



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 85

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

HON. T. DOYLE (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr. Speaker.

I would like to table the regulations of the Private Homes for Special Care Allowances Amendment Regulations, 1974.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the honourable the Minister of Tourism I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, in response to the question posed last week regarding mumps and the situation with mumps vaccine. The situation is that during 1974 mumps has been prevalent and has been reported in many parts of Newfoundland among the children of school age. Although this disease is usually mild and complications rare, cases of the disease may require the time and attention of doctors and nurses and children lose time from school and the parents have the problem of caring for the sick child.

In the past two to three years, a safe and effective vaccine against mumps has been developed. This vaccine may be given to children at twelve months of age combined with the vaccine against measles and rubella as a three in one shot. In 1975 the Department of Health because these cases of mumps require the time and attention of doctors and nurses and because children may lose time from school, we will commence in the department to offer this three in one shot against measles, mumps and rubella to children as they reach twelve months of age. The cost of this will be approximately five dollars per dose. I would say that no other Canadian province is yet giving this vaccine as a part of their immunization programme.

The addition of mumps vaccine to the provincial immunization

schedule means that as children grow up they will receive protection against seven different diseases, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, poliomyelitis, measles, mumps and rubella. Immunization against infectious diseases is fully available throughout the province at the baby clinics organized by the department and from the family doctors. That sums up the situation with regard to the present situation, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could put a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the Premier care to indicate to the House whether (a) the government has any customers for any power that may be recovered from the Upper Churchill or; (b) does the government have any customers for any power that may be developed on the Lower Churchill?

HON. P.D. MOORES (PREMIER): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes we have a great many customers for the power once we eventually get it to the province.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier care to indicate to the House who these prospective customers are?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The first and foremost are the 500,000 people who live in this province who will benefit by getting more cheaper power.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir. Would the Premier indicate to the House if there is a shortage of power on the Island of Newfoundland at the moment?

MR. MOORES: The answer is that there will be if Ottawa does not soon make up its mind, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder would the Premier indicate to the House whether

or not there is any foundation to the reports over the last forty-eight hours that Ottawa will help the Province to finance a transmission line, pay half the cost of a transmission line to recover power from the Upper Churchill rather than go ahead with the development of the Lower Churchill. Apparently the cost has escalated beyond all control.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no, the government have not had any communique from Ottawa in that regard. I heard the same speckle of a story as the member from Bell Island. I am sure, Sir, that the representative of Newfoundland in the Federal Cabinet would not allow that to happen because the power being brought to the Province, all that power to be used in Labrador and for the Province is far too important for the Federal Government to have made such a decision. I am sure that is not the case. I am sure that Mr. Jameison would not allow it to happen and, Sir, we would do everything in our power to make sure it does not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is it a fact that because the government have dragged its seat over the last couple of years and did not call tenders -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, order, order, please!

MR. NEARY: Did not call tenders to award contracts for the development of the Lower Churchill two years ago that the cost has now escalated beyond control and that it would not be considered economically feasible to develop the Lower Churchill?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, when the feasibility study was being done for the Lower Churchill which took one year, this government instigated it, tried to get some power back as opposed to giving it away which happened previously in this Province. The fact is that it took that long to get the feasibility study done. From that time the Federal Government have insisted upon reviewing it, quite rightly. The delay over the last six months has been waiting for a reply from the Federal Government. I can understand why there was a delay but the time has come for them to act now. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that inflation as everybody knows, has affected every project of every kind but still the development of Gull Island,

the development of power in Labrador for the servicing of all our Province is still the best and most efficient and cheapest manner of supplying power for both our domestic consumers and for industrial development potential in this Province. For the honourable member to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Province has waited for two and a half years to call contracts on the Lower Churchill, when he sat in the Government that gave away the power on the Upper Churchill, I think only reflects his lack of understanding of anything economic and that is the reason, people like himself who were in that Cabinet, the reason this Province was in the mess it was when we came in and the reason why it is much better today, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Hon. the Premier is going off his head, Sir, but I will merely turn the other cheek to some of the remarks that he just made and ask him -

PREMIER MOORES: Turn around then.

MR. NEARY: When I turn around the other cheek, the Premier, he knows what he can do with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! As the honourable member is aware, this is the question period. It is not a period for the honourable member to get up and make a speech. The statements he is making now are preambled to nothing apparently. If he has a question I suggest he ask it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir: The Hon. the Premier indicated a few moments ago that the customers would be the 545,000 people in Newfoundland. Would the Premier indicate to the House if the 545,000 people in Newfoundland that he is talking about can consume all the power that will be developed as a result of the Lower Churchill or if they can consume the 400,000 kilowatts that can be recoverable from the Upper Churchill.

PREMIER MOORES: To get the honourable member for Bell Island's arithmetic straight, Mr. Speaker, it is 300,000 recall we have from the Upper Churchill

Some of that has to be used for the industries and the people of Labrador, naturally and so it should be. There is considerably less than 300,000 megawatts available for recall, not 400,000 as he says. The fact is that by the time the power could be transmitted to the Island, yes, there will be domestic use for all of that amount. For the total development of Gull Island it will take several years before the domestic use would certainly be there for it, many years, but hopefully, Sir, that will be the only way that this Province can have a hope for industrial development and industrial customers will have to be attracted for it. There may have to be some short term agreement with Quebec-Hydro. There may not. The fact is that it depends entirely on how many industrial development people, industries that develop in the Province itself and until of course we have firm commitment from the Federal Government of what assistance they are going to give us, until we have a firm contract as to when the power is going to be available on the Island,

only then, of course, can we get any concrete deals set up with any industries to be established on the island.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier care to elaborate on any short term agreement -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, is this a debate?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a debate. I am entitled to ask all the questions I want. Just keep quiet. Take it easy. Do not be so sensitive.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: The open line show got to you this morning.

MR. NEARY: The Premier is digging himself in deeper all the time so let me continue. Will the Premier care to elaborate on any short-term arrangement that may be made with Quebec Hydro and would the Premier indicate if there are any negotiations at the moment in progress with Quebec Hydro to buy the power.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that no, there are no negotiations with Quebec-Hydro to buy the power because it would be our intent to use it here. Hopefully that is the way it will be. It is our intention, Sir, to sell Quebec-Hydro as little or none of the power but as little as possible, hopefully none so that it can all be used in this province.

Certainly to get it clear in the member for Bell Island's mind, it is exactly the reverse from the Upper Churchill in that we want it all for the province as quickly as possible as opposed to shipping it all out as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, another question concerning the same matter, Sir. Would the Premier indicate to the House what the current estimated cost of (a) recovery of the surplus power from the Upper Churchill and; (b) the cost at the moment, the estimated cost of developing the Lower Churchill?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think to give an accurate answer to that we will have to await the final report from Ottawa with our own people. I think it would be wrong for me to give a figure now that could be marginally out. I think there is no urgency for that question to be asked.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier undertake to get me the answer to the question including the cost of the tunnel across the Straits of Belle Isle?

MR. MOORES: When the information is available, Mr. Speaker, I will most certainly get the cost. The exact cost will be known particularly the tunnel for the member of Bell Island because I assume he and whoever it is who supports him on this will be bidding on the construction of it. He talked enough about it to bid on it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House, Sir, if the government intends to follow a recommendation of the Atlantic Provinces Chamber of Commerce, namely that the tunnel that will be built underneath the Straits of Belle Isle should also accommodate a railway facility? Could the Premier make a statement on that, please?

MR. MOORES: I think it is a marvellous idea, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a tremendous idea. I think it would be very costly. I think it is unlikely. In the beginning, I think, what we are primarily interested in at this time is power lines and tunnels for that even though, I think, everybody thinks it is desirable to have the other thing. I think it will be a few years after the transmission line tunnel or whichever method they choose to cross the Straits with.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy made a rather peculiar statement today concerning uranium reconnaissance going on in the province. I wonder if the minister would care to elaborate on that statement, what it means because a lot of people are confused? Is it the same as the uranium enrichment plant that the former Liberal Administration proposed for Labrador?

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, reconnaissance comes from the Latin "Connaître", if I recall correctly, to acquire knowledge, to know. Is this correct?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is right.

MR. BARRY: And "Reconnaître", to reacquire.

MR. DOODY: All of which is wasted completely on them.

MR. BARRY: Reconnaissance, Mr. Speaker, if we trace that derivation, means to go out and reconnoiter, to go out and search, to go out and

look and, in this case, to go out and search and look for uranium.

The programme, Mr. Speaker, is a programme which, at this stage, is a proposal which appears acceptable to the province but the details of which still have to be worked out, a proposal for a uranium reconnaissance or exploration programme which will see the entire province being mapped and explored to determine just exactly what the uranium potential is in the province. We know already, Mr. Speaker, that there are significant reserves on the Coast of Labrador and BRINEX is engaged in

delineation of the exact amount of these reserves at the present time. An improved price for uranium, improved market conditions have lead to a renewal of interest in this area. We know also, Mr. Speaker, that there are occurrences on the Burin Peninsula and earlier this summer we had an aero-magnetic survey carried out on the Burin Peninsula, the results of which we have not yet attained. Basically the Reconnaissance Programme will see the geological survey of Canada engage in both an aero-magnetic survey and a geochemical survey to determine the Province's potential for uranium.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is another one of these "Nippy" things. Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, if he would care to comment on a public statement made by his colleague, the member for St. John's South on whether or not the police talk to the minister as stated by the member for St. John's South, as a matter of fact in today's Daily News "Police don't talk to Minister", "Police don't talk to Minister - Wells". Would the minister care to comment on that statement?

MR. HICKMAN: I would say that during the past twelve months there has been more communication between not only the officers of the Newfoundland Constabulary but the men and myself than at any time in the history of that proud force.

MR. NEARY: Well, then maybe the communication problem, Mr. Speaker, is between the minister and the Member for St. John's South.

Sir, I would like to direct another question to the Minister of Justice. When an inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is conducted by the minister's department -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: When an inquiry is conducted by the minister's department concerning any matter that is raised as a public issue -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, that one was tabled. I am coming to the one that was shown to the Minister of Social Services and not to the other gentleman who was involved. Is it the policy of the department to withhold that report, that inquiry report from everybody or just from certain people?

I am referring to the inquiry that was done in Central Newfoundland concerning the custody of a child in Central Newfoundland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What is the policy of the minister's department? It is not a personal family affair. Mr. Speaker, what I am getting at -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Maybe the honourable member's question is out of order and perhaps if he placed it in writing and submitted it to us for the Order Paper it could be considered.

MR. NEARY: The point that I am trying to make here is that "Ank" reversed a stand on public viewing. Sir, what I want to ask the minister -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! The honourable member -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! It applies to all honourable members. The honourable member's question has been dealt with. I suggested that it would be more appropriately framed for the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I wonder if I could get back to the Hon. the Premier again. Would the Hon. the Premier care to indicate to the House what salary Mr. Groom will receive as President of the new Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation and will this be in addition to the salary that he receives as the President of Churchill Falls Corporation? Will this be in addition? Will Mr. Groom be living in Newfoundland or will he be living in Montreal and what fringe benefits will Mr. Groom receive from the taxpayers of this Province for heading up these two organizations?

PREMIER MOORES: There is legislation before the House, when that can be debated. It will be discussed, at that time I

assume, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime I would suggest the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to my old buddy over there, the Minister of Public Works.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I will deal with him in the next election.

MR. ROBERTS: I said he is after pork barrels not pickle barrels.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please! I remind honourable members this is the question period, it is not a period for honourable members to get things off their chests, that is out of order.

MR. NEARY: I want to ask the Minister of Public Works a few serious questions about the Health Sciences Complex. First I would like to ask the minister if the project is on schedule?

DR. T. FARRELL: The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is that the latest date I got for completion, optimistically, was the end of next year 1975 but a few months greater than that. Due to certain problems which have occurred during the year, which I know the honourable member has conversed with, there have been some labour problems, material problems but basically it is within or closely on schedule. There will be a little delay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What about cost problems, has the minister encountered any escalation? Have Scrivener asked for any extra money? Have all the contracts being called and let?

MR. FARRELL: All I believe, but I am not quite sure, all the contracts have been called and for that reason the project, Sir, is close to budget. We do not have the exact figures but which we will have very soon. We cannot of course give them until close to the completion of the project. There have been some escalation but not a great deal on account of the fact that the way this was planned that some of these contracts were called several years ago. I am hopeful that it will come in very close to budget, I think we will be a little over budget but not grossly. I will have those figures later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Public Works could indicate to the House whether Mount Scio House, the home of the Premier for the time being, is still under the jurisdiction of the University or has it been transferred back to the minister's department?

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is that, it is still under the jurisdiction of the University.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the Hon. Premier again for a moment. The Hon. Premier, Sir, in announcing a settlement of the fishery strike, the trawler strike there some time ago, indicated that one of the conditions under which the strike was settled was that an inquiry board would be set up to look into all aspects of the fishery. Would the Premier care to comment on a statement made over the weekend by the Minister of Fisheries that no industrial inquiry will be set up until some time away off in the distant future?

MR. MOORES: My interpretation on that, Mr. Speaker, is that it was our intent to set up the Board of Inquiry shortly after the Conciliation Board itself had been established. However, upon the request of both the union and the companies, they asked that it be delayed until such time as the Conciliation Board had an opportunity to report. This was done. The Conciliation Board Report quite obviously takes it into the social sphere as well as the economic ability to pay sphere. This has tremendous ramifications as all members of this House recognize. This will now be taken and developed but a Board of Inquiry will be established or a group to take the Conciliation Board Report to the next stage or the stage beyond that whereby all the industry is opened up to have a hard look at it so that when the final proposal for the solution to the fishery is brought into being that we will have had the benefit of all of the experts available.

The Minister of Fisheries over the weekend I am sure meant that whilst it was not being done now, first of all it was on the request not to do it, and secondly, it is a matter of when the solution came up, we have come up with it now, first of all, we had to deal with the Conciliation Board Report, and secondly, in the long term we obviously have to have an inquiry

that will involve industry, the fishermen, communions with the federal government and the provincial government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Premier indicate to the House whether or not this information has been communicated to both parties involved in that dispute, namely; the fish merchants and the union?

MR. MOORES: They are both totally aware of it. Mr. Speaker, the situation of the federal government and ourselves together with both these groups are now actively working on the Conciliation Board Report and naturally both parties are as anxious to come up with a final position as quickly as possible but it is a huge problem. It is a problem that was not tackled for twenty-three years. It is a problem that we are now trying to tackle but it will take time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, seeing the Premier is so talkative today, I wonder if he would care to comment on a report, Sir, that we have a topsy-turvy record of unemployment in this province as a survey revealed that was done by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council?

MR. MOORES: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that but I am sure that the Member for Bell Island when it comes to talking takes a second seat to nobody.

I am just surprised he has not referred back to early last Saturday morning when there was a very topsy-turvy situation happening in the news media of this province. I am just wondering if the honourable member for Bell Island is going to run for the third party or whether he is going to follow his leader.

MR. DARRY: I might be able to add some information to that affair.

MR. NEARY: I am dealing with the boss.

MR. BARRY: If the honourable member would check with that report, he would find that that was the report referring to the time period between 1962 and 1972, and I agree with him completely.

MR. DOODY: Tell us more about the topsy-turvy bit. He was the Minister of Labour during that time.

MR. BARRY: During that period, right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are awfully sensitive today. They appear as if they are shellshocked over there.

Sir, I do not know if I asked this question of the Minister of Justice before or not, but does the Minister of Justice favour compulsory roadside tests to track down impaired and drunken drivers? Does he really, as quoted in the 'Evening Telegram' on November 5, 'Justice Minister Favours Compulsory Roadside Tests'? The minister did not make -

MR. HICKMAN: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, how -

MR. NEARY: Want me to read it, how it starts?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: 'Justice Minister T. Alec Hickman says the compulsory roadside breath analysis test -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Table it! Table it!

MR. NEARY: Certainly it should not be criticized.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Wait now. Say it again.

MR. NEARY: "If it works to cut down on the number of impaired drivers on the road", the minister said that it should not be criticized, the compulsory roadside tests for impaired and drunken drivers.

MR. HICKMAN: What I said then and what I say again now is that I have less than enthusiastic sympathy for those who are screaming that this stop check programme which is a programme which permits police officers to indiscriminately stop motorists on the highway to check to see if they are under the influence of alcoholic. I have less than sympathy for those who say that that is an invasion of the liberty of the subject. I would be much more impressed if the same people showed a bit more concern for the rights and liberty of the subject who may take his life or her life in their hands when they go on the highway as a result of encountering motorists who are under the influence of alcohol.

The Province of Alberta has implemented a stop check programme. I think, if the House will permit, I would like to give very briefly the manner in which this works. It is not - I do not want people to get the impression that the police are out all day long stopping all motorists or motor vehicles on the highway. What they do apparently in that area and if it should ever come to Newfoundland would do, is that they have records, the police have records which indicate the time of the day and the days of the week when there are particularly large and on particular sections of the highway where you find a high rate of motor vehicle accidents.

If we say that between the overpass here and the Holyrood turnoff is a bad area between five and eight o'clock on a Friday evening, the police would announce in advance and give a lot of publicity that they will be indiscriminately stopping motorists and without inconveniencing them to any great extent asking them to indicate whether they have been drinking. The hope is that this will deter motorists from going out on the highway when their ability to drive is impaired. There has been no policy decision by the government of Newfoundland as to whether or not this will be implemented here.

I can say that we have asked the RCMP to furnish as soon as they are in a position so to do, to furnish us with a report of the success or otherwise of the Alberta programme. That is where it now rests.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, judging from the gaiety and laughter from the government benches, maybe the minister should bring the breathalyzer

into the House.

Sir, I would like to direct a question to my good friend,
the Minister of Social Services. I would like to ask the minister if -

MR. MURPHY: I am no friend of yours, I guarantee you that.

MR. NEARY: I thought the honourable minister was a very charitable
person.

MR. MURPHY: I am but not to you though.

MR. NEARY: I see.

Would the minister care to indicate to the House if his
department has yet taken a decision on whether or not special allowances
will be paid the blind

people in this Province?

MR. MARTIN: Excuse me.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, at that time we had been looking at the whole situation and as a matter of fact, I hope within the next few days to have a statement to that effect. We have promised the blind people but in view of the fact of the attitude taken at the federal level it would be based on need only, not the cost of need. It has been rather difficult between the provinces. Some provinces have initiated a special allowance for the blind and we are feeling very sympathetic in my department to it and the monies can be found so we certainly hope to put that allowance through.

MR. NFARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Social Services. Would the minister care to indicate the various groups that will receive the 12.7 per cent increase the first of January that the minister announced a week or ten days ago? Will it be sick people or will it be people who are unemployed through no fault of their own? What groups? Could the minister give us some idea what groups will receive this increase? Will everybody receive it or will it just be selected groups?

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir, everybody will not receive it. Those who are earning \$50,000 a year will not need it. There are no groups. There are just those people in need whose need is established through the regular channels. They will receive it, Sir. That will consist I say, of 99.99 per cent of the people who are now receiving it. Someone receiving \$320 today, their family will receive \$361 beginning in January. That is an increase of something over one-eighth if you like, of the present income. We have the whole table worked out. If any member is anxious to know what people will receive after January 1, we will be only too happy to give it. All the information is available, Sir.

Everybody who can establish a need for help this department will give it to them. There will be no groups. We do not take groups anymore. Everything is based on the need of the individual and that covers every individual who has a need in this Province. If the need can be established they will receive the increase as we have announced here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Social Services care to indicate to the House if there is any foundation to the reports that the number of people on welfare allowances, social assistance in this Province has increased by twenty-five per cent as compared to this time a year ago.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to that. It is another question that was thrown out like the honourable member for St. Barbe North threw out on Friday, knowing it would be taken up by the media, of a certain gentleman being made ombudsman. There is not one word of truth in it. The amounts have increased, Sir, substantially because of the attitude of this government to increase the benefits. The numbers have decreased but naturally if we increase the benefits thirty to fifty per cent, the dollar value is going to be much higher than it was previously, notwithstanding, our numbers are down ten to twelve per cent. All I say, Sir, is there is no substantial increase. We did have a rough period I think in September when the trawler strike was on. That increased the numbers on social assistance. Basically, Sir, the regular flow of welfare recipients is down as compared to other years.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: There is something on that point I just want to be -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, the first time he spoke since two thirty Sunday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I just want to be -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is on a sticky wicket. He does not need a sticky cannon. I just want to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that I understood the minister's answer. Is he saying that the number receiving assistance now, the short-term or long-term, however it is broken down, is less than it was twelve months past. Is that what I heard him say, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MURPHY: I said that the numbers are down from last year. The amounts are up because of substantial increases in our programme which range from something like twenty to twenty-five per cent up to forty per cent in a lot of cases. Naturally the numbers could be down twenty-five

per cent and the dollar's value would still be up because of the increases that this government gave, Sir, to these people.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): There will be one more question. The half hour is over but I did not give honourable members any notice so we will have one more question.

MR. NEARY: Sir, time really flies. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House, Sir, if the assistance that is being paid out or has been paid out to strikers is being recovered by the minister's department?
Would

the minister care to indicate just what groups of strikers received any benefits from the Department of Social Services?

MR. MURPHY: if the gentleman would give notice, the "gentleman" I said. If he would give notice I would be only too happy to answer it, put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well could the minister undertake to get me the answer rather than have me -

MR. MURPHY: No, if he will table the answer, Sir, I will be only too happy to answer it.

MR. NEARY: Great co-operation! Talk about arrogance.

MR. MURPHY: I have too many things on my mind - people. There is no arrogance there.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG):

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked leave of the House in accordance with Standing Order (23) that the regular Order of the House be adjourned, Sir, the regular order of business of the House be adjourned, to discuss a definite matter of public importance, namely, the singular growth of unemployment in Newfoundland among all other Canadian provinces. This House should be the forum, Mr. Speaker, in which are discussed matters of grave importance to the ordinary citizens of our province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when one-fifth, one out of five of our potential workforce is suffering the indignities and the hardships that go with joblessness particularly at this season of the year and in these inflationary times, it is clearly our duty, Mr. Speaker, in all conscience, of all members on both sides of the House, Sir, to face up to this tragic problem that is peculiar to Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! I think the honourable member will probably be the most surprised person in the House if I were to allow this motion. While I agree that this is a matter of definite importance, certainly none of us can disagree with that, it is not something that warrants the adjourning of the normal order of business of the House and accordingly it is not accepted.

Motion (1).

MR. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, when this debate adjourned on Thursday last, it was a matter of a point of order which I rose on, on the proposed amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Bonavista North in connection with this motion. My grounds of objecting to the amendment, is that, and I quote Beauchesne, page 170 Section 202, (12) "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order." I submit to, Your Honour, that the amendment proposed by the Member for Bonavista North is indeed really a direct negative to the main motion. Now direct negatives are not allowed because the members have an opportunity to vote on the motion, either "aye" or "nay" and if it is a direct amendment in effect, or if it is a direct negative in effect, you are having a double vote on the same motion.

The nature of this amendment proposes that we not accept the - the resolution, let us put the resolution first. The resolution is that we approve with alterations the recommendation of the Newfoundland Electoral Districts Boundary Commission. The amendment proposes that what we do is we adopt forty-two seats instead of the fifty-one seats.

Now I would submit, Your Honour, that the nature of this amendment goes not only entirely against the commission itself but goes entirely against the Bill which we are considering. It is not a matter really on discussion. It would negate the commission itself. It would be utterly possible for the honourable member if he wishes to bring in an amendment to say the district lines should go in this direction rather than the other direction, but an amendment to reduce the seats to forty-two is not under discussion at this time. It directly negates the main motion itself because what we are considering is the boundaries with alterations of fifty-one seats. Consequently, I think, Your Honour, that it is clearly really out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to the point of order which the gentleman for St. John's East has just raised, let me first of all agree that it is common ground that an amendment which serves only the purpose of negating the motion it purports or the resolution it purports to amend, is out of order. That is common ground. Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not, in my view,

attempt any such end. The motion before the House is to approve with certain amendments - I wonder if the gentleman for St. John's Centre, Mr. Speaker could either continue his conversation outside or refrain from speaking. It really is difficult to speak with him chatting to his colleague there. The point I was making, the main motion before House is one to approve a certain scheme of electoral boundaries. The negative of that, Mr. Speaker, is to disapprove any change in boundaries at all.

The amendment moved by my friend for Bonavista North achieves a purpose or would achieve a purpose if it were to be accepted that could not be achieved by voting in the negative against the original motion. I submit, Sir, that is the test by which the matter must stand.

The honourable gentleman made a reference to a citation in Beauchesne, may I refer him and Your Honour to the Erskine May's parliamentary practice the 18th. Edition, and May, of course, is the source, it is marked as "M" throughout Beauchesne. It is the source from which most of Mr. Clarke Beauchesne's comments on amendments are drawn. On page 379 of the 18th. Edition of May, will be found the words "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question."

I submit that the amendment moved by my friend for Bonavista North falls squarely within that rule, Mr. Speaker. The only object of it is to make the original question, if it were accepted, if the amendment were accepted, to make the original question more acceptable and it is to present the House with a different proposition as an alternative to the original question.

I would point out further, Mr. Speaker, that the question of forty-two or fifty-one seats has not been decided in this session of the House of Assembly. It was decided in the 1973 session which was the third session, was it? I am sorry, in the second session of the this general assembly. It has not been discussed at any time in this session of this House of Assembly.

So I would think on all grounds, Sir, this amendment is in order. It is not a direct negative of the motion. The purpose it would achieve cannot be achieved by simply voting against the motion. If one were to vote against the motion that would achieve a certain effect. If one were to vote for this amendment, Mr. Speaker, that would achieve a different effect.

So I again say that with all respect to the honourable gentleman opposite, his point is not well taken and the amendment is in order and it should be accepted, put and then debate proceed upon it.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Having considered the arguments of the two honourable gentlemen and having checked with my confreres at the desk, I am inclined to agree with the argument as proposed by the honourable House Leader and his reference to Beauchesne that this amendment does in fact constitute a direct negative and accordingly is out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! It is very good actually that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition left the Chamber when he did. Certainly if he were here he would be called upon to apologize for the remark made. There is a method whereby an honourable member can make known his objection to the Speaker's ruling that is by appealing the Speaker's ruling, not by a casual remark uttered over his shoulder as he leaves the Chamber. I think that is shameful.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): It is too late to appeal the Speaker's ruling now. The honourable the Member for Bonavista North.

MR. NEARY: The member has not spoken yet. Why is it too late, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chair does not recognize him.

MR. NEARY: The member has not spoken yet, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You know this is intolerable, you know the childish, churlishness of the Leader of the Opposition and accompanied by the Member for Bell Island, obviously the Leader of the Opposition stayed out beyond the usual customary ten o'clock

o'clock to do some research and it did not work.

Now the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member for Bell Island is getting up and asking

to appeal Your Honour's ruling. The member for Bonavista South was on his feet and had been recognized. The rules are quite clear, Your Honour, that an appeal has to be taken immediately. They have lost their opportunity for the appeal.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. I wish to point out to the honourable House that the member for Bonavista South was not on his feet, Sir, had not been recognized, apparently had no intention of speaking, is not even in attendance in the House today. So, I suggest that I was in order, Sir.

MR. STODOLSKI: To that point of order, Sir, neither was the member for Bonavista North recognized because that is why he sat down. He was not recognized by the Chair.

MR. MARSHALL: The point is if Your Honour wishes to make a ruling now and the honourable members on the other side who are smarting under Your Honour's ruling wish to appeal the instant ruling they can. It is obvious that the ruling of Your Honour was made and not at the earliest opportunity was it challenged. If Your Honour wishes to say that they did not have the opportunity to make the appeal, and they wish to get up immediately and do it, that is a different situation altogether. I would suggest that the honourable gentlemen on the other side concern themselves more fully with the debating of the resolution rather than showing their childish frustrations.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Again this whole episode was brought about by the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition as he left the Chamber. The honourable member for Bonavista North was about to be recognized by the Chair. Certainly there was no move to object to the Speaker's ruling which must be taken at the earliest possible opportunity. If no honourable members wish to speak to motion one, than I guess we can vote on it.

The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I just rise on a point of clarification. I am not certain what has transpired here with all these motions and submotions. Could you just clarify what the situation is with regard to this resolution at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): On two occasions I have called motion one

which is the order of business. I am waiting for one of the honourable members in the chamber to speak on it. An earlier proposal for an amendment was ruled out of order. So, the ordinary course of business goes on as usual. That is quite clear or at least should be quite clear.

The member for Bonavista North.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was more or less delaying getting up because I thought there was a point of order on the floor at the time.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday when I finished, I was discussing the comments that had previously been made in this honourable House by the present Minister of Education and the Minister of Justice. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is worth repeating again a few of those words that the minister, the present Minister of Education, uttered in this chamber on April 25, 1972.

The minister at that time, Mr. Speaker, said, "The only thing that we of the administration can take credit for is in our first election to office we irrevocably, irretrievably put an end to this kind of political skulduggery by stating in the Speech from the Throne the government's intention and policy to establish an independent commission that is obviously binding to us." Now, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously the minister and all the other ministers and the members on the government side of this House have had second thoughts on this subject.

They voiced their opinion on the matter. They verbally assassinated the previous administration for what they called gerrymandering. They said that they were going to set up a commission that would be binding on them, that they would listen to, that they would adhere to. Lo and behold! Mr. Speaker, we find that a year after this commission report is submitted to government, that it is no longer binding on the present administration. They have taken the commission's report and they have torn it asunder. They have changed

something over thirty boundaries from the commission's report. They have not adhered to historical ties in any of the districts. They have not adhered to the present communications ties, any trend in population as the Premier stated in his opening address.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this is one of the most blatant examples of gerrymandering that we have witnessed here in Newfoundland, the most blatant example. Mr. Speaker, if this principle is pursued and if it is maintained by the present administration then may I ask them never to set up any commission on any subject in this Province again because the whole idea of setting up a commission is so that the commission can submit a report to government that will solve any problem involved, especially, Mr. Speaker, when ministers of government state that the commission's report is binding. This is just a waste of the taxpayer's money.

This past three years, Mr. Speaker, we have had more commissions set up in Newfoundland than in any previous three year period before. If we could only find money as easy to solve the other problems of our people as we do in finding money to set up commissions then, Mr. Speaker, we would not have many problems in Newfoundland today. I am not sure how much money but it must be in the tens of millions of dollars that we have spent on commissions this last three years especially in and around the St. John's area.

MR. NEARY: Tens of thousands of dollars.

MR. THOMS: Hundreds of thousands not tens of thousands, maybe into the millions. I suspect that it is possibly up around three or four million dollars but this is only a guess.

MR. HICKMAN: You would be more than, say, ten thousand per cent out.

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Justice Minister said, if I am ten thousand per cent out this goes to show that we should not in future set up these commissions. After all, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland elected a government to do really what we are asking the commissions to do. What is wrong with the members of government? Are they that incompetent that they cannot solve these problems of our people? If they are, then they have no business being the government. After all the money that they wasted on this commission, there was no need of it because

the final report, the resolution which we have, the boundaries within the resolution were penciled out at the dead of night probably down in the Cabinet Room by one or two members of the Tory Party.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: It is a shame! It is a shame!

MR. THOMS: Naturally it is a shame! It is a shame! Not only is it a shame but it is an insult to the four members of the commission.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Gentlemen, all gentlemen.

MR. THOMS: They are gentlemen indeed. They are all worthy Newfoundlanders, outstanding Newfoundlanders but this government does not think so because they think that they did not do a good enough job.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A great job.

MR. THOMS: Actions, Mr. Speaker, speak louder than words.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is why we had to face Harbour Main-Bell Island.

MR. THOMS: Oh! Is that what all of this is about? What is this - a get "Stevie" movement, is it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does he think so?

MR. THOMS: It must be. It must be.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is he worried or what?

MR. THOMS: No, he is not worried. There is no member of the opposition worried.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: We are all looking forward to that big day, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier waltzes down to the Governor-General's house. This is the day we are waiting for. This is the day, Mr. Speaker, that they are preparing for.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: But they may prepare all they like, it does not matter. They can cut up the problems all they like. They can put the boundaries where they like. The final result will be the same, a disastrous defeat for the Tory Government.

MR. NEARY: They can attack Ottawa all they like.

MR. THOMS: They can attack Ottawa, they can attack the members of the opposition

can even attack the people of Newfoundland like they have done on a number of occasions. Mr. Speaker, the result will be the same.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the honourable member is really being relevant to the resolution but I think I really have risen to remind him that he has got about ten minutes left. So, he might want to say something in the last ten minutes as he has not said anything in his first thirty-five.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, that is typical of the kind of points of order that we have been getting from the honourable gentlemen, Sir, childish, nonsensical, foolish and it is about time that the honourable House Leader on the government side learned the rules of the House.

MR. THOMS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I may say that the honourable member for Bonavista North has said more than the honourable member for St. John's East because he has not got guts enough to speak in this debate the same as many members on the other side have not either.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There will be blueberries this year.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Maybe honourable members do not wish to hear the Chair's ruling on the point of order. The point of order is good, at least was relevant when this debate began. However, there have been so many irrelevancies introduced into it and the debate has been so far ranging and wide and sometimes irrelevant and often irreverent, that I am going to allow the honourable member to continue.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are so many problems in Newfoundland, so many huge problems, so many problems that 99.9 per cent of our people are very concerned with - Mr. Speaker, the House of Assembly opened this fall almost two weeks ago now and I thought the government were going to come to grips with some of the major issues of the day, some of the major issues that concern our people, some of the problems that our people are really concerned about.

One of the problems that they are not concerned about is redistribution because, Mr. Speaker, I would say ninety-nine per cent of our people, if you ask them today if we need fifty-one members, the answer would be no. Many of them would say if you need -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Aw, be quiet will you "Schoolboy", be quiet and allow me to speak will you.

MR. BARRY: Sit down and let the bill go through and then we can get on with the other problems you are talking about.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: The honourable member for St. John's South thinks everybody should speak.

MR. THOMS: What does he mean filibustering for a week. We have given you people ample opportunity to speak and not one of you has spoken yet with the exception of two.

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

A lot of people are guilty of filibustering, I guess. Some of them filibustering if they do not have the floor. The honourable member for Bonavista North has the floor. However, if his remarks are intemperate or provocative, then he is going to evoke comments such as he did from the other side.

The honourable member's points that he is making are basically irrelevant. He has been allowed to make them because of the many irrelevancies that have been allowed before. If the irrelevancies evoke the responses from honourable gentlemen to my left as they have in the past, then he will have to bear with it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before this honourable House at the present time indeed asks us for authority to increase the districts of this province and therefore increase the membership in this honourable House from forty-two to fifty-one.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Approve the boundaries.

MR. THOMS: Well, if you approve new boundaries, you automatically approve new members for this honourable House. You automatically do. This is the content of the resolution.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not mind the political pigny over there.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this indeed is unnecessary. There is no need of it. We have enough members at the present time. As far as I am concerned, the only reason that this government is increasing the membership of this honourable House is to justify the unnecessary, large cabinet that it has, nineteen members in the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, thirty-three special assistants.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Unheard of. Unprecedented in the history of the province.

MR. THOMS: Unprecedented most definitely in the province. Unprecedented in any province of Canada, unnecessary. Really, Mr. Speaker, our people will not stand for it. It is too expensive. This is contributing to high inflation in our province.

MR. DOODY: Tell him to keep above the belt now, Mr. Speaker. Keep your mind closed.

MR. THOMS: Never mind, "Stevie" will take care of you in the next election in Harbour Main, Bell Island. Guaranteed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members are in a particularly jocular mood today especially honourable members to my left. I remind the honourable member for Bonavista North that he has approximately two minutes left. I would suggest that honourable members to my left allow him to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: Almost impossible, Mr. Speaker, because the members on the other side really do not know how. The greatest irritation the people have at the present time is the Tory Government. Of course, we will scratch out that irritation in the next election.

Whether or not, Mr. Speaker, we have fifty-one members, fifty-one districts or whether we have forty-two, that great irritation which only comes to the people of Newfoundland every thirty or forty years, will be scratched out, even in Harbour Main, Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up my few words. The present government commissioned a commission to increase the membership of this House from forty-two to fifty-one which is unnecessary, which is most definitely

unnecessary.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You voted for it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, at that time they said, "When this commission's report comes into this House or comes into the government, it will be binding on the government." Now, these words were uttered by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, for the present government to sway from these words is grossly misleading this honourable House and grossly misleading the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is one area which I would love to have the opportunity to debate. That is the one concerning whether or not we need fifty-one members in the House. Since the rules state that we must be relevant to the subject and the resolution does not mention that, I will merely say that I am, if anybody is interested, It is a matter of record that I am not in favour of increasing the number even though we did vote for it.

What concerns me in this debate and what should concern every member of this House, is that when the bill was introduced we were given to understand that it was the first step toward taking the delineation of electoral boundaries out of the hands of politicians and putting it in the hands of an independent commission. That, more than anything else, was the reason that I voted for that particular bill.

It is unfortunate that we have seen the commission's recommendations turned down the way we have but I do not think it is anything that we should be very, very upset about nor surprised about because after all it is traditional that politicians should try to protect themselves in the electoral battlefield.

It is unfortunate that we did not see an independent commission's recommendations taken seriously and adhered to but I do not think that we should be too surprised about it.

I think in the first instance, the commission might have been

given better terms of reference in that the norm that was taken as I think it was 10,000 and a quota of twenty-five per cent deviation up and down from that figure. I believe the commission should have been told that they could go down only to 7,500 in order to take into consideration the difficulties of representing rural areas, that it was wrong to go up because that allowed the commission then and anybody who choose to change the commission's recommendations to place the boundaries wheresoever they might please. This of course is what is happening.

We heard at the introduction of this resolution the honourable the Premier make statements to try to excuse the diddling of the recommendations by government. I am disappointed. We are all disappointed in fact that honourable gentlemen should stoop so low after the honourable the Minister of Justice having told us that we would not have to go through that sort of business again. Then the honourable the Premier to have to get up and prove him wrong.

He mentioned such things as community of interest, of special considerations for geography and special problem areas. He mentioned giving fair and equitable representation and then proceeded to outline the new boundaries without any consideration at all for those things.

I would like to deal, first of all - perhaps I will restrict my comments only to the situation in Labrador since the island part of the province has been well covered by members of the opposition. I would like to point out again that had the Electoral Boundaries Commission's recommendations been adhered to, we still would not have been entirely happy with it but we would have been satisfied to take that as the best of all possible worlds and would have contented ourselves that at least there was no political fiddling.

Subsequent to the recommendations of the commission we learned that the census upon which those boundaries were based had not given the true figure for population in Labrador. We took pains to bring this to the government's attention through petitions, letters, discussions of various nature

and we sincerely felt though that we were making some progress. We had attempted to deal fairly and squarely and face to face with the government, and we thought that we were providing some kind of logical and sensible and responsible representation.

We thought that we could believe the government when they said, that our representations would be listened to and taken into account. We find that such was not the case. In fact, we were studiously ignored so much so that we have taken it as a direct and deliberate insult. The census figures in Labrador West are wrong and they can be proven to be wrong. If anybody should choose to do so, examine the tax records for the municipalities in Labrador West, examine the school board records then you will find that we are approximately 10,000 short. If that is the case then it is incumbent upon this government to hold up any decision on this resolution until those census figures can be corrected. If that were done then, Sir, everybody could see that we are entitled to two districts where the present District of Labrador West now stands. If that happened (We are stating quite emphatically that this is the only way that we can get fair and equitable representation is to have those figures corrected .) it will affect, of necessity, all the rest of the electoral borders coming down south through the province.

We were ignored and we are disappointed but we get the message. We get the message loud and clear that regardless of our efforts of trying to act responsible in this House, regardless of our effort to try to provide sensible representation for the people of Labrador it does not count for very much to those gentlemen on the other side. We will have to act accordingly.

The community of interest which the Premier spoke of certainly does not show up on the proposed map that sits in the corner there. I cannot for the life of me see why the honourable gentleman should think that there is more of a community of interest between St. Anthony and the Southern Coast of Labrador than there is between the Southern Coast of Labrador and Goose Bay when all of our transportation facilities, our

communications facilities are located in Goose Bay. That is a fact that is undeniable.

For the people of the Straits Area it was said that their community of interest lay towards St. Anthony. I will agree that their community of interest lies more toward the Island of Newfoundland than it does toward Goose Bay but it is certainly not St. Anthony. If there is a community of interest it lies toward Deer Lake and Corner Brook.

The justification was given that long,ungainly, unworkable district that is proposed to be called "Eagle River" that stretches from Henley Harbour north to Saglek and was supposed to contain some kind of a community of interest. I fail to see what it is except that they had a

common problem of government neglect, traditionally. Maybe that gives some kind of community of interest. There is more of a community of interest between the Northern Coast of Labrador and Goose Bay than there is between the Northern Coast of Labrador and the Battle Harbour-Henley Harbour Area. Everything coming off the Northern Coast or going on to the Northern Coast must pass one way or the other through Goose Bay. The same applies to the south. There is a definite, geographical, social and cultural separation down to the Lake Melville Inlet. So much for community of interest.

These honourable gentlemen, when they took the commission's recommendations and decided to change them around for their own benefit, might have come up with stronger excuses than that. There is no way that any man, any person, can adequately represent that District of Eagle River as it now stands. The electoral boundaries were taken and changed so that the only two relatively easy areas on the coast of those districts, the traditional districts, the only two relatively easy areas to represent were taken out and the hardest areas combined into one district. In the Straits Area in Labrador South there is at least the semblance of a road. It is relatively easy to represent those seven communities. Between Battle Harbour and Rigolet, the difficulty is compounded by weather, lack of proper transportation, lack of proper accommodations and all the rest of it. That relatively easy part of the district was taken away from that area and put with the Straits of Belle Isle District.

In Labrador North the same thing occurs where people of the Northern Coast, at least, had the advantage of getting more of their member's time because it was easier to represent the Area of Goose Bay-Happy Valley. Now to take the two most difficult areas of two districts, to combine them into one district, makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. To say that the community of interest lies in the fact that Coastal Labrador needs special attention, we are confusing economic problems with political problems. The excuse just does not hold.

In the Straits of Belle Isle, in that part of the district which is now called Labrador South, which I have the honour to represent, we have a problem that is growing every day, that has already been recognized by the honourable gentlemen opposite, that is well-known to my colleagues here in the Opposition and in fact was recognized by the Labrador Royal Commission and by the Commission on Electoral Boundaries, and that is the feeling of alienation between the Coastal Labrador people and the people from the Island of Newfoundland. Whether or not that is justified, I am not prepared to debate at this moment.

I will say that the feeling of alienation is caused more by the leaders of the people of the Island of Newfoundland than it is by the people themselves. It is a fact that there is a feeling of alienation that has been called separatism or territorialism or whatever you want to call it.

The people of the Coast of Labrador have reached the point where they do not want to have anything whatsoever to do with the Island of Newfoundland. While that may be slightly off the track and may be slightly misguided and they may be putting their frustrations in the wrong place, it is a fact that it is there.

Now, if I had the choice, Sir, to have somebody else make this next argument for me, I would much prefer to do it because having to argue the case for the disenfranchised, if I may call them that, people of the Straits Area of Labrador South, puts me in a position of having to try to defend my own political position. I have already stated that I do not intend to run again in any district so perhaps I can be forgiven if I say that the District of the Straits of Belle Isle as it is proposed, is not only unworkable by reason of geography, by reason of special and peculiar problems, by reason of being remote from the capital, it is also like waving a red flag at a bull.

The commission recognized the problem of the feeling of alienation. The commission recommended that if a district had to be created in that area, that it would be fifty-fifty, fifty per cent on either side of the Straits. They recommended that it be split to one-half. When I appeared before the commission I asked that that point be made clear. What was meant by one-half? The commissioners agreed that it meant fifty per cent on the north side and fifty per cent on the south side of the Straits.

Honourable gentlemen opposite agreed with that and built it into the amendment, built it into the resolution or at least said that they would. Instead of leaving it like it was which was bad enough, instead of leaving the boundaries in this proposed district the way that the commission wanted it, they have made it even worse and enlarged the population area on the Newfoundland side.

Now, Sir, I do not care what kind of a person is going to represent that district. I do not care who he is, what party he belongs to, the fact that that district is so overbalanced is going to create problems. Political considerations will be given, there is no doubt about that, to how much time that representative spends in whichever area. Since the block, the majority of the population resides on the Island of Newfoundland, then he is of necessity going to have to spend more time there if he hopes to be re-elected. The time that he spends on the Labrador side of the Straits is going to be time taken away from that majority. They are going to be upset. If there was ever any way of increasing the depths of this feeling of isolation and alienation and separation or whatever you want to call it, it is by increasing the size of the population on the Newfoundland side of the Straits of Belle Isle.

These honourable gentlemen are going to have to come to grips with this problem because it is going to become an issue and it is going to become an issue on the Island of Newfoundland as well as in Labrador. I do not for a minute think that the ordinary people of the Island part of this province wish to have the people of Labrador mistreated and neglected as they are by their government. I do not for a moment think it is the ordinary people of this province who are creating this feeling of alienation. I do not think it is necessary to have this feeling of alienation. I do not think we should be having talks of separation. The fact that we are and the fact that it is increasing is a result of the government's inability to grapple with this problem.

If nothing else, I think, that issue is reason enough to have this whole resolution reconsidered. There is no point in asking

that the resolution be withdrawn because honourable gentlemen opposite have obviously made up their minds that it is going to go through. In the interest of fairness, and taking the honourable the Premier at his word, I would ask that consideration be given to delaying slightly, postponing the implementation or the passing of this resolution until such time as census figures can be checked in Labrador West. There is no need to take my word for it or anybody else's word. It can be checked simply and easily and relatively quickly. All that has to be done is for the government to authorize a new census in that area. If this is done and if they are concerned and if they are genuinely interested in giving fair and equitable representation, then I am sure they will see that the boundaries are again referred back to the commission.

Without belaboring the point, Your Honour, I will ask backbenchers and cabinet ministers alike to give this some very serious thought. If there is any way at this time of causing friction between the two parts of this province, the way to do it is to let this resolution stand. Thank you.

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, having to follow the honourable gentleman from Labrador South and after listening to his remarks, actually his plea to this House of Assembly for the Premier and his cabinet and government and in fact the entire House, to delay, postpone for a while at least the entire resolution, I think, because of reasons given by him, I think it behooves this House, the government and this House, to do exactly that. We have all heard from both sides, particularly from the opposite side of how neglected the Labrador has been and blaming all the neglect on the previous Liberal administration.

Now, surely goodness, we do not want to add to that now. Those of us who are honoured to be in this House and to represent the people of this province, surely we would want to put a stop to it now. I was very disappointed because the amendment brought forward by my colleague from Bonavista North was not accepted. I thought it was a good one. I really did. For two reasons, for instance.

Number one, I think, was the principle behind it and the lack of principle in the resolution as it presents itself to the House

now. Having referred back to Hansard, the remarks made by cabinet members and by the Premier himself, remarks which were utterly ignored, when the commission's report was brought in, I wonder just how the surviving members of this commission feel now, what their reaction is, if one were to speak to them and ask them down in their heart of hearts how they feel about it. These men were good, reliable, honest to goodness, down to earth gentlemen who, having a job to do, without any political affiliations whatsoever, tried to do that. I wonder how they feel, "r. Speaker? I wonder.

Of course, it is quite obvious naturally to everybody in Newfoundland, even to a person who cannot read and write, who listens to the news on the radio, it is quite obvious to him why the alterations were made. As the member for Labrador South has said, I suppose it will always be that way unless this resolution is changed. I propose actually to bring forth an amendment to change it - oh, it has been typed for me, thank you.

I gave my first reason, I think, on the principle. Now I shall go to number two. Here again we did all vote in favour of

the increase in the number of seats in the honourable House. I must say that although I did vote in favour of it, nevertheless I was not wholeheartedly in favour of it because I did not think for a moment that this little province could afford it really, financially. I hope that some day it will, mind you. I hope that it will. I doubt whether it can now.

You know we heard last week from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that in a very few years the requirements, that is, the square footage for office space for the government -

MR. NEARY: There is no quorum. We cannot even keep the members in the House that are here now, Sir, let alone adding another nine. A quorum call, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please! We have a quorum.

MR. GILLETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying when the quorum was given, we heard that just last week that this government are going to require additional 400,000 square feet of office space. Now I do not think this is any way to try and lick the unemployment situation in the province by giving everybody or as many as possible a job, Mr. Speaker. By increasing the number of M.H.A.'s plus the bureaucracy that goes along with it and no doubt increasing the cabinet a bit more is going to present too great a financial burden, I believe, on this province. I still think that we are not in a financial position to do it.

We must admit, I think, that in recent years, at least in last few years that we have steadily increased the number of municipalities throughout the country

and the municipality, of course, is a level of government. We have the federal government, we have the provincial government and the municipal government.

All of these services lessen the work load of the M.H.A. They have to. The very nature of their existence makes it thus. In the area of the government closest to the people is their municipal government. We have representatives, for instance, of the rural development in our areas. These men also help to lighten the load of the M.H.A. All of it together, Mr. Speaker, still goes to prove, I think, without a doubt that we do not require fifty-one members of this House of Assembly.

Almost every conceivable reason has been given by the speakers who preceded me and I have no intention of going back over them again. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the Hansard reports, in view of the principle behind the commission that I should make this amendment and the amendment is this, that the resolution be amended as follows: By deleting the words "With alterations as set forth in schedule hereto" and replacing them with the words "Without alteration and further that the schedule be deleted and replaced with the electoral district boundaries set forth in the final report of the Newfoundland Electoral District Boundaries Commission."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. GILLETTE: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will, I think, put us back to square one.

MR. ROBERTS: He has to say whether it is in order yet.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Has it been seconded?

MR. GILLETTE: Yes, it has been seconded by the Member for Fogo. I am sorry!

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! In view of the fact that this amendment is of considerable substance and will lead to protracted debate, I will adjourn for a short period of time to consider it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I shall hear representations before we adjourn, that is if honourable members prefer to make representation.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): If honourable members wish to argue at the present time I will entertain argument if not I will adjourn to make my decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): If there be no argument I will adjourn to make a decision.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I have considered the proposed amendment as put forth by the member for Twillingate and I find that it is in order.

MR. GILLETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At last I think that the honourable members on the government side are beginning to see that this resolution does need to be changed, it does need to be altered. Had the Speaker not accepted it and had the resolution gone through as it reads, I would have been left along with thousands of others. I would say, to conclude only that the government majority overrules the minority regardless of whether the argument is just or unjust.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable member, while his amendment has been ruled in order, is now drawn to the rule of relevancy.

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, I feel that almost everything - at least I cannot think of another sentence that can be spoken in debate in this resolution. Actually our leader covered almost everything in his speech when the resolution was introduced. Subsequent speakers have done the same. Now, I could perhaps, speak on my district where my district disturbed -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. GILLETTE: No, I have not got a copy.

I have no quarrel with the boundaries. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, does not change the boundaries of the District of Twillingate. The report did. It took Change Islands, Boyd's Cove, Comfort Cove into the district. So, therefore I have no quarrel because the boundaries of Twillingate District have not been changed and Twillingate District still remains as it is now and it has been for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to take very serious consideration of Labrador, its needs, its people, how best it can be served. I have every respect for the member for Labrador South. I believe he knows what he is talking about. He is mixing among his people all the time. I think his voice should be heard. I hope it is. I hope the voice of my

colleague, the Member for Labrador North, has heard. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to know that the amendment has been accepted and I trust that the debate that comes from this amendment will be for the betterment of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Everybody will benefit from it. I can only say that the people of Newfoundland look to this House of Assembly to take care of their needs, individually and collectively, and this resolution and the amendment to it, is meant to do that.

Thank you.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am continuing on the resolution rather than the amendment. I take it that that is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): At the present time, we are speaking to the amendment. The amendment must be disposed of before we can either speak to the amended motion or the motion as was originally proposed.

MR. WINSOR: All right, the next time around.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment so ably moved by my colleague, the Member for Twillingate.

Sir, I might say that I am speaking at a little bit of a handicap because I thought Your Honour that we had Map No. 2 in the Opposition Office, Sir, but I am afraid that the map has been borrowed by the CBC and they have sent out for it and it is on the way here to the House of Assembly now. I am wondering if the Honourable Premier has the second map that we could -

MR. MOORES: You have one.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know but we loaned it to the CBC. It is on the way back now. I would like to have one, Mr. Speaker. I would like to get a map to replace that coloured one down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. NEARY: It is what in the House?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I want to get the pointer, Sir, and go over the map like a schoolmaster, the same way the Premier did when he brought in this - Map No. 2. The Honourable Premier knows what I am talking about. Does he have it down on the Eighth Floor that we could borrow it?

MR. DOODY: The Honourable Premier knows what you are talking about. He deserves to be leader -

MR. NEARY: What else would you expect from twenty-five per cent discount Doody, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, what this amendment means is that not one item of the royal commission report, Sir, is changed. We adopt the recommendation of the royal commission unchanged. That is what it means, Mr. Speaker.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that so far in the debate, (I am the first one to speak to the amendment. I do not know, Sir, if it is in order to refer back to the resolution. Maybe it is not. I do not want to refer to the resolution as such but I do want to say this.) I am amazed and surprised at the few members on the government benches, Sir, who have taken any kind of an interest at all in this matter of redistribution. I do not know if they have been muzzled by the Honourable Premier, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Social Services says that they have not had a chance to speak. Well, Sir, if the Honourable Premier, if he had spoken this afternoon before my colleague, the Member for Twillingate rose in his place, the Honourable the Premier would have closed the debate. Is there closure? Are the members on the other side - have the members been given -

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

The honourable member prefaced his remarks wondering whether they were in order, they are irrelevant to the amendment as proposed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that on this amendment that we will hear from the honourable tongue-tied members on the government benches, Sir. I hope

I hope that the Premier has not sent out instructions, has not ordered his backbenchers and ministers to remain silent on this most important amendment. I hope for instance that the member for St. John's South, Sir, who has been so vocal on redistribution outside of this honourable House, will have the courage of his convictions, Sir, and will stand in his place in this honourable House and give us the benefit of his experience and the benefit of his few remarks on this very, very important matter.

I hope the member for St. John's North, Sir, who has had a few words in the past on redistribution both inside and outside the House I hope that the member will favour us, Sir, with his knowledge of this subject and speak to this amendment. The amendment, as my colleague, the member for Twillingate started to say in the beginning, puts us right back to square one.

If members on both sides of this honourable House, Sir, accept and vote in favour of the amendment moved by my colleague, then what we will be doing in effect is accepting the report of the Royal Commission on Electoral Boundaries in this province. You know what that means, Mr. Speaker. That means that we on this side of the House would again be going back to the fifty-one members but, Mr. Speaker, what choice do we have? Is it not better for us, Sir, here on this honourable side of the House to now go along with the fifty-one members - we do not have much choice, we are being forced to - rather than the gerrymandering that is being done by the administration that we see on that coloured map in the corner.

As much as we would object, Sir, to fifty-one members, we would grudgingly, because we think it is better than what we have before us now in the original resolution, we would grudgingly, even though we know there is galloping inflation in this province, Sir, and that the report of the Royal Commission on Electoral Boundaries in this province should have been shelved, should have been given the twelve month hoist, although we really and honestly and sincerely, Sir, believe that, although we really believe, Sir, that there is no need to add another nine members to the already overburdened House of Assembly, even

though we really believe that, Sir, we would be prepared to make the sacrifice rather than accept the gerrymandering of the Moores Administration.

Sir, I might say that in regard to fifty-one members that the royal commission had no choice. They were told by the administration that they had to set out the boundaries for fifty-one electoral districts. They had no choice, Sir. They were not told, Mr. Speaker, by the administration that they could go out and they could shift boundaries here and there and that they could use their own descretion on the number of members that are required in the House of Assembly. They did not have that privilege, Sir. The late Judge Higgins was not given that in his term of reference. They were told they must bring in fifty-one districts. The poor old royal commission, Sir, did not have much elbow room. They had to work within the terms of reference. One of the main terms of reference was that they had to bring in fifty-one members, no choice.

Even though probably, Mr. Speaker, if the late Judge Higgins were standing in my place on the floor of this honourable House today, that he might disagree with fifty-one members and certainly, Sir, with galloping inflation in this province, I am sure that not only the late judge but the other common sense Newfoundland members of that royal commission would disagree.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point or order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is debating the fact of whether or not really there should be fifty-one or forty-two. Now, the amendment before this honourable House now is that the original or the final recommendations of the

commission be accepted. The final recommendation constitutes fifty-one seats. I would suggest that the honourable member is entering into a realm of debate not relevant to the amendment itself.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. My colleague is not entering into any realm of debate that is out of order. He is merely saying and I have been following him, even though I have been taking some advice from the Clerk on a point of procedure, I am following him quite carefully. He is merely saying why we want to go back to the original boundaries. He is making his point very effectively and obviously annoying the honourable gentleman for St. John's East that, Sir, has nothing to do with the rules of the House. My colleague is simply saying that we would prefer there be forty-two but since there are not to be forty-two and the Tories will not have it, then we prefer to go back to the fifty-one, and the fifty-one as recommended by the commission, by the commission headed by Mr. Justice Higgins. That is what he is saying. He may be saying it in rhetorical fashion but, Your Honour, have we come to the point in this House where a member cannot speak in explanatory, declamatory or rhetorical fashion? Surely we have not.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Well I am not sure. If I can interpret the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's last remarks but nevertheless the honourable Member for Bell Island was irrelevant. The amendment as it is to be debated has to be debated in very closely defined lines of relevancy and he was outside of it. I am sure the honourable member being the experienced parliamentarian that he is can get himself within the scope of this amendment.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I do not know, I mean I am sort of walking the razor's edge here, you know. We are talking about the final report of the commission, Sir, which set out fifty-one boundaries -

MR. ROBERTS: And why we want to go back.

MR. NEARY: And why we want to go back to that report, Sir, rather than this monstrosity that we have before us.

The reason we want to go back, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a few moments ago, even though it is against our better judgment, Sir,

it is against our gall to agree, to even appear to agree that at this time of galloning inflation in Newfoundland that we should want fifty-one members in the House of Assembly. But, Sir, that is better, we feel, and that is why we move the amendment, Sir, my colleague moved the amendment. We feel that is better than what we have before us in the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is second best but way ahead of the Tories.

MR. NEARY: It is second best. We would like to see the whole thing given the twelve month hoist, Mr. Speaker, but obviously the government are not going to do that. They are eager to press on with redistribution. They are eager, Sir, to rush this through the House as fast as they can so that the Hon. Premier can climb into his gas-guzzling Cadillac drive down to Confederation Building, dissolve the House. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what the issue is going to be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I can tell you what the issue is going to be.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! While the honourable member has been drawn to the rule of relevancy -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! It is rather difficult to make the same ruling four or five times in the same afternoon and attempt to make it in a different language so that it is not monotonous. However, the honourable member is drawn to the same ruling I made earlier. He is making debate that is, while interesting, irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: Sir, we are talking about redistributing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Redistribution.

MR. NEARY: The electoral boundaries in Newfoundland, Sir. I would submit, Your Honour, and I am not appealing Your Honour's ruling but I just want -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is questioning it.

MR. NEARY: No I am not questioning it. I have more respect for the Chair than that but, Sir, this does have something to do with an election. Redistributing the boundaries, Sir, does in some small way, some minor way - you can connect it with a provincial general election.

Your Honour, if the Hon. Premier is not anxious to ram this Redistribution Bill through the House so that he can call a provincial general election, Sir, then maybe the reason he is so anxious to get the Bill through the House, Sir, to get the House closed is that he wants to go down and warm his shins in the waters of Florida or in the West Indies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very relevant! Very relevant!

MR. NEARY: Sure it is all very relevant. The Hon. Premier is obviously, Mr. Speaker, in a hurry. Obviously in a hurry, Sir, when he stood up this afternoon to choke off the debate and get a vote on this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is nonsense.

MR. NEARY: It is not nonsense, Sir, the Hon. Premier did stand -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he stood.

MR. NEARY: To try to wind up the debate today.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is also not relevant to this motion. The motion before Your Honour

now is that we go back to the final report of the commission. Whether or not the Premier got up on the resolution and whatever the honourable member for Bell Island supposes or presupposes, or the Premier for that matter, what anyone is going to do, has no relevance whatsoever to this particular amendment.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Again, the honourable member when he begins to make his points relevant is quite successful at it but unfortunately he is drawn into irrelevancies quite frequently and when irrelevancies come before the House it is the right of any member to object to them on a point of order, certainly for the Chair as well. The honourable member may proceed with relevant material.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the maps are on the way. I wish I had the map here so I could go over it, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir, and I am sure there must be a map outlining the second report of the royal commission, Sir, somewhere in this building.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It was in the paper, was it?

MR. ROBERTS: No, the Tory Government tried to hide it. - the people in the House -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do remember this, I do remember this and I have to agree with my colleague to the right here, the member for Labrador South who unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, will not be with us next time around. The member has -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He has the right to change his mind.

MR. NEARY: He could change his mind. But, Sir, in the report of the royal commission, Mr. Speaker, Labrador was given three districts.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, the Premier moved that amendment himself.

MR. NEARY: The Hon. the Premier, I am reminded by the Leader of the Opposition, moved an amendment, Sir, making it law that Labrador, immaterial of what the royal commission did, Labrador would have three districts,

MR. ROBERTS: Two and a half.

MR. NEARY: Two and a half?

MR. ROBERTS: But they only have 2.2, three and a half.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Three and a half.

MR. NEARY: Three and a half. That is right, Sir. Three and a half, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is all the same to "Ank".

MR. NEARY: Now they end up with what, 2.2?

MR. ROBERTS: 3.2

MR. NEARY: 3.2 Well, maths was never one of my best subjects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the page could bring down the bulletin board up in the corner there and stick it out in the middle of the floor.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We can put the map on it, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps we can go over it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will remember that over thirty districts have been gerrymandered and when we put map number two up, Sir, which is the report of the royal commission, Your Honour will hardly recognize it. We are told, Mr. Speaker, that districts were drawn up because of the community interest. I would love to have that little silver thing that -

MR. DOODY: Where is that little silver spoon that the Premier had there the other day?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Here we are, look. Now, Mr. Speaker, just in case my honourable friends on the government benches do not remember, do not recall, in case, Sir, they had a lapse of memory, in case they are suffering from amnesia, here is map number two, the second map.

MR. DOODY: I wonder if he can move that over here. We cannot see it.

MR. ROBERTS: It is better stuck up old man.

MR. NEARY: This, Sir, was the recommendation of the royal commission under the late Judge Higgins.

Members will notice, Sir, members will notice that Labrador was given by the royal commission three and one-half districts. Three and one half. Three point five districts. And, Sir, -

MR. DOODY: Now which one of you gents won the leadership? Let us get this straight.

MR. NEARY: Honourable members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the District of St. Barbe Sir, was not stretched out to cover a coastline of about, what? Three hundred and fifty miles? It was cut down - a district the size of - that could be serviced by a member.

MR. DOODY: You are doing a great job.

MR. NEARY: Without any problems at all, Sir, it could be looked after. Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker. Here is a good Liberal - they are afraid to call a by-election down there. But, Sir, under the royal commission report the Baie Verte Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, was to be a district by itself, a district of its own which makes a lot of sense. It is a growing area, you have all kinds of mining going on down there and it makes a lot of sense because of the transportation problems and so forth -

AN HON. MEMBER: Got rid of St. Mary's to do it.

MR. NEARY: It is a wonder they did not put Baie Verte in with St. Mary's, Sir, the way they gerrymandered the other map. But, Sir, that makes a lot of sense. It makes a lot of sense, Mr. Speaker, for Baie Verte to be a district unto itself the same as it makes a lot of sense, Sir, to have that portion of White Bay a district by itself.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, but at least you do not have to get into a boat -

MR. DOODY: No, use water wings.

MR. NEARY: Under the gerrymandered map, Sir, Baie Verte is in with this part of White Bay North.

MR. DOODY: Tell me how to get from Cat Arm River to St. Anthony without getting in a boat.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, at least, Sir, this is serviceable. This is serviceable, Sir. There is no way that one member can service a district the way it is gerrymandered.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of thought went into this map, Sir, this report. A lot of thought. There were a number of representations made to the royal commission. As a result of the representations that were made they changed the first map and developed what we now know as the second map. They changed some of the boundaries because of geographic difficulties, Sir, and made them more serviceable so that members could look after their districts.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to get a little closer to home. I want to get down here on the Avalon Peninsula where, I suppose, we have the worst example of gerrymandering in Newfoundland's history.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when there was a district in Newfoundland known as Harbour Main - Bell Island.

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear! Now it is back.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that district extended from Marysvale down to Paradise, I think it was, and included Bell Island.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Fahev, Mr. Jackman, Mr. Smallwood - all honourable gentlemen.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, the people of Bell Island could never understand why they were a part of the Harbour Main - Bell Island District. They could never understand it.

Mr. Speaker,

The time finally came when because of the population growth on the southshore of Conception Bay and the population on Bell Island rising to about 14,000, that the administration of the day in its wisdom thought that it was time to make Bell Island a separate district. Safeguarding, Mr. Speaker, the traditional factors that were involved in making Bell Island another district, looking at the religious factors -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They do not use that.

MR. NEARY: No, they do not use that anymore.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, indeed they do not use it anymore. That is because Bell Island, Sir, had predominantly an RC population, it was always considered as an RC district. So, that sort of evened things out, Sir. It balanced things out.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It balanced out with what?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it balanced things out in this way; that there is a large concentration, Sir, of Roman Catholics on the Avalon Peninsula. a large concentration. But, Mr. Speaker, they do not have the representation really. If you look at the overall picture of Newfoundland, they do not have the representation in this honourable House, Sir -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Here it comes. Here it comes.

MR. MURPHY: The Ecumenical Council is finished.

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen to old charity over there himself.

So, Mr. Speaker, the royal commission, Sir, continued to recognize this fact, that it was necessary -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The royal commission, Sir, I would say had this in the back of their mind. They did recognize the fact that the status quo, that the traditions of this province, one the honourable the Premier did not mention when he was introducing his map, that religious representation, Sir, does have some bearing on the way you -

MR. DOODY: Are you running for Bell Island or Vatican City?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, Bell Island was always considered to be a Merasheen district but now, Sir, it is being tossed back in with Harbour

Main.

MR. DOODY: Yes, and there will be an awful battle at Tom Patrick's at the head of the bay.

MR. NEARY: Is that so.

MR. DOODY: (First part inaudible) This is terrible "Steve". Forget religion will you and get back to the House. Do not be so bitter and small, boy.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, it has always been a factor, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable members care to recognize it or not. It is there, Sir, and it is continuously seething beneath the surface. Oh yes, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not want to bring them back again.

MR. BARRY: Does your leader approve of this line of speaking?

MR. ROBERTS: Why did the Tories change from the recommendations Jim Higgins twice made that Portugal Cove, Bell Island should -

MR. NEARY: This is what I am coming to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Oh, the leader knows this line of speech.

MR. NEARY: What line of speech? Mr. Speaker, I am quite sincere, Sir, in my line of speech, in my logic. I would say it is something that we should get out in the open. We should not try to sweep it under the carpet as the honourable Premier tried to do when he introduced that third map.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that there is no bigotry or prejudice involved. I hope there is not and I am sure there is not, Sir. I am sure there is not. I am sure the honourable Premier would be above that, would rise above it.

Sir, the District of Bell Island on the two maps was thrown in, Sir, with Portugal Cove and a part of St. Phillips, all that area east of the Old Broad Cove Road going down about two tenths of a mile down the Indian Meal Line, Sir. It was to be the new expanded district of Bell Island, Portugal Cove, twice recommended by the royal commission.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Once.

MR. NEARY: Twice, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Only one report.

MR. NEARY: This is the second map, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Only one report.

MR. NEARY: Twice it was recommended.

MR. DOODY: One report.

MR. ROBERTS: Ignore him "Steve". He is afraid to speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how in the name of common sense could the government, the honourable the Premier fling it back with Harbour Main again? How? Why?

It does not make sense. We have, the people of Bell Island have, no community of interest any more with the people in the head of the bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh gee whiz! Half Bell Island is up there right now.

MR. NEARY: Aw! Maybe over in my honourable friend's district but not up in the head of the bay, on the south shore of Conception Bay, Mr. Speaker. A lot of my constituents resettled on the south shore of Conception Bay when the mines closed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I would not be so ignorant as to do what the honourable minister did on television this afternoon, dragged my mother into this thing. I will give the honourable minister fair warning that if he ever does it again, Sir, there will be a repeat performance of what happened in this House a few years ago. Leave my poor eighty year old mother out of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was she not born in Harbour Main?

MR. ROBERTS: She had little control over where she was born. The honourable gentleman over there has control over what he says. The honourable gentleman over there does have control over what he says. Mrs. Neary had no control over where she was born.

MR. DOODY: That is quite obvious. I just asked was she or was she not?

MR. NEARY: What has my mother have to do with this? I warn the honourable member if he keeps it up he will be bottom up over there before he knows what struck him.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: That may not be relevant!

MR. NEARY: Well it may not be relevant, Sir, but it will be relevant to the minister I will tell him that right now.

But, Sir, how do they manage to reconcile the fact that Bell Island should be thrown back with Harbour Main? Sir, the commission, in my opinion, were quite justified, quite right in putting Bell Island, expanding the District of Bell Island in with Portugal Cove and a part of St. Phillips. Quite justified. The ferry terminal is in Portugal Cove. There is no question about that. People from Portugal Cove earn their

living directly because of Bell Island, both working on the ferry and working at the terminal and taxi driving. So the obvious place to put Bell Island, Sir, was in with Portugal Cove was it not?

MR. DOODY: Down on the Burin Peninsula the taxis should be a part of St. John's East.

MR. NEARY: Is not that the obvious thing to do, Sir? You know what they have done under the new map, Sir, they have divided Portugal Cove right down the centre.

MR. MOORES: What about St. John's? Corner Brook?

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Community of Portugal Cove, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: You will not divide Happy Valley/Goose Bay -

MR. NEARY: The Community of Portugal Cove divided right straight down the centre, if you want to put water and sewerage in, Sir, and you have Tory member on this side and a Liberal member on that side and the government happens to be Tory, you will put in half a sewer system.

MR. ROBERTS: You better hope that Babb Construction gets the contract.

MR. NEARY: And Babb Construction will probably get the contract.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not tender.

MR. ROBERTS: The young fellow has got to make his living. What is his name?

AN HON. MEMBER: Brian.

MR. ROBERTS: Brian.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it certainly made a lot of sense, Sir.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier to withdraw that statement, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: He is on a sensitive point - Babb Construction.

MR. MOORES: No, he is there talking about salmon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What about the honourable Minister of Industrial Development -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Talking about my mother on television yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the honourable member take his seat.

MR. NEARY: Come on! Come on! Come on, let us go!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member take his seat please!

This House is becoming quite disarrayed.

AN HON. MEMBER: You might say that, Sir, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The honourable Member for Bell Island presumably is speaking on the amendment to the boundaries and there is much, too much talk going from either side of the House. I would ask honourable members to hear him in silence and I would ask that he get on with the debate to the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Who is going to get who? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Charlie Bret has made his only contribution here, he is going to get me.

MR. NEARY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. the late Judge Higgins, in his wisdom, took into account not only the status quo as far as religion is concerned but the population growth of the various parts of the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Sir, that is a fact. I did not make it up. It is there. Members can tut! tut! tut! tut! all they like.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Of course he did.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is not a factor. The Premier does not consider that to be a very important factor in this whole matter, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: - across the Tickle.

MR. NEARY: I am across the Tickle.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the commission knew what they were doing. They put a lot of thought into this report. They had received representation, Sir, all over the province.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told in this honourable House in the last few days that a number of organizations, Sir, in the head of the bay, objected to the way the Hr. Main District was divided. Well, Sir, I am told that these objections were solicited by the Junior Member for Harbour Main and passed over to the Premier. The Honourable Premier was misled, Sir.

MR. DOODY: You are wrong.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not wrong, Sir.

MR. DOODY: They were not passed over to the Premier, they were passed over to the Boundaries Commission.

MR. NEARY: Passed to the Boundaries Commission? Ah! Now, we are getting an admission, Sir. Now we are getting close to the truth.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Old pickle-barrel went up to the head of the bay, Sir, and asked these organizations to submit an objection.

MR. DOODY: Every Progressive Conservative up there objected.

MR. NEARY: Ah! Mr. Speaker, there was not one individual, not one person in the head of the bay who asked to have the district put back to Harbour Main-Bell Island - not one!

MR. DOODY: Do you want the letters?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I want the letters tabled. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition already asked to have the letters tabled. The Honourable Premier has not seen fit to table the letters.

MR. DOODY: I will have them sent to you personally.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have them. Mr. Speaker, these letters if they are around and I have very grave doubts as to whether they are around or not, if so the Honourable Premier would have tabled them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Were solicited, Sir. They were procured by the honourable Junior Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOODY: You do not want to be associated with Harbour Main.

MR. NEARY: I am very proud to be associated with Harbour Main.

MR. DOODY: You are going a great way about it.

MR. NEARY: I have Harbour Main blood in me.

MR. DOODY: You are going to have more if you keep this up.

MR. NEARY: Maybe that is where I get my Irish temper. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that is where I get my Irish temper.

MR. DOODY: It will be spreading from one end of Harbour Main to the other if you keep this up.

MR. NEARY: There was not one person, Sir, in the head of the bay who wanted to return to the old District of Harbour Main-Bell Island, not one. Any objections to the report of the royal commission were solicited, procured by the honourable pickel-barrelled member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, am I supposed to put up with that kind of abuse, excuse the expression, from the honourable member. Is this parliamentary? Is this allowed?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker ..

MR. DOODY: Sir, I am trying to contain myself. It is not easy. I have been provoked, honestly.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy) Yes, it is a point of order. I think the honourable gentleman from Bell Island is being unparliamentary when he refers to the Member for Harbour Main in using that name. He is an honourable member and he will be referred to as such. I would ask you to retract that phrase that you used in reference to the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. NEARY: If Your Honour wants me to take it back, I will take it back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the royal commission took into account, Sir, when they were dividing up the boundaries, that Newfoundland

has the second lowest average per capita income in the whole of Canada. The average per capita income in Newfoundland, Sir, is \$2,464.00 as compared to Nova Scotia, \$2,991; Prince Edward Island, \$2,442. Incidentally, Sir, Prince Edward Island has the lowest average per capita income. We are outdone only by little old Prince Edward Island. New Brunswick, \$2,793; Newfoundland, Sir, has the lowest personal per capita income in the whole of Canada.

The government, Sir, when they wrote the terms of reference for the royal commission, not even taking this into consideration, not taking it into account, asked the commission to increase the burden on the taxpayers of this province of running the House of Assembly by 21.4 per cent, to increase the cost of running the House of Assembly, Sir, by 21.4 per cent.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the royal commission took into account the members' basic remuneration that I mentioned the other day when we discovered that Newfoundland was the second highest in Canada. We are paying our MHA's, Sir, the second highest basic remuneration in the whole of Canada.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Who said no?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Wrong.

MR. NEARY: Wrong? It is right, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the royal commission took a look at the legislature membership right across Canada, took a look at what the other provinces were doing in the way of redistribution. I am sure that they took a look at the number of taxpayers and the number of voters that were in each constituency in the other nine provinces of Canada. Taking all this into account, Mr. Speaker, after considering all this and spending many sleepless nights, many months of research, after spending weeks and weeks going around the province holding public hearings and so forth, they finally produced, Mr. Speaker, what they considered to be a realistic electoral map for Newfoundland. They submitted their recommendations to the government.

Everyone, Mr. Speaker, but everyone in this province, including

I might say, a number of honourable gentlemen who are sitting on the government benches at the present time, everyone felt in their hearts that the recommendation of the Higgins Commission would be accepted without a change, without amendment, it would be accepted by the government.

Mr. Speaker, do you know the other day I was talking to a minister sitting on the opposite side of the House, Sir, and his reaction to redistribution was he said, "Ah, it will only be a nine day wonder." He said, "You will add another half million onto the expenses of running the House of Assembly and it will only be another nine day wonder."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. NEARY: A minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. Do you want me to name him?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A minister of the crown?

MR. NEARY: A minister of the crown. I will name him if you want me to. He was just yawning over there a few minutes ago. He said, "Ah, it will only be a nine day wonder."

MR. DOODY: It is a wonder he is not asleep or either one of us.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope on this amendment that men of principle on the government benches, that honourable gentlemen who have said outside of this House, "Oh, it could be forty-six, it could be forty-nine, it could be fifty-one or it could be fifty-six, I hope that

everybody, all members of the House will participate in the debate. I hope that. I hope it." Well all members have not participated in the debate, so far, including that honourable gentleman -

MR. DOODY: Sit down and give us a chance.

MR. NEARY: Who was so wishy-washy.

MR. DOODY: If you would get that stick out of your hand, someone -

MR. NEARY: What is wrong, Mr. Speaker? What is wrong with the honourable members on the other side they are not speaking out in this debate?

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe they have been ordered.

MR. NEARY: Have they been ordered by the honourable the Premier?

MR. MURPHY: For the same reason you did not speak out in 1962.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I came into this honourable House in 1962 and they have not been able to keep me quiet since. Mr. Speaker, when I sat for six years, Sir, when I sat for six years as a private member on the government side of the House I was the most vocal over there.

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

MR. MURPHY: Vocal? Indeed. Yes master. No master. Yes master.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! While the honourable member has said his piece, I presume he is going to deal with matters that are relevant now. I must say he has had some assistance in being drawn into the irrelevancies.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a funny thing. When I get up to speak in this House they all get irritable and jumpy over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cannot take it.

MR. NEARY: They are half asleep until I get on my feet and then they all come back to life. They get the jitters. They do not know who is going to get mowed down next. Well, Sir,

MR. DOODY: The people felt the same in England during the Blitz, they did not know who was going to get clobbered next. We have to be nervous.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope on this amendment, I hope, that all those members who claim outside of this honourable House, Sir, that they are doing so much in this honourable House to help the ordinary people of this province, I hope that they will have the courage of their convictions and stand in their places in this honourable House and lash out on this amendment. Speak out. Do not be cowards. Do not be silenced by the honourable the Premier. Get up and say what is on their minds because, Mr. Speaker, I know, I know, Sir, and I have been told, and I do not want to break a confidence, I have been told by honourable members on the government benches that they approve of the report of the royal commission and they disapprove of the gerrymandering brought in by the government. I have been told that, Sir.

They are over there now, Sir, and they cannot look you straight in the eye. They are having pangs of conscience. Mr. Speaker, if they are genuinely and sincerely interested in the people of this province, let them get up and speak now or forever hold their peace.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a good line. Mind if I use that?

MR. NEARY: They will have to answer to the people of this province, Sir, on this sort of doodling, gerrymandering, that they are up to now. It will backfire on them.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this map it looks more realistic than that one underneath there, that coloured one. It is too bad this one was not coloured, Sir. It looks more realistic, Mr. Speaker. I beg and I plead with honourable members on the government benches, if they have any sense of decency whatsoever, if they have any principles at all, if they have any moral principles, they would go back to the recommendation of the royal commission and not the recommendation that the honourable the Premier is bringing in.

I would say, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said the other day when I wound up my few remarks, Sir. Although, Mr. Speaker, although

it is against my better judgement, it is against my principles to agree to increase the membership in the House of Assembly by nine members, although, Sir, that is against my grain, I would rather accept the report of the

royal commission than that monstrosity that the Premier brought in the other day recommended by the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you this. One honourable member on the government benches - How many more minutes did you say I had, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Thirty seconds.

MR. NEARY: Thirty seconds?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: One honourable member over there, Sir, says, "Oh! that is the government's right, the government's right, the government's right, Sir, the government may as well go back to commission of government or have a dictatorship if they did not have the right to change the reports of the commission." What foolish nonsense, Sir! You may be able to get away with that down in court but not here in the House of Assembly, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I beg the honourable members as I did the other day to stand back and take a look at what they are doing and live up to the obligations and responsibilities that were placed on their shoulders by the people that elected them to office about two and a half years ago.

I asked them, Sir, in all conscience -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!. The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: I asked them in all conscience to support the amendment to go back to map two in the report of the royal commission.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. Maybe I am wrong but I understood that the honourable the member for Fogo did get up and say a few words in this debate on the amendment. Then I believe, Mr. Speaker, he sat down and I thought he yielded the floor to the member for Bell Island. I could be wrong but it appeared that way.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! The honourable member did rise earlier. He asked to be heard on the main motion. He was informed at that time that

he could not be heard on the main motion at which time he relinquished the floor to the member for Bell Island. I do not consider that he has spoken in the debate today.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I was in this House, the same thing happened six years ago. The honourable Leader of the Opposition at that time, he moved to speak, he was under -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: He was under misapprehension, Sir. Nevertheless, the honourable Leader of the Opposition at that time, Mr. Ottenheimer was not allowed to speak. It came his turn. I am not against anybody speaking but if you are looking for these facts they are in Hansard, Sir, and some of these same gentlemen got a great kick out of it. It was wonderful at that time. Sneering "Ed" and the rest of them all thought it was a wonderful thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour has made a ruling and as I understand the situation, Your Honour, the only way he challenges is if somebody moves that the ruling be appealed and then be decided by the House. Your Honour has ruled that my colleague has the right to speak to this amendment. Unless the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre choses to appeal the ruling then I would assume my colleague has the right to be heard in silence.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, you have not ruled whether I am in order or out of order. Therefore I have to assume that I am in order.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I ruled that the honourable member proceed.

MR. WINSOR: Yes, I am sorry.

In rising to support this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I do so in clear conscience. I am against and I have always been against the increase in the number of seats, from forty-two to fifty-one.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: I know. It is every man's privilege and it takes sometimes a man to change his opinion and we have done that. You have honourable gentlemen over there who have changed their minds, not once, not twice, but three times. So there is nothing wrong with changing your mind. But, Mr. Speaker, when we were informed of the commissions recommendation and

it was drawn out on the map. We had no choice then. We had no choice but to accept that the number of seats would be increased to fifty-one. There was no argument there. The commission, I think, was given strict orders to bring in a redistribution consisting of fifty-one seats. They did that. However, what we have objected to and what we still object to is the way the gerrymandering has taken place since that second recommendation of that commission. I say, Sir, now that it is one of the worst

acts that any government could lay on a commission to have them bring in a report and make recommendations and then for the government of the day to ignore it completely. That, Sir, to me is very shameful. It is a disgrace to the honourable gentleman who served on that commission.

Mr. Speaker, just look at the map. When we think of that vast area of Labrador, known now as Eagle River, the House must remember that what we are dealing with here is a land mass greater than the Province of New Brunswick, greater than the Province of Prince Edward Island, greater than the Province of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland all combined. Here we have a district or an old pole area divided up into two point five districts. I agree with the Hon. Member for Labrador South that there is no way that one man can serve that district.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. It is not two point five. I think we have to get the Hansard to get straight on this.

MR. WINSOR: Well maybe two point something.

MR. MURPHY: Three point five.

MR. WINSOR: Three point five, I am sorry.

MR. MURPHY: You are speaking and you do not even know what you are talking about. That is the tragic part of it.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to do this but the Hon. Minister of Social Services, in my opinion, has reached a position that he never expected to reach.

MR. MURPHY: Hear! Hear!

MR. WINSOR: Since he has gotten there, he has failed to add any dignity to that seat whatsoever. I would say to the honourable minister to inject a little dignity into that portfolio which he now holds. It may be difficult.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

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

The Hon. Member for Fogo has the right to be heard in silence. That right is not being observed.

MR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is very difficult to speak in silence in this House. To me, it is very unusual because of the years I have spent here, This last two and one-half years, Sir, this House has been anything but what you would expect of an honourable House of Assembly. The conduct is outrageous.

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

The honourable member is speaking to an amendment and maybe that is one of the reasons why this honourable House may not have been as dignified as he would wish it to be. Honourable members sometimes tend to disregard the rules, which the honourable member has done.

MR. WINSOR: Fine, Mr. Speaker. I will try to get back on the track again. I was speaking before I was so gently interrupted by my friend over there, the Minister of Social Services.

When we think of the District of Eagle River, the District of Labrador South, I said, Sir, that there is no way that one man can do justice to that particular district. It is not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, (I have travelled that coast as many times as any other honourable gentleman in this House and perhaps in the province) to find one's self delayed by bad weather between Mary's Harbour and Batteau for days. Then again if you went further north, the same thing could apply. I have been as long as four days, stormbound in Hopedale on one occasion when the election had to be deferred up there for days and days. No one could get near the place. However, putting that to one side, Sir, I think it is a grave injustice to the good people of Labrador to find themselves now having to have a representative in this House of Assembly to

take care of all of the coast from Mary's Harbour all the way to Nain. Here again, Mr. Speaker, it may be extended beyond that. While I was the member for that district, we had two settlements then of Nutak and Hebron which is approximately two hundred and twenty-five miles further north than Nain.

On one occasion when the fishermen were operating north of Hopedale or north of Nain they had to go another eighty miles up to Nachvack. That was their fishing settlement and there were as many as twenty-five and thirty families from that area, up in that region and you had to visit them. You had to because they all had needs and those needs had to be taken care of. So, Sir, I would say that that district alone needs to go back. If it cannot be amended then surely the least the government can do is now go back to the second report of the royal commission.

Then we have the little settlement here of Change Islands. That is an amusing one. That is an amusing one. The honourable the Premier dropped down there by copter during the July election and I am sure the people of Change Islands were very happy to see him and extended every courtesy to him. They were overjoyed when the Premier promised them that in a few days they would start that road across the island. So well and good, there is no complaint about that. As a consequence of that, of course, Change Islands went strongly P.C. in the July election.

However, the second commission's report put Change Islands an area between Fogo Island and Twillingate Island, they took it out of Fogo District and put it in Twillingate District. However, it is amusing to see that what is termed as gerrymandering, that settlement now or community of Change Islands was manoeuvred all the way out from Lewisporte to be included in the Lewisporte District. Not Twillingate, not Fogo but Lewisporte, and the Premier's alibi was that they had more association with Lewisporte than they did Twillingate or Fogo. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Change Islands go to Twillingate mostly for all medical care. Very seldom do they ever go to Lewisporte. If any community has any influence on the people of Change Islands it would be Twillingate rather than Fogo or Lewisporte.

I would be interested to hear, when the Premier closes this debate, why that community was taken out of Twillingate District and put into Lewisporte. That is one that even the people of Change Islands do not understand.

However, Sir, in supporting this amendment or this motion, I think the government would be well advised, because, Sir, let us not forget there was no outcry from the people or the public of this province to add additional seats to this honourable House. There was no outcry. People were perfectly satisfied with the representation they were getting. I might add that the representation that the people are getting now, when you compare it with a few years ago, is much greater. With all of the communications which are available, roads etc. etc., there is no problem for one man to look after the district which he was elected to do.

Sir, I would plead with the honourable the Premier, plead with him, to reconsider and have this whole thing go back either to a commission again or adopt, in justice and in fairness to the people who made the recommendations, let him go back and adopt the second commission's report.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): The Member for St. Barbe North:

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment

so ably moved by my colleague from Twillingate. Sir, essentially, it is asking us to pass the revised commission report, the report that was revised as a result of a fair number of hearings throughout the province, hearings that were held in reaction to the first map, the first set of boundaries drawn up by the commission. Sir, we would have preferred, as we mentioned earlier, to maintain the number of districts, that forty-two, but we are left with no other choice now other than to support or bring in an amendment for fifty-one districts. Certainly, Sir, we would expect these districts to be built around the final report of the commission that was set up to draw out the electoral boundaries in this province.

Sir, I am terribly disappointed that more honourable members on the other side of the House have not seen fit to stand up and speak for or against the resolution, the original resolution or any of the amendments that have been presented.

Sir, we have witnessed over the past few days honourable members shooting barbs across the floor. None of them have the principle nor the courage to stand up and speak for or against the resolution or the amendments that we are alluding to now, Sir.

Sir, the great political pigmy, the intellectual midget from St. John's South continually shoots barbs across to this side of the House and accuses honourable members on this side of representing rural districts and of being tourist members.

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's Centre!

MR. F. B. ROWE: St. John's Centre, I am sorry.

Sir, I would ask the honourable member who he thinks the Member for St. Barbe South or the Honourable Premier himself or the Honourable Minister of Justice or the Minister of Education are, if they are not tourist members?

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

The honourable member's remarks are out of order to this amendment.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I rise in support of this particular resolution, is that it partially repairs the damage done by the gerrymandering that the government has carried out.

Sir, the government, in bringing in this third map, did not (I re-emphasize that) "did not" ensure that the rural districts or the more remote districts from the Confederation Building were not discriminated against. In other words, the rural districts of our province are discriminated against because of the fact that most of them are not close to the lower tolerance level of say approximately 7,500 in population. As a matter of fact, Sir, we have seen abuse on the Northern Peninsula where these three rural districts are in the order of over 10,000, 11,000 and over 12,000 in population. Sir, this is not doing a service to these districts. Let us forget about the members. The members will have a difficult time representing these districts but we are not giving the citizens in these rural districts, a fair shake when it comes to representation in this House.

Sir, if anything, we should have had the districts close to the capital and the more urban districts, such as the St. John's Districts and the Metro-St. John's Districts, the Grand Falls Area, the Gander Area, the Corner Brook Area, the Stephenville Area, which in relative terms in this province, can be considered to be urban districts. In certain cases, we got to take this into consideration the fact that some of them are a combinations of urban and rural districts. Sir, if we look at the final report of the commission, we will note that even that report did not take the quotient or the tolerance factor of plus or minus twenty-five per cent into consideration to an extent where the rural districts would be more fairly represented. When we look at the changes that the government themselves made to the commission's report, we see that they have made that situation even worse. Now, Sir,

the fact of the matter is that the government did not allow geographical size to be a factor to any great extent. They did not take the remoteness of the various districts into consideration to the extent that they should have.

MR. MARSHALL: Does the honourable member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be only too happy to adjourn the debate.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1974 at 3:00 p.m.