a Liberal district or a Progressive Conservative district, Sir, I think they are entitled to the same treatment, Sir.

We talk about Labrador being neglected, being this and that and the other thing. I feel, Sir, as individuals the people of Labrador get far more attention than do the people on the island part of the province. I say that without reservations, Sir. There are conditions that exist in Labrador. I know that. Perhaps the communications are a bit difficult on the coast. We have five or six communities with a mere handful of people in most of them, Sir.

Western Labrador, perhaps the most viable economy in the province. Goose Bay, Happy Valley, I would say a very nice area, Sir. Then we go to other places. The social problems alone - I hear talks and the honourable member for Fogo - I do not know if he was minister at the time - will recall. The housing problem in Labrador - we built these beautiful homes in Northwest River, Sir. I was down this year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I was the one who instigated it.

MR. MURPHY: One that instigated it, Sir. There is not one of these homes lived into today, and people, people everywhere crying for homes, Sir. Hundreds of thousands of dollars - and some without a window in them, not a storm door. How old? Five or six years old? Seven perhaps.

So, they talk about this neglect and insinuate that this government has washed its hands of Labrador. Absolute bunk, Sir, absolute bunk. The report of the Commission on Labrador that spent something over a year or a year and a half investigating Labrador, all departments are looking after the recommendations of this, Sir. This might be the one thing that Labrador needed to bring it, Sir, within the area or the orbit of the Island of Newfoundland. This might be it. I know and I will say this that the Minister of Health and some of his officials toured the district. They saw the social conditions, Sir, that prevailed in different areas of Labrador and Northern Labrador particularly.

Already, Sir, my department has taken steps to get people to go into these areas. We know the problems, Sir. I read a report today from one area where there were no men to work there, Sir, that a woman is unloading ships. They had to get a janitor in from Goose Bay, Happy Valley Area, Sir. What is the problem? Are the members representing these districts, Sir, strong enough to get in and look at the social problems that exist in that district, Sir? We all have them, economically, the same as my department, Sir, economically. The problem is not that great now. We have gone a long way to solve it.

Socially, Sir, do the people in these areas get enough attention from their members or are they only given lip service. It is one thing to answer a telephone, Sir, another to answer a letter, and another thing to spend half the day clipping something out of the papers. We could do that. You do it as an exercise I think, as a matter of fact, in kindergarden and all the schools, cut out pictures and paste them up, clippings. I suggest that they talk to the people every now and then and

then they would not have to be writing letters, Sir.

I would like to know and I do not want to be unjust, just how much time, Sir, is spent by different members in their districts. Is it practical?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I lived there.

MR. MURPHY:

congratulations to the Member for Bonavista North. I say you are doing a good job as a member. You are not a commuter, Sir. You are not a tourist. You live in the district. You can sense the needs of the people because you are living among them, Sir. It is like, as I say again - the members of the St. John's Districts, look around at any of them. We know within minutes almost of the feelings of the people because we are meeting them continuously, Sir.

So do not let us draw the red herring or tell the people of this province that this is going to destroy everything and this is not democratic. It is a lot of piffle! This will be, in my opinion, the first move providing that the people of this province, whenever the election is called, use their heads and their judgement to elect the man who will do the job for them. I am one of these on whom rests the responsibility, Sir, of serving the people whether the boundary is Bonaventure Avenue, Whiteway Street or whatever you want to name in St. John's Centre. That is what counts. The districts are drawn there. This side of the House, I will not say without exception but I would say that ninety-nine per cent are going to support this. Sir, this is the policy of this government and that is why we are supporting it. If we do not support it, we are not members of this government, Sir. We are not members of this government. I say that with a lot of feeling within me because I have been associated here for a great many years, Sir. I know what I went through in this honourable House, Sir, whether it be redistribution or anything else.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: We know what it is all about. This is a resolution, Sir, to do this for Newfoundland. It has been doomed already to defeat. It has been termed unjust. It has been termed every other thing in the world. I will say this, Sir, that with these lines drawn there, notwithstanding where you were born, notwithstanding what colour you are

notwithstanding what creed you are, this government has pledged every individual member to work for the people they represent. That is what we are here for, Sir, Whether you are an urban or whether you are a rural district, you represent people.

As I say, Sir, again and I will come back to it, I am satisfied in my own mind, my own conscience and, Sir, that is the only governing factor that I have to go by.

MR. WOODWARD: What a conscience!

MR. MURPHY: I will say that, Sir. Notwithstanding the millionaire from Labrador.

MR. WOODWARD: What a conscience!

MR. MURPHY: Very well I spent two and one-half days -

MR. WOODWARD: Where else do they go?

MR. MURPHY: Two and one-half days in two months in my district. What a gesture!

MR. WOODWARD: I live in my district.

MR. MURPHY: How much a day does that amount to for serving the rural areas of Labrador North, Sir.

MR. WOODWARD: I live in my district.

MR. MURPHY: The gentleman lives in his district is right, Sir. I have already said that. But how many hours does he spend in Nain, in Makkovik, in David's Inlet?

MR. WOODWARD: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: I am speaking now because he happened to be the gentleman who interrupted me and I have to take one example.

MR. WOODWARD: Sit down boy!

MR. MURPHY: I have to take one example.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Whether I can spit or not - it contains some of the finest people in this province and dare you say anything else, Sir.

But, Sir, whatever the distance - as I said, the honourable Member for Bonavista North is living in his district and I give him credit for it. But outside St. Brendan's and I do not know about Valleyfield -

AN HON. MEMBER: Green's Pond.

MR. MURPHY: He can get in his car, Sir, any nice morning and he can take his wife.

Do you have a wife? Are you married?

He can take his wife if he is married and say, "Look, we are going to go up"- where could it be? Anywhere? Is Lumsden up in that area?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Centreville or any of these places.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: He says, "Darling this is a lovely day, let us go out for a run." He goes up and he says, "Here you are, look there is Mr. So and So." He says, "God I have not seen you since the

election: 'Boy look, I will tell you, I did not get a chance to get up. Now that is the truth.' But me in St. John's Centre, Sir, I meet them every minute, every hour of the day. I go home and they are on my doorstep out there. On my doorstep. My wife is on the phone and I can hear her saying now: 'No, he is not in yet but he should be here in about five minutes. Can I take the number?'

This is not in any way a disparaging speech on anybody. All I am trying to put in focus, Sir, is the fact that our responsibilities are to the people of this province, the whole 520,000 if there are that many. Whether 10,000 live in St. John's South or Bonavista North or St. Barbe North they deserve representation, Sir, and that is what we get paid for as Members of the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: That is nice. It is nice for them to go out and get the guide to show them around their districts. I think it is nice. I think it is nice to go up there every now and then. Sure! It is nice for the people to see them because they say that they do not get the newspapers regularly. I do not know if they get T.V. but it is nice to see the member in person to show that he is a real person that they voted for on election day. I think it is nice and it is no more than these people are due, to see their member.

Mr. Speaker, to sit and listen to what has transpired here the past two or three weeks and to hear, to hear the type of opposition that emanates from over there, and to hear the Leader of the Opposition the other night discussing this (What do you call it? Parliamentary - that we have where we can talk and can call people anything?)

AN HON. MEMBER: Immunity.

MR. MURPHY: Immunity? Parliamentary immunity. To hear him say; 'Yes, it should be changed. God help us, Almighty! I sometimes wonder, Sir, what this House of Assembly is and what we are supposed to be doing here. As I said, there will be another amendment now. Perhaps the top echelon are in creating another amendment to delay, to delay this, Sir, instead of saying: "Let us get at it. Let us get at this."

I know if the Member for Hermitage had to be elected leader he would say: "Let us get this over, I have to get together with my president. We have to get candidates for these districts. I know that because he is a pretty brilliant fella. He will tell you himself that he is one of the smartest. Pretty brilliant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not enough votes though.

MR. MURPHY: That was not his fault. I backed him. I backed him. He was not a part of the DREE project.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: I know I did. That is all right. I am prepared to do that. He is a pretty decent fellow.

But, Mr. Speaker, (Half past five. I must be nearly - do I have much longer?)

AN HON. MEMBER: Lots of time "Ank."

MR. MURPHY: Lots of time?

MR. SIMMONS: We certainly hope so.

MR. MURPHY: I am glad that you are enjoying this. I feel that it is the most sensible speech that has been made yet in this debate. I may be wrong, but I really feel that. The only reason I am saving that is because it is true.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very, very serious matter. It is serious. I am treating it seriously. There could not be anything more serious, Sir, than pleading on behalf of the people of this province that we get to work, get to work to try to cure some of the ills that beset us. We know them. We hear amendments - adjourn the House, talk about the cost of living, how much are motor cars? What do they sell for? This is the kind of stuff we are getting here. These stupid, stupid motions and amendments to delay, Sir, to keep this House open.

Is it true that there are only a few people you give contracts to? Then we bring the man before the Bar of the House because he defends himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: I know I am being a little irrelevant.

Now to get back - I am very serious usually, Sir, it just gives me a little bit of a break so that I can carry on with my speech. I am apt to get a little bit emotional when I talk of the people of Newfoundland because I am one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I say this; with all due respect and all sincerity, we can all take this thing apart if we wanted to now and sit down with an individual, we could take that map apart and say: "Look, the boundary should not be on Bonaventure Avenue it should be on Whiteway Street." My honourable friend from St. John's South could say; "Look, this little bit of Kilbride should be a part of mine. Or this little piece of St. Phillips down there - you know, it is terrible to have people feel that they do not get along with the people on the other side of the line and why should they be brought in there.

Are we going to say, Sir, are we going to say and have another one of these so-called (What do we call it? From the people?) plebiscites? Will we go to them and say; "You people on Springdale Street prepare to come into St. John's Centre with the people on Barter's Hill? Will we go to Portugal Cove and say; "Look, we are thinking about putting you in with the people from Beachy Cove. Is it all right? Do you know anybody over there?

MR. CARTER: Would the honourable minister permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Sir.

MR. J. A. CARTER: Does the minister differentiate between urban areas, that is, large urban areas and smallish rural areas, where a whole community is cut in half? I maintain that there is a great difference between a rural community which numbers perhaps less than 1,000 and a vast urban community of St. John's which numbers over 100,000. Does the minister not agree that there is a difference not only of sign but of content as well? There is a difference in meaning when you talk about an urban area and a rural area.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, forty-five minutes, finish her up.

Differentiate - what do you mean differentiate? Sure I differentiate. I know in St. John's Centre how many people there are. I know in Portugal Cove how many people, I know in St. Phillips how many people, I know in Logy Bay how many people there are, I know in Outer Cove, I know in Carbonear, Blackhead, Bay de Verde, we all know that. I mean this is no revelation. It is not a revelation to tell me that St. Phillips is somewhat different from the great teaming City, the great metropolis of St. John's. God help us, almighty, I only had the sixth book but a kindergarten knows that.

Sure I differentiate that, but what is all the problem about. Do you feel that the people on this side of Portugal Cove are going to go to war against this because they are in some other district. Look, I will say now, Mr. Speaker, that if you had a questionnaire, not of this new one but the last one and asked people what the boundaries of St. John's Centre are, the boundaries of St. John's North, the boundaries of St. John's South or any boundary you would not get ten correct answers out of 500. I will say that now but it is this that is being raised by people who are so jealous of what this government have done in two short years, Sir. So jealous that is the whole problem of what is happening in this province today, Sir.

Here we have it. I will support it, Sir. I will support it, these boundaries because I think and I will say again, that as far

AN HON. MEMBER: He has no choice in the matter.

MR. MURPHY: I have all kinds of choices in the world. The same choice I had when the Liberals offered me \$3,000 to run in St. John's West in 1956. I had the same choice then - I need the money but I do not like your party. Now there is the choice I had.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear! Hear!

MR. MURPHY: I have said in this House many times -

SOME HON. MEMBER: That is putting him in his place.

MR. MURPHY: Many people may own my house, they may own the clothes I wear but they can never own my mind or my conscience that belongs to Ank.

AN HON. MEMBER: That a boy, Ank!

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir, I try to be fair to everybody, Sir, and my record in this House is to stand up and be counted, Sir. Stand up and be counted. It was easy to be a Liberal, Sir, in 1962.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Is the Member for Hermitage finished, I would not like to interrupt him.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! All honourable members are aware of the rules that the member speaking has the right to be heard in silence, if you differ as far as opinion is concerned with what the honourable member is saying there is a time and place for any honourable members to make their feelings felt.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Sir. I do not mind, I mean if anybody has a question to ask I am only too happy to answer it, Sir, but stand up and let the people see us, speak out loud and let me know what your question is, I will answer it.

Sir, my time must be just about up. I could go on, I could go on possibly for weeks with this. I could bring in seven or eight amendments possibly, you know, to this thing. I know that they

would love to have it. They might even come over to the back of the chair and chat with me all about it, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: It would be wonderful! Wonderful! But, Mr. Speaker, again I cannot reiterate -

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Sneaker,

MR. MURPHY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. All these

MR. MURPHY: A point of order, no, no, no, point of order for me.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: I have the floor, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Okay.

MR. MURPHY: I am only in the House twelve years, I do not know the rules yet. Carry on.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Member for Trinity South does not know the rules would you bring it to his attention that he should only speak when he is sitting in his place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: O-o-o-oh!

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! I think all honourable members should have their memories jogged

at this point. We are nearing the end of a long week and certainly we would not want the week to end on a discordant note. I note that there have been repluses across the floor that are completely unparliamentary. Both sides are equally guilty of it. I suggest of all honourable members to hold their thunder for at least the next twenty-five minutes.

The honourable Minister of Social Services.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Is everybody finished now. Give everybody a chance before I stand up. I would not like to interfere with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and I meant earlier, Sir, to congratulate the Speaker who is now in the Chair, the Deputy Speaker for the tremendous job he is doing in his district. He lives in his district, Sir. He commutes back and forth and I say to you, Sir, congratulations, I get very glowing reports. You are a model member, Sir. You hold your regular meetings with your constituents, not every three months, Sir, not on fine days in July and August but basically pretty well all through the year and I think you are a model, Sir, for that member.

MR. WINSOR: Will the honourable minister permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: I certainly will.

MR. WINSOR: Is he now advocating that all ministers who do not reside in their district resign from the Cabinet and go out and reside in their district?

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir, I said earlier, perhaps again, I do not know if the honourable member, my honourable and illustrious friend from Fogo, we have been friends for a great many years, I said earlier, Sir, that in my opinion, if I were a member I would live in my district. If I was ordained or elevated to a Cabinet minister it would be something different. I just could not reside in the district. Now I am not saying, Sir, please do not misunderstand me that there are not members in this house who represent districts outside of where they live, that are not doing a darn good job.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! I am extremely loath to interrupt the honourable minister when he is saying things such as he was saying. Unfortunately he should have started them somewhat earlier. His time is up.

MR. MURPHY: Can I just say thank you for the attention and for the great

support I received from the whole House? Thank you. I thought you used to get two minutes notice, warning. Can I -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Yes, the honourable member can have another minute.

MR. MURPHY: I have another minute. I knew. I knew. I am timing myself here. Everything I do is just about correct. I just want to say, Sir, quite frankly, Sir, how happy I am to be able to do this, Sir -

MR. NEARY: What about the special diet for the Lundrigan child?

MR. MURPHY: Oh! She was over to see you. So there will be a special meeting of Mr. Neary, Mr. Harrington and the rest of the freedom fighters Sir, tomorrow morning to talk about this famous thing and my executive assistant, one of the outstanding men in this Province and I am happy to pay him tribute at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in conclusion and it is in conclusion and finally in conclusion that I feel that the members of this House, let us stop this foolish, petty stuff of bringing in little amendments delaying the House. Let us get at it, let us let the member for Twillingate go back among his people, the member for Labrador North and the rest of them. Let them get back and chat to the people, find out what they need and say, "I am the member for Bonavista North." Let him get back to his district, to people. He knows them all. He knows their needs. He comes in here, Sir, and anything Sir, that they need count on Ank Murphy to support them. Thank you very much.

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

The Member for Hermitage.

A. HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. R. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the orchestra leader quits over there, I will begin. He is back. He is back. He is back. Mr. Speaker, I like the members on the opposite side thoroughly enjoyed the rather fine speech which the Member from St. John's Centre just

gave and I certainly would like to congratulate him. I do not know what the relevance was to the subject at hand. I am not questioning the Speaker's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: For entertainment value, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly yield and allow them to do so.

In terms of getting some enlightenment on the subject at hand, I listened to him for entertainment reasons but also because I had hoped to hear something to the point, some justification why government has seen fit to change the boundaries so ably drawn up by the independent boundaries commission. Now the minister makes light of the imaginary line. If it is so imaginary, Mr. Speaker, and so unimportant, why the urgency to change it, to change thirty-one of the fifty-one districts completely. The minister did not answer that question. He did not address himself to it. He used the very red herring approach that he accused other members of using.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the motion asked him. That is what the resolution is all about. If he does not understand the resolution, send him over. We will explain it to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I have to ask honourable members to observe the rule of courtesy to the honourable member who has the floor. All honourable members have the right to be heard in their turn. They do not have the right to be heard out of turn.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I asked the question earlier when I spoke and I believe other colleagues on this side asked the same question: Why did the government see fit to alter thirty-one of the fifty-one boundaries that were drawn up by the boundaries commission? Thirty-one of the fifty-one were changed. The Minister of Social Services sees fit to make light of that. He says I did not

ask the question. All of us have asked the question all through this debate. He has spoken but other members on his side have not spoken. I ask the question again. Will some member on the government side, somebody who knows what is behind all this redrawing of the boundaries by the government, somebody who understands the reason for it, instead of getting up and blindly supporting it as the Minister of Social Services advocates you should do - he talks about freedom, he talks about being his own man yet he cannot even tell us why the boundaries were changed. I ask some member on the government side, who has not spoken, to address himself to the question. Why the need to change thirty-one of the fifty-one boundaries that the commission had so ably drawn up? I have not been convinced of the reason for the need.

The minister makes light of boundaries having to be somewhere and dividing Portugal Cove, St. Phillips and Bonaventure Avenue and that kind of thing. That has been our argument, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Bonavista South will accord me the courtesy, I always accord him when he is speaking, I will tell him in time how I feel about the fifty-one districts verses the forty-two or the forty-one.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Bonavista South is confused which is normal for him. The province is not confused in this at all. The province knows where we stand on this matter of the number of districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services talks about their arbitrariness of dividing the boundary, whether it should be Bonaventure Avenue or Whiteway Street or whatever and that he could take the pen in hand and divide St. John's Centre from another district in a different way than someone else has done it.

That is part of our point in this debate, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly what he and his colleagues have done, what he and his people in cabinet have done. They have taken the pencil and arbitrarily drawn lines to their own advantage. That is the whole reason for the legislation of a year and a half ago. That is why we had the electoral boundaries delimitation legislation in the first place so that we could take it out of the hands of people who had vested interest like the Minister of Social Services and the other ministers and the other members in government. Take it out of these hands and put it into the hands of people who did not have a vested interest but who could approach the subject -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, not give it to the opposition, Mr. Speaker. We, too, have a vested interest. We would do as good a job as the people in government have done on the subject, I will tell you that.

No, Mr. Speaker, we have a vested interest, too, as I said yesterday and

as everybody is well aware of give it to people as the legislation provided for a year and a-half ago and as the Minister of Justice so ably defended that move a year and a-half ago. I am anxiously awaiting to see where he stands now, Mr. Speaker, a year and a-half later. Does he still stand by what he said a year and a-half ago? Does he still stand by that, Mr. Speaker? Or has he now got some new rationales, some new founded rationale that somebody invented for him. I know he does not own it, he does not give birth to it himself because I know what he believes. I know he believes what he said a year and a-half ago, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of thing ought to be done by an independent commission and that is the way it was done or it was set out to be done until the butchers got a hold of it, Mr. Speaker, until the butchers in government, the people have decided that if they had -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Until they decided, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: It depends on the audience, Mr. Speaker. I had a mature audience at the convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir, is Your Honour going to enforce the rules of this honourable House?

MR. SIMMONS: You know the difference of that Steve.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I ask, I plead, I beg the Speaker to enforce the rules so that my colleague here, Sir, can speak in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Or to be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable member's point is well taken whether or not it is courteous for him to ask the Chair to enforce the rules is one thing but certainly the point made by him is

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The point made by him is correct, I made it on two or three occasions myself asking honourable members to refrain from participating in the debate when they do not have the floor. Both sides are equally guilty of it, of course, and when guilt is attributed to both sides it is very hard to enforce any rules.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services was talking about the arbitrariness of taking a pencil and dividing the district at Bonaventure Avenue or at Whiteway Street or wherever. This has been part of our argument here, that is exactly what the government have done. Quite arbitrarily or quite for their own motives, they have done that. That is why, that is the whole rationale behind giving this kind of a task to an independent commission rather than have it done from a vested interest standpoint or from an arbitrary standpoint, give it to people who will study the question over a period of months as this commission did and then be prepared to abide, by and large, by the report that they bring in.

Now the minister never addressed himself to that question at all. He never even sought to enlighten us or to tell us why, he who voted for the legislation setting up this independent commission a year and a-half ago, why he has now come to the point that he has to support this gerrymandering, this butcher job, this changing of no less than thirty-one of the fifty-one boundaries. He has not told us why. He gave us a nice entertaining speech, as he said himself, with all modesty, certainly one of the best speeches we have heard today but not a very enlightening one in terms of subject at hand.

We thank God, Mr. Speaker, we thank God we have such fellows as the Minister of Social Services around who can break it up for us once in awhile and it was in that spirit that we sat by and listened to the irrelevancy which he indulged in for forty-five minutes. He talks about people living in their districts and out of

their districts. He gives us his own special interpretation, his own special definition of what a member should do. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is because he has been in an urban seat all of his life that he displays such a lack of knowledge of what is involved or what is demanded of a member for a rural district. I do not buy his arguments at all, when he says; "That it is not for a member to write letters." I do not buy that at all. If you have four city blocks, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to write many letters whether you are a cabinet minister and have assistants or you are a backbencher. You do not have to write many letters if you can look out your front window and see the whole district or get in your car and in fifteen minutes of driving on good paved streets get through the whole district. It is easy for him to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and make light of the kind of job that the rural member has to do. Well, perhaps it is because I am a rookie, perhaps it is because I am green at this but it takes all of my time, Mr. Speaker, and I do not do much of the clipping of papers that he talked about. It takes all my time to answer the letters. Sure you can visit. Sure

you can live in your district but if you have seventeen communities in that district you cannot live in them all. You can visit them, and I do, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: No, Sir! No, Sir! This is not an inquisition, Mr. Speaker, I know a member who lives in his district and he was referred to by the Member for St. John's Centre. I know of one person who lives in his district and who hangs a sign on his business door saying that his constituents can see him from two to three o'clock once a week.

It is useless to live in a district if your constituents cannot get to you because you are too busy running your own business. That is fifty-two days a year.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Get your facts straight! Get your facts straight first of all. It is easy to make glib statements. The authority on rural districts. Here he is, Mr. Speaker, the supreme authority on rural districts and he knows all about all the rural districts. They even had to tell him whether Lumsden was in Bonavista North or Fogo. That is how much he knows about Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SIMMONS: The expert on Labrador knows all about the social problems. He is not doing much about them, Mr. Speaker, but he knows all about them. He says that Goose Bay is a nice place. That is what he knows about Goose Bay.

MR. MURPHY: I spent more time in Goose Bay than you did.

MR. SIMMONS: No you did not, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Up in the bar.

MR. SIMMONS: No you did not, Sir. No you did not, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help it if the member was there before I was. That was not my fault. I have certainly been there as much as he has. It is easy to make those glib statements until you have to

back them up.

MR. MURPHY: There is nothing wrong with Goose Bay -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh no! No.

MR. MURPHY: No, you are damn well right there is not.

MR. ROBERTS: One of the nice things about it is that the minister does not live there.

MR. MURPHY: I had two big fights down there.

MR. SIMMONS: That is where his friends are. I wondered where his friends were. They are all in Labrador.

MR. NEARY: We did not know Terry Trainor lived down there.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Terry Trainor is not a friend he is on the payroll.

MR. MURPHY: Terry Trainor is one of the finest men in this province. Characterwise - against any - not fit to wipe his shoes. Not fit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister for Social Services would get the message and know what you mean when you say; "Order" if he would shut up I would get on with the subject at hand.

He talks about the separatism in Labrador being nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the minister is right. I really hope that the Minister of Social Services is right when he labels that as nonsense. I hope that it does turn out to be absolute nonsense with no foundation, no ground at all. The word I am hearing and I have been in Labrador City, Wabush, Churchill Falls, Goose Bay and Happy Valley -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, quite apart from the leadership period. I have been in Northwest River, the other communities I have just named, all in the last six or eight months, and three times in the past year in most of these places.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: They were excellent were they not? Excellent. Do you want to know who wrote these? You could do with some yourself. You could do with some. I could get them written for a price.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lots of money to spend.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh a terrific amount of money. No shortage of money.

Do you want some written yourself? It would be a lot better of course than what you are doing yourself now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member I am sure is aware that when he is directing his remarks they should be directed towards the Chair and not directly to another member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I thought it to -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is now six o'clock.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, I will move the adjournment of the debate and call it six o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no, do not - no.

MR. SIMMONS: If I move the adjournment I will have the floor next day.

Mr. Speaker, am I going to be allowed to continue in silence or do I have to listen to that tripe over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask for a ruling before you sit down.

MR. NEARY: Name the Minister of Social Services for harassing my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! If I were to name all the members who have been harassed or who have been harassing someone else today then perhaps the honourable Member for Hermitage would be the only one left in the House.

I am sure that honourable members are aware that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. For the nth time today I would ask them to adhere to that rule. The honourable Member for Hermitage may continue.

MR. SIMMONS: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the comments about separtism

in Labrador are nonsense. I happen to feel from having visited those communities I have named in Labrador in the past six months and some of them several times in the past couple of years, I happen to know that there is a feeling there of not belonging. You can call it what you will. You can parade out all the statistics you want. You can place your own interpretation on it if you want but if you do not go there and hear those people, hear what they are saying, hear what they are feeling - I had a meeting of about twenty people, a private meeting of about twenty people in Labrador earlier this fall and I was amazed, absolutely amazed. I counted myself as one who had kept in contact to some degree. I do not have any job commitment in Labrador but over the years I have managed to keep in some kind of contact with Labrador. Yet I was amazed with the tenor and the direction of the questions that were put to me at this particular meeting.

Many of them related to this subject we are on here right now, Mr. Speaker, this subject if you call it separatism, call it psychological isolation, call it the feeling that they are left out, call it what you will, there is a feeling here that has to be accommodated. It cannot be accommodated, Mr. Speaker, by the Minister of Social Services, a senior man in cabinet getting up and making light of it. Where are they to go? That is his question, Mr. Speaker. That is how he treats the subject.

I will answer the question for him, Mr. Speaker. They will stay where they are physically. They may well see it to their advantage if people in cabinet have that kind of attitude. They may see it to their advantage to latch onto some other province or to become a separate entity, politically all their own. That is where they might go. I am not advocating it, Mr. Speaker, but I would appeal to the minister in his good sense not to get on with that kind of nonsense. If anything is nonsense, it is his treatment of the subject, Mr. Speaker. I appeal to his maturity and good sense to not relate any more in that kind of way to a very serious subject. I suggest instead of bragging about being in Goose Bay in 1954 that he go down there in 1974 and get the

feeling of what is going on down there in 1974.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Keep quite, the Speaker told you to keep quite or you will be named and flung out.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I thought because of the tone of the minister's speech, a rather entertaining digression from what we have been through here in the past few days, I thought that I could have excused the first comment about separatism, about it being nonsense, as being a light comment but then he comes to this business of the naming of the province. Then he equates Labrador with a number of other parts of the province, all of which are very important parts, Bell Island, St. John's Centre and the other places that he mentioned. He misses the entire point, Mr. Speaker, the entire point. I have a question for him which I would like him to answer in due time. Is he giving notice, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to change the name of the province back to the Province of Newfoundland? Is he giving notice of that?

I know what it is officially, Mr. Speaker. I know. They are trying to confuse themselves, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes it depends on what stationery they are using and so on. I am asking the Minister of Social Services to indicate in time whether they are going to strike all references to the dichotomous reference, the dual reference of Newfoundland and Labrador.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am about to paraphrase it for the benefit of the fellows in the back rows.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Keep quite, boy. The Speaker told you to keep quite.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the honourable member for Hermitage has adjourned the debate.

On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, December 16, 1974, at three of the clock.