



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 91

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. S. A. NEARY: The honourable Minister of Fisheries was going to get me an answer to a question concerning the Linerboard Logging Operation in Goose Bay.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): The honourable gentleman must be psychic. I am just getting to my feet, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to getting the honourable gentleman information, in fact, I love getting him information, especially with Christmas coming on us. The only thing that I am going to give the honourable gentleman for Christmas is some information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman asked a question yesterday, the honourable and agile gentleman -

MR. NEARY: Do not be nasty now!

MR. CROSBIE: Agile is not nasty.

Mr. Speaker, the position is this there is nothing sinister, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman asked a question yesterday as though there was something sinister happening at the Labrador Linerboard, you know something unusual, something out of the ordinary. Now the position is this, Mr. Speaker, that all of the employees of the Labrador Linerboard Limited, in the Happy Valley/Goose Bay Area who are covered by the collective agreement are treated in the following manner in order to encourage people from the Island to go there and work, loggers and that kind of worker - they have the following arrangement: when they go up there from the Island of Newfoundland their transportation up is paid by the company.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute! I never asked the honourable gentleman to answer a question for me, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer a question for him. Their way up is paid by the company, sometimes it is paid by Canada Manpower.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: If - Thanks for your help. Now that payment though is deducted from their wages, you see, but if they stay for three months then their transportation up is refunded to them or credited to them. If they stay for four months and they produce at a certain rate, two and a-half cords a day, I think, for cut and slash or something or other, cut and haul, anyway there is different amounts for different phases of the activity, if they meet those incentives and they stay four months then their way out to the Island is paid by the company, they are given two weeks leave and their way back in is again paid for by the company. If they stay six months but even do not meet these various incentives but if they stay six months their transportation up to Labrador and back again to the Island is paid by the company in any event. So that applies to those members the operation covered by the collective bargaining agreement.

Now in addition, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are also a large number of employees there who are white collared workers or a part of the management or administrative staff not covered by the collective bargaining agreement. In an attempt to attract people to work in the area and to stay there and to be contented the company decided that some kind of an arrangement like this would have to be put into effect for the administrative staff. The scheme devised is that employees who are not in the collective bargaining unit, if they have worked with the company for six months or four to six months the company decided that they would pay their way out to Stephenville, St. John's or Montreal, they and their wives, in the case of men if they are married. they will pay their way out and back before Christmas so that they can go shopping or whatever. They will have a trip out and back paid for by the company. That is what the honourable gentleman was asking about yesterday. If a woman is involved who works for the company -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The worse fear I have, Mr. Speaker, is that I will wake up some morning and turn on the radio and not hear the honourable gentleman's voice on the media. I have never seen a media so constipated

for news that they had to use the outflowings of the honourable gentleman.

MR. DOODY: He gets a LIP grant every morning.

MR. CROSBIE: If it is a woman involved who works for the company, Mr. Speaker, her way is paid out but not her husband's. Now that is the policy and it seems to me eminently sensible.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister explain why the government are holding back fifty per cent or one-half of the compensation payments for the lobster fishermen of the province until the spring of the year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I thought, Mr. Speaker, I explained that the other day but I do not mind explaining it again. Now the honourable gentleman asks - this has to do with lobster pots? The position, I think, is very simple that the federal government officials advised that the value of the lobster pot today is ten dollars. Therefore, the scheme devised is that the fishermen will be paid now five dollars so he can get the material to construct his lobster pot. The honourable gentleman knows, I assume in just about all cases, they make their own lobster pots. So they are now being paid five dollars.

Now we would like to ensure that the gear is replaced. We do not want to pay to a fisherman who says he lost 200 lobster pots \$2,000 and then he does not spend it on lobster pots, he goes on a trip or he spends it on his house or he does whatever he likes with it. So in an attempt to ensure that the money is used to replace the lobster pots he says, he lost, he is to be paid five dollars now so he can construct the lobster pots and the fisheries officers will go back next spring and see has he got the lobster pots made that he said he was going to make to replace those he lost. Once they verify that he has now got the lobster pots constructed that he was given the five dollars for then he will be



the other five dollars. So it is five dollars now and five dollars when the pot is constructed. The reason for that is to attempt to ensure that the pot is replaced.

MR. F. B. ROWE: A supplementary. I do not know how to ask this without putting it into a form of a statement but does the minister realize that the fishermen do, in fact, have to buy the wood and they have to buy the twine, the wire and the nails and what have you -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: In view of the fact, Sir, that I have had representation from the fishermen of my own district saying that, they do not have their own little sawmills, they do not cut their own slats or whatever they are called, would the minister undertake to just check into this a little further?

MR. F. ROWE: and see whether the fishermen can get all the lobster pots constructed before the spring because in the spring they need to put the pots in the water and not start constructing the pots all over again.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you know I am advised by the experts that this should be eminently satisfactory but I will ask them to ensure that it is. Now I do realize that the lobster pot has to be ready by the spring because I understand that is when the lobster season is, in the spring, that is not this fall and it will not be in January or February. I am glad the honourable gentleman brought that to my attention because I am a bit of a land lubber and I surely want to make sure. I will check that out.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, seeing the minister is in a generous mood this morning, going to give me a Christmas present, I think I will put a lobster pot in his stocking for Christmas.

Sir, would the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation inform the House if he has received a request from the Town of Badger for additional government financial assistance to install an artificial ice plant in the new stadium to complete this project in Badger.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. DOYLE: Yes we have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: If the answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wants information -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I got the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I want just to make this simple statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think the honourable Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation has answered the question for the honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am about to ask a supplementary, would the minister inform the House what action the government has taken on this request?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not care about strings over here, Mr. Speaker. We are not puppets on a string. We have members who vote against us. There is nobody on a string over here. We have democracy in this great party, in this great government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of action that the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation takes. He communicated with me as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and pointed out to me that Mr. Rompkey had said to the people in question in Badger that this ice surface on the stadium at Badger was very likely a good project for DREE and I took it up with the honourable Donald Jamieson during our five hours last Thursday and Friday. One of the items discussed was an ice surface for the stadium at Badger. I think I concluded from that conversation that the chance of getting the ice surface at a stadium in Badger from DREE -

MR. NEARY: They have the ice surface, what they need is an artificial -

MR. CROSBIE: It was at least five hundred million to one against since DREE does not engage in the financing of recreational programmes. I want to inform the people of Badger now that they have been misinformed by Mr. Rompkey. They will not be getting an ice surface on their stadium at Badger from DREE. That is the kind of action we are taking. We are following up every lead even if the chances are five hundred million to one.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to spread the questions around a little bit this morning. I wonder if the honourable the Premier could inform the House what action his government has taken to encourage the development of a more integrated and more competitive system of food marketing in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. MOORES: The Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the honourable the Premier, I wonder if the Premier, Sir, could inform the House what action his government has taken to provide an improved regional system of storage, including particularly storage with controlled temperature for perishable foods to reduce the cost of living in Newfoundland.

MR. MOORES: Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries, I want to spread them around a little bit, Sir. In view of the difficulties reported by consumers throughout the province in buying fresh fish, will the minister indicate to the House what action his government has taken on a recommendation of the Food Prices Review Board to give consideration to the establishment of retail fish markets in St. John's and other urban centres.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we now have an intensive search underway to contact Mr. Michael Maher and get his report on what happened to his fresh fish venture on the Southside. When we have the results of his experience we will let the honourable gentleman know.

MR. NEARY: The dragnet would be out for brother Andrew.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of -

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be attacking your fellow Liberals.

MR. NEARY: Fellow Liberals my foot, sabotaged the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Agriculture care to indicate to the House if the provincial government has enquired into the marketing of eggs in Newfoundland, especially, Sir, the margin between producer prices and retail prices as recommended in the Food Price Review recommendation.

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

MR. COLLINS: MR. Speaker, there must be an investigation into every egg that is produced in Canada I believe. I have lost track of them. The officials in the department are trying to get them all together and see if any of the investigations might make sense. I mentioned a little while ago that we are awaiting the outcome of the special committee in the House of Commons which is supposed to report to the House this week and that will determine what we might do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, can I fling one over at the Minister of Justice? Would the minister care to indicate to the House if the C.I.D. has been reorganized as promised by the Minister of Justice in a public statement of November 6.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not recall making that kind of promise, Mr. Speaker,

but there is a great deal of reorganization going on within the Newfoundland Constabulary at this time and we have provided I think it is either four or six additional posts within the C.I.D. but that is only part of the reorganization that is going on. The rest I will be able to indicate to the House when we have completed the assessment of what the cost item is.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, can tell me in thirty seconds or less if there is anything he can report on a study that was undertaken by BRINCO into the feasibility of establishing a cement plant in the Port au Port Area?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that that study is still proceeding. I am not aware of when they expect to have a final report in but I should expect that it would be within the next six months.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Mines inform the House, Sir, if he has yet received a report of a peat-moss consultant, Dr. Bruce Grahame, who was engaged by the government, Sir, back earlier this year to investigate the possibility of commercial sale production of peat-moss for the export market? Would the minister make his answer brief?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister has received the report will the minister be making the report public or tabling the report in the House?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I shall take a look at it and see if it is appropriate. It was an internal report done to assist the Department of Mines and Energy in continuing the excellent work that is being done in developing the mineral resources of the province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, from recollection that there is no reason why the, substance, in any event, of this report could not be made public.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the same minister, Sir, would inform the House if he is yet in a position to give the details of an assessment of dolomite deposits on the Port au Port Peninsula?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this will be the subject matter of a report, if it has not already been published and I do not remember at the moment whether or not it has been, but this -

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Information Services have not put out the information yet.

MR. BARRY: This matter, Mr. Speaker, was the subject of a field-party, I believe, from the Department of Mines and Energy that periodically goes out and assesses various mineral potentials within the province. Once the findings are put together, Mr. Speaker, they are usually published - once the geologists have had an opportunity to analyze their findings. I am sure that the results of this particular party will be published just as soon as it is in an appropriate form.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the minister could now inform the House whether or not the success of this particular research will be related to the operation of the magnesium plant?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask Tom Doyle.

MR. BARRY: I am not aware that the magnesium plant is a sine qua non for the report on dolomite being published.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you aware of that?

MR. NEARY: Sir, I would suggest to the minister that he read the Newfoundland Information Services Bulletin that was put out under the minister's signature?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Hon. Premier, Sir, would tell the House what steps have been taken by the government to fulfill a commitment to the Town of Stephenville, the Community of Stephenville to provide a community college?

MR. MOORES: Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Order Paper?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, Sir, would inform the House what action his department or the government have taken on a request from the Newfoundland Federation of Labour to include in the curriculum of the schools throughout the province at least the basics of the trade union movement?

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

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): We are working with the Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, to try and devise some sort of a programme. There is to be a pilot programme out on this year, I believe the Minister of Education can answer that better than I can but there is to be a pilot programme out on this year in Grade X. We are hoping to expand that into the high school curriculum in all grades and as well with trade schools but the subject to be taught in the schools has not been devised as yet.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Education care to elaborate on that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): I could add something to that, Mr. Speaker, in a number of the vocational schools now courses in industrial relations are in fact being given. In the high school, of



course, it is something of a different matter. I would say in many of the civic classes that this is an important area and that it is covered. It certainly is not done in all schools but in most of the vocational schools industrial relations is being taught.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Justice could inform the House if a writ has been served on him by "The Daily News" for unchecked crime apparently in the downtown St. John's Area? I know the minister has had a lot of writs served on him recently.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): No, Mr. Speaker, there -

MR. NEARY: Would he remember that one?

MR. HICKMAN: There have been no writs served on me or anyone acting on behalf of "The Daily News". I must confess I would love to see the grounds of the cause of action. I would be very curious.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject of writs, Sir, I wonder if the Hon. Premier could tell us whether or not a writ was served on himself and the Minister of Industrial Development during his recent trip to New York for kidnapping?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes or no?

MR. MOORES: I thought it was public knowledge. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was public knowledge. The answer is partially, yes. It was kidnapping plus some other facetious charge.

MR. DOODY: .... because I did not get one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does he feel left out?

MR. NEARY: Well just the Premier then had a writ served on him in New York.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: In a law firm in New York.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that all she served on you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: As these matters have international implications -



AN HON. MEMBER: Repercussions.

MR. NEARY: Repercussions or whatever way you want to put it, Sir.

I wonder if the Hon. the Premier would tell the House whether or not the issuance of these writs "South of the Border" in the United States would have any effect on business relocating in Newfoundland or would it have any effect on our borrowing in the United States bond market?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, of course is "No". I do not even think it will affect the kidnapping right in the States.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that in 1972 his government announced that they were going to set up a Newfoundland Conservation Corp? If so, would the Premier care to give us a progress report on the activities of the Newfoundland Conservation Corp?

MR. MOORES: Order Paper!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Twillingate.

MR. H. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism, if he will. It concerns the good ship "The Norma and Gladys". Will the minister inform the House how much has been spent on that project to date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TOURISM): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that under advisement, I do not have the exact figures.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the honourable House in accordance with Standing Order No. 23 that the regular business of the House be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, Sir, namely: the serious affects of alcohol on our citizens and their families this time of year and the absolute necessity, Mr. Speaker, for the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation to set up emergency telephone numbers in major centres throughout the province from the present time through to January 6, so that individuals feeling incapable of functioning properly because of overindulgence in alcoholic stimulants, Sir, or is incapable of driving or reaching his home by another means may through

these telephone numbers, Mr. Speaker, secure transportation and any other assistance necessary at the expense of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation. We would like to get this through, Sir, we want to protect the administration. Self-preservation.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion resembles somewhat and some implications of, well it is not really similar in that sense to the motion made previously by another honourable member, I think the same Member for Bell Island. The Chair does not consider it to be of such urgency that we would adjourn the ordinary business of the day to debate this matter.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, as usual the government are running ahead of the printer in its business and we have not got the Order Paper but Motion (2) I would like to call which is first reading of the Labour Bill of the Minister of Industrial Relations.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the honourable member shall have leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Labour Relations Act." Is it the pleasure of the House that the honourable Member shall have leave to introduce the said Bill. Those in favour "Aye", those against "Nay". Carried.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, under Standing Order 16(B). Can the House proceed without an Order Paper, Sir? We have no Order Paper before us. The government may call orders in whatever precedence they want, I mean there is no question about that but can the House proceed without an Order Paper? Up until this point our proceedings have been governed by the appropriate Standing Order which sets forth the regular routine order of business and so-called. We are now down to Orders of the Day and, of course, the Government House Leader has the right to call orders but from what, Sir? There is no Order Paper before the Chair at present unless the page has just dashed in with one now.

MR. SPEAKER: The page has just dashed in with one but if that had not been so, this procedure has been followed in the past, it has been done several times when the Order Paper was not available for a while, so it is going to be done any way.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Labour Relations Act", read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister without Portfolio.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking on this bill, introducing it because it is the same as the bill that we have discussed for the past three weeks, the resolution, that is, with respect to redistribution. I do not see really myself any point in, as you know everything that can be said has been said. I would urge the Opposition - the Opposition have made their points in the resolution. I know that the Opposition are probably tired of listening to this debate as much as we are on this side and everybody who has had to listen to it. I think everything really, Mr. Speaker, has been said on it. As far as the government are concerned, the government are determined, of course, that the bill is going through and it is

going through as a government measure and it is going to be adopted and I would hope that the opposition now would accept this for second reading without seeing the necessity of any protracted debate on it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, despite the House Leader's honied words, I for one have no intention of seeing this bill go through at all if I can prevent it and I do not think for one minute that I can prevent it but that does not mean that I will not try and I feel confident I speak for my colleagues, including those who are not here, I expect they will all be here before the debate ends.

The gentleman from Bonavista North has I gather, run into some trouble driving in from his home in Gambo. The gentleman from Labrador North is on his way, courtesy of EPA. The gentleman from Fogo has had some illness in his family but he will be present and the gentleman from Hermitage has served his sentence, endurance vile and will be back in time for the debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, either we can have little Leo participating in the debate in the proper way or we can have him participating in the debate in his usual way and I am quite prepared to deal with him, however he chooses to raise the issue. I would not bother threatening little Leo, Mr. Speaker. He is not worthy of a threat. I would only say to him what John Diefendbaker once said to a number of people -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition he is not being relevant to the particular bill being debated.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was being perfectly relevant to the bill when I said that when one is searching for elephants one does not get distracted by rabbits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable little Leo's mentor, Big John is in action now. Now, Mr. Speaker, considering that the Minister of Fisheries has not had the courage to participate in this debate and has in fact sat idly by, this I suppose must be the first debate since he left the Smallwood Administration, over an alleged issue of principles, six or seven years ago, this must be the first debate in which the

Minister of Fisheries has not favoured us, usually at some length, with his views. I would hope that he will speak in this debate because I would like very much to hear from him his explanation of how and why he accepted the course of action that the administration of which he is a part have done with this Redistribution Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Party discipline.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I think that is it, party discipline. His principles, whatever they may be, have taken second place to party discipline and if the truth be known, Sir, that is exactly what has happened with every one over there with the sole and laudible exception of the gentleman from St. John's North who whatever the rights or wrongs of what he has done on a number of issues in the past and he and I have certainly disagreed on many political issues and I suspect we will continue to disagree on a number of political issues but at least he had the courage to say in this House and to support his words with his vote and say what many of the honourable gentlemen opposite have said privately and almost publicly outside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader, the gentleman from St. John's East, I think made one of the most shameful statements I have ever heard in this House in his very brief introduction to this bill. I do not know if I am quoting his words exactly but I reproduced his thought precisely. He said in effect, the government are going to put this bill through, it does not matter what anybody says, it does not matter what anybody thinks, we are going to put it through. Now I accept that fact. I accept it, I take it as a statement of fact and I think the honourable gentleman meant it. I have no doubt at all he meant it. That one statement by the House Leader, Sir, reveals in a nut shell the entire and whole strategy of this Tory Government with respect to this redistribution exercise.

I say, Sir, that they set out a couple of years ago to deliberately mislead the people of this province, that each and every one of them is guilty of taking part in a conspiracy to deceive this House and to deceive this province. The conscious agent of this was the Minister of Justice who,

when he spoke in the government's name, spoke for the government, aided and abetted by the Premier in March of 1973 in support of this bill or in support I am sorry of the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act, the beginning of the redistribution process, said in unequivocal terms that the Tory Administration of which he was so proud a part and was so proud to be a part, would never again engage in electoral gerrymandering. In a second or two I will have his words and although they have been read before I think they are worth reading again because if honourable gentlemen opposite have any conscience or any political courage, they will address themselves to the point. Now they do not have to agree with us. Men of conscience and men of courage can disagree on political issues and disagree genuinely and disagree openly and honestly.

I do not know if there are any rights or wrongs in many questions. These are not matters of moral rightness, they are not matter of philosophical absolutism, they are matters of which men may differ. What I find hard to accept and what hundreds and thousands of people throughout the province find hard to accept is the abysmal lack of courage and the retreat from principle, the abandonment of principle which honourable gentlemen opposite have shown. We had a lengthy debate on the redistribution resolution and so we should have. The debate went forward according to the rules of the House and no member spoke more often or at greater length than the rules permitted him, indeed encouraged him to do.

That debate, Sir, was marked by the cowardly cringing of members opposite. The gentleman from Bonavista South spoke, I think he spoke twice. He spoke in the main debate and he spoke on the amendment. He certainly addressed himself to the question of fifty-one or forty-two. Let me say now that question of fifty-one or forty-two is a question on which men can differ. There is no magic about any number in the House of Assembly. This House, Sir, at one time had twenty-seven members. In 1949, the first election, the first House after Confederation had twenty-eight members, the twenty-seven districts which were constituted, on which the 1932 election was fought and then the one extra district which was given to Labrador. It then went to thirty-six and then it went to forty-

two. Previously in the 1920's it had been forty members. There is no magic about the number of members in the House. Men can disagree. They can disagree reasonably and with conviction. The member from Bonavista South spoke to that point and while I do not agree with him and he does not agree with me, I think we can agree to disagree.

We say that forty-two is enough for the present time and we made our points. I do not propose to go through them again, but I do want to re-emphasize the point. We originally felt that fifty-one should be looked at but it quickly became obvious to us when the commission began work that fifty-one was too many, so we said forty-two. We still think forty-two is enough and we will be moving an amendment at the appropriate time in this debate. I believe committee stage will be the appropriate time. We will be moving an amendment there to make our point again.

I may add we are not alone in our view. I have here a letter which came to me a day or so ago. It is addressed to me and I do not propose to read the name of the lady who sent it because I do not want to embarrass her by bringing her name into the debate but she sent me the letter and she did not mention anything about keeping it private or confidential or personal or anything else.

"Dear Sir," it is a letter from a lady who lives here in St. John's, "Though I have always voted P.C., I most



strongly oppose the redistribution bill at present before the House. The Province most definitely does not need and cannot afford fifty-one members. Your efforts to prevent the passing of this useless, wasteful and senseless piece of legislation are much appreciated.' Yours sincerely," and the lady signs her name.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know the boundaries well enough. She may or may not live in St. John's North and I say; "So what if she does?" She lives in St. John's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House these last couple of weeks has been performing on a higher plain than it has during much of the earlier part of this session. Whether or not this laudible achievement was a result of the absence of the Member from Burgeo/La Poile I know not but I know that he is back again and if he insists upon performing and making a fool of himself in this debate, -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, - Your Honour did not rise to reprimand any honourable gentlemen opposite and I have a right to defend myself. If the Member from Burgeo wishes to participate in this debate in the way in which he usually does, I am willing to deal with it. I regret it, I think he is a will not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! While it is certainly very true that the honourable member speaking has the right to be heard in silence, if he is interrupted or provoked by some member opposite it still does not give him the right to make comments with regard to the comments from the other side.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fair enough, Mr. Speaker, but I assume and hope Your Honour will crack the gentlemen on the other side. It is all very well. They interrupt and then when we reply to them, then we are

MR. BARRY: Sit down. Sit down. -

MR. ROBERTS: I have no desire to sit down. I will sit down when the Speaker asks me to, not when little "Leo" does. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Members to my left do keep on interrupting and speaking when perhaps they should not. I mentioned that a



few moments ago when I made a few comments with regard to the Leader of the Opposition. I recognized the Leader of the Opposition, he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, this lady writes me a letter. It is a very short, it is a very polite letter, it is very much to the point. I think, I know that the sentiment expressed by that lady is shared by many people, some of whom may have voted Tory in the past, some of whom may even vote Tory in the future, some of whom may have voted Liberal in the past, many of whom will vote Liberal in the future. This question of fifty-one or forty-two is one issue before the House with respect to this bill. We stand against it. We think that forty-two M.H.A.s can adequately represent this country. The government differ with us. So be it. We will fight them. I do not fear the fact that the government majority, the trained seals on the other side will triumph. In that sense every question in the House is predecided. Indeed it is not even decided by the members on the other side because the private members have no real say in this. They do what they are told.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that so?

MR. ROBERTS: They do what they are told, Mr. Speaker. The Cabinet decide and it is not even the Cabinet. It is a small group within the Cabinet and probably aided and abetted by some men who are not even in the House. In any event the naked force which the honourable gentleman from St. John's East talks about does not bother me in the least. I have as much right to stand in this House and so does the gentleman from Bell Island or from St. Barbe North or from Hermitage or from Twillingate as does any honourable member. I care not whether the government will triumph or not. They may triumph here, they will not triumph in the country. Any time they want to put it to the test, the Premier has merely to get in his car, go down and call upon His Honour the Governor. He will not need a Bill Saunders this time. All he has to do is call upon His Honour and advise His Honour to dissolve the Assembly forthwith and it will be done. I will gladly take my case to the country at any time under any map they care to bring up.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South spoke in

the debate. The honourable gentleman from Placentia West spoke in the debate and I thought the "Evening Telegram's" editorial comment really took care of what little he had to say. The honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services spoke in the debate in his usual entertaining fashion. Other than that, Sir, and of course the Premier opening and closing the debate, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I will come to the gentleman from St. John's North. I do not, I am sorry, the gentleman from Trinity North gave us, I believe, some of his vile and concentrated half wit stuff.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Be nice now.

MR. ROBERTS: I am being nice to the honourable gentleman. If I were being kind to the honourable gentleman, he would be in the Waterford institute by now. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the notable facts of this entire debate is the lack of participation by any of the honourable gentlemen opposite. I say that they will have to live with that. I find it most interesting that the one man who had the courage to say what he really believed, the gentleman from St. John's North, made the statement here in this House yesterday and it has not been contradicted, that at least one-half of the members on the other side are not happy with the government's redistribution bill. He made that statement and I say that the only way that can be disproved is for every honourable gentleman opposite to indicate to the contrary.

The honourable gentleman from St. John's North sits in their caucus. Why should he not? - He is one of them. He had the courage to say where he stood. The gentleman from Bonavista South has said where he stands, he accepts this gerryandering. The gentleman from Trinity North accepts it. The Premier perpetrated it, so he accepts it. But now what about all honourable gentlemen opposite. I say they have an obligation to speak and a special obligation rests upon the gentleman from Labrador West. He has given us one of the greatest displays of political cowardice I have ever seen. This bill and the Premier yesterday in closing the debate on the resolution, the Premier rejected any suggestion of any amendment with respect to the two seats in Eastern most Labrador.

He made a-half concession with respect to the seat in Labrador West, the new seat to be called "Menihok". The Premier's half concession should have been a full concession because, I think, everybody concerned feels that there are more people living in Labrador West than there are reported by the census figures. Even the Statistics Canada people confirm that and they give the explanation and the reason why.

But, Sir, my concern for the moment is not with Labrador West, I think, they are entitled to more representation because, I think, there are more people there. I think that point has been established. My concern is with the coastal seats. Every member with any knowledge of Labrador who has spoken in this debate, and I do not feel that the Minister of Social Services has any knowledge of Labrador, he keeps exposing that to us, every member with any knowledge of Labrador who has spoken, and I am not saying that I for one am not an expert on Labrador, I am not but I say that I have some knowledge of Labrador.

My colleague for Labrador North who has lived in the Goose Bay/Happy Valley Area for twenty years, who has twice been elected by the people there to be their representative, the gentleman for Fogo although he has never lived in Labrador traded up and down the coast for twenty or twenty-five years and was elected in 1956 and in 1959 and in 1962 and in 1966, four times elected by the people of the old districts, the present District of Labrador North, the gentleman for Labrador South who was born in Cartwright, grew up in Cartwright, has worked in many parts of the coast, has thrice contested in an election down there, twice came close and the third try was elected by a majority. Each of these men has said two things about Labrador in this Bill. First of all, that there is a very real danger of giving fuel to the separatist cause. Secondly, that the seats as constituted do not reflect as adequately as they could the true needs of the people of Eastern Labrador.

Now let me deal with each of those points, Mr. Speaker, because I believe they are important. First of all, let me deal with the separatism point. The Minister of Social Services gave us, I am sorry he is not here, I gather he is out in Clarenville doing something

with the Social Services Department. Yes, I must say I agree Clarenville is a great place to be and I would think that the citizens of Clarenville will feel it is even greater when the Minister of Social Services leaves it later today. Mr. Speaker, the minister attempted to dismiss the talk of separatism or of separatist feeling. That can only show his profound and abysmal ignorance of what is really happening in Labrador.

Now I suppose somebody opposite is going to stand and say that I am contributing to the feeling by talking about it here in the House. Well let them say it. I reject it utterly and completely. There is a problem, there is that feeling. How strong it is, I do not know. How concentrated it is or how pointed it is, I do not know but it is there. There is a feeling among people in Labrador and it is growing that their interests can be best served by some form of political arrangement other than the one they now have as part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. They feel that.

The gentleman for Labrador West if he had the courage to stand in this debate would have to confirm that feeling does exist. The Member for Labrador South, the Member for Labrador North, any of us who has anything at all to do with Labrador knows that the feeling is there. I say, Sir, that this bill can only add fuel to that feeling. The feeling is not going to go away by ignoring it. The people's House, the House of Assembly is the proper place to discuss this issue.

The people in Labrador, Sir, many of them, and I have noticed in the past two or three years a growing number of important and influential people who are more and more attracted to the thought of a new political arrangement. Some talk of territorial status similar to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, some speak of going it alone as in effect a separate province. All of them have the common underlying denominator that they are not getting a fair deal, that the present political system in Newfoundland and Labrador does not give adequate vent to their needs and to their feelings. If we do not take that into account and try to measure it and cope with it then it will be at the peril of this province, Sir, because it is the province that will lose.

When this administration came into office most people in Labrador, no matter what their political affiliation, and I may add, the Tories have had little political support in Labrador at any point, the gentleman for Labrador West got a very good vote and did very well indeed in the 1972 election. In 1971, the Tory candidate in Labrador West finished a dismal third. The most recent test of electoral opinion, in a provincial sense in Labrador was Labrador South where the Tory candidate Mr. Kearsley from Corner Brook, formerly an executive assistant to the Premier, got less than six per cent of the vote. The people in the district tell me that he had more people on his payroll than voted for him in the election. Whether that is true or not, he had an abysmal vote. He got 132 votes out of 2,150 cast. The member elected got about 1,150 and the Liberal candidate got just under 1,000. The Tory Party have had no support there but despite that fact, I think, many people in Labrador, the people who think about these issues, who are fair-minded and who are prepared to try and make things work, many people felt that when the Tory Government came into office they would get their place in the sun, that Labrador would come into its place in the sun.

After all the Tories had said that they would do it. The Liberal record in the last few years with respect to Labrador was not satisfactory to the people of Labrador. Many of them spoke out against it. We saw the growth of the New Labrador Party, a regional party, the first time we have ever had a regional party in this province, the first time. The first time that we ever had any party, certainly in modern times, that did not make an attempt to appeal to all parts of the province and to all segments of the population. The New Labrador Party grew, Mr. Speaker, because it was fertile soil. The Tories when they came in people believed that they would do something about these problems and that they would take them into account and that they would bring in policies that would help to remove the feeling and help the people of Labrador to feel that they were a part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador cared about them and dealt

with their problems.

What has happened now? This map, Sir, these seats, this bill will add fuel to the separatist cause. The gentleman for Labrador South has announced he is dropping out of active politics at the next election. As far as I know his decision was not connected with any redistribution issue but his decision to leave active politics, I fear, and I fear as a Newfoundlander, I do not fear in a partisan sense, his decision will add fuel to the separatist cause as well. I fear that in the next general election we will see in Labrador a frankly and avowedly separatist party. I think, that is going to happen. I think that the Tory Government are going to make it happen. I think this bill will do it. Now, Sir, I do not know whether they are trying to punish Labrador or not. It may be that they are. Labrador, with the one exception of the gentleman for Labrador West in 1972, has consistently voted against the Tory Party. Mr. Court Janes got the skinning of his political life when he hit Labrador. I mean it was shameful. The poor man went down to Goose Bay to sneak. He had the big gun, he had the Minister of Finance as he then was with him and they got fifteen people at a meeting. They had to hold it in a phone booth there was that little interest for the Tory Party. Maybe the Tory Government are punishing Labrador. They are trying to punish the Northern Peninsula, maybe they are doing the same to Labrador.

But in any event they are persisting in a course of action that is ill-advised and it can only lead to harm. I am not asking for more seats for Labrador, although I think there should be more, but I will not press that point now. What I am asking is that the Tory Party and the Tory Government reconsider this ill-advised bill. It does not take - it is no humbling of their pride if they redraw that boundary in Labrador. Every segment of opinion in Labrador with the notable exception of the gentleman from Labrador West, every segment of opinion that has come to my notice favours the recommendations of the final report of the Higgins' Commission.

I had a letter the other day from a well-known clergyman, Reverend Francis Buckle.



AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I know but I am going to read it again. The Reverend Mr. Buckle, who is a native of Forteau, I believe, on the Straits, an Anglican Priest, he is now at the Parish in Happy Valley, he used to be on Bell Island, he was at the Cathedral Parish for a while, sent me a copy of the letter which he sent to "The Evening Telegram". He sent a copy to the Premier, to my colleague from Labrador North and to the gentleman from Labrador South.

I think it is worth reading again, Mr. Speaker, because I think this letter expresses the feelings of many people in Happy Valley. As far as I know the Reverend Francis Buckle has no political axe to grind. I have never heard of him in any political context at all, I have never heard of him in any partisan frame. To my knowledge if he votes at all, Sir, his vote is a matter that only he knows about. I do not think he has taken any political part.

The letter reads: "Dear Sir; " (It is addressed to the Editor of the "Telegram.") "If the present plan of redistribution of seats in the House of Assembly is passed Labrador will be the real loser. The plan, as Mr. Mike Martin has stressed, does not take into consideration the expansion of population in Labrador West. It is difficult, actually, to see what it does take into consideration other than political

expediency.

The area from Battle Harbour to Nain for example is by far the most deprived area of the province. It poses an impossible problem for any M.H.A. to deal with its many and varied problems. Travel in the best of times is difficult and expensive. It is simply an insane proposal to include this vast area in one district. Surely more than the number of people in any given area must be taken into consideration.

The proposal to place a section of Southern Labrador as an appendage to the Northern Newfoundland Area is a political move and if passed shows how far this government is willing to go with integration. Mr. Moores has expressed real concern for tradition in dealing with some Newfoundland districts, let him apply the same kind of logic and concern to the Labrador districts.

Traditionally Labrador has stood on its own. The decision some years ago to change the province's name to Newfoundland and Labrador was simply a recognition of that fact and made some of us feel for the first time, a part of the provincial and political scene. Unfortunately there have been countermoves in the last several years to break down any special place that Labrador might have in the political setup, even though Labrador is nearly three times as large as Newfoundland. I feel strongly that if the southern part of Labrador is included in the Newfoundland district it will be nothing more than a subtle political move to integrate further Labrador into Newfoundland.

How far is this government willing to go? Sincerely, Francis Buckle."

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are strong words from a gentleman of the cloth. I say to the Premier again, I appeal to him to reconsider these Labrador seats. Every single expression of public opinion that has come to my knowledge, with the notable exception, I will return to him, of the gentleman from Labrador West, every single expression from Labrador has been in favour of the Higgins' recommendation as against the government's recommendation. People are not satisfied with the Higgins' recommendation but if they have to choose they will take the Higgins one over the government one.



Now why do the Tories persist? The Premier yesterday rejected any change and gave absolutely ludicrously foolish reasons for doing so. He talks about setting up a corporation in Cartwright and more power to them. The Premier is having a fascinating chat and I am interested in hearing it but it is very hard to both listen to him and it is hard not to listen to him when he is speaking in his stentorian voice again. If he wants to chat, maybe he and the House Leader could slip outside and do whatever they want to do.

What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is why the government are ignoring this feeling from Labrador. Are they trying to punish Labrador? Are they trying to hurt the people down there? They talk of a corporation in Cartwright. Now first of all, Sir, Cartwright has about as much in common with Makkovik or Nain or anywhere on the Northern Coast as Florida does with Spain. Nothing in common, Sir. They are a different type of people, they live in a different environment, they live in a different way, they have different political needs. They talk of a Crown Corporation in Cartwright. The biggest need of Cartwright right now is water and sewer. It is not a very dramatic need but a very real need. That is the biggest need of the people of that community right now, not a Crown Corporation. We can have the Hudson Bay Company and the Grenfell Mission and a Crown Corporation and all the people there will still be living amidst water and sewerage problems. But a Crown Corporation, Sir, will do nothing to solve the political problems, the problems of representation. So I say again to the Premier why not? It is no great partisan defeat. Nobody is going to go out and cheer and crow about it. It is not going to change the balance of seats in any way. There are two in a given geographical area now, there will be two in that given geographical area if that proposal were to be accepted.

The Higgins' Commission made a suggestion, heard hearings and changed their suggestion. The government for no apparent reason have changed it back. The member for Labrador South said that the Tory proposal fuels the separatist feeling. My colleague for Labrador North feels the same way. Why are this government doing it, Sir? Forty-seven years

ago a group of Newfoundland patriots won a battle in the Privy Council to make Labrador, to have it declared a part of Newfoundland. The Tory Government now are trying to do away with that? Is that it? This is the government that talked so much about developing the Churchill and yet here they are for no reason, no reason they have given, hurting Labrador, going against the open and expressed wish of the people there.

People came out to the hearings, all kinds of people, not just the M.H.A.'s. The government have given no reason. What are they trying to do? Why? It is not as if one were suggesting more seats. No, Mr. Speaker, the same two seats, the same geographic area except instead of the line running east and west it will run north and south. That is all.

Anybody who knows that coast, anybody who knows anything about that area would realize that the Higgins' proposal is instantly to be preferred to the government's proposal. So I say again to the Premier that I appeal to him to reconsider this point. They are going in the face of everything, all reason, all logic, all expressed public opinion. There is no need for it, Sir. There is no cause for it. It will not cost anything. It will not make any real difference except to the people in Labrador to whom it will make all the difference.

As a Newfoundlander I am concerned. I think the people in Labrador have just grievances. I think this decision will add fuel to it, so will the proposal in the Straits. The Higgins' Commission Report was bad enough. They worked within the bounds of the legislation and that they had to do. They had no say in the legislation. They had to work with what they were given. They did the best of it.

The present government proposal, Sir, is designed deliberately to hurt the people of that part of Labrador South and the people of the Northern Peninsula. That is quite obvious. They are being punished because they vote Liberal. There is no other reason for it. You cannot talk of a balance of interests. The gentleman from Labrador South has made it quite clear where the interests lie and he knows the area well. Less than 2,000 people on the Straits side, nearly 9,000 people or more than 9,000 people

2,000 people on the Straits side, nearly 10,000 people on the island side, that is not giving Labrador a fair deal. The eighth largest seat in population in the entire province and one of the most difficult to travel in.

No, it is just a clear case of punishing the people on the Northern Peninsula. That is all it is, punishing them because they voted Liberal, because they dared to express their free right to vote as they wish in a secret election and because they consistently voted Liberal. They voted Liberal in 1972 and they voted Liberal in the fall of 1972, not even Jack Marshall has won St. Barbe North. They voted Liberal in 1974 and they will vote Liberal whenever the next election comes because they will do what they believe.

It should be recorded that the Tory Government are punishing them. That is the only reason for the change, to punish them, to hurt them. The gentleman from Labrador West is aiding and abetting it. I am hurt and disappointed. When I spoke earlier on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I called upon the honourable gentleman to speak. He has not said a word. That can only mean that he has accepted this. I really thought he would take a stand. He has not. He is part and parcel of the conspiracy to hurt Labrador

and it will haunt him. People in Labrador will not forgive nor will they forget. There comes a time in a man's political career, Sir, when he must take a stand and this is such an issue for the gentleman from Labrador West that he has taken his stand. He has taken his stand with the Tory Party against Labrador. If he had any courage he would have left the cabinet. He could have come back next week. He could have gone to the Premier and said, "Premier, I cannot support that proposal. If it is not to be changed, if the decision of our colleagues in the cabinet is to stand by it, I must leave the cabinet. I shall vote against that bill." The gentleman from St. John's North is going to vote against the bill. He does not have to leave the Tory Party to do it. The gentleman from Labrador West, Sir, when the crunch came did not have what it took. That is a very sad thing to have to say. It is true, Sir. I wish I did not have to say it. I like the honourable gentleman personally. I consider him a friend. I hope we will always be friends. Politically, Sir, he has met his Waterloo and he is on Napoleon's side and not Wellington's. He has failed in the hour when he was needed.

The other members from Labrador have spoken. The gentleman from Labrador West has not spoken. Therefore under the rule of collective responsibility, he must be taken to agree with what the Tory Government are doing. When the Premier spoke yesterday to close the debate, he spoke for all the cabinet. The Premier rejected any changes. The gentleman from Labrador West has accepted that. He sold Labrador, Sir, for whatever gain, whatever in his own mind, he sold out Labrador. It stands very much to his discredit. I had honestly and genuinely believed that he had what it would have required, if necessary to leave the cabinet. It is not a terrible blow. The honourable gentleman was not elected as a minister. He was elected as a private member, as a backbencher. He was then invited into the cabinet and he has added considerably to the stature of the cabinet. He has added to his own stature as well by his performances.

When the crunch came, he just could not do the right thing. He just did not have what it required. He did not have what it takes. I say that with infinitely more regret than partisan feelings. He is the one who will pay for it. He will pay for it personally and politically. The people of Labrador will hold him to account more so than any other individual because he is the only Labrador Member who sits in the cabinet.

This is a cabinet bill as the Member for St. John's East made quite clear. The member has accepted it. Indeed for all I know, he may have encouraged it. He has not said a word in this debate. He voted in favour of it. It is recorded in the journals of the House. He accepts it. He glories in it. He supports it. He will have to answer for it. My regret is not that the honourable gentleman will have to answer for it. That is his concern. I believe he knows what he is doing. I believe he has decided to junk Labrador, to scuttle Labrador and take his stand with the Tory Cabinet. He has decided that. That is his decision and more power to him. He has not tried to weasel about it. He stood up and he voted for it in the House. He has not tried to weasel nor whine, no. My regret is that the people of Labrador will suffer. I think that the Member for Labrador West has enough influence with the cabinet to swing them on this point. What conceivable difference can it make? They have already agreed in their minds and in the House to give that section of Labrador two seats. What conceivable difference does it make where the boundary lines are drawn? What could it matter? I know what it matters. It is designed to punish Labrador. It is designed to make a man go down there and get elected whatever party he is in, a man who cannot possibly serve those people. I am sorry. The honourable gentleman from Labrador West has let himself down as well as letting Labrador down.

As for the Minister of Justice, the least said the kindest. Of all the hypocritical men who have ever been exposed in this House, he has to take his stand at the head of the line. He

came in here two year's ago and trumpeted his virtue. He was like a woman of easy virtue parading her virtues. Then when it came to the crunch he knuckled under in a sycophantic way as I have ever seen. He has not had the guts to stand in this House and say a word. He has not had the guts to stand. He just silently stands by and watches the dirty deed being done. He is the man who used to boast, "We will never again see gerrymandering in this House."

"The Evening Telegram" : "Hickman's words back to haunt the Tories." Of all the sad spectacles in public life in Newfoundland, the Minister of Justice. A little cutting from "The Evening Telegram," January 3, 1974, Sir, another quote from the honourable gentleman. You see his change of heart on this was only recently when it was put to him. "Boy Alex either you accept this or you get out." He did not have the guts to do it. "The Evening Telegram," January 3, 1974: "Hickman wraps Liberal House Leader." 'Why does he not read the act?' an irritated T. Alex Hickman said today of Opposition House Leader, Bill Rowe, who Wednesday called for the immediate release of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Report?"

'The act provides for two debates on the report's recommendations,' Justice Minister Hickman said. 'What is all the fuss?' Answering his own question (in those days the minister used to speak) Mr. Hickman said, 'He can understand why the Liberals are upset about the Electoral Boundaries Commission. 'The Liberals firmly believe in gerrymandering, he said, 'their record proves it.'"

Now the minister would never be part of that, Sir. He would never stand in the House and vote against a motion to adopt the report of the independent commission. Oh not our Minister of Justice! Not that man of principle, of virtue, of honour, not him, no! Of all the hypocritical, sycophantical actions ever taken -

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

The word hypocritical is one of these unparliamentary words that falls within the prohibitions outlined by Beauchesne, Section 155, page 130. Although I know that it has been used a number

of times in this honourable House, I think that it is now time that it cease misuse.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not been advised that it was not parliamentary because, as you said, it has been used in the House without drawing the Speaker's ruling. Of course, I will accept your ruling.

The minister's actions speak for themselves. I do not need to put a word on it. Everybody in Newfoundland has already done that. The minister's actions speak for themselves. Let us just refresh our memories because it is worth recalling. Whenever the minister speaks from now on, Sir, the people of Newfoundland will know him for what he is. His words are not worth the paper they are written on. His words sound fine and they sound sincere until he has to put his principles to the test and then he backs off and does whatever the convenience of the moment dictates.

Hansard, March 20, 1973, the Minister of Justice, great words, Sir, great words: "Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this bill, The Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act, I think that this should be regarded as somewhat of an historic occasion in this House because we are and we will, if this honourable House approves the bill, take out of the hands of government the responsibility for setting the boundaries and the population of the various electoral districts in the province." That is what he said in March, 1973.

January, 1974, he said: "However we believe in setting boundaries by a public commission." Right!

December, 1974, how the mighty are fallen. The great protestations of principle now have been put aside, a man of no political principles and no political courage. A



shameful act, shameful and he has not even spoken. I hope he will speak. I hope I can draw him into the debate. I hope he will stand and explain his conduct, these words, clear, unequivocal, straightforward, clean-cut, sincere, the way we used to regard the minister, the way even "The Evening Telegram" used to regard him until they looked at his words and looked at his subsequent actions. Talk is cheap, Sir, and the minister has shown just how cheap and how shoddy his talk can be; thirty-one changes out of fifty-one, some of them minor, some of them very major, the changes reversing the report. Almost every major change made was to reverse the considered report of the commission. The map the government proposed is close, Sir, to the commission's first recommendations, close. The only big change really is trying to save the Minister of Rural Development by creating a little seat for him in Trinity Bay. It is the only real change.

The commission, Sir, presented their preliminary report and after hearings and after taking evidence and after mature and considered study proposed another map, the one that is there on that easel now and the government have thrown that out and gone and done their own little thing. The Minister of Justice - there used to be hundreds of people, thousands, Sir, I suppose, who felt the Minister of Justice was an honest and honourable man. I speak only of his political stand. They used to believe the Minister of Justice, my friend from Hermitage once followed the Minister of Justice in a leadership campaign, helped to draft his speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Not the speech he gave.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but he should have taken the speeches that were written for him, they would have been better than the ones he gave. There were hundreds and thousands of people throughout this Province, Sir, who believed the honourable gentleman was a man of political honour and political principle. His name is often spoken of as a man who aspires to higher office from the mere legislative office, a man who might even rise to the heights of his chosen profession at the bar of the Province. Common talk among our brethren at the bar, Mr. Speaker, and among the people who take an interest in these matters, regarded as a man who would stand for what he believes, a man who left the Smallwood Cabinet because he would no longer accept it.

If one looks at the record one sees his reasons for leaving as stated at the time were a little different.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bora Laskin.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he is not even fit to walk upon the same earth as Bora Laskin trods but a man, Mr. Speaker, I tenderly regarded and genuinely regarded as a man of courage, as a man who would stand and when he brought in this bill, we for one, Sir, supported it. If you want to look at my colleague, the then member for White Bay South, spoke for us in the debate, welcomed the words and said that whatever may have gone on in the past, I mean - want to talk about the past? Sure the Liberals may not have done perfect in the past and the Tories cannot always claim to have been completely above board. There was the marvellous Tory Government in 1924, the last Tory Government we had with the exception of the one that drove the country under. It is necessary to go back a long way in Newfoundland to find a Tory Government, the Tory Government - Mr. Walter Monroe was Premier. That ended income tax. That was a move that helped the little man, the little fisherman, it really helped them and increased the tariffs on nets and gear and it was sheer coincidence that leading members of the government controlled -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! I fail to see that this is relevant although very interesting.

MR. ROBERTS: It is relevant because I am attempting to show that what went on in the past is not necessarily a guide for the future. The Premier yesterday was allowed to go on at some length, I do not know if Your Honour was in the Chair or not, about alleged past misdeeds and all I am talking about is, saying that while I do not feel, the Premier has no idea what he said yesterday but neither does any of his listeners either. What I am showing quite simply is that while I am not prepared to say that everything the Liberal Party did was the acme of wisdom, I can equally show that not everything the Tory Party has ever done is the acme of wisdom and light.

However, I have made my point. I do not quarrel with Your Honour's ruling. I am all for relevancy in debate. I think it is a very useful rule to have. I was talking of the Minister of Justice speaking of irrelevant

things. People used to believe he was a man of courage and principle.

Well he has shown us now.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition gets carried away from time to time with his own rhetoric and only he gets carried away with it. But, Your Honour, he is not allowed to make allusions to any member of this House with reference to their courage or their principle. He is allowed to draw issue with statements that have been made from time to time if he so wishes but allusions against the integrity of an individual, their courage and their principles, it has long been established that such derogatory reference as to other members is not permitted under the rules.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking of the minister's political -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Why do you not listen "Witch Hunt" for once?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has on most occasions, virtually all occasions, prefaced his remarks of political courage and morality with the word political. However on the last occasion he may have been carried away and did not preface it as such although I drew by inference from having listened to his debate earlier that he was not departing from his earlier theme although I draw to his attention that he should preface his remarks properly in the future.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course I am speaking of the honourable gentleman's lack of political courage and lack of political principle. His private life, his private standing is entirely his own. I was speaking of his public life, his life here in this House.

What I was saying is that most people in Newfoundland, I think, would have felt that the honourable gentleman's political principles were above reproach, that of all the men in public life in Newfoundland, he stood at the summit, not necessarily alone although he may often have felt so but stood there alone a paragon, of virtue, sincere, straightforward, would never stoop to any low political chicanery, would never be part of anything as terrible as a gerrymandering of a redistribution bill, that he was the man

who was responsible for setting up the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Commission, that the legislation was his handy work, that he had sponsored it, that he had spoken for it in the debate, that he had chivvied it through a reluctant Cabinet and they think all of those things were true. I think the honourable Minister of Justice was regarded as such. But now he has come crashing down, not just feet of clay, Sir, he has knees of clay and thighs of clay. The honourable gentleman should be ashamed of himself. I am ashamed of him and I do not speak as leader of an opposing political group. I once served in a cabinet with the honourable gentleman, once served in a cabinet with him and he has not had the courage let alone the decency to stand and to speak in this debate. Just as every other honourable member opposite, he has not addressed himself to the central problem of whether boundaries are to be set by an independent commission or whether they are to be set by the government.

We take our stand. We say they are to be set by an independent commission. Although we would have said that we felt there should be forty-two members rather than fifty-one, we are prepared, we were and we are still to accept the principle of having the boundaries drawn by an independent commission. If the House decides on fifty-one and the commission recommends some boundaries for fifty-one then we will have to accept that.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice does not feel that way. He has not even had the decency - I understand he has no political courage and I understand that his political principles have been jettisoned. He has not even had the decency to stand up and say, "Well, boys, I did say those things and you know how it is, Mr. Speaker, I could not carry through with it. When it came to the crunch at the Cabinet I could not carry the crowd with me. I just had to go along with it. I was not willing to leave the Cabinet on the issue and so I accept it and here I am." A little sackcloth and ashes, a little humble penitence - no, he will sit over there brazenly, arrogantly and above all silently. Maybe I will tempt him into the debate. Maybe after my few words about him, he will be able to get up and try to explain this course of action. I hope so, I think his friends and his admirers, some of whom are in the Tory Party, some of whom are not, would expect it of him. I

December 17, 1974.

Tape 2179

RH - 5

think he owes it to himself to try to explain. Nobody expects it, for example, from the Junior Member from Harbour Main. He made no speech in the House about not being in favour of gerrymandering.

You know the minister is being consistent. I am paying the minister a compliment. The minister should be aware in that case I can tell him but I am paying him a compliment. He has not recanted his political principles. This bill I have no doubt is quite true to the minister's political principles. He would have been equally at home with Mr. W. J. Browne, the Honourable Bill Browne twenty or thirty or forty years ago concerning what went on then. Of course, he would. Of course, he would. You know I will give him full marks for consistency and for - but it is the Minister of Justice who paraded himself as being the paragon, as being above reproach. He used to tell us so time and time again. Why I could find, if I were so minded, in the Hansard, Mr. Speaker, I am sure one hundred times when we knew the Minister of Justice for being so sincere and honest because he told us so here in the House but now we know him for what he is. If this debate has established nothing else in the political history of Newfoundland, it has established that the Minister of Justice is a man whose political principles blow with the wind and they are like the snow here today and gone tomorrow. The only difference is the snow is white and clean. Well he fell off his white horse, as my colleague says, and he is now in the product of the white horse, the product that comes out of the stern end of the white horse.

Anyway I could go on but out of kindness to the honourable gentleman I just as soon, I think, I have made that point.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier opened this debate he told us at some length, by way of trying to justify the unjustifiable that the reason the government had rejected the commission report and made thirty-one changes in fifty-one districts was that they had received hundreds and hundreds and more hundreds of representations from people and from bodies and agencies and organizations. He was quite eloquent on that. I challenged him to produce one. He has not. Therefore, we are forced to conclude that either they do not exist or the Premier is just so arrogant and so uncaring for the sensibilities of the House and the people of Newfoundland that he will just try to dismiss the issue.

But I believe there are some such representations. I know that the Councils in Marystown and in Burin did request some changes in the name of the constituency. I think the name of the constituency in the bill now very much is satisfactory to them but that is not the sort of change of which I am speaking. I know there are representations from Harbour Main District, the people there were very unhappy about the commission's proposals and so were the commission as they say in their report. I have no doubt there were such representations. I do not know to what extent they may have been solicited.

AN HON. MEMBER: To a large extent.

MR. ROBERTS: To a large extent they were, in other words the member went to the council -

MR. DOODY: Oh, no, not by me, they were solicited by the late ...

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, okay, well we will trace the change back but we cannot until and unless the Premier is man enough to produce them.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean I asked the question and I wanted the answer and I am grateful to the honourable gentleman. I think everybody was unhappy with the Higgins recommendations with respect to the Harbour Main Area but that does not mean that two wrongs make a right and the present solution, of course, is even worse.

So I am forced to the conclusion, Sir, that the Premier either has no protests other than the two that I have mentioned, the two areas I have mentioned, the two geographic areas I have mentioned, in which case he is making up his statement out of whole cloth or he is just choosing to ignore it. He has not produced anything, not a letter not a jot, not a tittle, not a scrap of paper has he produced to convey any protests. So I say, that with the exception of the Burin/Marystown Areas and the Harbour Main District, and each of these made a valid point, and only one dealt with boundary changes, the other one dealt with a name change, if you want to include name changes thirty-seven of the fifty-one districts were changed but I am only concerned with substantive changes in boundaries, the name really is of little import, I say that the Premier has not got any protests and that is why he has not produced them. I say that he cannot produce them, not a matter that he will not,



that he cannot. He was challenged. He did not meet the challenge. Now the Premier is not a coward, he did not back away from the challenge. He could not meet the challenge.

So I say to him again now produce those representations because if not the people of Newfoundland will judge him, they will take his words and they will measure them against his performance, and the two, there is a great gap which only he can close. Of course, even if there were representations the Premier in no way, no honourable gentlemen opposite in any way dealt with the substantive point that if the government were not satisfied with the Higgins recommendations and wanted to make further changes, how come everybody in the province was not allowed to get in on the act?

Let us recall what happened, Mr. Speaker. Let us recall what happened. The Higgins Commission was constituted under legislation passed with the support of every member of this House. The Higgins Commission produced a preliminary report, as they were required to do under the legislation. This report was widely circulated. It was printed in the newspapers. The Commission as they were required to do then proceeded to hold a series of public hearings throughout the province. They received briefs and representations. Then they submitted to the government their final report. That report was submitted about a year past, in December 1973. The government made it public, I am not sure whether they made it public in the House or whether they made it public through the Minister of Justice, who then had some political principles, releasing it to the press but, in any event, it was made public. The map which is there is the diagrammatic representation of the commission's final report.

What happened then? That was in December 1973. The House met at the end of January, six weeks after that. The government in their Throne Speech which was read by His Honour the Governor, Mr. Harnum was governor then, the government said that they would be laying before the House a bill to implement the electoral boundary changes. That was January 31, if I am not mistaken. The end of January the government said that. The House then met for February, March, April, May, and June. We

were in adjournment for July, August, September, October, and most of November, and not a word was heard about redistribution or about the Higgins Report or anything else. I know what was happening, the Premier and his bunch of merry men were down on the eighth floor with their little pencils trying frantically to draw some boundaries that would save their political hides.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman for Bonavista South can laugh, it will not save his hide no matter how they draw it. The only chance he will have of getting elected is a boundary that included his wife and himself, if his wife did not vote. He would probably win that election.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I must say, you know, Al Evans adds something to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! I detect a note of disillusion to the debate. I suggest to all honourable members that the right of an honourable member to be heard in silence be observed.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burgeo is really a will not, and I will not go any further than that because -

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is that the government gave no notice that they were going to make any changes. Some of us less charitable than others may have suspected it but, in any event, the government gave no notice. Then for no apparent reason they called together the House the end of November and suddenly it is urgent that we get the Redistribution Bill through. Well some of us have our thoughts as to why it may be so urgent but we will deal with that in due course, I, for one, hope that it leads to a general election. I would like nothing better than a general election fought under any Redistribution Bill because I do not care how the Tories do it, they are not going to win it. Mr. Speaker, if they do not accept my word, let us put it to the test. Let us!

But now, Mr. Speaker, what was going on all of those months? The gentleman for Labrador West was wrestling with his conscience and he wrestled successfully. The gentleman for Burin, the Minister of Justice confronted himself and decided that

all his talk of political principles should go by the board because political convenience dictated that he stand by the Tory Government and against his principles and alleged protests were coming in.

We have not seen a protest. I will grant the ones from Harbour Main, I will grant the ones from the Burin - Placentia Area and St. Mary's as well. When I talk of Harbour Main I mean the proposed Conception - Salmonier. The real protests, Sir, were members opposite scurrying in and saying, "Premier, boy I am up the creek, if you do this I will never get myself re-elected." Now the Premier, having to cheer up the troops who were in bad form anyway, said, "Boy you are going to make it," but then he said, "We are going to change some boundaries." That is what happened to the gentleman from Bonavista South. That is what happened to the gentleman from Trinity South and Trinity North. Sure! Sure, that is what happened. The gentleman from St. Mary's, nobody in the province was allowed to participate in this except the members of the Tory Party. Nobody on Bell Island was given the opportunity to make any representation or even told that representations were being received.

MR. NEARY: They will in due course.

MR. ROBERTS: Not one member of the government, not even the Minister of Justice who at that stage had not exposed himself as being without political principle, not even the Minister of Justice had said, "We are thinking of possibly making some changes because we are not entirely satisfied with the report." There was not a word out of him, not even a syllable, not even a letter.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the honourable Leader permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: I will permit any question the honourable gentleman would like.

MR. MARSHALL: Do you not think it is rather ludicrous for a man who sat in the Smallwood Administration for eight years to talk about political principles? Somebody who sat there when \$30 million was floating between Paris and Panama, somebody who clung to power with his toe nails when he ought

to have resigned. Do you not think it is a little bit foolish talking about political principle in that case?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we will now talk about political principles in the Smallwood Administration, if it is in order?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! If I may interject here, I do not think that the honourable the House Leader's point was a point of order -

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was a question.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): In that case I apologize to the House for having interjected!

MR. ROBERTS: I am most anxious to deal with it at some length.

Let us talk about the \$30 million. The honourable the House Leader has just attempted to deliberately mislead the House. He has deliberately misled the House, consciously, openly. All he has to do, he has had access to the documents and he is one to talk about political principle, he and his colleagues.

Let us just go down the line now and talk about some of them.

We will talk about the Premier's political principles in dealing with the Smallwood Administration. We will talk about the Minister of Finance's political principles in dealing with the - (is Your Honour scratching or is Your Honour about to say something?) Or is he electrocuted or something?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: We will now talk about some of the other political principles of gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! Having refreshed my memory on the rules and being refreshed by one of the gentlemen at the table, the fact that a question is asked does not make the ensuing debate in order and certainly a prolonged debate on the political principles of the present government or the past government is irrelevant to this debate and accordingly this whole line of questioning and answering is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I reluctantly accept your ruling, Sir. Of course I do accept it but I am sorry that I cannot expose, there will be another opportunity to expose the gentlemen opposite for what they really are. But I will come back to redistribution and we will go on from there. We can talk about the political principles of a man who is the solicitor for the Bank of Montreal. We could talk about some other things too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, nobody in the province was given the least opportunity to make any representation. There was no public statement from any of the honourable and loquacious gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Manpower, who issues more press releases than a dysentery sufferer issues dysentery, said not a word on this. The gentleman from Ferryland whose picture appears in the papers with all the regularity of "Little Orphan Annie" and with about as much relevance, said not a word on this point, not a word. Nobody in the province had any idea the Tory Government were considering any changes. After all, all they knew was what the Minister of Justice had said, the man whom they then thought was a man of political principle and political honour and what he had said was that the government would never again - and I will find his exact words in a minute - would never again set the boundaries by political purposes, they would always set them - yes here we are, page two, three, four, seven of Hansard. I would suggest -

AN HON. MEMBER: What date is it?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh it is March 20, 1973. It was the day of infamy. The day that the Minister of Justice wishes he had been born dead. "Today we find that people are no longer happy over the prospects of the government of the day, with the majority in the House, sitting down and carefully calculating what number of seats would be in their best interest and how boundaries should be adjusted in order to suit voting patterns throughout the particular jurisdiction over which that particular parliament governs."

"I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation (the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act) will convince the people of Newfoundland that we, as a government," he was not even speaking just as a solitary man of political principle, he was speaking for "we the government," the honourable crowd over there as my colleague from Bell Island calls them, that "we as a government, and that we, as a House of Assembly, are determined once and for all to do away with any suggestion that there can be gerrymandering insofar as electoral boundaries are concerned and voting patterns in this province of Newfoundland."

There they are. Words which should be enshrined in the democratic

history of Newfoundland. Everybody in Newfoundland believed those words and right up until two or three weeks past, the time is going so quickly I lost track of exactly when the House met, it was two or three weeks ago we reconvened, everybody believed that was the government's position. Why should they not? This man is the Deputy Premier. This man is the Minister of Justice. This man is the paragon of virtue and of political honour and of political principle and of political sanctity. Those were his words.

I have not misquoted him, I have not attempted to misconstrue them. I have not misrepresented them, I have given them in context and fully and completely. This man spoke for the government. He would not permit any gerrymandering. Why the very least he would do would be to send in his resignation. He did it before when a Premier had a row with him over an electoral contest in a leadership convention. He left the Cabinet over that, not a great public issue, a dispute between two men. Surely an issue like this, where the minister had nailed his colours to the masts on behalf of the government, the very least he would do, the very least a man of tender political conscience would do, the very least that would be done by a man who had any concern for political morality or political propriety would be to resign. But what did our buddy do? He just accepted it. Cravenly and politically cowardly, that is what it is. Scandalous.

Not only that, Sir, he misled, and the government misled the people of this province. Nobody in Newfoundland was told that the government - no I will not say nobody was told, some of the favourite people in the Tory Party were told, but the people of Newfoundland and this House of Assembly were not told that the government were going to redraw the boundaries. There was not the merest hint. It was a deep, dark secret, nearly as deep and as dark as the deal with TRIZEC. But it was a deep, dark secret and they were down there scuttling around night by night, I can just picture, drawing their little pencils and saying, "Ah, put a jig there and a jag there," and then somebody had the genius of an idea, "We will nail Neary. We will put him in there with the junior member for Harbour Main and we will nail him." There was great jubilation. They probably all went off to Boston and had a party on the strength of that,

a tea party. It will be the first time that those of that particular group ever drank tea.

AN HON. MEMBER: Boston is famous for tea parties.

MR. ROBERTS: Boston is also famous for political principles. The honourable gentlemen opposite would not know about that either.

Mr. Speaker, the government misled the people of Newfoundland. The Minister of Justice misled the people of Newfoundland, consciously, deliberately, defiantly.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Deliberately, misleading may or may not be parliamentary. I will have to adjourn for a minute or so.



MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please! The Leader of the Opposition has, to coin a phrase, or to use a familiar phrase, been on the razor's edge for some time in his remarks concerning misleading or deliberately misleading or whatever. I think his last remarks saying that "The government or the Minister of Justice has deliberately misled the people" amounts to charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood, dealt with on page 130, Section 155(1) of Beauchesne and accordingly is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw the statement.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing it without qualification. What I will say is that the people of Newfoundland were misled, I do not say by whom, they can judge for themselves. The Minister of Justice made a speech in the House, it was widely reported, then the government made some subsequent legislative action. I am not saying who misled anybody but I will say the people of Newfoundland were misled. Those who did it can answer to themselves and to their constituents.

Now, Sir, -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable member may not say indirectly what he has not been allowed to say directly. I think again he is skating very close to the edge of the lake, to use another phrase, I suggest that he may have gone beyond, it could be the subject of some debate and I suggest to the honourable member that he refrain from this type of allusion.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour for Your Honour's guidance, I shall try and heed it.

Now the point I was making, Mr. Speaker, was that the government received this report about one year ago. It was made public shortly thereafter. I think it was made public only after there were some public demands by my friend, the then Member for White Bay South. That, of course, produced the cutting to which I referred the Minister of Justice saying that "The government then believed in setting boundaries by a public commission." A most interesting little statement.

Then came the Throne Speech with the announcement in it that the government intended to proceed. Then nothing happened publicly for ten months but obviously a great deal happened privately and then in comes the bill which is a classic example of gerrymandering. A classic example. Sir, clear cut, unarguable, undefensible and indefensible and nobody on the other side to give them credit has even tried to defend it, even the Premier has not tried to defend this. No honourable gentleman who has spoken has tried to defend what the government have done. Not one man has risen on their side, Sir, to defend this course of action. The two or three who were tempted to their feet, the gentleman for Trinity North, the gentleman for Bonavista South spoke only of their own little - I am sorry the gentleman for Placentia West spoke only of minor matters, not one of them dealt with the great principle. The gentleman for St. John's North did to give him his due. When he spoke, when he said, what he believed, when he spoke to the principle he had to vote against the government. He did. No other honourable gentleman has spoken, not a word. They would like to do this I would suggest, Mr. Sneaker, in the dark of night. They would like nothing better than to have the House meet some night and about four o'clock in the morning whip the Redistribution Bill through. That is the way they would like to do it because they are ashamed of this. They know what they are doing and yet as the House Leader said when he opened this debate on the bill now he said, "We are going to put it through. We do not care what anybody says. We do not care what anybody in Newfoundland says, we are going to put it through. We are determined." I have no doubt they are. I have no doubt they are. I have no doubt they are, Mr. Sneaker but I say to them that they may have the final word in this House, they do not have the final word in this province. There is a greater court, a greater body than this. I have seen even in my short political career, I have seen governments come and go. There was a government elected in 1966 that sat over there with infinitely more talent and infinitely more men than the present government have to their backs.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened to them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: That government, Sir, in five years was humbled by the people of this province. I say to this honourable crowd, Sir, these gentlemen opposite that they too have a day of reckoning coming. The people of Newfoundland, Sir, know what is happening. It matters little where the boundaries are drawn and one can always argue for or against and every point raised by an honourable gentleman opposite can be countered and dealt with on its merits. There is not a point about the boundary of whether it should go here or half a mile this way or two communities the other way that they cannot argue one way or the other. That, Sir, is not the issue here. Honourable gentlemen opposite would like to think that it is, would like to have people believe that it is.

The issue is whether the boundaries are going to be drawn not by the House, no, Sir, whether the boundaries are going to be drawn by a group of men working in the office of the Premier or under the Premier's direction, the cabinet's direction or whether they are to be drawn by an independent commission. People of Newfoundland know, they know two things, they know that the Tory Government said that they would never again gerrymander and the Tories have not kept that promise. Then they know too that they have gerrymandered.

This bill will go through. The government intend to have the House meet tonight, maybe at three or four o'clock tomorrow morning the debate will end and the bill will be given, I suppose, they will probably have the Governor standing downstairs ready to give the Royal Assent. The bill will go through, sure! This majority over there, the same as any majority anywhere can do what they wished. Mr. St. Laurant and Mr. Howell put the Pipeline Bill through parliament at Ottawa too. It went through, all stages, all readings, bang! bang! bang it went right through. Of course, it did but there is a greater court and there is another majority. Honourable gentlemen opposite stand indicted in that court and stand exposed, exposed by their own words and by their own actions. The Minister of Justice stands exposed by his words and by his actions. He stands in the dock, the dock of political sin. The

Member for Labrador West stands there. Other honourable gentlemen stand there. The only one who can stand with courage, political courage is the gentleman for St. John's North who defied his party -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Who defied his party to do what he believed. It may be that other honourable - I am not saying that honourable gentlemen opposite do not believe in this bill, Sir. I assume they do. I will give them that much credit but that just shows how perverted their political principles have become if they believe in this bill.

They were the crowd who made the great reform. Let us never again set boundaries by a government. Let us set them by

an independent commission. Instead, Sir, when it came to the crunch they backed away. They think it does not matter. In a sense it does not because as I said earlier, if the government cannot claim the support of a majority of the people in an election it will not win that election, nor should it. That is what happened to Joe Smallwood. Of course it did. That is what will happen to the present Premier if it has not happened already. They will find out when the writs are issued for another general election to elect a general assembly to succeed this one.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland believed the Tory Party, believed they were men of political honour and political principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: Still do.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, they believed what the government said, but never again will they. This article in "The Evening Telegram," a newspaper that I read and though I often do not agree with it, it very often does not agree with me. It is one of the saddest indictments I have ever seen of a man in public life. That is worse than what they used to say about Mr. Smallwood when "The Telegram" led very effectively the opposition and Mr. Smallwood.

I am sorry that Ray Guy is not writing for them. I would like to hear him comment on the performance of the gentlemen opposite. It would be very entertaining.

It is a sad day when a government that held itself out as being unlike other men, as being above other men, fell away from that high standard, for no reason except the grossest sort of political expediency. We have seen it time and time again. We have seen it time and time again, now we are seeing it in clear and unmistakable terms. There can be no defence of this bill and in three weeks of debate not one member opposite has attempted to defend it, not one has attempted to defend this bill. We get the final revelation of the government's position today when the House Leader, the Premier has not even got the gall to propose this one, he has used up his quota of gall, which is considerable, and now he turns it

over to his seat mate, an equally galling or gallful gentleman, the gentleman from St. John's East. He says, "We do not care what you say. We are going to put it through." Fine, in due course we will have a vote and then we will stand and vote as they wish, vote as they believe and it will be recorded and then it will pass and we will go on to do some of the other crucial business before the House, the reason we have been called together. Such things as, "An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites and Records Act."

There was a mass public meeting the other night demanding that this go through immediately. We will be sitting from 6:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. tomorrow morning. We will be sitting Christmas Day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Here is one that concerns the honourable gentleman obviously because he will benefit from it, "An Act To Amend The Child Welfare Act." We will be sitting Christmas Day to deal with that one.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we will have another one which really hits home with the people of Newfoundland, that will help them, "An Act Respecting Public Libraries and Boards to Operate Them."

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the matters that come before this House and when we deal with the Redistribution Bill, when we deal with the Redistribution Bill, when it is disposed of, we will deal with these great crucial matters and we will see the honourable gentlemen opposite expose their political principles again.

MR. NEARY: They would be arrested for indecent exposure.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, except they have so little to show. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose now, I will in committee stage, go through the changes the government have made and expose exactly why each boundary has been changed. I shall give the portion of the story that the Premier conveniently or not did not give. But I will say without any fear of contradiction, people may argue it but they will not be able to contradict it, that the only changes that have been made in the commission report, are ones that in the belief of the Tory Government, will help the Tory Party. Those are the only changes.

The districts they are punishing, and I use the word "punish," it is a sordid word to describe a sordid act. The districts they are punishing are the Northern Peninsula districts that voted liberal. The commission said there should be three seats on the Northern Peninsula. That was their considered opinion, operating within the terms of the legislation so eloquently and with such great devotion to political principle, introduced and sponsored by the gentleman from Burin.

The government with no reason stated, with every reason in their minds, political cunning and expediency, have decided to throw that out. They have created, Sir, two seats on the Northern Peninsula, one of which is the second largest seat in a population sense in the province, another which is the sixth or seventh largest in the population sense in the province, seats which geographically will be extremely difficult for a man to serve and seats which will add further fuel to the separatist feeling in the Labrador part of this province.

They have done it for only one reason, to punish the people for voting Liberal and to try to protect their members down in Trinity Bay. That is why they have done it, Sir. Let it stand on the record. Let the people judge. They talk of growth, how can they explain growth, when the largest seat in the province, the proposed Conception Bay South seat, is one in which we are going to get great growth. That is an area of the population of which we will expand, expand very rapidly if ever the Tory Government can get moving and provide water and sewer services there. But it is an area in which the population will grow rapidly. So that principle of growth does not exist.

They propose to create the proposed seats of St. Mary's - The Capes, Ferryland, two of the smallest seats in Newfoundland, an average of 8,200 people a constituency. On the Northern Peninsula, difficult, remote, they propose to create seats with an average of 11,000 and 12,000 people a district. Why? There can only be one explanation and let it be said, to punish the people, to hurt them, to try to take away their political voice, to give two members on the Northern Peninsula instead of three. That is why they are doing it, to punish them because they voted Liberal.

Sir, I say to this government, that the people on the Northern



Peninsula will vote as they believe, no matter what seats they have. I think they will vote Liberal. But we will find out when the time comes. But in the meantime they are being made to suffer for their political beliefs.

The gentleman from St. Mary's profits directly from that decision, as do the gentleman from Ferryland. Neither of them has had the political courage to stand in this debate and take part. They accept what the government are doing. Silence is consent. The government are punishing Labrador. Stubbornness on the Premier's part because he made a fool of himself in introducing the bill, a resolution I am sorry. He made another fool of himself in the House, he did not know what he was talking about. He made that obvious. He will not give way on Labrador. It can make no real difference. The same geographic area divided between two seats, just a different boundary. A boundary change that every expression of public opinion that has come to my attention, and I know of none elsewhere, a change is favoured. They are too stubborn. They are too small minded, like a child, like a four year old child who is too stubborn to admit he is wrong.

The government, Sir, and I do not mind them being stubborn if they want, that is their problem not mine. But, Sir, it is the people of Labrador who will suffer and the government will not listen to anybody who knows anything about Labrador. They just will not listen. They do not care. That is the message that is getting through the Labrador. That is the message that is getting through, Sir. That does not hold well for this province.

Nearly fifty years ago a group of men fought hard to ensure that Labrador was part of this province. Now we have a group of men who apparently are determined to split this province and to encourage Labrador to go its own separate way. Strange actions for a group of men who like to pretend that their big monument will be the Gull Island project. They cannot maintain both positions, Sir, not with any consistency of principle. Of course that does not bother them. The Minister of Justice has showed us where political principle ends up when he has to show some guts.

8353

Yes, I stood by the Smallwood Cabinet, Sir. I did it openly, right or wrong. I will stand by what I did, Sir. If the people do not think that is the way that a man should act there is a remedy available to them, just as there is a remedy available when it comes to the Minister of Justice, whom I assure, will have to seek re-election if he is to continue in political life. It is either that or back to the Bar. I do not think that he will get to be the Chief Justice or the Justice of Appeal. I hope and I pray that with no matter what deal he may try to work out with Ottawa -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is ridiculous for the Leader of the Opposition to be getting on with his personal innuendoes, not innuendoes but direct references which are completely irrelevant, childish, churlish, out of order and he should be called to order for it, Mr. Speaker, and told to desist from this type of diatribe against the Minister of Justice. It only derogates the Opposition and himself.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The honourable Leader of the Opposition was being irrelevant and I think he was on the verge of impugning perhaps the character of the Minister of Justice. I suggest that he get back to the principle of the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: I need not impugn his character, Sir, his actions speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making is that the government are too stubborn to make the change in Labrador. I have no hope that this government will desist from their decision to punish the people of the Northern Peninsula, to hurt them to try to harm them because they voted Liberal. There is no other explanation for creating a seat with 11,600 people, another one with 12,088 people, according to the government's figures compared with other seats, 8,000 in Grand Falls; 8,000 in Ferryland, 8,400 in St. Mary's - The Capes. There can be no justification. History? The only history in the Tory action is the history of trying to save some of their members. There can be no justification.

I regret that they say they will not change the Labrador boundaries. I appeal to them again to do so. It will not change the balance of seats. It will give the people concerned an infinitely better opportunity for political representation no matter what man or representing what party they choose to send

to this House in the future. The commission wrestled with that problem and came up with a solution. I might add that one of the members of the commission, Magistrate Seabright, who has said the obvious thing that, of course, the government are free to do what they want with the recommendations and we knew that. He said so and it was fair enough. Magistrate Seabright has lived in the Happy Valley Area for a couple of years now. He has been posted there by the Minister of Justice as a magistrate or what they call provincial courts now. We no longer have the honoured title of magistrates, we now have provincial courts.

Mr. Speaker, Magistrate Seabright was a member of the commission, with firsthand knowledge. The commission made an unanimous finding so we assume that Magistrate Seabright's personal knowledge agreed with the findings on the Labrador seats. The government just will not give way. If they will not give way because they believe they are right, that is one thing but they have given no arguments to show that they are right. The Premier yesterday was not even pathetically weak in his arguments. He was just ludicrously weak. He showed once again that he has no understanding of Labrador, of the people there, of their needs, of their aspirations and of their hopes. He just proved that conclusively.

I will not claim it is a triumph if it will make them feel happy. I will not say it. I will ask my colleagues not to say a word that, ah, we made them change their minds. Let them do the right thing for that part of the province.

The Straits thing, if they want to change that, then they have to go back to the Higgin's Report. They will not do that because they have decided to scuttle their principles and protect themselves. Let them speak for Labrador. Let them care about Labrador. If we have in the years to come a separatist movement

growing in Labrador and the nucleus of it is there now, these men here this day will have done a great deal to foster its growth. One of the great disservices ever done to the people of this province is this act.

Mr. Speaker, I will comment in detail on committee stage. The bill requires each boundary to be called, there is a clause dealing with it and each boundary can be debated, the clause as a whole and it can be debated. We intend to debate it. If it requires that the House meet until 4:00 A.M. or 5:00 A.M., that is the government's decision. If they want to ram this thing through, if it is so urgent that all business must stand aside and the House of Assembly must meet morning, noon and night, we will be here. They will not shut us up that way, Sir. They will not wear us down that way. The people of Newfoundland will judge for themselves the urgency of this business and the way in which the government are handling it.

I want to make one further point, Sir. The government have put in the bill a request that the quorum be fourteen. It is now fourteen out of forty-two. It should be seventeen out of fifty-one. Even that is ridiculously low. It should be at least one-third of the House. I would ask that they consider amending it. I am prepared to move an amendment or equally if they prefer to have one of their own men do it. I would be quite willing to stand aside on the point. Mr. Speaker, the quorum of the House should be one-third of the members. That in itself is low enough. I am sure that that was just an oversight in the draftsmen. Nobody really put much attention to that point. It is fourteen out of forty-two. The principle has been established throughout the years. It was twelve out of thirty-six and it should be seventeen out of fifty-one. That is few enough men to deal with the business of this province. It is an easy amendment to move. It would be just simply to drop the word fourteen and replace it with the word seventeen.

Sir, that is what little I have to say on the bill at this stage. I will not vote for it. My colleagues will not vote for it. We will not vote for it because we feel that fifty-one M.H.A.'s

are too many. There will be no change in our position in that from the time I stated it in this House two or three weeks ago. We have been forced by the rules to engage in some procedural gymnastics in an attempt to enable the matter to be fully debated. We will do it again. Our position is quite clear. We think that fifty-one M. H. A's are too many.

Mr. Speaker, I say now that the next Liberal Government, which will take office whenever the next general election is held, will bring in a bill that will set up an independent commission that will be directed to draw the boundaries on the basis of forty-two M.H.A.'s. There will be no gerrymandering then. Those words will be noted in Hansard. I expect to have a certain role to play in the next Liberal Administration of this province. Those words, Mr. Speaker, will be there on the record. The Liberal Administration will honour those words. Fifty-one M.H.A's are too many. A House of forty-two can adequately represent the interests of the people of this province. We do not need fifty-one. The government have given no reason. The only real reason is to justify the swollen size of the cabinet. Furthermore, Sir, we will vote against this bill because it is gerrymandering, because it represents as bad an example as has ever been seen anywhere in Canada of a government in power redrawing an electoral map to try to benefit its own political supporters. We will do so, Sir, with more regret than usual because we had hoped and believed that honourable gentlemen opposite would stand by their political principles and not sacrifice them to expediency, such men as the gentleman from Labrador West, the gentleman from Burin and others whom we believed would do the right and proper thing, not for the Tory Party and not for the Liberal Party but for Newfoundland and Labrador

because that, Sir, is the cause that we all serve no matter where we sit in the House or no matter what we say on any given proposal, we all serve this province. On this bill there can only be one way to serve this province and that is to propose an independent commission and to let that commission draw those boundaries and then let those boundaries be enshrined in the law and let the people decide who is to be their government.

Sir, I will oppose the bill and I will do it - if I had three votes I would use all three against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Finance:

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to speak in this debate at all because I felt that this Redistribution Bill would, as it should, have gone through with very little debate. The fact is, as everybody has said on this side of the House, it is the fairest treatment of our people that has ever been devised in the twenty-five years that we have been returned to Responsible Government.

Anybody who looks at the numbers which have been disclosed in the redistribution knows that it offers to our people in every segment of this province the greatest opportunity to be fairly represented that they have ever had. I am not going to say that this bill is absolutely perfect. It has been said on many occasions, I think, by members on both sides of the House that at this initial stage this bill is far from perfect. It does give the opportunity to take a step in the right direction and that this government are doing. This is the first time in twenty-five years that this province has ever seen any fair or an attempt at fair and equitable representation to the people.

With reference to Labrador it is obvious that if the statistics are revealed to be incorrect, as the Premier himself has said, that can be changed in another session of the House. Even as it is Labrador today with its scattered nature of coastline and scattered population, with three and one-half districts, is getting far better representation or will get far better representation than it has had in the past. It will enable this government and any future government to concentrate on sections of that vast part of our



province to give it a fair deal.

Now this is not the purpose, Mr. Speaker, for which I rose. What forced me to my feet this morning is what I considered to be a most unethical and despicable use of political verbiage to try to discredit members on this side of the House. My friend and colleague the Minister of Justice and also my friend and colleague from Labrador West are both honourable men, both trying to do their best to help govern this province properly. What I have heard today is nothing short of political assassination for which, I suppose, any member of the opposition could be forgiven, but it borders on personal assassination.

What has been said about these honourable members? I heard all sorts of statements on principle. God help us, it turns me inside out! I served with the government and I know what principle means. I know the Leader of the Opposition - when the crunch came where were his principles?

MR. NEARY: In cabinet you were a dummy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. EARLE: When I served in that cabinet and when the crunch came where were his principles? In his own words he has condemned himself. He stuck with the government when the heavens were falling around because there was nothing of principle left in that government at that time. He supported a non-principle for his own political ends. That is what that gentleman forever and a day condemned himself as, a protagonist of principle. It turns me inside out, it makes me bilious.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable member is completely irrelevant. Will we have the same leeway on this side of the House when we speak in the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! That was not a point of order that was raised by the honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir. I would submit to Your Honour that the member who is speaking is not relevant to the matter under debate.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. We listened for an hour and a-half this morning to a diatribe from the Leader of the Opposition casting personal innuendoes about the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Transportation and Communications. It was certainly relevant at the time when the Leader of the Opposition cared to do it, so certainly, it should be relevant for the purpose of answers.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition he was brought to order on the grounds of being irrelevant when he was referring to the past and I suggest the same apply to the Minister of Finance.

MR. MARSHALL: He was brought to order, Mr. Speaker. He was brought to order because he was impugning the integrity of the Minister of Justice. In other words, when he was going too far and he goes too far most of the time.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Who are the honourable members opposite trying to fool here? The honourable the Leader of the Opposition in -

MR. NEARY: Is this is order, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: His previous comments was engaging is the same tactics that he has engaged in for the last two years namely; to personally attack members of this honourable House when he is on weak grounds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: This has nothing to do with the point of order. This has nothing to do with the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: This has nothing to do with the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, obviously I am getting a little close to home.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! I remind honourable members to my right that the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has risen

to a point of order and I suppose it is up to the Chair to judge whether he is relevant to the point of order or not. He does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, as I said, obviously I am getting a little too close to home for the honourable members opposite. My colleague the Minister of Finance has made a good point. He has pointed out that the honourable member opposite, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the small Leader of the Opposition has gone on for two hours the majority of which comments were personal attacks, personal attacks not political attacks, Mr. Speaker. Vicious, sly, devious, personal attacks on honourable members on this side. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in all fairness the honourable the Minister of Finance is entitled to reply to those.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think this matter is being developed into a debate on a point of order. The Chair considers that there has been argument enough for this matter and I am sure members are aware that it is rather difficult to make a ruling on relevancy or irrelevancy. I feel that perhaps the honourable Minister of Finance was straying somewhat from the point and I think he should get back to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to get into any diatribe. I am not capable of it and I do not think those opposite are worthy of that kind of attention.

What I do say, Mr. Speaker, is that we have in this session of the House been lectured on principle, not only on this occasion but in previous discussions in the House. I was just defending the principle of my colleagues who are supporting this bill. I think I have every right so to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him speak for himself.

MR. EARLE: I am speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, to this effect: I believe and sincerely believe that the demonstration given by my colleagues the Minister of Justice and the honourable the Minister of

Transportation and Communications is one of the greatest demonstrations of political principle that I have ever seen shown in this House.

MR. SIMMONS: Open you eyes. Open your eyes.

MR. EARLE: For one year after having unanimously this House approve fifty-one seats the opposition decides to play hokeypokey and jiggerdy-wiggerdy and get back and forth on whether is should be fifty-one or forty-two or forty-nine or forty-six. That was done with and should not have even entered into the discussion.

Having had a year since that decision was made for the government which is its own right on the recommendations of that commission to decide what were the best steps to take for the people of the province as a whole in the distribution and redistribution of these districts, decided in its wisdom rightly or wrongly what was the proper separation of these districts.

Regardless of what the Minister of Justice may have said a year ago or any other member of this House for that matter, the government act on one principle and governments as has often been said on both sides of the House act on one great political principle and that is that when the government as a whole or a majority come to a decision the members back that up or they leave the House or cross over to the other side. That is one of the fundamental principles of democratic government.

In spite of the embarrassment caused the Minister of Justice and the Member for Labrador West, they have stuck to that principle simply because they feel as I feel also, that this whole Redistribution Bill is not a matter of conscience to the extent that they must leave the party. If I did I would be the first to leave. I already demonstrated that with the previous government. When a matter bothers -

MR. NEARY: He hung on by -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. EARLE: When a matter bothers my conscience to the point that I feel that I can no longer go ahead or go along with it, I will leave

the party, I will leave whatever party I happen to belong to at that time. I have already done it once so I do not need to verify that. I do feel that the Minister of Justice and the Member for Labrador West and other members on this side have shown the great principle of solidarity with their colleagues which is the fundamental principle of good government.

I know these are honourable gentlemen. If they felt that by so doing they were going against their conscience

I do not think for one moment either of them would be sitting on this side of the House. Unfortunately the Opposition will not give them the credit of being honourable gentlemen. I do. I feel that they have demonstrated far more than has ever been demonstrated by the yakkity yak from the other side or these people in the House who so glibly speak for political purposes. I feel that they have demonstrated a political principle which is the foundation of democracy. I admire them for it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable minister is very anxious to get the House closed. The honourable minister has already made overtones toward opposition to get this bill rushed through the House, close the House on this very day but, Sir, I cannot see any way that we can dispose of this bill today in the House. They may bring us back into a night session, Sir, tonight. We cannot meet tomorrow morning because tomorrow is private members' day. We cannot meet after six o'clock tomorrow evening. They may try and force us into an all night sitting, Sir, to ram this dastardly piece of legislation through the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Christmas Eve when Santa Claus is coming down the chimney, right here.

MR. NEARY: As my colleague the Leader of the Opposition indicated, Sir, we are quite prepared to stay in this honourable House until Christmas Eve. We are prepared to take Christmas Day off, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: Back on Boxing Day.

MR. NEARY: St. Stephen's Day off,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: As is the situation in the public service, Sir, with business and industry across the province and then come back the day after St. Stephen's Day and get down to business again. We are quite prepared to do that, Sir, even if it means, Mr. Speaker, that we are wasting our

breath just trying to convince the members of the government what a rotten, dastardly bill this is, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Leader of the Opposition this morning made one of the most magnificent speeches that I have ever heard in this honourable House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: I only wish, Sir, that my honourable colleague's speech this morning was televised.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So that the people of this province, Sir, could see, in living colour, the position taken by Her Majesty's Opposition in this House and the position taken by the government and then let the people judge -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Let the people judge, Sir, of what side has the most valid points, of what side the people of this province, Sir, would agree with. Would it be the position of the government or would it be the position of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. If the debates of this House were televised, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the people of Newfoundland would be disgusted and disillusioned and depressed and demoralized by the attitude taken by a party, Sir, by the government during two provincial general elections in this province when the peoples' hopes and expectations were built up, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that things were going to be different from now on in this honourable province. We were told, Sir, by the Leader of the Tory Party, now Premier of this Province, that there was going to be no more gerrymandering of the districts, in Newfoundland and Labrador. We were told a good many more things by the head of the administration. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is go back two or three Throne Speeches ago, just look at the Santa Claus list that was presented to this honourable House.

Now, Sir, some how or other the Premier and the members of his administration and the members who sit on the opposite side of the House keep referring back to the Smallwood days, to the Smallwood



Administration. What stand did you take when you were in the Smallwood Administration and gerrymandering? Well, Sir, the only answer to that is, the only obvious answer to that is that nobody in this honourable House can shape the past including members on the government benches, Sir, who sat in the administration. We cannot shape the past. Mr. Speaker, we can interpret the past. Honourable members have chosen to interpret what they want to interpret from the past but we can shape the future, Mr. Speaker. We cannot shape the past but we can shape the future, Sir. That is what we should be doing in this honourable House today, Sir. It is not yakkity yak about whether or not somebody took this kind of a stand or that kind of a stand when he was a member of the Smallwood Administration. I would not be divulging any cabinet secrets, Sir, when I suggest to this honourable House that the Minister of Justice, who must be still smarting under the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition this morning, took a stand on nothing when he was a member of the Smallwood cabinet. The honourable minister sat by my left hand for almost two years, the honourable minister was incapable of making a decision.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Incapable of making a decision, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right, at least I took decisions. I was man enough, Sir, to make decisions that is more than I can say about the honourable minister, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$25,000 worth of decisions.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the decisions that I took in the interest of the poor people of this province. It would be far better, Mr. Speaker, if the half million dollars or so that it is going to cost to add another nine members to the House of Assembly to put another nine members on the payroll, it would be far better, Sir, if that was distributed amongst the poor of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa, Sir, I think, there was unanimous agreement on the Redistribution Bill and they did not increase their membership by twenty per cent as we are doing in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well we are not debating salaries here, Sir. Salaries are another matter. We are not debating salaries now, Sir, we are debating the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what it will cost the taxpayers of this province, Sir, to put another nine members on the payroll? It will cost another, just for the basic salaries and remunerations and sessional indemnities and travelling, it will cost well over \$200,000, Sir. Well over \$200,000. The total amount, Sir, that it will cost just for the basics in this honourable House will be \$1,121,000. It would make one stop and think. Mr. Speaker, are we worth it? The

attitude with the things that we are doing in this honourable House. Are we worth it, Sir? No I cannot bring down the - the average cost per member, Sir, the average cost per member in this honourable House is a little over \$22,000. That is what it costs to keep a member in this honourable House, just the basic, Sir. It does not include offices, office space, Mr. Speaker. It does not include office space and if you bring in nine more members in this honourable House then they are going to be looking for office space. We are told that Confederation Building is already overcrowded and the opposition have been looking for, to improve the accommodation, Sir, for the last two years. We have not been able to get it. There is no space available in Confederation Building.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we will drive up the cost of governing this province by almost a-half million dollars. You know what it works out to, Mr. Speaker, the average number of voters in each one of these new districts that was proposed by the Premier? The average number of voters, Sir, is 5,000 voters, that is what each member if this bill is approved. Each member will represent an average of 5,000 voters. Scandalous! Ridiculous, Sir! We can do a little better than that, Mr. Speaker.

We have already said, the Leader of the Opposition has already stated that we believe that the boundaries should have been shifted. We could have done it based on forty-one districts, Sir. We could have. The government in its wisdom decided to appoint a royal commission. The royal commission had no choice but to consider redistribution with fifty-one members.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out this morning, Sir, we did a little political gymnastics during this whole debate. We tried, Sir, we tried desperately to get a compromise even though, Mr. Speaker, we are deadly opposed because of the galloping inflation in the province, deadly opposed to putting another nine members on the payroll of the House. Nevertheless we were prepared to accept fifty-one members providing the government reverted back to the map we see

down here, the second man or the final Report of the Royal Commission.

We could not even get an agreement on that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

We tried everything, Sir, in this debate and it has been a long debate and it has been a very worthwhile debate. It is not over yet, Sir. It is not all over yet. It is a matter that should be debated. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, myself to be debating the high cost of living in the province at the present time. If I thought for one minute, Sir, that if we agreed to dispose of this bill that the administration would put forward recommendations to solve the unemployment problems, the high cost of living, vandalism, and the shortage of houses in this province. Sir, if they were going to put that forward, Mr. Speaker, I might agree to get this bill off the agenda of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the matters to which I referred to a moment ago, the crisis in the fishery thrown in, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member is not being relevant, need I say more?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the situation in the province at the present time is like a bomb, it is ready to explode at any moment. Why, Sir? Why do we have that feeling of despair and uncertainty in the province amongst our people at the present time? Why, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you why, Sir, because the administration keeps bringing before this House matters like redistribution that are completely irrelevant to the real needs of the ordinary people of this province. That is why, Mr. Speaker wherever you go throughout Newfoundland and Labrador today you get the feeling of despair, you get the feeling, Sir, that all somebody has to do is light the fuse and bang she is gone. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, this Redistribution Bill could be the thing that would ignite the fuse. It could be the torch, Mr. Speaker, to light the fuse and the whole thing will backfire, and explode in the administration's faces, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I have yet to meet a single person in this province who approves of this Redistribution Bill. I have yet to meet one apart from the honourable gentlemen, Sir, on the government

benches. I have yet to meet one person in this province to say that this is a good bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, one of the commissioner's did not, all one of the commissioner's said, Mr. Speaker, was that the government had the right to gerrymander, if they wanted to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I can quote -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is what Magistrate Gordon Seabright said,

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please! There are two debates going on here at the present time, the one that does not have the floor appears to be the far more serious of the two, I am able to detect the general tenor of it and I do not like it. I suggest that the honourable Member for Bell Island has the right to be heard in silence and that, that right be observed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, somebody referred to the remarks made outside of this honourable House by Magistrate Gordon Seabright who was a member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Sir, or what Magistrate Seabright said. He said that the government have acted properly in making changes in the Redistribution Bill. The government can make any changes it feels necessary in the Redistribution Bill according to the terms of the reference of the bill. It is clearly understood by the commission that the government might accept or reject or change any recommendations made. Well, Sir, that is just motherhood, a kindergarten student knows that, Sir. The government can be a dictatorship if it wants to with the majority it has.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen seem hell bent on using their huge majority to force this Redistribution Bill, in its present form, through the House and gouge another \$300,000 or \$400,000 or \$500,000 out of the provincial taxpayers. I claim, Sir, that it would be better for us in this honourable House, and I think this is very relevant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! A couple of honourable members here are persisting in having a little debate of their own, tones and words that are certainly uncomplimentary each to the other and they are being very discourteous to the gentleman who has the floor and also discourteous to the House. So I suggest honourable gentlemen observe the rules, it has been brought to each members attention sufficiently.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition this morning already referred

to the position of the Minister of Justice back in March, I think it was, 1974, when my colleague the then Member for White Bay South asked the Minister of Justice publicly to release the Electoral Boundaries Commission Report.

My colleague already referred to a clipping from "The Evening Telegram", Sir, which reads; "'Why does he not read the act?' an irritated T.Alex Hickman said today of Opposition House Leader Bill Rowe who Wednesday called for the immediate release of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Report. 'The act provides for two debates of the report's recommendations' Justice Minister Hickman said. 'So what is all the fuss?' the honourable and learned gentleman said. 'So what is all the fuss?'" Answering his own questions, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Hickman said he can understand why the Liberals are upset about the Electoral Boundaries Commission. 'The Liberals firmly believe in gerrymandering' he said, 'Their record proves it. However,' he said, 'We believe in setting boundaries by a public commission.'"

"We believe in setting boundaries by a public commission." Famous last words, Sir. Famous last words. That was the last utterance we heard from the Minister of Justice an honourable gentleman who aspires to beoming very heavily involved in the administration of Justice, more so than he is at the present time, in the administration of justice in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Finance, speaking in his place in this honourable House a few moments ago accused the Leader of the Opposition of political assassination. Well, Sir, I am going to take a chance and the minister can interpret my remarks in whatever way he sees fit. If the cap suits him he can wear it. Any honourable gentleman on the government benches, Sir, can interpret my remarks any way he wants to. They are the artists, past masters at character assassination.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the feeling of concern and anxiety and the feeling of suspicion that would be probable among our people if an honourable gentleman gives his word, Sir, (Not necessarily the Minister of Justice) that there is going to be no more of this, there is going to be no more of that, there is going to be no



more gerrymandering, there is going to be no more skulduggery with calling tenders and awarding contracts, if a gentleman gives his word on that it does not make any difference - we can use a hypothetical case, Sir, - and that gentleman at some stage during his public life is elevated to the bench what would the people think, Mr. Speaker? What would they think? Mr. Speaker, it would be enough to make our people lose faith in the courts and the administration of justice. Would it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: It would not?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, carrying my hypothetical case a little further would it not be enough to make the people of this province lose respect for law and order? Would it not, Mr. Speaker? Is that not what is happening at the present time in this province, Sir? People are losing faith in their politicians. They are becoming cynical because, Mr. Speaker, we are -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order please! I think the honourable member in drawing a comparison a short time ago may or may not have been relevant but he was allowed to continue in any event. Now he is not going to be permitted to expand upon that further and to things that are purely irrelevant. The honourable member will speak to the principle of the bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why people are cynical, why they are disillusioned, demoralized, depressed. When we spend all our time in this honourable House foisting things on the people like redistribution. We come into this honourable House, Sir, and carelessly and cruelly, carelessly and cruelly impose another hardship on the already overburdened taxpayer of this province by adding another nine members to the payroll of this honourable House. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, in so doing we add to the galloping inflation in the province.

My honourable and former friend the Minister of Finance told us a few moments ago that the Redistribution Bill should have gone through with little debate. "Should have gone through" he said "with little debate." Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance is going to

be in this House in the next session struggling with his budget if he ever brings a budget before the House again, of which I have very grave doubts, Mr. Speaker, because this bill once it is passed will be the forerunner of a provincial general election.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: The issue will be an attack on Ottawa. That will be the issue in the next election, Sir. Attack Ottawa! They will try to create a synthetic, phoney, false issue. Well let us say that I am wrong, Sir, and I do not think I am but let us say that I am wrong and the Minister of Finance has to come into this honourable House with a budget, the poor old minister will be down there night and day burning the midnight oil trying to balance his budget.

MR. ROBERTS: You are being leaned on, Morgan.

MR. NEARY: Trying to balance his budget, Sir, and will probably have to increase taxes. Whether they do it before or after an election and I am more inclined that they will do it after the election, Sir, -

MR. ROBERTS: They will not be doing it after any election.

MR. NEARY: This is what they hope. This is their strategy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can listen to this diatribe about the budget and all that sort of stuff but would you mind informing the House what that has to do with redistribution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order please! I think the honourable Minister of Finance's point is well taken. I was about to give the honourable Member for Bell Island about ten more seconds to see if he was going to make the point relevant. I do not think he was about to so I suggest the honourable member might get on with it now.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I was just about to make the point relevant by saying that the minister would have to find another half million dollars to pay for these nine members who are being added to the payroll of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, may I move the adjournment. Shall we call it one o'clock?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. We have a half hour to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, we have a half hour to go.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: May we call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we call it one o'clock? Agreed? Agreed.

It now being one o'clock I leave the Chair until  
three of the clock this afternoon.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 92

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think the honourable member for Bell Island adjourned the debate and he has fifteen minutes left.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose for lunch I was talking about how mousy looking the members on the other side looked over this whole matter. They had the look of guilt, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They have, Mr. Speaker, a mousy look. They know, Sir, that they are doing something wrong. The member for St. John's North confirmed this yesterday when he told the House, Sir, that he knew for a fact, he was absolutely sure, he made the categorical statement, Sir, it was not a wishy washy statement and it has not been denied by any of the honourable members, made the statement in this honourable House, Sir, that over half of his colleagues were against this rotten piece of legislation.

MR. EVANS: Point of order, Sir, here is one member right now who is not against it. The rest can speak for themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burgeo did not raise a valid point of order.

MR. NEARY: No wonder, Mr. Speaker, no wonder they are coming into this honourable House, Sir, no wonder they are coming in here in the last three weeks with bags under their eyes, unable to sleep at night, Sir, no wonder they cannot sleep at night. They are having pangs of conscience over this Redistribution Bill, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: There are those, you know, Mr. Speaker, there are those amongst us who would say that the debate has gone on long enough. We have talked, we have been talking for the last three weeks on the Redistribution Bill and why do we not give it up? There are those who would say that. The government has taken a position. The opposition has taken a position. Neither one is going to budge. Why prolong the agony? There are those amongst us who would say that, Sir. While I might agree, Mr. Speaker, that the message has gone out to practically every nook and cranny of this province,

Sir, while the word may have gone out to every corner of the island and of the mainland part of the province, Sir, there may be a few, there may be, Sir, who yet have not gotten the message, so another few hours of debate is not going to make all that much difference, Sir. Members may be anxious to get out to do their Christmas shopping or to go down in the Caribbean and warm up their ankles in the -

MR. ROBERTS: The balmy waters of the Bermudas.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The balmy waters, Sir, in the West Indies. So, Mr. Speaker, another few hours is not going to make all that much difference, Sir. I do not think we can meet tomorrow morning, tomorrow is Private Members' Day. We cannot go beyond eleven o'clock tonight.

MR. MARSHALL: We can.

MR. NEARY: No, we cannot, Sir. Tomorrow is Private Members' Day. We have to cease tonight at eleven o'clock, no matter who is on their feet speaking.

MR. MARSHALL: We can sit all night if we want to.

MR. NEARY: No. That would only just go to show, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province that the government are trying to do something shady, trying to ram this bill through the House by forcing it to sit all night. After three weeks, Sir, there is still a few things which need to be said about this Redistribution Bill, Sir. There is a couple of things that have not gotten through yet, a couple of things, Sir.

I object to the bill, Mr. Speaker, for two main reasons, two main reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Number one, Sir, number one I do not think we should be considering adding another nine members to the payroll of the House when we have galloping inflation in the province, when we have a dwindling number of taxpayers in the province.

MR. MARSHALL: We subtract the honourable member -

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the honourable minister, Sir, the only sensible thing he said since he came into this honourable House, what we should be doing, Sir, is taking nine members away instead

of adding another nine members on.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the only good feature that I can see about this bill is that it will give the people up to the head of the bay, up in the Harbour Main part of my new district, it will give the people, Sir, an opportunity to at last get a good member of the House of Assembly. The only good feature I can see about it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, what we really should be doing, Sir, is taking nine members away from the House, Minus, not a plus it should be a minus then we would be doing something worthwhile for the people of this province, Sir. They can joke and laugh all they like about it. The message is getting through, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that there are people who think we should terminate the debate today.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about minus forty-one?

MR. NEARY: Minus forty-one, no, minus nine. So, Sir, there is still a few little corners of this province I suppose where people have not yet gotten the news of what was going on in this Legislature for the past three weeks. There may be a handful of people in the province who are not familiar with gerrymandering, Sir, and there may be other people, Mr. Speaker, who will say, "Well, one party is just as bad as the other. When the Liberals were over there they did it, now the Tories are over there they are doing it." But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, surely the people of this province will remember that the honourable the Premier went around this province campaigning and at least gave the people of the province an impression that he was half honest,



that he was going to bring honest politics to Newfoundland, that he was intellectually honest. The Premier told the people of this province that he was going to clean up the mess, that any administration that he headed up would not do what the Liberals did. The honourable Premier says that that is right. The honourable Premier has changed his mind. Yes, Sir, the honourable Premier has changed his mind. The people of this province, Mr. Speaker, have lost faith in the Premier and his administration because they have not fulfilled their promises.

One of the promises they made, Sir, was that there would be no more gerrymandering. Is that correct? That we would have an independent royal commission and, as we were told by the colleagues of the honourable the Premier and told by the Premier himself, that there would be no more going down on the eighth floor, sharpening up your pencils, carving up the districts. Ah, that is right. Then why did the Premier change his mind? Why did he not accept the report of the royal commission?

MR. MOORES: Community of interest.

MR. NEARY: Community of interest - Mr. Speaker, community of interest, let me see now, community of interest.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Harbour Main, Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us take Harbour Main, Bell Island. In order for me, Sir, to get to the Harbour Main part of my district, I have to go through three other districts, one of which, Mr. Speaker, has been split right down the middle. Two, Sir, two communities. I have to go through one community, Portugal Cove which has been split right down the middle.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sure, they are nice people.

MR. THOMS: Gordon Dawe will not be there.

MR. NEARY: I am afraid that honourable gentleman will not be around very much longer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

For some days now I have noted this. I had hoped that perhaps I would not have to mention it. I would remind all members in all galleries that they are not permitted to make any unnecessary noise. I

consider, perhaps in the galleries to my right, that there has been some unnecessary noise. I would ask these people to judge themselves accordingly.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was beginning to wonder there for a while if we were down in the Belmont Tavern.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Whatever you are used to.

MR. NEARY: Now, that is very funny, very funny.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am not used to having my hand down in a pickle barrel.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: No, in a pork barrel.

MR. ROBERTS: That is where it is now, yours.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$250,000 worth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Is that the price of the Trizec bill?

MR. NEARY: We will find out all about \$250,000 when we get over on that side of the House I will guarantee you that. We will find out about some of these contracts that are being lashed out and money going into the Tory Party from the Health Science Complex, the expansion at the Waterford Hospital and the hospital in Carbonear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It is not a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you cannot use that unparliamentary term in this honourable House, call a member a liar. The honourable Premier, Sir, just called me a liar. I demand, Sir, that Your Honour ask him to retract.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair did not hear the honourable the Premier call the honourable member a liar. He made a statement to the effect, I think, that something the honourable member said was not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir. The Premier distinctly

used the word lie. Now, Your Honour may not have heard it but it is pushing credibility to say that Your Honour heard the Premier say something was not true and did not hear the word lie. The Premier used the word lie. Your Honour may not have heard it. That I can accept because Your Honour is at one end of the Chamber and the Premier is midway down the Chamber. But to stand and say that Your Honour did not hear the word lie but did hear that the Premier said the honourable statement was not true, Sir, that I protest and I would ask Your Honour to reconsider that.

MR. SPEAKER: I said that I did not hear the honourable Premier call the honourable member for Bell Island a liar.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is what he did say.

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

The honourable member for Bell Island is supposed to be speaking to the principle of this Redistribution Bill and I feel he is straying far afield. I will remind honourable members to my left that he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I realize I only have a few minutes left, Sir, and I am going to wind up my few remarks by again, Sir, appealing to members on the government benches to stand back and take a look at what they are doing to the people of this province, Sir. Only three years ago the honourable the Premier with all of his honourable crowd in tow went around this province, Sir, and told the people that things were going to change. It seems to me, Sir, that the more things change, the less they change.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The more they are alike.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The less they change. We are right back to square one, Sir. We are right back where we started. Unless the Premier and his administration are prepared to reconsider this whole matter of redistribution, they will have absolutely no credibility whatsoever left with the people of this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I want to bet, put it to the test. The sooner

the better. I am ready, Sir, willing and able, anytime. If the honourable the Premier gerrymandered the whole Redistribution Map just to get me, Sir, he better get up again.

Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this bill for two reasons. First of all, because of the gerrymandering and secondly, Sir, because it is imposing another hardship on the already overburdened taxpayer of this province. Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment seconded by my colleague, the member for Twillingate, Sir, that we strike out all the words after the word "that" and replace them with the following: "This House reaffirms its support of the principle that electoral district boundaries should be set by an independent commission. The House regrets that the administration have abandoned this principle which they hitherto supported. The House declines to give a second reading."

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

MR. NEARY: Just a second now. Just take your seat until I deliver the second one.

MR. MARSHALL: I am rising on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sit down. Sit down.

MR. MARSHALL: Come on now.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard on this. This is a motion by the member for Bell Island to the effect that an independent commission be struck to consider the matter. He says that all words after "that" we are considering a bill. I do not see the word "that" in "Be it therefore enacted by the Lieutenant Governor of the House of Assembly in legislative convened as follows." The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this completely and absolutely negates the main motion, that the honourable member wishes to have this matter which is now before the House and to be considered by the House and considered as a matter for consideration by the House of Assembly to be delegated to an independent commission as such.

Now, we have had an independent commission as such and the

commission has made its report and the House of Assembly exercising its rights and exercising its jurisdiction in respect of this matter, has decided that it shall consider the report of the commission with certain amendments. What the honourable member is attempting to do is to squelch the amendments that have been placed before it and in effect it negates the main motion and as such is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order. The House Leader's eloquence is not only misdirected, it is misspent because the motion does not refer at all to the appointment of a commission. The amendment, as Your Honour will see - Your Honour has a copy before him - is this House reaffirms its support of the principle that electoral district boundaries should be set by an independent commission. The House regrets that the administration have abandoned this principle which they hitherto supported and this House declines to give second reading.

Now, Your Honour the question before the House at this stage is that this bill be now read a second time. That is the question before the Chair. The House Leader does not seem to understand what we have been debating.

Now, Sir, if I may refer Your Honour to the authorities. Your Honour may wish to look at page 277 of Beauchesne, citation 382. I shall read it in its entirety, Mr. Speaker.

"It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its

progress or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges. Your Honour will find that Sir Erskine May's book, the most recent edition, the 18th, page 487, "It is also competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill to move what is known as a reasoned amendment. This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word 'that' and to add other words and the question proposed upon the amendment is that the amendment be made. A reasoned amendment may fall into one of several categories. It may be declaratory if some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of this bill."

It gives as citations in support of that the Property Tax Bill of 1842, The Bank Charter Bill of 1844, The Representation of the People Bill, 1859, The Army Discipline Bill, 1879, The Arrears of Rent Ireland Bill, 1882, The Criminal Law Amendment Ireland Bill, 1887, The Unemployment Bill, 1933-44, The Housing Bill of 1934-35, The Prices of Income Bill of 1966-67. Your Honour may also want to look for support of this principle in The Commons Journal for 1842 at page 113, at The Commons Journal for 1844 at page 265 and at page 468, at The Commons Journal for 1845 at page 721 and at The Commons Journal for 1882, page 337, all of which support the principle and support the words used by May and reaffirmed by Beauchesne.

I submit, Sir, the amendment is in order and should be allowed to be debated.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, if I may. I am completely squelched. I have no doubt that Your Honour will wish to go to White Hall and perhaps to go to Ottawa to examine the journals but the fact of the matter is a motion before this Chair is that this bill be read a second time and the motion made by the honourable the Member for Bell Island, in effect, is that this bill be not read a second time but that it be referred to a commission. As such I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 170, paragraph 202(12), "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up

by verbiage, is out of order." This in effect, Your Honour, is an amendment which proposes really a direct negative to the bill itself. It is really something that in substance I would submit to Your Honour has already been considered by this House in the matter of the main resolution itself and I would refer Your Honour to Section 203, number seven, page 172 of Beauchesne which is the main authority under which we operate apart from our Standing Orders, "Mr. Speaker Sproule on the 13th February, 1913, 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 raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has given a decision in the same session'."

Now we have very shortly, just yesterday, rendered a decision with respect to the resolution. I would submit that this amendment is substantially the same as the amendments that have been presented from time to time to this honourable House to the resolution that was presented to this House, that this is regurgitation of unnecessary argument before the House, something that has already been decided and as such is obviously and absolutely out of order.

So although I am devastated by the authorities quoted by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, having seen the proposal made by the Member for Bell Island, I doubt very much whether Your Honour wishes to go to White Hall or to Ottawa to examine the authorities and I think it is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: They are pretty desperate if they have to cheer for that sort of stuff. Mr. Speaker, first of all the citations I gave are quite clear and nothing the honourable gentleman has said anyway detracts from the force of what Beauchesne and May say. Secondly the honourable gentleman kept referring to citation 202 of Beauchesne. He neglected to mention number 13. He read one or two in that section but he neglected to mention subsection 13, "An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition



with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved." I suggest, Sir, that on the precedents and on the authorities the motion moved by the honourable gentleman is entirely in order. It does not touch upon the principle of the resolution which the House adopted earlier this day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I reject the amendment on two grounds: (1) It appears to be a direct negative of the main motion; and (2) The same effect could be reached of not allowing second reading when the motion to have second reading is put by a vote of "aye" and "nay".

MR. ROBERTS: But the authorities, Your Honour, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Shameful!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the honourable gentlemen are not in agreement with the ruling from the Chair, I am sure they know the proper procedure to follow if they wish to appeal the same.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, I think the matter is disposed of now. If I may speak now.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the members on the opposite side of the honourable House have accused members on this side of getting on with unwarranted verbiage with respect to debate on the resolution that came before this bill 126 and with respect to debate on bill 126. Sir, I submit that the verbiage contained in bill 126 will not be accepted by the people of this Province. Sir, we cannot say that in this case power corrupts, an absolute power corrupts absolutely. We cannot say that, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: It is not me, Sir. The honourable the Minister of Fisheries knows the author of it. Sir, I would suggest that in the case of this administration, power has lead to a certain degree of euphoria, to say the

least. This administration have fallen out of touch completely with the wishes of the people of this Province. Sir, this administration has done enough already to lead to their defeat in the coming election and I would submit that this particular bill puts the lid on the defeat of this administration because, Sir, there was an impartial, nonpartisan commission set up by this administration and supported by every member in the opposition -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Including the -

MR. ROWE: Leader of the New Labrador Party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The member for St. John's North.

MR. ROWE: And the member for St. John's North. This commission was supported, the resolution of the bill setting up that commission was supported unanimously in this House on the grounds that the final report after public hearings would be accepted by this House. The words of the Minister of Education, the words of the Minister of Justice, the words of the Premier and we have repeated them enough times in this House, Sir, hopefully trying to get one of these Honourable ministers to get to their feet and defend the words that they have spoken earlier in this debate. But the fact of the matter is, Sir, that an impartial commission was set up. Their report was subjected to public hearing from people all over the Province of Newfoundland and in Labrador and Sir, they submitted a final report which the Minister of Education said in debate and reply on the Speech from the Throne that such a report would be final and binding. The Minister of Justice said as much in approximately twenty-three pages of the verbatim report of this House of Assembly, that the final report of this commission, electoral boundaries commission, should not be altered by this House of Assembly let alone the administration or even the Cabinet itself.

Sir, we have witnessed thirty-one changes, thirty-one changes in the commission's report. Now, Sir, if that does not amount to gerrymandering

what does it amount to? If any changes, Sir, were to be made to the commission's report, I submit, Sir, that the changes of the report should have been considered by the House of Assembly, by all members of the House of Assembly so that backbenchers on the government side would have an opportunity to have some input in the areas that they know best, presumably their own districts. The report would be considered by the House of Assembly, spoken to by cabinet ministers, by backbenchers and by members on the opposition side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is democracy.

MR. ROWE: That is democracy? Another thing, you cannot expect that, Mr. Speaker, from an administration that says one thing one year ago and does the exact opposite one year later.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not at all.

MR. ROWE: But, Sir, would it not be reasonable and democratic if we did consider amendments were put to the commissioners' report and then these amendments were put back to the commission for consideration and after that procedure the commission's report comes back to the honourable House and is considered by the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am out in my district more than he is.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Sir, -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, running his business.

MR. F. ROWE: But, Sir, we did not see that. We did not witness that. We saw an impartial report, an impartial set of recommendations given the butcher job, the hatchet job by presumably less than half or at the most half of the members on the other side because it has been admitted -

MR. NEARY: The top three.

MR. F. ROWE: Probably the top three but we can safely say we -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Industrial Development, Public Works and the Premier.

MR. F. ROWE: We have tangible proof, Mr. Speaker, we have reason to believe that at a maximum one-half of the members and I would suspect there is a lot less than that, one-half of the members had nothing whatsoever to do with the drafting up of this final bill. The honourable

Member for St. John's North said "That half of the members on the other side of the House of Assembly are concerned to use -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: A mild word, "We are concerned over this bill." Sir, this has not been denied by one single member on the opposite side of the House, not one single member has denied the charge coming from the Member for St. John's North.

Sir, to my utter amazement, the Minister of Education, who stated in the Address in Reply "That the final report should be final and binding," has not spoken, has not uttered a word during the debate of this resolution nor the debate of this bill. The Minister of Justice, in spite of us pleading and appealing to him to stand on his feet and try to rationalize or justify or explain the statements that he made one year ago, still sits silently in his seat, in spite of editorials in local newspapers, in spite of articles that seriously questioned the integrity of the Minister of Justice -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: In "The Evening Telegram", Mr. Speaker. The minister still sits and refuses to speak in this debate. The Hon. Premier, Sir, gets up and utters a few words and simply says "That this is the fairest Redistribution Bill ever to come before the House" without offering one single shred of evidence of proof that his own statement is true, not one single shred of evidence.

Now, Sir, I will submit that this is the final blow, this is the straw that will break the camel's back as far as the electorate of this province is concerned. This government have been steadily losing credibility ever since they assumed office.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, this bill is the final straw. There is no way, Sir, their own act, in an effort to survive politically, their own act of gerrymandering will be an act of their own destruction in the final analysis because, Sir, no matter which way you divide this province up, and history will prove this, Mr. Smallwood tried it, as

mentioned by honourable members on the other side, and we are the first ones to admit it. There was a time, Sir, when this province accepted the principle of the Premier of the day saying "You run there, you run there, and you run there." And that is the way it worked, Sir. That system has changed. It has evolved.

MR. NEARY: You are not allowed to speak over there now.

MR. F. ROWE: As this thing should have evolved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What time is he going to make a speech in the House?

MR. F. ROWE: This was a great reform, Sir, brought in by the Hon. Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, it is significant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: At the head of the bay.

MR. F. ROWE: It is very significant, Sir, that the Hon. Minister of Justice who introduced the bill setting up the commission and closed the debate on the bill to set up the commission has not uttered a word since. He has not had the gumption or the gall or the spunk to stand up in this House and say one single word. The Hon. Premier was the one who had the gall to get up and introduce the resolution and close debate on the resolution and he ran out of gall and the honourable House Leader, presumably with some gall left, was then called on to introduce Bill No. 126. Presumably the House Leader will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Presumably he will, unless he listens to some reason coming from this side of the House, presumably he will close the debate. But, Sir the honourable House Leader cannot comprehend reason, Mr. Speaker. It is not a matter of hearing, he cannot comprehend reason. It is as simple as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Both honourable gentlemen are reminded that abusive and insulting language is unparliamentary. I suspect that honourable gentlemen left unchecked would soon be very

abusive or more abusive and insulting than they have been to one another.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but to whom are you referring?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I am referring to the honourable Member for St. Barbe North and the honourable House Leader.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Go back on his lilly pad.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are those, Sir, -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): And now the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. F. ROWE: And what about the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. NEARY: What about the Minister of Fisheries, Sir?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there are those - I must say that I listened with interest to an editorial on C.J.B.N. at dinnertime and I respect -

AN HON. MEMBER: No commercials.

MR. F. ROWE: I respect their opinion, Sir. I cannot say however that I completely agree with it. The editorial suggested something along the lines that the government have stated emphatically that they are going to vote for this bill unaltered, unamended, unchanged, and that the opposition are going fight this bill to the death or we are not going to vote for it. Therefore, the question was asked: What is the sense in continuing debate on this bill?

Well, I submit, Sir, that having listened to some reason from this side of the House that some honourable members who have spoken before and have let their political principles fall by the wayside will be shamed into, will have pangs of conscience, will finally get up and retract the statements they made or justify what the present administration are now doing because it is a completely different situation from what we heard last year. Last year this was the greatest reform ever introduced into this House, the setting up of an independent commission. Sir, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, "What foolish virgins we were, Sir, when we got sucked in to agreeing with

December 17, 1974

Tape 2192 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

the government, supporting the government on that particular bill and then later on being accused of supporting wholly and solely the principle of fifty-one seats. Sir, at that very time we questioned whether they should have a specific number of fifty-one seats. We suggested that there should have been a certain degree of flexibility built into it, to enable the commission to draw up boundaries in a fair way because with a specific number you get locked in as is evidenced by the chart down there (That is not the chart).



probably somebody here, Mr. Speaker, could turn over to the map sometime in the next few minutes. The final mess, the monstrosity that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Whose coat?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Joseph's coat is it? Joseph's coat. Sir, it is evidenced by that map, obviously whoever drafted up the final mess we see there on the map started in St. John's and boxed themselves in on the Northern Peninsula or started in on the Northern Peninsula with a serious intention of whipping out one seat, doing away with friths, taking half of St. Barbe North and throwing it in with the Leader of the Opposition's seat and taking the other half of St. Barbe North and throwing it in with St. Barbe South, taking one seat away from the most remote and isolated and difficult part of the island part of our province, increasing the remaining seats, making them impossible practically to represent fairly compared to other districts of this province, an insult, Sir, to the people of the Great Northern Peninsula. The most needy people of the island part of our province are given the largest districts, the most difficult districts to represent and in fact a district is being taken away from the Northern Peninsula at a time when the government is increasing seats from forty-one to fifty-one.

Now, Sir, if you can explain the logic in that I will be happy to hear from anybody in this honourable House. There is no logic whatsoever. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the Northern Peninsula people are being punished for their previous electoral history. It is as simple as that.

Now, Sir, I am not an expert on Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: We all know that.

MR. F. ROWE: Now how would the honourable member know that when I have not spoken about Labrador yet. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I probably knew more about Labrador when I was thirteen years of age than any honourable member on the other side of the House does now and I have forgotten more about Labrador since that time.

When I was thirteen years of age I had the honour of accompanying my father as cook on a boat that was chartered when he was member for the district and we visited every single community on the Coast of Labrador and into Goose and Happy Valley and Northwest River. That was Labrador at that time, Sir. That was Labrador. Sir, I knew the sense of isolation even at that time under a previous and a Liberal Administration. I am not saying that everything that the previous Liberal Administration did with respect to Labrador was correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you going around at government expense then?

MR. F. ROWE: I was not going on government expense. Do not be so foolish. It was a political campaign. The old man was saving a cent by putting his son to work at below the minimum wage rate and under the proper age, saving money for the Liberal Party, Sir.

Sir, since that time I have had the pleasure and the honour to work in Labrador, in Labrador City, Wabush City or Wabush. I have worked in Northwest River, in Goose and along the Coast of Labrador on geological surveys and I have become very familiar with the communities of Labrador. I can tell you one thing now, that the honourable member for Labrador South and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the honourable the member for Labrador North, are absolutely correct when they state that this Redistribution Bill will do more to cause the separatist movement in Labrador than anything that has been done since Confederation. All he has to do is listen to the people of Labrador, speak with them, talk with them.

Sir, today we heard a Mr. Michelin - Would he be from Northwest River that Mr. Michelin?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: From Northwest River state on the radio, Sir, that Labrador is being cheated of their democratic representation under this Redistribution Bill. "Labrador is being cheated of democratic representation." That is the particular quote that Mr. Michelin used and that the people of Labrador should take whatever action necessary, Sir, whatever action necessary to rectify this problem.

The honourable Minister of Social Services and other honourable

members get up and say it is hogwash when we talk about aiding and abetting the separatist movement in Labrador and that we are condoning it. Bull, Sir, we are not condoning it any such thing, we are trying to advise this government, that if they carry on with this insane carving up of Labrador, that there is going to be trouble in Labrador and I am convinced that my colleague, the honourable the member for Labrador South, will have much more to say about it and with a greater degree of knowledge that I do myself with respect to Labrador.

Sir, we have heard from the member for Labrador North, Labrador South, the two experts on Labrador in this honourable House. There is one other expert, Sir, there is one -

MR. MARSHALL: Never mind with personalities.

MR. F. ROWE: Get back on your lily pad.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Clean over there.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the honourable the House Leader that this House is composed of personalities, and political personalities and presumably what they say should mean something.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Precisely. Sir, there are three experts in this honourable House on Labrador. We have heard from two. Sir, the government has not accepted any suggestions whatsoever from these two experts and sadly enough, Sir, sadly enough the third expert, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the member for Labrador West, has not uttered a squeak. As my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, mentioned this morning, he has sold Labrador out. He has been negligent in his duty with respect to representing Labrador in not speaking on this bill. It is as simple as that. Sir, the honourable Minister of Finance, gets up this morning in this honourable House and suggests that Labrador has three and one half seats. Sir, that is not true.

MR. SIMMONS: How would he know?

MR. F. ROWE: It is simply not true. Labrador has three and two-ninths seats at the most.

AN HON. MEMBER: One-ninth.

MR. F. ROWE: One-ninth, okay. My colleague from Labrador South says three and one-ninth seats. How is that three and one half, when in fact, Sir, representation made to the commission suggested that there should be four. Labrador mess - Labrador West, which is a mess as a result of redistribution, the Coast of Labrador, a small population, geographically impossible to represent.

But, Sir, they will not listen to reason. They will not listen to advice from those who know their districts best. They will not even listen to the advice, the suggestions, from their own colleague, the member for St. Barbe North when he attempted to move an amendment and not one single member over on the other side, Sir, would even second the honourable member's amendment.

MR. MORGAN: Not St. Barbe North, you are confused.

MR. F. ROWE: St. John's North. St. John's North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Where? Oh I never visit my district. Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Social Services obviously has a spy trailing me around in my district because he accounted in some detail the other day for the number of visits and the number of hours and where I was, at what time in my district.

MR. SIMMONS: Incorrectly.

MR. F. ROWE: Incorrectly by the way, a most peculiar revelation, when honourable ministers over on the other side can give you a log in this House of one's goings on in one's own district, a unique situation. What have we got in this province, a spy network?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! I do not think I need remind the honourable member that he is speaking to a particular bill and he is not dealing with it. He is branching further and further afield and getting into provocative statements that could only lead to disorder so I suggest the honourable member bring his remarks back to those which are relevant.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was straying away from the substance of the bill because of the constant harassment from the other side, so I apologize to the Chair and I respect your ruling. I would ask that honourable members on the other side keep silent while another honourable member is on his feet trying to speak.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Finance also suggested this morning that we made personal attacks - or the honourable Leader of the Opposition made personal attacks on the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Minister of Justice. Sir, what complete hogwash! That has about as much credibility, Sir, as the minister saying that Labrador has three and a-half seats. It has about as much credibility, Sir, as a telegram he sent to Sandy Cove the latter part of the summer saying to go ahead and install their water system only to find later on it was found that, that telegram was meant for Sandy Cove, Bonavista South.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Sir, I am off track I will get back on.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable member is reminded for the second time, in a very short period of time, that he is not being relevant. There are appropriate rules to deal with a member who persists in being irrelevant.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I was attempting to establish the credibility of the statements made by the Minister of Finance in relation to this particular bill (Bill No. 126). Sir, I said that the statement made by the Minister of Finance suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition was making personal attacks on these two honourable gentlemen on the other side is completely untrue. Sir,

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. I think Your Honour has already ruled that the honourable member on this tack is being irrelevant. I draw Your Honour's attention to Article (34) (2) of Beauchesne page 107 - "Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or the Committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech,

Now the honourable member while he has been on his feet has been totally and absolutely irrelevant. I would suggest to Your Honour that he has transcended the bounds really of patience of normal, reasonable, rational human beings and perhaps he might be directed to discontinue his speech.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I respected the Speaker's ruling. The Speaker said that I was irrelevant on the grounds that I was talking about a telegram sent to Sandy Cove, so I ceased to deal with Sandy Cove. Now I am back rebutting the arguments put forth by the Hon. Minister of Finance this morning in the House of Assembly with respect to this bill. I submit, that if I am not allowed to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: What is the House of Assembly all about? It is a forum for debate. So I am debating the statements made by the Hon. Minister of Finance with respect to this bill and presumably I would assume that the honourable the Speaker was simply asking me to get off this subject of the telegram dealing with the water supply to Sandy Cove and that I did.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I am inclined to agree with the Member for St. Barbe North, when it was brought to his attention that he was being irrelevant he then proceeded to make his point using arguments which were relevant, he is not using irrelevant material to make a relevant point. I suggest the honourable member may continue.

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

Sir, I would like to clue up the point I was trying to make by suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about the lack of political principle of the Minister of Justice and the Premier and the Member for Labrador West. Sir, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition provided documentation by way of quote from Hansard to prove his point. So the Leader of the Opposition was not engaging at all in personal attack or political assassination of honourable members opposite.



Now, Sir, I am hoping that before this debate ends that the Minister of Justice will see fit to stand up and give his point of view on this bill. The same thing, Sir, goes for the honourable Member for St. John's South. Sir, the honourable Member for St. John's South was on "Open Line", he makes press releases regarding this Redistribution Bill but the Honourable Member for St. John's South has yet to utter one single word in this House of Assembly regarding redistribution. Sir, where are his principles? His commitments? The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, who had not spoken previously on the bill nor the resolution, I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister of Fisheries who has seen fit to resign from previous administrations, on principle, would get up and give us some words of wisdom with respect to where he stands on this particular issue. The same thing, Sir, goes for the Minister of Education, and the Member for Labrador West.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Social Services unfortunately showed his complete ignorance of rural Newfoundland when he was speaking earlier. He said "The government represents people." It is people they represent not rocks, not woods, not rivers, not coastlines, its people. He calls some honourable members on this side, Sir, "Tourist Members." Tourist Ministers, because they were not living in their districts. He accused honourable members for just answering letters and making phone calls.

Now, Sir, if you take a district like the new Straits of Belle Isle District. Is the Hon. Minister of Social Services suggesting that if a member resided in the Straits of Belle Isle District that he could do a better job? Is he seriously suggesting that? Where would he reside, Sir? Barr'd Harbour? New Ferolle? Ferolle? Reefs Harbour? Shoal Cove? Savage Cove? Flowers Cove? Bird Cove? Blue Cove? Eddies Cove?

AN HON. MEMBER: West.

MR. F. ROWE: West? And East? Green Island Cove? Green Island Brook? L'Anse-au-Clair? Fogo? Red Bay? Roddickton? St. Anthony? Croque?  
(Is there a Croque in there?)

AN HON. MEMBER: Croque.



MR. F. ROWE: Croque? Quirpon? Where is the honourable member going to reside in that district? What is that honourable member going to do in Barr'd Harbour with no electricity? How is he going to make representation without any phones in some of these communities? How is the honourable member for a district going to make representation when the electricity is out, which it is quite occasionally in these areas? Would not the -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You know, we are debating second reading of a bill which has been debated in a resolution, we are to a large extent regurgitating what has occurred but there is a limit to which any House of Assembly will endure and that limit is set forth in Section 148 (3) of Beauséne, page 127. I draw Your Honour's attention to it, in which it says "Reference to debates of the current session is discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant as it tends to reopen matters already decided. Direct reference is permitted however when a member wishes to complain of something said etc." But the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that such a rule is set down there for obvious reasons, because obviously a legislature could go on ad infinitum and forever and a day with dilatory type of motions and motions brought up from time to time and new matters brought up regurgitating ad nauseam and it has been ad nauseam, in this case, to the utter and complete boredom of the people in the House of Assembly and to the utter and complete disservice of the population which it serves of similar situations that occurred before.

So the honourable Member for St. Barbe North is constantly and, in this case, referring to previous debates and right now he is right on the position of referring to statements made by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. Now the Hon. Minister for Social Services spoke in the debate with respect to the -

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not through yet - spoke with respect -

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Spoke with respect to the debate on the resolution,  
and this

is a reference to a debate of the current session which has already occurred and as such is out of order. In other words he is rebutting and regurgitating something that has come to the attention of this House before.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that so-called point of order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there are some good things in the newspaper. It says "M.P. says few under sixty plan to retire". He is not talking of the crowd opposite, he is talking about Ottawa. I suggest some opposite are planning to retire and that is a good thing for them and the country.

The motion before the House now is a bill to amend the House of Assembly Act. The matter has not been debated in the House in this session. All my colleague is doing is referring to some points which in his opinion justify his decision not to support the bill. The harassment by the honourable gentleman from St. John's East, I submit, should not be allowed to exist. I invite Your Honour to prevent the honourable gentleman from deliberately trying to monopolize the time of the House with these irrelevant and quite nonsensical points of order. My colleague is referring to some comments made by another honourable gentleman. I submit if the honourable gentleman who first made them was in order to make them, my colleague is in order to rebut them.

MR. MARSHALL: If I may, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is rather unusual.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Both honourable gentlemen might resume their places. I recognize the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the point that I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): On a point of order.

MR. ROWE: Oh! On a point of order. What was my point of order? The point that I was also trying to make with - On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was demonstrating, trying to demonstrate that that District of the Straits of Bell Isle would be impossible to represent whether you lived in it or lived without it or lived outside of it. That is the point that I was trying

to make. I was making casual references to some of the remarks made by the Minister of Social Services speaking on the resolution but the point that I was leading up to is that that district plus the other three in that area are absolutely impossible to represent whether you reside in them or you reside outside of them. That was the point.

MR. MARSHALL: (First part inaudible) I mean this is rather unusual in that this bill was brought before the House by virtue of a resolution. So consequently the matters were very thoroughly discussed and consequently when it comes up for second reading the limit and the scope which a member may address himself to is somewhat narrow. The fact of the matter is and I think it is unassailable and irrefutable, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member was referring to speeches made by the honourable the Minister of Social Services at the time, and the only time the honourable Minister for Social Services spoke was in the matter of the resolution. That was a debate which has come, which has gone and which has been voted upon. So the member is entirely out of order when he refers to the Minister of Social Services. We are now in a new debate, granted it is kindred and what have you but the fact of the matter is we are on a new debate and this is the very reason for this particular rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I am prepared to make a ruling at this time. I think a ruling should be made. Honourable members sometime cast a very difficult duty on the Chair. The Chair is asked sometimes to be clairvoyant, to know what honourable members are going to say. I must say that some of the points being made are repetitious. However in dealing with section 148, subsection (3) read by the House Leader, the later part of that section is relevant where it says, "Direct reference is permitted however when a member wishes to complain of something said or to clear up a misrepresentation or make a personal explanation." Really this appears to be what the honourable Member for St. Barbe North is doing. I suggest he may continue.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I was able to make my point on the point of order, actually. Mr. Speaker, may I request how much time I have remaining please, in view of the points of order raised?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Ten minutes.

MR. ROWE: Ten minutes. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anybody who looks at

this map that the government have gone against their stated principles completely in the space of one year in stating that they would end gerrymandering forever. Sir, they have made thirty-one changes, some of them major, some of them minor, but, Sir, it is significant to point out that the major changes have been made in areas where the size of the seats has been increased rather dramatically in rural parts of Newfoundland. I am sure my friend, the Member for St. Barbe South, whose seat has been increased in size or will be increased in size to over 10,000 people, taking in half of St. Barbe North, St. Barbe will be St. Barbe South plus half of St. Barbe North.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: The point is there, Sir, is that this happens to be a growth area, a growth area, the Gros Morne National Park, the Daniels Harbour Zinc Mine Project. Sir, this would indicate that St. Barbe, the new district of St. Barbe, is certainly a growth area and if anything should have a low population relevant to other populations. Instead that has over 10,000 whereas the average population on the twenty Avalon Peninsula seats are just over the 9,000 population mark. Yet, districts such as St. Barbe, the new St. Barbe increased in size, remote, distant from the capital has been increased in size. I am surprised my friend did not stand up and object to that because, Sir, the people in St. Barbe South are upset over the fact that their district is being increased in size. They are incredibly upset, Sir, incredibly upset. We do not need sixty seats to rectify the problem. We need sense, common sense which does not seem to be so common after all with respect to members opposite. We need common sense.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Abusive and insulting language-to characterize an honourable member as not having common sense as far as the Chair is concerned is abusive and insulting. I suggest the honourable member may make his point but not in that manner.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying, if it is insulting to say a person does not have common sense, I will say they have not used common sense in designing these districts.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no evidence of common sense.

MR. ROWE: There is no evidence of common sense as indicated by the honourable

Minister of Tourism now who suggests the way to rectify the problem is to create sixty seats. Foolishness! It can be rectified very simply, by following -

MR. T. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I hate to have words put in my mouth. I did not utter any such words that we need sixty seats. I simply asked the member if he wanted a solution to the problem along the lines he was suggesting, we would have sixty seats. Now he is objecting to fifty-one. Surely he does not want sixty. That was my point.

MR. ROWE: (First part inaudible) do not want sixty but it is easy to rectify the problem on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: We want forty-one.

MR. ROWE: Follow the very recommendations that the government made in setting up the commission in the first place. There was a twenty-five per cent tolerance factor built in. Presumably these districts, these areas close to the capital with municipal government, with good organization, with good facilities, with few communities, or part of a town or city, presumably they would be towards 12,500 people in population if the formula was adhered to and presumably remote districts with very few social services, isolated, distant from the capital, rural, composed of unincorporated communities, presumably, Sir, these seats would be close to 7,500 in population. The second commission report came very close, Mr. Speaker, very close to achieving that end, not to the degree that we would have wished but the government has gerrymandered even that out of existence completely.

Sir, our stand and we will maintain our stand, is that we accept the report of an impartial commission. That is the only thing we find acceptable, the report of an impartial commission. That was the principle enunciated in this House sometime ago and that we stand by and we stick by and we will continue to fight supposing we have to - Sir,

I am probably naive, a political rookie of two and a-half years, probably I am naive when I expect some honourable member to get up, awaken and realize the seriousness of what they are creating in this redistribution bill.

Sir, in view of the fact that this thing is being pushed through the way it is, I would like to move an amendment seconded by the Member for Twillingate, Sir, if that is in order, to amend the motion so that it reads that this bill will be read a second time this day six months hence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: The hoist. It is time for somebody to sober up, Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this amendment. Six months of sobriety in the hope -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Oh they might sneak the one little election through. We would welcome an election, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: (First part inaudible) may or may not be in order here.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is in order in every other House.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that this type of amendment is the type of amendment usually introduced in most Houses on third reading rather than on second reading. I really doubt at this particular stage of the game whether or not it is in order.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am reluctant to recite authority because of what has gone before. All I will say is that the authorities are quite clear that it is in order to move a six month hoist at second reading or at third reading. Although the House Leader has given his directions I have no doubt the Speaker will find according to the precedents.

MR. SPEAKER: (Stagg): Is there any further argument on the point?

I shall take a short adjournment to consider.

Order please! First of all this ruling may take some time. I will begin by saying that the amendment is in order. However, there are some factors that are complicated as the result of it being in order and I will first refer to Erskine May, eighteenth edition, page (459):



It deals with the delaying amendment and I quote from it: 'The second method is by an amendment to postpone the second reading until after the end of the session, the formula for this amendment being to leave out the word 'now' and add at the end of the motion 'this day six (three months)'. Notice is generally given on the Order Paper of this amendment and the mover of it usually though not invariably speaks after the mover of the motion for the second reading.

An amendment of this kind has, however, being moved without previous notice. As soon as the amendment has been moved it is proposed from the woolsack (which is this seat behind me) and the question before the House then as amended be agreed to. A decision on this question is usually decisive on the fate of the bill. If the amendment be withdrawn or if it be defeated on a division the original question is put. (This is very important and I shall repeat this) If the amendment be withdrawn or if it be defeated on a division the original question is put that this bill be now read a second time and agreed to without further discussion. If, however, the amendment be agreed to the bill is rejected without the original question as amended being put.

MR. ROBERTS: (First part inaudible) we can all speak again and we shall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes! Oh yes!

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! Also gentlemen,

MR. ROBERTS: I can speak on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Also gentlemen, the debate on the amendment is proscribed by Beauchesne which sets out in rule (32), page (106), of the fourth edition, sets out which motions are debatable. This is not one which falls within that category and accordingly it is not debatable.

MR. ROBERTS: That is an absolutely shameful ruling

MR. NEARY: Is the honourable speaker being told what to do?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! May I have a copy of the amendment please? I have misplaced mine.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: We are not going to continue this. We have continued this for two or three years and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has said absolutely disgraceful - the speaker has been told what to do. Your Honour this is disgraceful to the office of the Speaker of this House which office you now hold. It was absolutely, not that there was any need for any honourable member of this House to deny but I was not near the Speaker nor would I intend to get near the Speaker nor would it make any difference whether I got near Your Honour or not. I invite the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that scandalous, scurrilous remark which is doing so much to derogate the operation of this House of Assembly and he as Leader of the Opposition as no other leader of a political party is contributing to the derogation of the House of Assembly of this Province.

I would suggest he withdraw this remark immediately without any reservations whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! I was in the process of putting away my paraphernalia here when the honourable the Leader of the Opposition made his statement. I will again adjourn, listen to the tapes and see what he did have to say.

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

I needed the confirmation of the tapes to make sure that I was not hearing things. Having listened to the tapes, I find that the remarks made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition to the effect that it was a "shameful ruling" and the remarks made by the honourable Member for Bell Island suggesting that - or his actual words were: "Have the government told the Speaker what to do?"

Both of these call for a complete and an unqualified apology from the two honourable members. I call upon first the Leader of the Opposition and then the Member for Bell Island.

MR. ROBERTS: With infinite regret I must say that throughout this debate, I found the Speaker to be partial. I cannot withdraw those words. I feel that it was a shameful ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, fling me out.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I have now to call upon the honourable member by name. Mr. Roberts, you are called upon to apologize to the House. If you have any apology to offer, now is your time to do so.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in apologizing but I must repeat that I have found the Chair to be partial in this debate. I concur that it is not an apology. I have no hesitation, as I said, Sir, in apologizing if I have offended any member of the House. I must repeat that I have found the Chair's rulings in this debate to be partial.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I ask the honourable member to leave the Chamber for the House to consider what penalty, if any, will be evoked.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw my remarks and I apologize to Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the well ingrafted rules of the British Parliamentary Society, it is not called upon for the Speaker of the House to enter into partial matters. It is up to the Leader of the House to propose to this honourable House the type

of punishment which is to be meted out to an individual.

I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, would very much desire to be suspended from this honourable House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: The point of the matter is that under Section 134 of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the honourable Leader of the Opposition be issued a reprimand. If the honourable Leader of the Opposition does not wish to come into this House for the purpose of hearing the reprimand, then I would suggest that, Your Honour may, in Your Honour's infinite and absolute discretion of wisdom, determine that a reprimand can be issued to the House itself so that it can be communicated in due course to the Leader of the Opposition.

We have no intention of perpetrating the type of thing that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to institute in this House. We are not going to fall into the trap. I would suggest, with Your Honour's concurrence, that the honourable Leader of the Opposition be issued a suitable reprimand by this House. If this is insufficient, then we will have to operate on the other procedures.

MR. NEARY: Is this a debatable motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not a debatable motion.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The motion is that the honourable Leader of the Opposition be issued a letter of reprimand. Those in favour "aye." Those opposed "nay." In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

We now move to second reading of the bill.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the said Bill be now read -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I am sorry. I had to propose the amendment. Yes, I was jumping a little ahead of myself there. It has been a rather interesting half hour.

I will now propose the amendment to the House which will be voted upon without debate. The amendment reads as follows. It is an amendment to amend the motion so that it reads: "That this bill we now read a second time this day six months hence."

Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

The motion is accordingly defeated.

It is moved and seconded that this bill - I have my precedents wrong.

Is it the pleasure of the House that this bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay." In my opinion the "ayes" have it. Carried.

DIVISION:

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

I detect a hum of activity both from the floor of the Chamber and from the galleries, especially from the galleries.

Call in the members.

Those in favour please rise:

The honourable the Premier, the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, the honourable Minister of Industrial Development, the honourable Minister of Health, the honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications, the honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the honourable Minister of Education, the honourable Minister of Justice, the honourable Mr. Marshall, the honourable Minister of Fisheries, the honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the honourable Minister of Finance, the honourable Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Bunphy, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Brett, Mr. Senior, Mr. Carter, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Young, Mr. Evans, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Howard.

Those opposed, please rise:

Mr. Gillett, Mr. Neary, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Rowe,  
Mr. Simmons, Mr. Martin.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I declare the motion carried.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Medical Association And Governing The Practise Of Medicine In The Province."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate on this particular bill, I merely want to reiterate one or two points already raised by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir. One has to do, Mr. Speaker, with compulsory membership in the Newfoundland Medical Association.

The minister, Sir, is trying to leave the House with the impression that there was an overwhelming majority of the 506 doctors in the province who voted for compulsory membership in the Newfoundland Medical Association. He is using this, Sir, as his argument to legislate compulsory membership in the association. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that this is an evasion of the Canadian Constitution of Human Rights. It is also, Sir, contrary in my opinion to the Newfoundland Human Rights code. I hope that the minister will realize this now that he has had an opportunity to sleep on the points that were raised by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition and amend that particular part of the bill.

In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, what happened was that the Newfoundland Medical Association sent out letters, so the minister tells us. We have not seen a copy of the letter so we do not know what was in the letter, Sir. I do not know if the minister has seen the letter or whether the doctors who received these letters realize the consequences of what they were voting for or against or in the case of those who did not vote at all, just what was involved. I would

like to see a copy of the letter, Sir. Out of the 506 letters that were sent out, 358 were returned. Out of the 358 -

DR. ROWE: No, 385.

MR. NEARY: 385? The minister told us yesterday, Sir, that there were 358 because I made a note of it here.

We are told 385 by



the minister were returned and 280 voted in favour. Sir, that is just barely a majority of the doctors in the province, 506. It is barely a majority. I would suggest, Sir, that even if the doctors indicated by secret ballot or otherwise that they wanted membership in the Newfoundland Medical Association, compulsory, this House should be very, very reluctant to create what I consider to be a very dangerous precedent. The next thing you will have the lawyers in looking for the same thing, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, they do not. Now you have to pay a fee to the Bar Society. It is compulsory to pay a fee. It is not compulsory by statute.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You cannot practice without it, Sir, but it is not the law of the land. It is merely the law of the Bar Society. What we are doing here, Sir, is that we are creating a precedent, a very dangerous precedent, in my opinion. You have all kinds of organizations and societies coming to the government looking for compulsory membership by law, by statute. This is the difference in what the Medical Association are asking for and what the legal profession have.

I hope, Sir, that the minister will reconsider this particular clause and bring in an amendment when he closes the debate.

Now, Sir, the other day when the minister was winding up his introduction of this particular bill, which apparently gives him a great deal of pleasure, as Minister of Health, to introduce in this honourable House - maybe rightly so, I do not know, I do not know what sense and satisfaction the minister would get out of introducing this particular bill any more than any other bill except for the fact that it may endear him to his colleagues in the profession, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The minister, Sir, -

DR. G. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am not criticizing the minister for bringing the bill into the House. The minister, Sir, could not resist the temptation at the tail end of his remarks the other day to make a little bit of politics to try to get a little mileage, to try to get a little mileage for himself, by telling us, Sir, that we now have 506 doctors in Newfoundland more than we have ever had in our whole history. I say glory hallelujah ! Hear! Hear! to that.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we have more doctors in Newfoundland at the present time is because the atmosphere for practicing medicine in Newfoundland, is much better than it was five or ten years ago. We have a better form of communications. We have better transportation. We have better wages, salaries and fees for doctors, Sir. Thanks, Mr. Speaker, to MCP, a great Liberal concept.

AN HON. MEMBER What about Ottawa?

MR. NEARY: Ah, Ottawa was the father of it, Sir. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I will go as far as to say this that the first medical care health programme in Newfoundland was down in my colleague's District of Twillingate. That was the original, Sir. The original MCP Plan in Newfoundland was started down in my colleague's district. The second place, Sir, was Bell Island when the mines closed. It was the Smallwood Administration at the time.

We pioneered in Newfoundland, both my colleague the Member for Twillingate and myself, MCP in the whole of Canada. It was a great Liberal concept, Sir. That is one of the main reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we can attract good medical men, doctors to this province at the present time. It is because of the developments

that have taken place in the field of transportation and communications and salaries and fees that are being paid to doctors. A doctor like anybody else, Mr. Speaker, will think about his family. We have better education facilities throughout the province thanks to the Liberal Government, the previous Liberal Government and not to mention, Sir, the medical school. The minister made no mention of that at all. The minister did concede the fact that we have ten practicing doctors as a result of the medical school. That is thanks to the Liberal Administration again. I understand from the minister that there are twenty-three now. Are there twenty-three? I believe the minister has his figures reversed there.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the young men and young women who have graduated from the medical college here in this province and who are doing their internship now, are better than the best.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three years teaching under the P.C.'s.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they are not three years teaching under the P. C.'s. They are better than the best, Sir

MR. DOODY: If Earle Haig had thought of that phrase, he would have used it after Beaumont Hamel.

MR. NEARY: The minister is beginning to sound a little shell shocked. He will be after I am finished with him in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, that is another reason why we are able to attract good medical men to this province. That is why, Mr. Speaker. Go down, Sir, to the Health Science Complex that we have heard so much about in the last week or so (It has nothing to do with the medical profession.) and you will find, Sir, some of the finest specialists, some of the finest medical men in the world. They have already occupied the Health Science Complex, Sir, which is another great Liberal concept. It was started by the previous Liberal Administration.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it may be a little expensive, since the Tories took over. Before the agreement was renegotiated with Scrivener, Sir, it was not all that expensive. It was \$40 million I think. Since then all the agreements have been renegotiated we are told. Now they have cost-plus something that the former administration was always blamed for.

MR. DOODY: The days of wine and roses.

MR. NEARY: They said that Mr. Smallwood was the father of cost-plus. Now we hear that over here at the Health Science Complex we have cost-plus.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: But already, Mr. Speaker, doctors, specialists from all over the world, some of the finest, are occupying the Health Science Complex which is another -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The medical school is well-organized, Sir. The foundation was built for the honourable minister by his predecessor and by the former Liberal Administration. The minister can try to get all the mileage he wants, Sir, for the wonderful health programme that we have in this province. I will give him all the credit in the world for his little, old ambulance service, Sir. He can go out and pull on his sirens all he likes but that is the only thing that I can give him credit for so far.

MR. THOMS: That programme was started by -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, he did not. As a matter of fact he just got it.

DR. G. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister like a list of all the hospitals that the Liberal Administration built in Newfoundland? Would the minister like that? Would the honourable minister, Mr. Speaker, like a list of all the hospitals we started?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: that the Tory Administration are finishing.

MR. SPEAKER: I remind honourable members to my left that the member when speaking does have the right to be heard in silence. I would also remind the honourable member for Bell Island that he is not being relevant to the principle of this bill.

MR. NEARY: I am only replying to statements that were made

by the honourable minister when he introduced the bill on Friday, was it? Monday, I think it was.

Well, Sir, these are the reasons why we are able to attract now good medical men, good doctors to Newfoundland. I would say, as the years go by, Sir, the situation will improve tremendously. It has to. There was only one way we could go, Mr. Speaker, and we laid the foundation, Sir. I am glad to see that the minister is continuing to follow our good example.

Now, Sir, the other matter, I think, had to do with mental illness and I am not looking at the junior member for Harbour Main, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition did make some very valid points on this particular clause of the bill, Sir. I hope that the minister when he is winding up the debate on second reading will have some amendments on this clause. The minister has had a chance now to sleep on this particular matter. I always get the feeling, Mr. Speaker - I do not know whether I am right or wrong but perhaps the minister can straighten me out. It seems to me that it would be a tremendous job to enforce section twenty-six of this particular bill because, Sir, doctors like lawyers - the minister can correct me if I am wrong - have a way of covering up for one another.

Oh, the minister shakes his head but, Sir, they do. Some of my best friends in this province, some of my best friends when I was growing up were doctors. I know how they can cover up for one another. They cover up other mistakes too. Sometimes they bury their mistakes, but that is not what I am referring to. I am talking about -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We are a gentile profession of brotherly love.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. Well, now I am not criticizing the medical profession, Sir. I have the highest respect and the highest regard for the medical profession. You always get that handful - there are always two or three or four who will make it bad for any organization, for any profession. There are always three or four. I agree with the minister, they have to be weeded out. The proper thing to do, weed them out.

MR. DOODY: The same thing applies to politics.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, the same thing applies to politics. If you have a bunch of farmers in the House, kick them out. Put in a bunch of common sense Newfoundlanders.

AN HON. MEMBER: A bunch of what?

MR. NEARY: A bunch of farmers.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is wrong with my honourable friend?

MR. NEARY: Well, the honourable gentleman knows -

MR. THOMS: Political farmers he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about political farmers, Sir.  
Political farmers.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that the minister will reconsider this particular section of the bill. I think the association is given enough power under section (25) of the bill, Sir. I do not think it is necessary to go beyond section (25). I think you could whip out section (26) altogether. The medical association would have all the power they need, Sir, for disciplinary action of its members.

I am, Mr. Speaker, very concerned about this compulsory membership. The minister has not convinced me in his arguments, in his introduction of this bill. The minister has not convinced me that we should make it the law of this province, make it the law of the land. Perhaps, Sir, when he closes the debate, he may be able to persuade me that this is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment, I would recommend this to the minister. I am not quite sure if these 506 doctors, when they were canvassed, when they were written and sent out ballots, if they realized what they were voting on. Did the balloting take place under the supervision of an official of the Department of Health? Did the doctors do it on their own? The Newfoundland Medical Association sent out the ballots. Does the minister have a copy of the ballot and the accompanying letter? Does the minister have it in his office?



DR. G. ROWE: I do not think so but I can get one.

MR. NEARY : I would like to see one.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the minister's introduction of this bill, that what we are doing here is undemocratic and unconstitutional. It is against our own Human Right's Code.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon. That is what the leader said.

The leader asked the minister to reconsider this particular section of the bill. I am joining with my colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which leader?

MR. NEARY: The leader who was just - headlines in the paper tomorrow, "Booted Out Of The House." He was asked to leave the House by the Speaker. He was named and asked to leave the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. Sir, I would suggest to the minister that he reconsider this matter of compulsory membership. If necessary, have the Newfoundland Medical Association canvass the doctors again, get their reactions again. Now that the bill is being brought before the House the minister can always amend this section in the next sitting of the House. Find out for sure. I am not convinced and I do not think the minister himself is convinced that 280 out of 506, 280 voting aye out of 506, Sir, is sufficient to make it compulsory to join the Newfoundland Medical Association by the law of this province, by statute. I do hope, Sir, that when the minister closes the debate in a minute or two that he will amend this particular section of the bill and the other section of the bill that has to do with mental illness that was mentioned the other day by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the time of the House for any very long period. We just had a very long debate in this House. I want to congratulate the minister first on all his

hard work in achieving the bill that is now before the House because I believe it took at least two or three years of hard work and negotiation with the Newfoundland Medical Association and the medical authorities in this province to bring forth this new bill.

Now in every situation, Mr. Speaker, where you are regulating a professional body or you have to decide what the rights are of the licencing and issues of that kind, you are treading on very tricky ground. I think that the minister in this legislation, which is agreed to and approved by the Newfoundland Medical Association and the members thereof, who are going to be subject to it, are responsible for seeing that the public interest of the province is protected, the public is protected. In this bill there are adequate safeguards to cover the stipulation that every medical practitioner must be a member of the Newfoundland Medical Association. It only stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, that they should be. The Newfoundland Medical Association, which has been a voluntary organization down through the years, membership has been voluntary, has represented the profession in all negotiations with government, provincial and federal and in all other aspects of the profession since its inception I do not know how many years ago. It is only fair that every medical practitioner practicing in Newfoundland should be a member and support that association. If they do not approve of something the association is doing or if they wanted to do other things that it is not presently doing, they have their chance. There are various annual meetings and so on to change the policies or the practices of the association.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: It is most peculiar, Mr. Speaker, that the last speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island, who is now apparently acting as Leader of the Opposition because the Leader of the Opposition had fled from the House in a fit of pique, to show his piquedness at his disappointment that he has not been expelled from the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I feel that the Honourable Minister of Fisheries was straying somewhat from the principle of the bill.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House three weeks now listening to honourable members opposite not only straying from the principle of the bill but also straying from their senses. Now that I at last have a chance to talk on something worthwhile, I am going to be interrupted and harassed and receive obloquy, taunts and derisory remarks.

when I attempt to speak on this little Medical Act that is now before us. In fact I should say that I have the right to be heard in silence. How often, oh, my God, Mr. Speaker, how often in the last three weeks have we heard those little plaintive voices from across the aisle saying that they have the right to be heard in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: All right.

Now as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member who just spoke, I have a right to be heard in silence. The honourable member who just spoke, the honourable Member for Bell Island, who is now acting as the Leader of the Opposition because the actual Leader has fled from the House in a fit of pique, got up here and spoke for about ten or fifteen minutes praising what he said were the accomplishments of the last administration in the way of giving health care in the province. Now that is entirely inconsistent, Mr. Speaker. Day after day, week after week, debate after debate in this House we have heard the honourable gentleman opposite tell us that we are not to refer to the past, that we are not to point out, that we are not to point out any peccadillos or any little mistakes or any little gerrymanderings or gerrymanderings that were done by the last administration. We are not to mention the liquor leases. We are not to mention, you know, abuse after abuse. We are not to mention what went on in the past from 1949 to 1972 should be forgotten. We are not to mention them, we should not even repeat them because this is a new group opposite. They have repented of all their misgivings of the past. They have left that behind them. They are on a new trend now. They do not want fifty-one seats, they want forty-two. They do not want Joey, they want Ed. You know, they are on a new whole charge into the future and we are not to mention the past twenty-three years. Well that rule has been broken here this afternoon by the honourable gentleman for Bell Island who tried to dredge up a few things the last administration had done in the health

field.

I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister of Health is superior to every other Minister of Health in our history with one exception, and that one exception -

AN HON. MEMBER: Only because he says so.

MR. CROSBIE: I am just giving my opinion.

MR. EVANS: He getting a lot of agreement over here too, you know.

MR. CROSBIE: He ranks with the greatest of our Health Ministers of the last fifty years. There are two exceptions, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the present Hon. Minister of Justice and I am too modest to say who the other one is, I will leave that to your imagination. He ranks, and actually I am prepared to concede that he is even greater. Yes, I will make that concession. He is the greatest Minister of Health in the last fifty years and the Minister of Justice and I of course are close behind him. He is certainly the one with the greatest heart. He has a brain also. He he has one difference than the Member for Bell Island, he not only has a great heart, he has a great brain. The honourable gentleman for Bell Island only has a great heart.

AN HON. MEMBER: The fact that he has a brain at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Well three per cent, I think was the - three per cent was the estimation of his brain.

MR. NEARY: The minister speaking had a brain transplant out of vegetation.

MR. CROSBIE: I really have not got the heart to engage in banter with the honourable gentleman for Bell Island because he is such a sad spectacle this afternoon. Oh, they will be scurrying through their Standing Orders now and they will be scuttling through May and they will burrowing through Beauchesne and when they next bring in the six month hoist they will know what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. Thank God for the Robert's rules of order.

Now to get back to the Minister of Health. This is one of the culminations of the present Minister of Health's hard work of the last two and a-half years. Mr. Speaker, as the Father of Medicare in Newfoundland, I now address the House. I am, yes, and in fact the last

Premier, the last Premier before our present Premier who was the only Premier we have had since 1949, there has only been two, there is this one, and that and the other one, and I do not mean this one so I must mean the other one. The one that was there from 1949 to 1972, actually said that I was the Father of Medicare in Newfoundland and I am proud today to say that, that is one thing that I agree with him on. I am the Father of Medicare in Newfoundland. I was the Minister of Health who devised the Medicare Plan with the officials in the Department of Health that was introduced into Newfoundland so successfully in 1968. It was carried on in a brilliant fashion by the Minister of Justice who was then Minister of Justice and who is now Minister of Justice and who is liable to be Minister of Justice in the year 2000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I am sure that if governments change he can change with them, only if it squares with his principles. I did not mean that, I meant that to sound like it sounded Alex, and we will probably be with you.

Now where was I? Oh, yes

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right. And that was, Mr. Speaker, without boasting, we can say that the introduction of Medicare into Newfoundland and the way in which it was done in Newfoundland and carried out in Newfoundland was the most successful in the Dominion. Why I am mentioning that is because the present Hon. Minister of Health was the President of N.M.A. when I started my term as Minister of Health and I had to deal with who was then Doctor Gus Rowe and was President of the N.M.A. when the Medicare negotiations started and the late Doctor Pat Whelan was the President of the N.M.A. when the negotiations concluded and legislation was introduced into this House that was agreed to by the N.M.A. and it was a great issue in those days and it has turned out to be satisfactory in its implementation since.

So what I want to mention is that our present Minister of Health has had a great experience in the medical society of this

province including the fact that he was a past President of the N.M.A.

Now what else do I want to speak on in this connection?

Oh, yes, there was another remark, Mr. Speaker, and aside by the Member for Bell Island, the Acting Leader of the Opposition, because the actual Leader of the Opposition has now left this House in a fit of dudgeon and high dudgeon. He is now out speaking to the media trying to pretend that he has been expelled from the House when all that happened was that he got a little flick on the wrist. He was not taken by the slack and thrown out as we were in 1971, six or seven of us over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Look before we could leave the Chamber in those days, Mr. Speaker, the motions were passed, five of us were expelled before we could insult the Speaker. They did it by auto-suggestion.

MR. NEARY: He insulted the Speaker on his way out the door.

MR. CROSBIE: That was the only chance we had, the action taken was so swift. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been reprimanded. He is free to come in and debate this bill. He is free to be here until six. He is free to come back until tomorrow, and that is a work of mercy because his words and suggestions were so scandalous that they bring me beyond words. Seldom in the history of parliamentary procedure has such a low course of action been taken and of so mendacious and vexatious a fashion as we saw this afternoon.

Now to come back to the Member for Bell Island. The Member for Bell Island said, Mr. Speaker, and he mentioned Scrivener's again, having once defamed Scrivener's in the House, he now defames them again, having heard the Minister of Public Works give the reply to his question about how contracts were awarded in connection with the Health Science Centre, he again brought it up this afternoon and started talking about cost-plus contracts. Can the honourable gentleman not understand English and explanations? The Minister of Public Works explained that tenders were called a few months ago for the electrical and mechanical



work at the Health Sciences Centre, that the result of the normal tender call were tenders of such outrageously high prices that they decided not to award those contracts to the lowest bidder because the lowest bidder was ridiculously high and it would have cost the people of this province additional unnecessary hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars had the contracts been awarded as a result of that tender call.

The Minister of Public Works went on to say that they had decided now to negotiate contracts for the electrical and mechanical at cost-plus, a fixed fee. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly the most sensible and most reasonable way to proceed in a situation such as the one we have today with the construction industry already very busy in the province, with them bidding very high prices, with there being very few mechanical and electrical contractors in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I find the speech by the Hon. Minister of Fisheries most interesting but he is not being relevant to the principle of this Bill.

MR. CROSBIE: All right,

Mr. Speaker, I was just replying to a point raised by the Member for Bell Island. I just want to correct any impression which I know you, Mr. Speaker, would want corrected, that there is any -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order. Is the minister challenging the Speaker's ruling.

MR. CROSBIE: Not at all.

MR. NEARY: Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I insist that you direct the minister, Sir, to be relevant to the bill under debate.

MR. CROSBIE: He just did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I directed the honourable Minister of Fisheries to be relevant to the bill and he has not been irrelevant since that point.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, every doctor, every doctor in the Health Science Centre today can be proud of the fact that tenders are being called in connection with the Health Science Centre with the exception of the two I mentioned for the reasons that I mentioned. Whether you are a doctor, a lawyer, an Indian chief, a Speaker, a member of the House of Assembly or whatever, every taxpaying doctor in this Province is proud of the fact that we are conducting our affairs -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I thought somebody said, "Order!" - that we are conducting our affairs in such an above - I will not say any more about that, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to be reprimanded by Your Honour and tapped on the fingers and have to go out of here in a fit of dudgeon and head up to the press gallery and try to say I was expelled and try to get some publicity tonight in such a cheap and jejune fashion. So I will leave that point, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, actually I think that one of the gentleman - This is a bill to regulate the Newfoundland Medical Association. In the ranks are included psychiatrists. I would not be surprised where the honourable leader of the Opposition is gone.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I have never had to go there yet but it can happen any day. The pressures are intense. I am glad that the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North is solicitous of my health. If I ever have to see a head shrinker I will see one, be glad to see him.

MR. NEARY: A turnip shrinker.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman from Bell Island wants me to conclude, Mr. Speaker, and I must. I want to conclude by saying that I think this is a very fine job that our Minister of Health has done in introducing this legislation. I agree that the points that the honourable gentleman from Bell Island made should be watched. I do not think that changes are required in this legislation now, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister of Health will have to watch carefully to see how the sections operate that have been referred to with respect to some possible removal from the medical registrar. There seem to be lots of protections in there now for the medical practitioner. He is entitled to legal council. He must be brought before the board. He has a right to appeal to the Supreme Court and the rest of it but I have no doubt that the Minister of Health and those who succeed him will keep a careful eye on how those sections of the bill work. So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I say that I am proud as a former Minister of Health to be able to speak in support of this bill here today and to be able to have a chance to reply to the acting Leader of the Opposition who is acting for the present Leader of the Opposition who should be in this house where he is fulfilling his duty instead of trying to fool the press and the media of this Province into thinking that this House has expelled him no matter how desirable that act might be.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for the general support of the bill which was introduced. I would like to thank also the members of the opposition who have given general endorsement to certain principles in the bill but there are certain sections to which they present some exceptions. But in point of fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill has been developed over quite a long period of time. There has been considerable

discussion between members of the profession, the medical board, the medical association, officials of the Department of Health and of the Department of Justice.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday mentioned the fact that he would have thought we would have included the Rand formula rather than the compulsory membership in the presentation of the bill. I can go back and say that we entered compulsory membership after a great deal of consideration and after this particular vote about which mention has been made and we have come to an agreement with the medical association that if compulsory membership was not accepted by what we would consider to be an extremely good majority, we would revert to the Rand formula.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that if you send out, and here I would have to apologize to my friend from Bell Island, I did give you the wrong figure this afternoon, - Mr. Speaker, of the 506 ballots that were sent out and 358 of these were returned and 280 of these were in favour of compulsory membership, only 71 against, I would feel that any of us who would receive the majority on any subject of that degree would feel quite satisfied in instituting that particular procedure. Therefore on the basis of this I think overwhelming majority vote, I have agreed for the institution of this aspect of compulsory membership in the bill.

Now we are not alone in this. You have mentioned the fact that Newfoundland is doing something undemocratic. This is not so. The Province of New Brunswick has something similar. The Province of Quebec and the Provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan are now considering the application of this principle.

The member for Bell Island when he spoke talked about the fact that it was under the previous administration that the Province became so attractive, that doctors came here of their own volition. Mr. Speaker, it takes a little more than a geographical representation to attract doctors. It takes vigorous recruiting campaigns. It is a lot more difficult to sell the Province of Newfoundland to a practitioner to practice in places like Belleoram or Bonne Bay rather than Vancouver Island. When we go to United Kingdom we do not have quite the same things to offer. The doctor who settles in certain parts of

Newfoundland has much more to contend with, not alone in climate, geography, schooling, but various other of the modern activities.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the number of doctors who have been attracted to this Province over the last few years has been as a result of a specific attempt and endeavour to indicate to them that there were opportunities in this Province and one of our important things that we can offer doctors coming in is our new medical school. I think that we would have to say that the faculty of the medical school has now among it some of the finest medical men who have agreed to come to Newfoundland to develop and I think present a medical school which is going to be and has already shown itself to be a considerable place of attraction, a place of considerable members with ability who have settled themselves. One would have to say this - it was through the vision, through the hard work of the previous dean, a Newfoundlander, Dr. Rusted now succeeded by an equally able Dr. Cox as dean. The men under him, I think, and the people who make up the faculty play a large part in the future of recruiting doctors into our Province. Certainly as each year goes by now, the number of doctors we present ourselves as Newfoundlanders will be from our own medical school and we will not be looking for recruits from elsewhere other than certain specific specialties which I mentioned yesterday in the presentation.

Just a word, Mr. Speaker, about the medical manpower which is one of the points which I tried to bring out. I will just read you very briefly that in 1971, for instance, there were two doctors in Bonavista, now there are three. There were two in Bonne Bay, now there are four. There were three in Botwood, now there are four. There were two in Burgeo, now there are three. There were three in Channel, now there are five. There were three in Come By Chance, now there are four. There were eleven in Cander in 1971, there are now eighteen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have here a tabulated record of which I can indicate to you that every part of the Province has benefited from the recruitment of doctors. The public at this stage, the public demands, the public requires and the public should get excellent medical services and the first part is to provide the bodies of medically trained people who can give the public this service and this, Mr. Speaker, we are doing.

On the question of the mental health, in section (26), you do raise a point which is of considerable concern but I will have to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this has been developed as a result of long hours of discussion with the Newfoundland Medical Board. I have with me correspondence that I will be happy to show the honourable member outside the House emanating from the registrar, indicating certain incidents with medical practitioners over the past several years where section (25) was not really applicable and could not enable him to take the action against these particular doctors that was really necessary for the protection of the public. I am quite satisfied to throw open this file to the member outside the House and let him sort of see the reasons on which this section is based.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

DR. ROWE: As I point out there are multiple reasons for this and I can only say, Mr. Speaker,

DR. G. ROWE: this will be watched but it is a dual safeguard for the public. The Leader of the Opposition said that mental illness should be considered as all other illnesses. This may well be fine and with which in principle I agree. When it comes to the practice of medicine, Mr. Speaker, we have to be somewhat careful that people who are admitted to the Mental Hospital - pray God that it might not be me. When a person is discharged from the Mental Hospital, someone has to certify that this person is then safe to go out among the public. This is a dual protection for the public. I am satisfied that it will be operated in a way with supervision and in a way which will be humane. I do maintain that it will be an added protection for the public. We will watch it very carefully. I think the registrar of the board, the members of the board, as it is now constituted, are responsible people who will not use these sort of powers with any ill-effect.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information which I have from the registrar and the board concerning the difficulties which arise when doctors become mentally certified, this section would have to remain.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to look at this again in several months or at any time when anybody has a suggestion or an application or an indication or an event which perhaps has been wrongly done.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little else to say other than again to thank my colleagues for their support. I now adjourn the debate on this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Medical Association And Governing The Practise Of Medicine In The Province," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.



Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Condominium Act,"

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, I simply direct the attention of honourable members to the fact that this is simply to provide for the enactment of regulations. The Condominium Act itself will become law on January 1, 1975. The legislative draftsmen in my department indicate to me that these provisions are necessary in order to effectively implement the regulations that are necessary for this act to become law.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend the Condominium Act is just to enable the minister to make regulations under this act. I must point out, Sir, to the minister that a lot of people, including the City Council here in St. John's are awfully disappointed that this act has not been proclaimed and that the government did procrastinate on the act, although the minister may not have been able to proclaim it because he could not make the regulations which was a bit of an oversight on the part of the legal draftsmen. I am glad to hear, Sir, that the Concominium Act is going to be proclaimed and will come into effect. I think it was January 4, the minister said.

MR. HICKMAN: January 1.

MR. NEARY: January 1. Well, Sir, there are some people who are looking forward to that.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Just in response, I do not wish to create the wrong impression. Most of the regulations have already been gazetted and passed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to become effective January 1, 1975 the day the act is proclaimed. These provisions are simply to make certain that some of the regulations are not ultra vires the act.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Condominium Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973."

MR. EARLE: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is merely the change in the Treasury Board whereby the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may designate the President of the Treasury Board. This is a question which has arisen several times in this session of the House as to who is at the moment, the President of the Treasury Board. I am under the old act but with this amendment, it would permit the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to designate the President of the Treasury Board. I, therefore, have much pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister's explanation was an oversimplification. Actually, Sir, what this amendment will do is it will get rid of the Minister of Finance as President of the Treasury Board. I think probably in this regard, the House will be doing the people of Newfoundland a favour.

Sir, what it will do is that it will pave the way for the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, which is the Premier and the Cabinet, to appoint a minister other than the Minister of Finance as President of the Treasury Board. It will pave the way, Sir, for the honourable the Premier now to put the finger on the Minister of Industrial Development. The Premier had already announced, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industrial Development was going to be the President of the Treasury Board. The Premier did not know, Sir, that the Financial Administration Act had to be amended before he could get his buddy, his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development on as President of Treasury Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Both buddies? Who is the other buddy? The Minister of Finance will not be the president of the Treasury Board once this amendment goes through.

Mr. Speaker, this merely confirms what we have been saying now for the last two years that the honourable Premier was trying to give the royal order of the boot to the past Minister of Finance, the past President of Treasury Board, the present Minister of Fisheries.

MR. THOMS: He succeeded.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Bell Island is very entertaining some times but not now. He is not being relevant to the bill. The bill purely and simply, in the simplest possible fashion, for the simplest possible members, says that the President of the Treasury Board be different than the Minister of Finance. It is as simple as that. It does not involve a debate. Whatever the Member for Bell Island's hallucinations may be on this particular subject or not, it is simply and purely that. The honourable Member for Bell Island is being totally and absolutely irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Your Honour I am being relevant, Sir. I suspect, Sir, that the reason the administration are asking for this amendment is to confirm the Minister of Industrial Development, which was already announced by the Premier, to become the President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Speaker, we can have a wide-ranging debate under this particular amendment if we want to but I do not intend to prolong the debate. I just want to make a few points. I think I am completely in order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister without Portfolio has made another foolish point of order, Sir. I would suggest that he learn the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of relevancy is sometimes difficult to rule on. The honourable Member for Bell Island may have been straying a little from the rule of relevancy but he may continue.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am merely pointing out, Sir, that the control of government, if this amendment is passed by the House, that the control of the province, the faith, the welfare of the people of this province, will then be in the hands of three people; namely, the honourable the Premier, the honourable President of the Council and the honourable President of the Treasury Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: It is not silly, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, we heard so much ranting and raving about the former administration. Is it all right with the Minister of Fisheries if I refer back to the past? Would that be all right.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I forgot to mention the fact that the President of the Council - no, not Deputy Premier. He is not the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier is the Minister of Finance. He is outside the three stooges.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this confirms our worst belief, Sir,

MR. NEARY: that the power is now in the hands of three people and in my opinion, Sir, this is morally and ethically wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industrial Development will now be elevated to the high post of President of the Treasury Board. A job, Sir, a job that his predecessor, the Minister of Fisheries, ran away from because the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, when he was President of Treasury Board, swore that he would never face thirty-nine groups who would be negotiating collective agreements in 1975 and he ran away. The minister was not booted out of the job, Sir, as President of the Treasury Board, the Minister was not booted out, the minister will only go where he wants to go, Sir, will only go where he wants to go. He did not get the boot although the Premier tried to give him the boot a few times. The minister went on his own, Sir, which really got the Premier off the hook because now he has got what he wanted, what he wanted for the last two and a half or three years. Once this amendment is passed, Sir, the honourable the Premier will be able to get his buddy, his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development into this very, very important position of President of the Treasury Board and then I would say God help us! God help us! God help us!

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the Premier and his buddy going off to London?

AN HON. MEMBER: To Wabana.

MR. NEARY: No they would not go over to Wabana, Sir. I have invited them. I invited the Cabinet to come to Wabana.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over on the Green.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, not on the Green, Sir, not on the Green, Mr. Speaker, over in the body rubbing clubs over in London. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Earlier I had a little doubt whether the honourable member for Bell Island was being irrelevant but now I am very sure that he is being very irrelevant to the principle of this bill.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as relevant as I can, Sir, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say this; that I have very grave doubts if the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, is equipped to fill this position, this very, very important position as President of the Treasury Board. What experience, Sir, what experience, what background does the minister have for this important job?

MR. DOODY: I have been facing you for three years.

MR. NEARY: The experience he has, Sir, as I have said so often in this honourable House, is his arm down in a pickle barrel down at one of the supermarkets.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are we again going to be subjected to this kind of personal character assassination as we have heard for the last couple of days on the honourable Minister of Justice, now we hear on the honourable Minister of Industrial Development? Mr. Speaker, I ask that the honourable member for Bell Island be prevented from this kind of character assassination which is downgrading the dignity of this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. That is a matter of opinion, Sir, not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Again it comes under a rather vague category, within the rules, that of abusive and insulting language. Sometimes the termination of abuse or insult is in the way the member delivers it, sometimes even in the way he looks, gesticulates.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot help it. Help me. Help me.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! This particular exchange certainly appeared to be in fairly good humour and maybe even encouraged by the honourable Minister of Industrial Development. I am not at this point going to direct the honourable member for Bell Island to refrain from his tack but may do so at any time.

MR. DOODY: If I can just interject one word, you know I really have no objection to my honourable friend bringing my employment record into the House of Assembly for discussion. Unlike himself, I have been employed most of my life gainfully.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I happen to have known the minister for a long time, Sir, I would question that. I would question it, Sir. However, I will not do it now. Maybe at a later date. But, Sir, the point I am trying to make is that maybe the minister will make a good President of Treasury Board. I do not know. Maybe you do not have to have the background. Maybe you do not have to have gone out and worked for business and industry. Maybe you do not, Sir. Maybe the minister has a natural instinct, a natural ability to be able to handle that job. I do not know, Sir. I really do not know, only time will tell. Maybe the minister will turn out to be the best President of Treasury Board we have ever had. It could be. The minister is sharp and witty but Sir, I do not know if these be the qualifications or not for filling that very important post.

But nevertheless, Sir, it is a very dangerous situation, Sir, that is shaping up here, very dangerous indeed. I have competition, Sir, from the back room.

MR. DOODY: Again? Who is it this time John Doyle or what's his name Crosbie?

MR. NEARY: No, it is Dick Greene, the bag man.

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

MR. NEARY: Sir, it is a very dangerous situation, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is making a power play, a power play, Sir, and getting his two buddies into positions that he wants them in, namely the Minister of Public Works, President of the Council and the Minister of Industrial Development, President of the Treasury Board. Then he has got it all to his own liking, Sir, all to his own liking. That is the way he wanted it ever since the administration was formed.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if it is a good thing to take the responsibility away from the Minister of Finance. At least the Minister of Finance, Sir, could exercise some control.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, will there not be a conflict of interest between - Mr. Speaker, let us say that the Premier gives the President



of the Treasury Board a directive that the Minister of Finance does not agree with, what recourse does the Minister of Finance have? What about if the trio -

MR. DOODY: Make an appeal to you.

MR. NEARY: The trio gets together and they say, "Look, we are going to lash it out right, left and centre. We are going to squander here, there and all over the place." The Minister of Finance says, "No, you cannot do that. She is just about belly up." Will the President of Treasury Board, will his power supercede the Minister of Finance?

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They will not. Cabinet? Mr. Speaker, the poor old Minister of Finance will come into the Cabinet as he did so often when I was a member of the Cabinet, with not a word in his cheek. The three, no I cannot refer to them as stooges, Sir, that would not be parliamentary, the three musketeers, how about the three musketeers, three honourables?

MR. THOMS: No. No. No. Do not disgrace the musketeers.

MR. NEARY: The three honourable musketeers, Sir, will run the whole show. They will run the whole show.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are the three musketeers names?

MR. NEARY: The three stooges, I know their names. Sir, they will run the show and the Minister of Finance will be shoved into the background, shoved into the background and this is the weakness and the danger in this amendment, Sir, and there is a very great danger, Mr. Speaker, a very great danger. I am sorry to see it happen, Sir, a sorry day for the people of this province when this little innocent amendment that the Minister Without Portfolio tells is so innocent, it is only a little amendment. It is hardly - it is four paragraphs. Two lines sometimes in a paragraph.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But does Your Honour know what it does? No, Mr. Speaker, I have no confidence in that honourable crowd at all. Mr. Speaker, we have been forecasting, Your Honour knows this, every member of the House knows it, we have been forecasting for months past, for the last two years, that the

December 17, 1974

Tape No. 2203

NM - 5

honourable the Premier wanted to jockey his -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, puppet is not the right word. People he can control, Sir, like computers, jockey them into position. Now he has them there. Once this amendment goes through, Sir, he will get his wish. There will be no controlling him. If their past record is any criteria they will go hog wild.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that marriage is now ended. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries now has enough problems of his own. The honourable Past-President of Treasury Board is in the hot seat. We can leave him alone now, Sir, we can leave him alone. We have to watch this setup. We have to watch it carefully, Mr. Speaker. We have to watch what is going to happen if we amend this bill.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I am half tempted to.

MR. DOODY: I would not be surprised.

MR. NEARY: It would not do me any good because they are going to ram it through anyway. A huge majority, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very dangerous situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: It will make fertile ground for the next royal commission.

MR. NEARY: That is what it will, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! While a certain amount of banter back and forth across the floor is tolerated if left unchecked and not brought to honourable members' attention the whole proceedings could degenerate quite swiftly. I suggest to all honourable members that they observe the rule of silence when an honourable member has the floor.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Justice introduced this little innocent bill, Sir, I do not think that he really expected it to go unnoticed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Who introduced it, the Minister without Portfolio?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Who introduced it? No, the Minister of Finance. Yes!

That is right! The Minister of Finance. We could hardly hear him, over there, he hardly spoke above a whisper. We could hardly hear him introducing this little, innocent piece of legislation that is going to remove the powers of the Treasury Board from the Minister of Finance and pass it over to the Minister of Industrial Development. Well, Sir, I hope -

AN HON. MEMBER: What a coup!

MR. NEARY: What a coup, is right, Sir! What a coup, is right! The Premier finally got his own way. Mr. Speaker, all the rest of the honourable members on that side are just flunkies, rubber stamps. That is all they will be once we pass this amendment. The whole province will be run by three men.

MR. ROBERTS: If they only were three wise men.

MR. NEARY: If they were three wise men, Sir, we might be able to agree with it. The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, is now out in the cold. Out in the cold. He is completely irrelevant to the operation. Completely irrelevant. The province is going to be run by the three honourable gentlemen that I named.

MR. CROSBIE: Three wise men.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I hope that honourable members on both sides of the House will take note of the importance of this amendment that the Minister of Finance tried to leave us with the impression, was so innocent an amendment.

MR. DOODY: The province is in the very best of hands, Steve. Relax.

MR. NEARY: The province is in the best of hands my foot.

MR. DOODY: The best of foots then.

MR. NEARY: "The Evening Telegram" -

AN HON. MEMBER: That yellow dog rag of journalism?

MR. NEARY: Yes. People who think in this province, thinking Newfoundlanders, Sir, thinking Newfoundlanders like Mr. Michael Harrington -

MR. DOODY: A gentleman.

MR. NEARY: A gentleman and a scholar and a good judge of the present

administration I might say, have all been forecasting now for the last two and one-half years, the last twenty-two to twenty-four months, what was going to happen.

This is no surprise to me, Sir. This amendment coming into the House is no surprise.

MR. DOODY: You knew it?

MR. NEARY: I knew it.

MR. DOODY: As soon as I quit Duff's Supermarket -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that why you quit Duff's Supermarket?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why, yes.

MR. NEARY: The minister can tease -

MR. DOODY: I am not teasing.

MR. NEARY: and tempt me all he likes. He can be as witty as he likes but, Sir, this is a very, very important matter. A very important matter. All the other members on the opposite side of the House will just be rubber stamps including the Minister of Fisheries who has now gone completely into the background, back into the woodwork. He does not amount to a row of beans now any more.

He had a little bit of a struggle with the Premier when he was President of the Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance but all that is now water under the bridge. The Minister of Fisheries could not face these thirty-nine groups. He could not face the rough year ahead, next year, Sir. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that neither will the new President of Treasury Board, be able to face these thirty-nine groups, be able to keep this province on an even keel.

An election! That is what we are heading for, Sir. We are going to have an election.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is twice. You said that before.

MR. NEARY: Yes and I will say it again.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are getting paranoid.

MR. NEARY: No I am not getting paranoid. I would welcome it. I would welcome it. The Premier says; "Relax" meaning there is going to be no

election.

MR. DOODY: Now, now, now, relax. You will have nothing to do after another two years.

MR. NEARY: I will have plenty to do, Sir. I will have plenty to do you need not worry about that. I have a full-time job now, Sir, trying to keep me eye on that honourable crowd. I shall never forget the story about the Deputy Minister of Finance who was down in the toilet and his papers blew out the widdow. He laid his papers on the windowsill and they blew out the window. When he came off the toilet he said; "Oh my God, Neary is likely to be down under and get my papers."

MR. DOODY: Under what?

MR. NEARY: Fortunately for him the papers bñew back on the windowsill. Sir, it was always bad enough, it was always bad enough trying to keep an eye on this honourable crowd but once the cagey and shifty Minister of Industrial Development -

MR. DOODY: Old cutie himself.

MR. NEARY: Oñd cutie becomes the President of Treasury Board you will have to have eyes in the back of your head, Sir. You will have to have eyes in the back of your head.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: We will deal with Harbour Main later.

MR. DOODY: Wait until I make my initial landing on the beach.

MR. NEARY: I will tell you what I will do - I will exchange poll captains -

MR. DOODY: I would not -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, this is a very, very significant bill even though the minister did not say so when he ðntroduced it. I hope that all honourable members on both sides of the House will take note of my remarks. I trust that my colleagues and the Leader of the Opposition will have a few words to say about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South:

MR. M.MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this. Having

witnessed what just went on through the last resolution and since the honourable the minister did not bother to give us any reasons why, I think the people of this province and certainly the members of the House are entitled to know the reasons why. They may be very well, good, honourable and just reasons and all the rest but I think we should hear the reasons why the President of the Treasury Board should be removed from the office of the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. ROBERTS: I am allowed back in the House not that I was ever out for more than a few minutes. I have had time to compose my reply to the letter of reprimand which I am awaiting with bated breath.

To come to the bill, the Financial Administration Act, I do not intend to be terribly lengthy on it. I will say that from what I have heard over the loudspeakers and here in the House the administration have not made out a case in favour of this. I find it very interesting that we are now amending the Financial Administration Act which was passed just a year or two ago. The present Minister of Fisheries was Minister of Finance and he piloted through this House what I thought was quite a good bill. It updated the old Revenue and Audit Act, indeed replaced it, with the Financial Administration Act a name that has no history in Newfoundland but copying the Ottawa Legislation on the point, in the point of the name, that bill provided among a number of other things that the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance would be one and the same person.

That was just a year or so past and that was one of the many products, as far as I know, of the great restructuring. I invite honourable gentlemen to recall the Premier announcing that restructuring was the greatest decision any government had taken in Newfoundland since Confederation. Well it amounted to a pile of horse manure, maybe the greatest decision his administration took, because now here we are less than a year later for no apparent reason, for no apparent



reason withdrawing from that principle.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is a reason. There must always be a reason. The reason, I submit, is not the one which the Minister of Finance gave. I do not know if the Minister of Finance knows if there is a reason or not. I know the honourable gentleman well and I served with him in a cabinet. I was witness to the spectacle of his being put out of the cabinet, pushed out and shoved out. One can still see the scrawb marks on his finger nails. I do not know if the honourable gentleman knows the reason behind this act.

I submit there is one of two reasons on this amendment. One of two, and the real reason why the House is being asked now to amend this bill in this way. One is either that the government have no confidence in the present Minister of Finance to handle the onerous duties of the Presidency of the Treasury Board. That is perfectly comprehensible to those of us who have watched the honourable gentleman's political career. Perfectly comprehensible. He is Minister of Finance and he is the same man who complained some years after the fact that the Budget Speech which he read as his own had in fact, been written for him by the then Premier, Mr. Smallwood. He was not heard to say so at the time he swallowed it meekly. A little later, a year or two or three, he then recanted and confessed and said mea culpa. That is an example of how that gentleman, the Member for Fortune Bay approaches the duties of being Minister of Finance. It may well be that the Premier and the cabinet have come to the conclusion that he cannot handle the duties of the Presidency of the Treasury Board in addition to the duties of the Ministership of Finance. That might be one reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: Personal attacks again.

MR. ROBERTS: It might be one reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: More personal attacks.

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking of the man's public career, Mr. Speaker, and that is not a personal attack, it is a matter of his performance of a public duty for which the people of this province are paying him one

thousand dollars a month and for which he has accepted the Queen's commission to be a minister.

MR. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition is -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let us call it six o'clock or do you want me to move the adjournment?

MR. MARSHALL: That would be easier.

MR. ROBERTS: Of the House or of the debate?

MR. MARSHALL: Of the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: I move that the debate do now adjourn, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay? It will be noted that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, December 18, 1974 at 3:00 p.m.