

VOL. 3

NO. 40

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to  
announce today support for a four season ski resort  
development at Marble Mountain in the Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Government is proposing to  
use the considerable infrastructure comprising the ski  
hill site as an incentive to the private sector. As well,  
we will be negotiating with Bowaters the purchase of land  
between the ski hill and the highway. I feel this course  
of action will substantially benefit both the Humber Valley/  
Bay of Islands area and the Province's tourism industry.  
It is only through the clustering of attractions and  
services that the Province can compete for highly dis-  
criminating vacationers. This is in accordance with our  
policy of developing key destination areas in various  
regions of the Province.

The facility should comprise  
a forty room resort hotel with lounge, dining and seminar  
facilities and indoor recreational facilities. It would  
consist of the ski hill, hopefully with snow-making equip-  
ment and varied Summer recreational activities. As well,  
the establishment is expected to form a base for oper-  
ation of tours to Gros Morne, L'Anse-au-Meadow and other  
sites in the Western region and on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. WINDSOR: This course of action has resulted from meetings with the Corner Brook Ski Club, the present user of the facility, and potential private sector operators. The Corner Brook Ski Club is fully supportive of this approach and will be involved in the process to ensure protection of their historic skiing rights.

As well, I am announcing today that government will expropriate sixty acres of land adjacent to the Terra Nova Park golf course near Port Blandford. This land will be offered as an incentive to private sector operators who are willing to develop an appropriate complement of services and commercial attractions. Government has been forced to take the expropriation option because of the land ownership in the area, which is mostly untraceable. In fact, a number of groups have foregone efforts to develop a resort because of this problem.

MR. WINDSOR: This development should offer a varied recreational experience comprised of golfing, swimming, fishing, water skiing, hiking, horse-back riding and other activities. The facility should consist of thirty rental cottages, a main lodge consisting of hotel units, dining and lounge facilities and indoor activities.

These projects, together with the St. John's Convention Center, form the basis of the Province's tourism strategy; a strategy designed to build upon existing resources to realize marketing opportunities. At both the Marble Mountain and Terra Nova sites, governments have invested substantial funds in major anchor attractions. Maximum impact cannot be achieved without the development of complementary hospitality services and the smaller commercial attractions.

Projects such as these are essential to achieving a high profile for this Province's tourism industry. We must have distinct attractions to convince residents and non-residents to spend their vacation dollars in our Province. The aggressiveness of our competitors requires that we have high profile facilities offering a quality vacation experience. These projects, combined with existing infrastructure in Eastern and Western Newfoundland, will ensure this.

The Marble Mountain development, upon completion, should create some forty full-time jobs and the Terra Nova Park facility is expected to create approximately thirty full-time jobs. It is further expected that significant employment will be created during the construction and development phase of both these projects.

I again state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that this government will avail of every opportunity to create meaningful employment through development of the substantial tourism potential of Newfoundland and Labrador.

May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1731

MJ - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the Legislature are pleased whenever any minister stands to announce that he will be creating some much needed employment in this Province. Actually this Ministerial Statement today seems as though it is in response to the Private Member's resolution that we were discussing last Wednesday and yesterday, put on the Order Paper by the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). That Private Member's resolution asked that government put more emphasis on tourism, on attractions pertaining to tourism and of course we are glad to

MR. CALLAN: see that Marble Mountain is going to be extended. We are glad to see that an area adjacent to the Terra Nova National Park will also be expanded and some jobs created there. I notice that the minister in his Ministerial Statement made no mention of a suggestion made by the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) which a couple of other members concurred in when they spoke in last Wednesday's and yesterday's debate - I believe it had been said in this House before - that one of the best ways to get tourists to come to this Province is for this Province to subsidize the fares on the Gulf ferries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Right now, of course, it costs far too much money, and that is why people who travel across America and across Canada stop at North Sydney and turn back, because to come across the 96 mile stretch of the Gulf costs far too much money. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, one of the ways to encourage people to make the trip, to cross on the ferry either to Argentia or to Port aux Basques, is to have that ferry rate subsidized by government. That will encourage them to come, and when they get here obviously they will come back because they will enjoy the beautiful Province that we have as was explained fully by the member for the Bay of Islands.

We concur with this Ministerial Statement and, of course, we are glad to see jobs created, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I would like to take this opportunity to extend a welcome to the galleries to forty students from St. Mark's School in King's Cove, in the district of Bonavista South, accompanied by their teachers, John Adams and Gerard Aylward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall). And I would like to ask the minister whether he took the opportunity of meeting with the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) when he was in St. John's yesterday to resume negotiations on the offshore? And if he did not,

MR. BARRY: whether it was because Mr. Alvin Hewlett has told him that obtaining ownership is no longer a priority?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is only asking the question facetiously. I understand that Mr. Chretien was in town yesterday. I did not have the opportunity to speak with him yesterday, never met with him yesterday.

MR. DINN: You saw him on TV.

MR. MARSHALL: I saw him on TV, though, Mr. Speaker, and I saw something very interesting. I saw a very, very interesting X-ray, because a TV is very often like an X-ray machine, when the hon. gentleman was asked about Mr. Lalonde calling him, he admitted that Mr. Lalonde called him. Also he is reported today in The Evening Telegram as saying in response to a question about the secret letter, he obviously, if you read it, was begging the question He said, 'There is no secret, it is going to be in legislation'. The question, Mr. Speaker, is not what is going to be in the legislation before the House of Commons. The question really is what was going to go in the legislation, was that in its entirety what was represented to us as being the agreement, the accord, between the federal government and the Province of Nova Scotia.

So I hope that gives a full and sufficient response to the hon. member. I know if the hon. member had been here rather than there before he went where, Mr. Speaker, I am sure he would have been commenting himself on what was an obvious revelation from the television camera, CBC, yesterday when it proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that it was a fact that Mr. Lalonde did compact Mr. Chretien. It was a fact that Mr. Lalonde was upset with the agreement that he had entered into, and now everybody knows.



May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1733

SD - 2

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as to why the agreement was in fact no delivered. We have a verification of it from the putative Prime Minister of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is aware of the same information that I have received from reliable federal sources that in fact, Mr. Speaker, apparently there was some difference of opinion between Mr. Chretien and certain other members of Cabinet with respect to the offer that Mr. Chretien was making to the Province of Newfoundland, but is the minister aware that in fact that same evening, or the next morning, Mr. Chretien had established, through confirmation of the Prime Minister, a majority of Cabinet, that Mr. Chretien's view with respect to the offshore was going to prevail, had the minister established that or was it because the minister was back in St. John's the next morning that he was not able to ascertain that in fact Mr. Chretien's view had prevailed in the Federal Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL: How do they say it, Mr. Speaker, how the worm doth turn, how the leopard changes his spots. The fact of the matter is, if the hon. gentleman wants to be consistent with it, I say that if that is a fact and he wants to accept that, perhaps he can advise us why, if Mr. Chretien's view was to hold sway, that when we went down to Montreal that we received not what Mr. Chretien agreed with me, but the Nova Scotian agreement, which Mr. Lalonde had negotiated with the Province of Nova Scotia, and which quite obviously was to be the agreement. I wonder, knowing those facts, would the hon. gentleman like

May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1734

NM - 2

MR. MARSHALL: to go to his new-found bed-  
fellow, his new-found federal colleague, Mr. Chretien,  
and ask him if

MR. MARSHALL: when he is obviously given the authority to negotiate on the part of the federal government, and the rug is pulled out from under him in that particular manner and he can not as honour bound deliver what he agreed on to me, why he did not resign from the Cabinet? I think the answer is obvious; because he is interested in the Prime Ministership of Canada. Whether the people of Canada will be interested in a person as Prime Minister who has not got the courage of his convictions, who is not prepared to stand behind his agreement and allows another minister to pull the rug out from underneath his feet is a question that has yet to be determined.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the minister in his reply is showing the same lack of knowledge and lack of information with respect to Mr. Chretien's position in Cabinet as he is showing in his comment on this Nova Scotia secret agreement on the offshore. Now I would like to ask the minister with respect to this so-called secret agreement, is this the same secret agreement that was stated by Mr. Buchanan in the Evening Telegram of February 2, 1984 where, in commenting on the Canada Oil and Gaslands Administration, Mr. Buchanan stated for the whole world to know, including even the minister, that the people making the report did not have information about federal/provincial understandings on equalization as it affects resource development? And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table that so that this House will have clear information

MR. BARRY: and so the minister can check and see is this the secret agreement that the minister is referring to more than three months after the fact, the one that was carried in the Evening Telegram that Mr. Buchanan told the entire world about?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, honest to heavens! After his opportunistic turnover, the hon. gentleman lost all credibility in this Province when he came into this House and attacked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), claiming the minister was crying and all that stuff, which was denied by Mr. De Bane. He is asking the same question of me he asked in Question Period the other day. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Buchanan made this statement after the federal/provincial assessment of the impact of the agreement.

MR. MARSHALL:

And what did Mr. Buchanan say? By that quote I think he said that they did not have the information that was available. Mr. Speaker, that is our complaint: We did not have the information either. Now, that is the whole basis of our complaint.

MR. BARRY:

Did you ask for it?

MR. MARSHALL:

It was represented to us that the agreement with Nova Scotia was within the four corners of the document that his friend, Mr. Lalonde, so joyously sent down by courier to us the day after it was signed in Nova Scotia. It arrived in the Cabinet room whilst we were meeting, it was sent to me because it was shortly after the hon. gentleman found the heat and did not want to take the responsibility of negotiating, so he went out of the Cabinet and I took over his position. So it was sent down to me.

At that particular time it was represented that this was the agreement they made with Nova Scotia. Subsequently in negotiations with Mr. Lalonde and with Mr. Chretien, it was represented that that agreement was the agreement with Nova Scotia. And we were in the same position, apparently, as the joint federal/provincial Nova Scotian assessment socio-economic panel were, Mr. Speaker, exactly. We did not know it existed and that is the cause of our complaint.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

On another point, I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) whether the Province has made any offer or counteroffer to

MR. BARRY: the Province of Quebec  
or to Hydro-Quebec with respect to negotiations on the  
Upper Churchill contract?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the President of  
the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we have made,  
as the hon. gentleman is aware - I do not know whether the  
hon. gentleman was here then or whether he was in Rome.  
I do not know where he was, but he was roaming somewhere,  
anyway.

First of all I want to say  
that we very calmly, coolly and explicitly made a response  
to the reversion case.

MR. MARSHALL: The Premier has sent a Telex to the Prime Minister of Canada indicating what we wish to have done by the federal government and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we have been assessing all impact of that reversion case in this Province. The fact of the Upper Churchill problem that we have is that there is \$800 million, approximately, every year going to the Province of Quebec, stemming from legislation which the Supreme Court of Canada says we cannot repeal, while the people of this Province get \$6 million and \$7 million a year. In direct response to his question I can tell the hon. gentleman that we have been in contact with the federal government about it, we have been meeting about it ourselves, and very shortly, Mr. Speaker, within the space of twenty-four or forty-eight hours we will be in communication with the Province of Quebec, and this House and the hon. gentlemen will be fully informed and advised of the nature and extent of that particular communication.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that. I wonder if the minister would explain, Mr. Speaker, how it is that the minister is prepared to make apparent counteroffers to the Province of Quebec in the media of this Province, as reported in one instance in the Daily News of May 15, 1984, where we have a statement from the minister that the Newfoundland Government would consider a 50/50 revenue split from the Churchill Falls hydroelectric project as part of a new contract. Now, I would ask the minister if he is aware of the insult that he has given to this House by refusing to supply hon. members, on his side of the House as on this side, with the details of his proposal to the Province of Quebec?



MR. BARRY: I would like to ask the minister whether he believes that this is the efficient way and the way likely to achieve success in negotiations, to go about attempting to negotiate through the newspapers of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: It was just within the past few days, the past week, that I remember the hon. gentleman urging me to make public the terms of the negotiations. Now, he is asking is this the proper way to be carrying on negotiations. I do not know what the hon. gentleman wants. I realize that one day the hon. gentleman was going to run as a federal Tory and the next day he is a provincial Liberal. But the fact of the matter is his erratic process of thought I just cannot really follow. On the one day he wants me to make it public and on the next day, now, he turns around and suggests if I make it public I am negotiating in public. I do not know what the hon. gentleman wants, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: Nor does he.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, what members on this side want is the same thing that the people of this Province want and that is for the minister to sit down at the bargaining table with the Province of Quebec instead of going through this nonsense of making statements to the media without even making an offer to the Province of Quebec. Now I would ask the minister, with respect to this offer that is apparently now being prepared by government for

MR. BARRY: transmission to the Province of Quebec, will the basis of this offer be this 50/50 division of revenue which the minister has referred to in the media?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: He makes an assumption, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is assuming that no offer has been made. I am not saying whether there was or whether there was not, but I am going to tell you that the universe will unfold very shortly in that matter. We had said when we began negotiations that at such time as it appeared to be in the best interests of the public that we would make a full and complete

MR. MARSHALL:

report to the people of Newfoundland. The fact that we have not done it up to now is because of the fact that we have not sincerely felt it was in the best interest to do it, precisely because, as the hon. gentleman indicated, we did not want to be in a position of negotiating in public. However, there will come a time, and maybe that time is almost upon us, when the public of Newfoundland will be fully informed of it. But I can tell the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman that every step that we are taking in the process, and every move that we are making, we are making after we calculate our move and we are taking what we deem to be initiatives and reactions in the best interest of the people and the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), It has to do with the policy of the Fisheries Loan Board as regards to the making of loans over \$50,000. As the minister and all hon. members are aware, in June 1980, the Department of Fisheries forced fishermen to go to banks for loans in excess of \$50,000 to build boats. We objected to that at that time because of the cyclic nature of fishermen's incomes and the instability of their incomes and so on. We have been telling the minister for the last year and a half or a couple of years about the serious situations the inshore fishermen are having in this Province.

In view of that policy of fishermen having to go to the bank for loans over \$50,000 to build boats, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if there have been any repossession of fishing boats in the last little while? And if so, just how many?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Loan Board has been operating I would say in a most efficient way since we restructured that Board back in 1980 when I became the Minister of Fisheries. And just prior to that time the Loan Board found itself really, technically, bankrupt, not only of course in a financial way, but also with regards to a very poor structure of operations. So we restructured the Loan Board itself, put in new staff, put in a new Board, and since that time the Board has been operating very, very efficiently, to the point where we put forward \$56 million in loans from that Board in the last two or three years. We have had to change the interest rates according to the changes in the interest rates by the various chartered banks. We were successful in negotiating an agreement

MR. MORGAN: with all the chartered banks in the Province to have the chartered banks act as agents. The fishermen in some cases, and I do not know if it is because the information is not being put forward in the proper way by certain members of the House and the Opposition in particular, are left with the impression that these loans are directly with the bank and the bank has all the control and jurisdiction over the loans, and that is not so. The banks are merely acting as agents for the Loan Board and are governed by our policies. Government set the eligibility criteria of the Loan Board, and they follow our guidelines and operate accordingly. Now naturally there are some loans that we found to be in default and there had to be action taken to collect the amounts owing.

I must say that the Catch Assignment Programme, whereby fishermen would agree to assign part of their catch to the board, through the bank, has been working out very, very well. It is a voluntary system, it is not compulsory, and it is working quite satisfactorily for all concerned, including the fishermen. And that has helped substantially to remove a lot of accounts that were in arrears. However, there has been some repossessions and these repossessions are in most cases, with very few exceptions - when I say very few, less than five in the last eighteen months - where boats were actually taken because of bad accounts with the Loan Board. And other so-called repossessions were at the request of the fishermen saying, "I am no longer in a position to carry on with this large boat, I am going into a smaller boat, I want to reduce my debt load and I want the Loan Board to take the boat off my hands and sell the boat for me." That is still under the whole perspective of repossession, but it is still at the

MR. MORGAN:

wish of the fishermen.

So all in all, despite the difficult financial times our inshore fishermen are going through, and we all know they have been going through some very difficult times, in the last two years in particular, with regard to catches, with regard to prices, and with regard to increased costs of their operations. But it is a well-known fact, especially in the longliner fleet, that despite all of that

MR. MORGAN:

The majority of fishermen have been very, very responsible in handling their accounts with the Fisheries Loan Board. There have been a few bad cats but there are always a few bad cats in every system, and these people had to be dealt with. In fact, I recall making a public statement six or seven months ago, I guess, saying exactly that, that there were a few bad cats and we were going to deal with them. We, in fact, have dealt with them. We have dealt with them and they have now paid up their accounts accordingly or they have had their boats taken away from them. But all in all, the overall situation is the board is operating quite efficiently and there have been very repossessions.

What I will do for the hon. gentleman and for the House is table the actual numbers of repossessions, even give the names of the boats, names of the owners of these boats or the previous owners. I feel that the House of Assembly is entitled to all this information and I will table it in the House.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that the reason I asked the question is that I understand that there were four of the larger longliners, perhaps the newer type ones, repossessed last month and there may be another seven repossessed this month. But I would like to ask the minister another question and that is one of our neighbouring provinces, Quebec, which fish in the Gulf, offers interest-free loans to its fishermen to build boats. That is correct. In view of the fact that our fishermen, on the West Coast, in particular, who fish in the Gulf are experiencing some difficulty with repaying loans from the Fisheries Loan Board through the banks, and in view of the fact that

MR. TULK: many of our fishermen are having financial difficulties and are facing prices as low or lower this year than last year, would he now consider or recommend to Cabinet that the Province should subsidize the interest on those loans? One fisherman last year, for example, paid \$28,000 interest on a loan and that was on a boat subsidized by the federal government. I am asking the minister if he would take the suggestion to Cabinet that these loans be made interest free or at least lower them to the 2 per cent or 3 per cent level that prevailed before 1979 or 1980 when he became Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and raised it to 12 per cent?

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



MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. gentleman is not living in the world or reality when he makes these kinds of suggestions. The fact is that we are now subsidizing the interest rate to fishermen. We charge them 8 per cent at the present time, but if they were to get a loan from the bank it would cost them more like 12 per cent or 13 per cent.

DR. COLLINS: It is now 14 per cent at the banks.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe even 14 per cent, my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicates. So we are subsidizing, in this case, 6 per cent on every dollar of interest paid by fishermen. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of subsidy that has the International Trade Commission in the U.S.A. so worried today that they are now attempting, making efforts - in fact, the study is now ongoing - to look at countervailing activity in the U.S. against fish products from Canada. This study is ongoing because of these kinds of subsidies going into the industry within Canada.

In Nova Scotia today the interest rates for fishermen are 10 per cent. Maybe Quebec can afford to do it, but how can they afford to do it? By taking the money they get from the Churchill Falls, for example, from our Province. That is the reason why they can afford to do it. They are getting \$790 million a year from the Churchill Falls power and we get \$7 million a year from the same power, power that we own. That is the reason why they can afford to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Compliments of the hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. MORGAN: That is right, compliments of the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who support these

MR. MORGAN: kinds of things going on in the country today, who will not take a stand on behalf of their Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the more pertinent point, the interest rates, we have no intention at this time of considering reducing the interest rates on these loans below what they are now. We are now subsidizing it, making the cost to fishermen 8 per cent, so we have no intention at this time of reviewing that Loan Board rate. It is the lowest loan board rate of all boards.

I am a member of the Rural Development Board, as is my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), and my colleague,

MR. MORGAN: the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the three of us, and we disburse loans on a monthly basis through applications made for rural development purposes. That loan rate is the same as that of the Fisheries Loan Board and other loan agencies, and they are all under the same policy. So to change the policy for one board we would have to change them all. So we have no intention at this time of doing that. I say again that the loan rate that we are charging fishermen is a quite reasonable one versus the Province of Nova Scotia, which is the next largest fish producing province. The fishery in Quebec is nothing compared to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland with regards to the size of the industry and its activity. We have no intention at this time of changing the interest rate system or in fact changing the loan board system. It is working to the benefit of the fishermen and working quite satisfactorily.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me say to his friend up here that his side of the House voted for that bad deal in 1966 and he can laugh over there all he likes but they voted for that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister a question. The restructuring of the deep-sea fishery, which is basically what we saw in September, bailed out the banks and the companies and provided relief for the deep-sea fishery, and it is good that that much was done. But let me ask him, if he will not lower the interest rates on fishermen's loans to build boats and so on, in view of the increasing costs of gear and so on, what is he going to do to relieve the situation that

MR. TULK: many of our inshore fishermen are now finding themselves being practically bankrupt? What is the minister contemplating doing if he will not lower interest rates and so on under his own loans?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, the same old Liberal tactic. Whenever anything is wrong under federal jurisdiction and something needs to be done, the Newfoundland government must do it. It has got to be us. Here is an example from the harvesting side of the fishing industry, which is strictly and totally under federal jurisdiction. There is no question about that like the matter of licencing which I mentioned yesterday and will deal with tomorrow in the House of Assembly. The harvesting jurisdiction is federal, but the Opposition want us to deal with the problems that are there. There is a problem with the inshore fishery and the need for higher incomes for these fishermen, approximately 15,000 full-time fishermen and a further 10,000 to 11,000 part-time fishermen. Sure there is a need for something to be done and we have been discussing that with the federal level of government. But surely he does not expect us to get involved in subsidizing the price of fish!

MR. MORGAN: Maybe the Liberal Party is advocating that; maybe they are advocating it as a policy that the governments of the provinces of Atlantic Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and ourselves, should now get involved and subsidize the price of fish. If they want that and if they stand for that, let them say it - do not be just queasing around trying to indicate that it should be done, indicate if it should be done or not. Because, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the ramifications of subsidies on the prices of fish today in our Province will be so gigantic that the U.S. would, boom-o, within twenty-four hours would be my guess, impose counter-vailing tariffs and we would have no market in the U.S., and the U.S. buys approximately 82 per cent of all of the seafood products of this Province. So does he want to destroy the whole industry? If that is the attitude and the policy of the Liberal Party, we want no part of it. But we do want to see something done for the inshore fishermen.

I have been saying that to the industry and to Mr. De Bane. We have a proposal now on the table and I am hoping to talk to Mr. De Bane, if he is still talking with me after the threat I threw out yesterday about licencing our fishermen here, taking it away from Ottawa - I do not know, I think he will. Indications are, in fact, he may talk to me more quickly now than before. But we will see tomorrow on that one.

But, Mr. Speaker, the quality programme, which the hon. gentleman did not want to support too strongly when I brought it into the House a little while ago, I mentioned in that debate a six cents per pound for fishermen -

MR. TULK: What a laugh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - based on their doing certain things will put six cents a pound in the pockets of fishermen. In what way? It will give them six cents per pound this year by the Government of Canada if the industry, the companies, would agree to implement that kind of a quality programme and put in place dock side grading. In other words, the product is graded; fishermen, if they want to, may gut and bleed their fish at sea and wash and ice it at sea, which will improve the quality substantially. In fact, it is unbelievable the difference in fish not gutted and bled, and the fish gutted and bled with respect to the quality of the final product in the marketplace, the cod fillets in particular.

So if he would support that kind of a programme strongly and firmly on behalf of his party and take the issue to his political colleague in Ottawa, Mr. De Bane, and his other colleague whom he is now supporting for the leadership, Mr. Chretien -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK: On a point of order. The Liberal Party has been on record for years as supporting incentive for quality control. The minister knows that, so he is misusing the truth. Let me tell him something else, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Burn your boats.

MR. TULK: He is misleading this House, whether deliberately or not, I am not sure. But let me tell him something else, Mr. Speaker. If there is anything in this Province that is going to destroy the fishery, it is sitting in that seat over there.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. member for Fogo (Mr.Tulk) obviously did not raise a valid point of order. It was more an opportunity to rise and express an opinion.

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in continuing -

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for the Question Period has now expired.

MR.MORGAN: Thank you, Mr.Speaker.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR.SPEAKER: I would like to take this opportunity pursuant to Sub-section 29 of the Parliamentary Commissioner(Ombudsman)Act to table the ninth annual report of the Ombudsman.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR.SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador."

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that, and with the agreement of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, the minister has introduced a bill which is in essence the same Order 12, Bill 12 on the Order Paper, 'An Act Respecting The Preservation

MR. MARSHALL: Of The Historic Resources  
Of The Province, With concurrence and by leave  
of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I would move that  
the bill to which the hon. minister gave notice replace  
Order 12 on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Do we have agreement for that  
proposal? Agreed.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice  
that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve  
itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider  
certain resolutions for the granting of supplementary  
supply to Her Majesty.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. WARREN: He has no answers.

DR. COLLINS: There are always answers.

The hon. member should not have that knee-jerk  
response of his. Without even looking around he  
said there are no answers. That is just a knee-jerk response.

Mr. Speaker, as acting Minister  
of Health, I guess -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is trying to hear an answer by the  
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and is having some  
difficulty.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, such noises  
from the people opposite. In answer to Question 40



May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1745

ah-3

DR. COLLINS: asked by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) of the Minister of Health (Mr. House), I would like to table this response. He asked it in regard to the number of doctors in the Province and their salaries and expertise and so on and so forth.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked me some questions about the opening of the parks and I indicated that I would get a copy of the press release that went out on May 2 for him. I hereby table the press release.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 3.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 3, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to move The Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act, 1973.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will take just a moment to indicate the procedure by which we operate in considering this particular resolution, which is a resolution to adopt the report of the Newfoundland Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission, which was tabled by the hon. the Minister of Justice some time ago during this present sitting.

Section 21 of the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act reads: "If the House of Assembly approves by Resolution the recommendations of the Commission contained in the copy of the report laid before the Legislature, the Government shall, as soon after such Resolution as conveniently may be, introduce a Bill to implement such Resolution."

Now, just by way of clarification we are considering this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I will be expanding the resolution at the end, in accordance with that section, to request that a bill

MR. MARSHALL: consequential on the resolution, if the House adopts the resolution, be passed. I would assume that now we are talking about it as a resolution and that once we pass the resolution, then we could get three readings of the bill which is, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act" which has already been distributed, so that we can have the debate at the resolution stage.

Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable we can proceed along that basis. In other words, we do the debate when the resolution is on.

MR. BARRY: Can you give us that again?

MR. MARSHALL: For some reason or other, I do not know why, the act provides that the report of the commission has to be considered and either approved, or approved with alterations, by resolution. The resolution is on the Order Paper. We are now dealing with the resolution. It is almost like a money bill except His Honour is in the Chair instead of the House being in Committee. What I would suggest is we have the debate during the resolution and with the resolution passed we can pass the act the same way as if it were the loan bill, or any of the other financial bills.

MR. WARREN: What time do we get?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we could agree on that. If hon. gentlemen wish to go the same way that could be by consent. As it is now we are before the House so it would be half an hour each if you want to do it that way, or you could elect to do it fifteen and ten and ten, whichever way the House wishes.

MR. TULK: Why do we not agree to that one?

MR. MARSHALL: Okay, we will agree to half an hour and then the rules of the House will apply. We will address the resolution now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. The Electoral Boundaries Act, which was passed by this House in the early 1970s -

MR. TULK: 1972 was it not?

MR. MARSHALL: 1972 or 1973 - provided for the determination of electoral boundaries in a manner which was impartial, by an impartially set up independent commission. It provides that every ten years there has to be a reassessment of the boundaries. The last one, as the hon. gentleman indicated, occurred in 1972 or 1973 -

MR. TULK: Gerrymandering by Frank.

MR. MARSHALL: - and now we have the report of the Commission which met during 1983 and 1984. That report, Mr. Speaker, was written by a commission which consisted of His Honour, Judge Rupert Bartlett, who was the Chairman of the Commission. I think everybody knows who Judge Bartlett is; he is a very distinguished jurist in the Province, a very highly respected judge, who has been very much active in community affairs all of his life.

MR. CALLAN: A good Liberal.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, he is not a good Liberal now, he is not a good Conservative now, he is a member of the Bench. We are not allowed to talk about members of the judiciary as having any political aspirations. Can you not visualize the horror that the hon. gentleman would exude if I had referred to, for instance, a member of the Supreme Court of Canada or the Supreme Court of Newfoundland as being a good Liberal or a good Tory or a good NDP, or what have you. These people, Mr. Speaker, are sacrosanct. When they are appointed to the Bench they are above reproach, they are not able to be criticized, they are virtual colossi who bestride this world like gods and are not allowed to be criticized at all. No one is allowed to criticize the substance of their decision, but you are not allowed to criticize them. And I say that because I would be the last one to criticize, particularly to criticize Judge Rupert Bartlett. I must tell the hon. gentleman, despite the fact that he thinks I hate all Liberals, which is true, there are a few of them, Mr. Speaker, that my heart will open up to. Such a one is Judge Bartlett, and he is not a Liberal now because he is a judge. But when he was a Liberal, sitting on the other side of the House for one day as member for the district of Trinity South, he was one of the few Liberals around whom I could - well, I suppose I should not say it, Mr. Speaker, in the House - whom I could stomach. That is what I will say, that I could stomach.

As the hon. gentleman remembers, he was a former law partner of mine. I learned many tricks of the legal trade at the desk of the hon. judge.

MR. MARSHALL:

And he acquits himself marvellously as a member of the District Court of Newfoundland and he certainly acquitted himself very, very well here as Chairman. I mean that sincerely. We feel that it was very difficult, of course, for any commission to set the boundaries of electoral districts. There are always problems, there are various interests they have to address. But, by and large, the government feels that he and his fellow members, Mr. Fintan Aylward, Mr. Frank Shortall and Mr. Rupert Short, did a most commendable job in setting the electoral boundaries.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has indicated, this is the first time that an Electoral Boundaries Commission is going to be put before the House by this government as a government measure, fully endorsed by the government and supported by the government without any change whatsoever. This administration feels that this was the spirit and nature of the act when it was passed and we want to see that, even though, as the act says, we may approve it with alterations if we so desire. Although certain members on both sides of the House might have a certain amount of misgivings in losing parts of their districts in some cases and gaining other parts, we feel, by and large, a very, very commendable job was done and we are going to adopt the report of the commission.

Now there are certain recommendations in there and there are very comprehensive reports. For instance, the commission feels that it should not be governed by two year old census figures when twelve month updates of the census figures are available from the offices of Statistics Canada. Now we feel that that is a good recommendation. We are not going to address it

MR. MARSHALL: right now in the act but we will consider leading an amendment to it. It is going to be ten years again before this becomes operative, so we will consider leading an amendment to that in the future.

With respect to the districts themselves, maybe some members wish to speak on their own districts, but I will just give an overall synopsis of the districts where it is perceived that there is any real change. For the districts of Mount Scio and Harbour Main - Bell Island, there were changes in the final report from the original proposal. The reasons given for this are very clearly set forth by the commission on pages 6 and 7 of the report that is before hon. members. They felt, for instance, that the Northern part of the Mount Scio district was much more easily incorporated with Bell Island with which it has probably a greater community of interest than Harbour Main and Bell Island where it had been before.

MR. MARSHALL: Harbour Main-Bell Island has been consequentially changed fairly considerably, It now extends, I understand, down to the Foxtrap Access Road, I was going to say Forest Road Access Road, but that is because I cannot get out of the East End of St. John's, But it now extends down to the Foxtrap Access Road. Then, of course, there is a consequential change in Conception Bay South; the Western part of the district, which is now incorporated into Harbour Main, will begin at the Foxtrap Access Road and extend I think down to the Paradise area. So that is an extensive change there.

Also there was a major change in the Humber East district and the Humber Valley district. This was brought about because of the necessity under the framework of the Act which provides that there is to be more of a population quotient in the urban areas than in the rural areas. Humber East, which of course takes in a large part of the city of Corner Brook, is an urban area, so there was a fairly substantial change done there where the Pasadena area was taken into Humber East. The Humber Valley one extends up the Great Northern Peninsula to a greater degree than it did before.

The districts of St. Barbe, the Strait of Belle Isle, Baie Verte-White Bay have been altered as well. The district of St. Barbe extends in a more Northly direction than it had heretofore. The Strait of Belle Isle will now take in the area of Roddickton and Englee. And Baie Verte-White Bay will continue to take in a portion of White Bay but the part of White Bay that it will take in to all intents and purposes will be Harbour Deep.

There have been fairly extensive changes, as one might expect, in the Avalon Peninsula districts particularly around St. John's, because there have been a lot of population shifts as normally would occur in a ten year



MR. MARSHALL:

period in the St. John's area.

Generally speaking all of the districts in the St. John's area now have populations in the vicinity of the 13,000 range. The same way with Mount Pearl, which will have 12,000.

There is a fair amount of Mount Pearl, approximately one-third, that has been incorporated into the Waterford-Kenmount area.

Once again it is because the act requires this quotient so it has been divided up accordingly.

The Act contains the schedules which give accurate descriptions of the way in which the electoral districts will be changed in the next election.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, of course, in the rural areas, other than what I have alluded to - Baie Verte - White Bay, the Strait of Belle Isle, a portion of Humber Valley and the district of St. Barbe - by and large there has not been any great change. In the Burin - Placentia West district there has been a change from the original submission in that Winterland was restored to Burin - Placentia West, but I believe Winterland is already in that district anyway. So that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps now I will take my seat and just respond to questions that hon. gentlemen may ask. I just lead this in and point out once again that this is the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. Once this is passed this will constitute the districts for the next general election in the Province of Newfoundland for the next Assembly.. We are proud of the fact that we are bringing this bill before the House as a government measure and we are endorsing it. It is the first time that an independent commission has sat and brought in recommendations of this nature which have been endorsed without any change whatsoever by the government. We realize that there are going to be certain members, as I say, who will be very concerned over the fact that certain portions of their districts have been altered, but I think that where there have been alterations they were necessary, as I say, because of the population shifts. I know, for instance, in the districts in the St. John's area myself and the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), and I believe the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), those three districts in the older parts of St. John's had a much lower number of constituents than other districts. The figures are there, but I think they were down to about 7,000, yet some of the other ones, including Waterford - Kenmount and Mount Pearl itself, were considerably

MR. MARSHALL: higher. So adjustments had to be made in order to suit the act. The general scheme of the act provides for fifty-two districts. You divide the number of voters by fifty-two and you come up with an equal number. You weight it then, you transfer to the urban areas more people than you would to the rural areas. There is a particular provision with respect to the Labrador districts. Now that was brought in by the Peckford administration.

MR. WARREN: No, it was not.

MR. MARSHALL: No, it was brought in by the Peckford administration. The hon. gentleman was not here and would not be here but for the fact that this was brought in. We had only one member representing the Coastal part of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, and the Peckford administration created two districts and now we have two half members representing the Coastal part of Labrador. The numbers of people represented are very much lower, but there is a very, very good and justifiable reason for that, obviously, and hardly needs to be stated, and this is because in the Coastal Labrador area the communities are very, very much further spread than they are in other areas. Communication is very often difficult and it is extremely hard for one person to service the entire district. The last representative who represented the entire district I think was Mr. Ian Strachan and he chose not to run again. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. gentleman saw the light. One of these days I predict the hon. gentleman there opposite is going to see the light as well, I think he has seen the light, really. Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that Mr. Strachan sees the light. Every day as I look at the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)

May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1750

MJ - 3

MR. MARSHALL:                   the inescapable truth looms  
that two Liberals equals one Tory. Anyway, Mr. Speaker,  
that is the

MR. MARSHALL: situation that we are in. In bringing it before the House we realize there are going to be certain members who feel sad that they have lost certain constituents, but it is a good report. We congratulate the Commission. We are proud of the fact that we are bringing it in without, as I said, any amendments, and that is the motion that we will be prepared to make. As I said, I will not talk any longer, but when I close the debate, I will certainly be prepared to respond to any questions that hon. gentlemen may pose during the debate itself.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, since the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) wants to close the House tomorrow, I would be only too glad to yield to other members whose districts are affected, especially the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), to have a few words.

However, I have a few words also about some of the changes.

Now, the minister began by praising the Commission. No doubt, under the rules and regulations that Judge Bartlett and the Commission had to follow, it was very difficult for them to come back with any different recommendations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister talked about my district of the district of Eagle River before the extra seat was created in 1978 or 1979. Mr. Speaker, maybe this story should be told to hon. members. At that time, Mr. Speaker, on occasion, I had to travel on the government-owned aircraft while I was a civil servant working with the

MR. WARREN: Department of Fisheries in Labrador. And at that time, while I was travelling, a special meeting was held on that plane between the candidate who had been selected for the new district and two particular Cabinet ministers at the time who said, 'We have this district set up purposely for you and once the election is called, you can go in hands down!' Mr. Speaker, as a civil servant sitting in one of those chairs at the time, listening to that conversation, I could not help, when the hon. the Premier called the election, jumping in with my thigh-rubbers on! And I was not long in jumping in there! And, unfortunately for the gentleman who was being railroaded into being their candidate, I believe that he came off on the wrong end of the stick.

The minister said that it takes two Liberals to equal one Tory. If we look, Mr. Speaker, at the Avalon Peninsula, we find that within twenty miles of the Overpass there are something like thirteen Tories representing this section of the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I could say to the hon. member that Frank Moores created eleven seats for this area instead of the traditional four or five seats. In the redistribution of 1972, so it seems you need eleven Tories to do what four Liberals could do. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker, and now it takes eleven to thirteen Tories to do what four Liberals can do. And for the hon. minister to get up and say two Liberals are equal to one Tory, I could reply, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Moores felt he needed eleven or thirteen Tories to be equal to two Liberals. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should take the Committee to task on some of its recommendations, particularly as they pertain to the hon. Deputy Speaker's district and the districts of Mount Pearl and Waterford-Kenmount. I believe Mr. Speaker, the way the boundaries have been drawn for the district of Mount Pearl is not in the best interest of a town the size of Mount Pearl. I believe they should not divide up Mount Pearl and put some of it in Waterford-Kenmount. I believe Mount Pearl warrants two districts, Mount Pearl East and Mount Pearl West. The Deputy Speaker can probably correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that his district of Kilbride takes in some residents of Mount Pearl. In fact, if it does not now, it will in two or three years when the expansion takes place on Brookfield Road. And, Mr. Speaker, Waterford-Kenmount takes in a large portion of the district of Mount Pearl. I think if redistribution is going to take place there should be a Mount Pearl East and a Mount Pearl West district.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: one problem with this legislature is that we have more members than is necessary.

MR. PATTERSON: Will we drop your district?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if this government wants to drop a district in Labrador, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the next time around I will still be elected in a district, and I will not have to try six times like the hon. member tried before he got in this House.

MR. PATTERSON: More than that.

MR. WARREN: I will assure members that I will not be afraid to contest the next election in any district that I chose.

MR. PATTERSON: I say that you could be elected as a Liberal in my district.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that within the municipal boundaries of St. John's there are three members more than they actually need. I think we need more than forty-two members but I do not believe we need fifty-two; probably forty-six or forty-eight but definitely not fifty-two. St. John's does not need the number of members that they presently have. The unfortunate thing about the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is that it is controlled by the St. John's members, and I am sure the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) must be saying the same thing. There is a feeling in rural Newfoundland what is good for St. John's is good for this government.

The one thing this government must credit Frank Moores with -and even the present Premier did not destroy it when he cut the cord between himself and Frank Moores - was Frank Moores' gift to the Tory Party of Newfoundland and Labrador: All those seats in St. John's



MR. WARREN: That is a nest egg all ready to hatch the day the Premier calls an election. But, Mr. Speaker, change is coming. Mr. Moores used the slogan in 1972, 'The time has come'. I would not doubt but when the next election rolls around this government will not be able to depend on Tory St. John's anymore. Mr. Speaker, I will say the same slogan Mr. Moores used, 'The time has come,' will probably be used in the next election but it will be used by this Party here. The people outside the Overpass are saying that the time has come. The hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) - I suppose it is going to be called Harbour Main - Foxtrap now or whatever it is going to be called - is going to have his hands full when he starts taking on the Taylors and the Kennedys and the Doyles from up around Kelligrews and Seal Cove. He will have his hands full, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go back to some of the other changes that have taken place. What have they done with Baie Verte? How obvious, Mr. Speaker, can a decision be made to take Roddickton and Englee and put it in the district of the Strait of Belle Isle. Mr. Speaker, this government knew that they never had a chance to carry the Strait of Belle Isle district so it decided to take Roddickton and Englee, which are predominately Liberal, and put them into a safe Liberal seat, which gives the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) an easier opportunity to win the next election. But that is not going to jibe, Mr. Speaker, because they are turning over in Baie Verte just as fast as they are turning over in the other districts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the commission has done a fairly good job under the rules and regulations that they had, but they could have done better because the rules and regulations should not have been as stringent as they were. I believe the districts should have been changed to tie in the relationships between the areas. Take, for example, Placentia

May 17, 1984

Tape No. 1754

SD - 2

MR. WARREN: and I believe the hon. member  
for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would agree with me on this one.  
The district of Placentia all of a sudden leaves the Long  
Harbour area and goes all the way down the Southern part of  
Placentia Bay to Southern Harbour.

MR. WARREN: The district of Bellevue comes up to the Trans-Canada-Long Harbour Road, goes down the Trans-Canada also, skips past Fair Haven, Little Harbour and Southern Harbour, goes past those three places, and then it goes on and takes in Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance. But surely it would be better if Placentia district took in Whitbourne and Markland.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, better for the people.

MR. WARREN: That is right, it would be better for the people. Likewise it would be better for the people in Southern Harbour, Little Harbour and Fair Haven to be in Bellevue district. It would be much better.

So, Mr. Speaker, logically, geographically, it would be better for the members and better for the people concerned. This is one area where the Commission failed.

Markland and Whitbourne could easily have been consolidated into Placentia, they have roughly the same population of those other three communities, and it would have been much easier for either one of the members to serve, whether they are Tories or Liberals or NDP, I do not care, it would be much easier.

And, Mr. Speaker, the same thing in Labrador. In my district I represent roughly 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the Native people. I told the Commission I had no qualms about having Shesheshit or North West River, where most of the other Native people of Labrador live, included in my district.

DR. COLLINS: What does that add up to, 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the Native people up there?

MR. WARREN: About 1600 roughly. However, I would like to advise the hon. member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) that when I go to my district I cannot stand on a hilltop and talk to all my constituents like the hon. member can do. The hon.

MR. WARREN:

member can go down on the Southside Hills and he can talk to everybody in his district with a bull horn. When I go to my district, I am not like the hon. member, driving through in a car, because there are no roads. When I go there I am obliged, Mr. Speaker, to spend a considerable time there and visit everybody and go in and have a cup of tea with them. I would say, Mr. Speaker, other than the few buddies that the hon. gentleman has, I would say he does not meet any of his constituents. Like I said, he can probably stand on the Southside Hills and use one of those bull horns and talk to his whole district. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go through some of the other things.

Do you know who has the largest district in rural Newfoundland?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Sir. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has the largest district in rural Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN: In terms of what?

MR. WARREN: In terms of geography.

MR. PATTERSON: How many constituents do you have?

MR. WARREN: Including the four babies born during the past week, I have a total of 3,211 - I think it may be 3,211 or 3,212, a couple may have gone the other way.

DR. COLLINS: That would fill one street in my district.

MR. WARREN: That would fill one street in the hon. gentleman's district, I agree with the hon. gentleman. However, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to make just one trip to my district in the month of March. I would not like for him to go up there in the Summertime because he would spend all his time fishing. I would not like for him to do that. And I would not like for him to go up in the Wintertime, Mr. Speaker, because then, in January or February, it would be so cold that the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) would have to make arrangements to get him back. So I would suggest that in the month of March when the weather begins to get a little bit warmer, that he come up and just follow me through the district. He would have to get on a Ski-doo and travel about sixty or seventy miles.

MR. WARREN: have had such a rousing trip on a komatik that I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it would be his first and last time in Labrador.

I have to sympathize with the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). I know he is having a very difficult time getting a rural development agreement in place and I believe some of the fault has to lie with the federal government, there is no doubt about that. But the main fault lies with this government, because the Cabinet is comprised of mostly 'townie' Cabinet ministers. Their concern is with Corner Brook and St. John's and they are not concerned about rural Newfoundland. That is one of the main reasons why we do not have an agreement today. The Tory Cabinet ministers are so concerned about St. John's and Corner Brook that we do not have a rural development agreement in place.

MR. DINN: Relevancy, Mr. Speaker. That has nothing to do with the subject we are on.

MR. WARREN: It does have a lot to do with with the electoral boundaries, Mr. Speaker. It may not directly, however, as my train of thought unfolds, Mr. Speaker, you will see that it has a lot to do with electoral boundaries. Mr. Speaker, the Commission could not reduce the number of seats in St. John's, and there are six or seven Cabinet ministers in the St. John's/ Mount Pearl area. That is why it has a lot to do

MR. WARREN: with the rural development funding. Now, Mr. Speaker, where do we go from here? I believe that before this resolution and bill are passed, there should be necessary legislation brought into this House to make sure that when the next Electoral Boundaries Commission is called, which has to be within ten years, that they will have more ammunition to work with, their hands will not be tied. Because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the capable gentlemen who were on this Commission were given more authority, they would have brought in recommendations reducing the number of seats in this Legislature. I sympathize also, Mr. Speaker, with the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) whose district has the highest population, the highest number of voters in any district of the Province. I am sure he has his hands full trying to cover from Blackmarsh Road up to Holyrood - I believe it extends to the Holyrood boundaries - and it is just too much for the hon. the member to do.

MR. WINDSOR: He makes a good job of it, too.

MR. WARREN: I agree with the hon. the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) that he does a real good job, a much better than the hon. member is doing in Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR: Certainly not.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I must advise the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) because he should not be ashamed because some other member on that side is doing a better job than he is doing himself. However, Mr. Speaker, the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) now has a fantastic district from the Foxtrap Access Road up to Paradise. Mr. Speaker, it makes the district so appealing since I spent two years out in that particular district in the teaching profession.

MR. WINDSOR: Where?

MR. WARREN: In the new CBS district.

MR. WINDSOR: I thought you were going to run in Mount Pearl?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this member wants me to run in Mount Pearl. I cannot go everywhere. Mr. Speaker, it is to the point now that I have been challenged by all members to run in different districts. The next thing is you will see the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) wanting me to run out in Placentia.

MR. WINDSOR: I would like to run against you.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what I like to see. I would like to see a physical heavyweight plus a possible heavyweight run against me, Mr. Speaker. Would that not be exciting, Mr. Speaker, in the district of Torngat?

MR. SIMMS: I thought you had federal aspirations?

MR. WARREN: Well, no, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let out what I am going to do federally yet.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to my train of thought.



MR. WARREN: I believe the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) has a real good district. But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing about the member is he has straddled the fence so often that I am sure every picket on that fence must have found a safe home. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate for the member. The member has to get off the fence because if he does not get off the fence then the voters are going to push him off the fence. So he has to remember that.

MR. DOYLE: Straddling the fence on what?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, again, that is another district. All due respect to the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), but here we have Conception Bay South from Paradise up to Holyrood and all of a sudden a signal is given and it goes into Harbour Main. In fact, I think the community of Foxtrap -

MR. DOYLE: Half and half.

MR. WARREN: That is right. It is half and half. If in the next election the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island gets elected as a Tory and the hon. member for Conception Bay South gets elected as a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, if this be the case the people in Foxtrap will have a choice as to which member they will depend on. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, they will depend on the member for Conception Bay South because by that time he will be the member who will be in government. It might be a shot in the dark but it is possible, Mr. Speaker. It happened in Saskatchewan where there was a bigger turn-around than we are expecting in the next election here. So, Mr. Speaker, no doubt we will see some changes.

I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that a Liberal administration will do when they get in power -

MR. DOYLE: If.

MR. WARREN: I did not say if, I said when they get in power - that is, if the Premier has the stomach to call an election. That is when we are going to get in power.

MR. CALLAN: He is going to call an election tomorrow.

MR. WARREN: Oh, he is going to call an election tomorrow! Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, I have to say a few words about what the hon. gentleman just said. That would not surprise me at all. Remember, last time the Premier called an election before we had our leadership in place, Mr. Speaker, and maybe he might do the same thing now. He knows that we are having a leadership convention in October and he may decide to call an election.

However, Mr. Speaker, in my closing remarks I will say that as soon as we can get in power, and that is up to the Premier when we get in power, we will make sure that St. John's will not be carrying around eleven Tories on their backs. No, Mr. Speaker, there will not be eleven Tories from St. John's carried around by the taxpayers of this Province.

MR. TOBIN: Are you going to gerrymander the place again?

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker. It will be changed in that there will be a reduction in seats in the St. John's area. Sure there will be, there will have to be, Mr. Speaker, because St. John's does not need all those members. We need two members for Conception Bay South, Mr. Speaker, that is where we need two members. We need another member

MR. WARREN:

on the Northern Peninsula although the population is not there , The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), I am sure, Mr. Speaker, would give his eye teeth for a district as small as that of the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) . The member for St. John's Centre Sunday morning before he goes to church can go on Flower Hill and talk to everybody. That is how big his district is.

MR. TOBIN:

The member for St. Barbe visits his district.

MR. WARREN:

The member for St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker, is doing a good job in his district. However, he could do a better job if his district were more compact. Let us look closely at rural Newfoundland. I believe the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) could give good service to his district by taking off Bell Island but not adding to it. Why add Kelligrews, Seal Cove, Upper Gullies and so on? It was not necessary. And the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) could do a lot better, Mr. Speaker, in his district if he would mind to put the time into it.

MR. TOBIN:

At least I visit my district.

MR. WARREN:

He visits his district but at the same time he is sorry for doing it half the time.

MR. TOBIN:

What about the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), and the 5,000 votes he got?

MR. WARREN:

The member for Grand Falls

MR. WARREN: I believe has a good compact district.

MR. CALLAN: They have a poor member but he has a good district.

MR. WARREN: The minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook), has a good district I do not think her district needs to be changed. But let us look at the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). His district can be more compact than it is but it could not be because of the population. I believe the member for Fortune-Hermitage's district is definitely divided wrong proportionately for the member's advantage and also for the people's advantage. There is no reason at all why part of the Fortune-Hermitage district could not be included in the member for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Tobin) district which is on the main highway coming down and part of that section, especially the Bay L'Argent section, could have been taken into the hon. member's district. There is no reason why it could not because geographically speaking, Mr. Speaker, it would be much better for both members.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for just a few moments. I certainly will not take the half hour available to me to say what I have to say, as did the hon. gentleman opposite but I suspect I will probably say a lot more.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that this is , of course, the first time that an Electoral Boundaries Commission has been accepted in its totality by government. And I certainly support that decision of this particular government. I think in fact it is in many ways a very courageous move by government to accept the independent judgement of that Commission and to accept it in its totality and to bring it before this House for ratification. So I support the decision of government, and I will be very clear on that, but what I do not support, Mr. Speaker, is some of the

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, are some of the recommendations of the commission and the way in which they approached many of the issues with which they were faced.

I recognize, as has been said many times in this House, of course, constraints that were imposed on the commission, or are imposed on the commission by the legislation under which they were asked to consider these questions. That is another issue. It may well be that we need to reconsider that legislation and to provide more flexibility for the commission. It may be a little too constrictive on them. I would certainly approve any move to review that legislation and to let the House in its wisdom decide if more flexibility needs to be given to the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

But that is not the question at issue today, Mr. Speaker, it is far too late for that. We should have made that decision before giving the commission its mandate and its responsibilities to consider the electoral boundaries of the Province, but we may well wish to do it prior to the next Electoral Boundaries Commission being formulated.

Mr. Speaker, many of the issues that were put before the commission, of course, were very difficult and complex with which to sort out the problems with which we were faced in the many areas, particularly the urban area of St. John's and Mount Pearl, Conception Bay South and the metropolitan region. The major problem was related to the incredible rate of population growth in this area in relation to the rest of the Province. Many of the districts in this area, my own being probably the greatest example, since Mount Pearl is probably the fastest growing community anywhere in Eastern Canada, and my own district was greatly affected.

MR. WINDSOR: When I first ran for office and was elected to this House in 1975, I had some 13,000 constituents, and, as of this date, I have in excess of 18,000 constituents. So that is an incredible growth over an eight year period in the number of persons whom I have the honour of representing. So I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the problem with which the commission was faced in being bound by a limitation of some 12,000 people as a maximum size that they could incorporate in any one particular electoral district.

The problem that it creates for me, and for the district of Mount Pearl, and I recognize what the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, and I agree with his remarks in relation to my district. It is not very often I agree with the hon. member, but I certainly do in this particular case, and many of the points he made are the same ones that I wish to make this afternoon.

I think, in order to really appreciate the situation as it relates to my district, you must look at the history of Mount Pearl, and look back and realize that many years ago, prior to incorporation of the town, Mount Pearl was basically a Summer community which grew into what was known as Mount Pearl Park. Eventually another area began to be developed West of Commonwealth Avenue and it became known as Glendale. Then there was the town of Mount Pearl Park - Glendale. Eventually, I think in 1955, when the town formally incorporated, it became the town of Mount Pearl and that incorporated all of the areas previously known as Mount Pearl Park - Glendale.

Subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, the Province, through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, undertook a major residential and

MR. WINDSOR: commercial development to the West of the Town of Mount Pearl, part of which, in fact, was in the original boundaries of the town of Mount Pearl. So we then, in due course, had the town of Mount Pearl, and Newtown, and Donovan's, and eventually private development moved to the North and West of the community and developed what is known as the West Hills area. So now we have



MR. WINDSOR: the Town of Mount Pearl, Newtown, Donovans, and West Hill area. Eventually, Mr. Speaker, government in its wisdom, with some gentle prodding from the member representing the district, eventually expanded the boundary to the Town of Mount Pearl to incorporate the community all as one town, which, Mr. Speaker, was always the intent, I think, of the planning for the Mount Pearl/Newtown and Donovans Development, all one properly developed and integrated community properly planned, probably, in fact, the best planned community anywhere in the Province, in fact, as good as any in Eastern Canada, with proper facilities, with proper planning for institutional use, for schools and so forth, for commercial establishments, for residential establishment, for the industrial base at Donovans, for churches, recreational facilities, conservation areas and so forth. So it is a properly planned community and the decision several years ago to expand the boundary of the Town of Mount Pearl to include all of that area, of course, was an extremely logical decision.

But finally, Mr. Speaker, we had one unified community. Prior to the 1975 general election, of course, there was similarly, at that time, an Electoral Boundaries Commission which created the district of Mount Pearl. Prior to 1975, the area of Mount Pearl was represented by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), who represented the district very well but, nevertheless, it was obvious at that time, and recognized, that because of the rapid growth of that area boundary changes needed to be made and that Mount Pearl at that point in time had indeed grown to a level where it was quite justified to create a separate district for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

So, Mr. Speaker, it was in 1975 that I had the honour of being elected as the first member for the new district of Mount Pearl which I have represented, of course, since that time.

But with the creation of the expanded Town of Mount Pearl and with the creation of the electoral district of Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, the boundaries were almost coincident, there were great similarities. They were not exact, but for all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, the boundaries of the two were almost coincident, which makes a lot of sense, Mr. Speaker, because over an eight year period representing the community I would say without any hesitancy that I have probably as good a relationship with the Municipal Council of Mount Pearl as is enjoyed by any hon. member of this House with any elected municipal council. I would further state, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of the success of the district of Mount Pearl and the Town of Mount Pearl over the last number of years is due in very large measure both to the relationship shared between that council and myself, and also to the very high quality of the municipal councils that have been elected in that community over the last number of years. And I give them, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of credit at the same time as expressing a great deal of gratitude for the co-operation that we have had. And that has been very

MR. WINDSOR: important to me in representing the community, in being totally in tune with the municipality, totally aware of what they were planning, and in turn keeping them totally aware of what government's proposals were in their particular community and as they effected that community. And that kind of liaison has paid off handsomely to the development of the community and for the betterment of a lifestyle of the people of the district and of the town.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to change that relationship, to change the boundaries as they were.

MR. WINDSOR: There were no problems with the boundaries, there were no reasons why the boundaries, in fact, would need to be changed, from my point of view, and I do not think from the district's point of view. I do not think that the constituents felt that they were not being properly represented. Indeed, I had the largest majority of any hon. member in the last election. The hon. the Speaker had the largest percentage, and he obviously has done a very good job of representing his constituents. I had the largest majority, in excess of 4,200 votes, so obviously, Mr. Speaker, I think that indicates some degree at least of constituent satisfaction in the way that they are being represented. Certainly it does not represent any mass dissatisfaction with their representation in the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK: You mean you are not too nervous about it.

MR. WINDSOR: I am not too nervous. Not yet.  
Now, Mr. Speaker, it could be said, of course, that 18,000 constituents have a right and deserve more than one member to represent them in the House of Assembly, and that indeed they should have a stronger voice in the House of Assembly. The hon. the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has something in the order of 3,000 or just over 3,000 constituents, whereas I have some 18,000. So there is a big difference, Mr. Speaker. But, obviously, because of the size of his district, some 750 miles long I would think, or close to it, whereas my district is about three miles long at best, there is a big difference in the degree of difficulty in serving the needs of the constituents of that particular district and that is why there has to be a difference in the population of various districts. But, Mr. Speaker, I would contend and I did contend

MR. WINDSOR: in my submission to the Commission that there were no good and valid reasons to change the district of Mount Pearl other than to make minor changes so that the boundaries of the district and the boundaries of the town were entirely coincident. They were almost coincident; the number of persons who were either in or outside, one or the other, was almost negligible. One could make the argument that the area of Brookfield Road, which is an agricultural area and in an agricultural zone and therefore does not come under the control or is not within the boundaries of the Town of Mount Pearl, that it would make some sense indeed to remove that and they, indeed, have put it with Your Honour's district of Kilbride. I have no doubt that Your Honour will represent them well and that the people of the Brookfield Road area will give you the same substantial support as they have shown to me. I believe there are four people over there who did not support me in the last election. It was, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the strongest poll that I had in my whole district. So I give to Your Honour a very strong supporting area of my district.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I regret losing the opportunity to represent those people, and I have enjoyed over the past eight years representing their concerns, I know most of them personally and have had many opportunities to have discussions with them and to represent their concerns both here in the House of Assembly and within government generally, but nevertheless I can recognize some rationale perhaps in putting them with the major portion of the agricultural area which is already represented by Your Honour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have real concerns as it relates to removing the Topsail Road area and the West Hills area from the district of Mount Pearl, and that

MR. WINDSOR: is, Mr. Speaker, because that area was only recently annexed to the Town of Mount Pearl and we are now, just over the last year or two, establishing a kind of relationship with those people and a sense of belonging in the community. I might add, Mr. Speaker, also that is the only area, the only section of my district which is not serviced by water and sewerage. Part of it is but a great portion of it is not, and so what is being removed from me is the responsibility for ensuring that that part of my district receives the same level of water and sewerage services as the rest of the district now enjoys.

MR. WINDSOR: I would have welcomed the opportunity to work on those projects and no doubt I will, Mr. Speaker. No doubt I will be involved in those projects and will be supporting them and helping to ensure that funding is made available on a timely basis. I will work very closely, of course, with my colleagues in that regard. But I regret, from that point of view, again breaking down something that has only recently been united.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, of greatest concern to me is the fact that almost all of the section of Mount Pearl to the East of Commonwealth Avenue will now be outside the district of Mount Pearl. That, Mr. Speaker, represents basically what was originally Mount Pearl Park, it was the core of the town of Mount Pearl, the district of Mount Pearl; it was where the community began. So the heart of the community, the historical part of the community will now be removed from the electoral district of Mount Pearl. That is a matter, Mr. Speaker, of great concern and disappointment to me. It is almost as bad as taking Pleasantville out of the district of Pleasantville -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: - which no doubt is a matter of great concern to the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). I find that almost incredible, Mr. Speaker, that that could be suggested and even considered.

Getting back to the numbers, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that 18,000 persons is a very large number and recognizing that perhaps these people, as I mentioned a moment ago, do have the right perhaps to more than one representative, I again concur with

MR. WINDSOR: the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that probably what should have been considered were two districts of Mount Pearl. I made that suggestion to the Commission. I also suggested potential boundaries to them if they chose to go that route; in fact I gave them options: I suggested a Mount Pearl East and a Mount Pearl West and I suggested some potential boundaries that they might wish to consider. And I suggested a Mount Pearl North and a Mount Pearl South if they wished to divide laterally, and suggested boundaries for that as well. So there were options that were available to the Commission to create two districts which in themselves would have had something of the order of 9,000 persons. Now, that is not a small district in comparison to many districts in the Province, Mr. Speaker, but when you consider that first of all, it is most likely that we will not have a provincial general election for two years and it is going to be probably, I guess, five years, is it, before we have another Electoral Boundaries Commission? And considering the growth of Mount Pearl over the last eight years and based on the number of building lots that we have developed in the Newtown area of Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not inconceivable that the population of those two districts, had they been created, would be very well up to 12,000 persons each by the time the next Electoral Boundaries Commission is constituted. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that looking at future growth in the area, the Commission should have really considered what would happen over the next five years. They failed miserably to do that, Mr. Speaker. They have also failed miserably to recognize a point that was made to them very strongly by myself and, as well, by other members, I am sure, who made





MR. WINDSOR:

much as possible. By physical boundaries, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest such things, and I did to the Commission as well in my representation to them, I suggested such physical boundaries as a river, for instance, which is very easily recognized as being a boundary and is easily identified by people. It is like this side of the river is one district, and the other side is the other district, or major arterial roads, or recreational areas. In the case of Mount Pearl, in the newer area of Mount Pearl we have pedestrian walkways at the rear of most homes and there are lineal parks which have been developed, they as well make very good natural boundaries for the electoral districts. In fact, they are the boundaries of the various residential sectors that we have developed in the Newtown area of Mount Pearl and they could have been utilized.

But the Commission has failed to do that, they have chosen to go down the centre of smaller residential streets and winding in and around and leaving one side of the street in one district and the other side in the other, and stopping half way down the street in the area of the stadium and darting across to the other side and doubling back again. It is very, very confusing, Mr. Speaker, to determine which district you are in. So you have people living nextdoor to one another who are in different districts, and people across the street from one another who are in different districts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that that shows on behalf of the Commission a great lack of sensitivity to the problems of serving the residents and of identifying residents with a particular district.

There is another area, Mr. Speaker, which is not of great concern, it was mentioned by the member

MR. WINDSOR: for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) again. It is not of great concern at this point in time, in fact, it is insignificant today, it is an area adjacent to the Brookfield Road which has been added to Your Honour's district, and that will be an area which is, in fact, within the town boundary of the Town of Mount Pearl. I referenced a moment ago the Brookfield Road area, which is an agricultural zone, which has been added to Your Honour's district, but there is also an area there which is as yet undeveloped, which is within the town boundary of the Town of Mount Pearl.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in defining the town boundary of the Town of Mount Pearl three years ago we very specifically included that area within the Town of Mount Pearl because it is, in fact, the next neighbourhood to be developed in our Newtown development scheme. So by the time the next election takes place there may not be any constituents residing there, but certainly there will be 200 or 300 or 400 approved building lots developed and perhaps some homes under construction. So, Your Honour, now, perhaps not in the next election, but certainly the one following, could very well have 700 or 800, maybe 1,000 residents of the Town of Mount Pearl who you will find are within your district of Kilbride. Now, Mr. Speaker, that makes absolutely no sense to me. There is no justification for putting that area which today has not one resident. so it cannot be based on the fact that there are too many constituents in Mount Pearl today, because there is not one resident in that area at present, it is a very pleasant open field and I suspect there are probably thirty or forty young people out there playing baseball this afternoon in that field, as they are every day when I go home. So, Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no justification, based on numbers, for putting that area within the district of Kilbride and taking it from the district of Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR: In future, Mr. Speaker, I can see great problems. In fact, if the boundaries are to stay as they are, and if that area is developed, two elections from now we will, indeed, have three members of this hon. House with the responsibility for representing persons who reside within the Town of Mount Pearl. Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more ridiculous, in my opinion, absolutely and utterly ridiculous, and I think it showed a great insensitivity on behalf of the commission to the unity of a community and to the ability of a member to serve that community.

I can just see it now, Mr. Speaker, when the Lion's Club have their annual dinner and dance, that Your Honour and I and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), or whoever represents those districts then, three of us will be lined up at the Mount Pearl Lion's Club dinner, three of us will be lined up -

MR. WARREN: And at the Canadian Legion.

MR. WINDSOR: No, I will not be lined up at the Mount Pearl Canadian Legion dinner, Mr. Speaker, because the Legion is no longer in my district. The Mount Pearl arena is just barely in my district, and I think they did that out of recognition for my part in building the arena. They managed to wiggle the boundary around the arena so that it stayed in my district.

MR. WARREN: Is the parking lot in your district?

MR. WINDSOR: No, I do not think the parking lot is in my district. The arena is, but the new soccer field is not. The soccer field is not so I can cancel my plans for providing more funding for the soccer field. It is now going to be represented by somebody else. Mr. Speaker, of course I will not do that, it is a good project.

MR. WINDSOR: But it is incredible, Mr. Speaker, how dividing a community like that by two electoral boundaries can impact on so many things, so many of the groups now that I represent there and that I meet with on a regular basis, the Mount Pearl Kinsmen, the Mount Pearl Lions, the Mount Pearl Legion, The Waterford Valley Rotary, the Knights of Columbus, the Anglican Men's Association, the Soccer Association, the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association, the Mount Pearl Minor Soccer Association, the Mount Pearl swim team, and I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. There are so many organizations in Mount Pearl because of the kind of community spirit, partly due, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, to the community unity and identity that we have been able to put in place over the last several years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the recommendations of the commission as they relate to the district will have an extremely, extremely negative impact on that.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other area which really does not impact now and it will never impact in the future, but just to emphasize again my point, as it relates to choosing easily identifiable physical boundaries, and I mentioned earlier that I strongly suggested to the commission that the boundary of the district be coincident with the boundary of the town of Mount Pearl, but there is an area, Mr. Speaker - the boundary now as is recommended runs along the Trans-Canada Highway West until it hits the Harbour Arterial Road, then it follows the Harbour Arterial Road for about 1000 feet or 2000 feet, then it dekes off, following the transmission line, or some artificial survey line, to another point in the middle of nowhere, and then it follows the boundary of the town of Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR: Now, the town of Mount Pearl boundary, Mr. Speaker, follows the Trans-Canada Highway until it hits a brook known as South Brook, which is a very definable boundary, and it follows it. So what the commission has done is taken an area of land which has not one resident. It has the Chalet Motel, but that does not count because there are no votes allowed in a commercial establishment, so that does not impact on any constituents, really, it impacts on one business. But there is a large chunk of land which is slated for rural conservation and recreational purposes, there will never be a constituent on it, never a house built on it, never anybody to represent, so why the Commission in their wisdom would choose to exclude that area from the district of Mount Pearl when it is included as part of the town of Mount Pearl, I will never know. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

MR. WINDSOR:

And again as it relates to physical boundaries, Mr. Speaker, the boundary crosses the Waterford River. As I suggested, if the commission did feel they had to take the Topsail Road area and the West Hills area and the Masonic Park area out of the district of Mount Pearl, then, well, the Waterford River is a good physical boundary they might consider. They did not bother with that at all, they went on up Commonwealth Avenue and went out Topsail Road so that businesses on one side of Topsail Road are in the district and the businesses on the other are not. Now it does not make a great deal of difference, Mr. Speaker, because there are only three residences on that side of the Waterford River which will still be within my district. So for the sake of three residences, Mr. Speaker, they could have just as easily used the Waterford River, which is a good physical boundary and easily identifiable.

MR. DINN: You are suggesting then that the commission should have gone up the river, are you not?

MR. WINDSOR: Yes. They could have gone up the river. The commission should have gone up the river.

MR. WARREN: Do you still have Mary Queen of the World School in your district?

MR. WINDSOR: No, Mary Queen of the World School is out of my district. That is not in my district either, neither is the Mount Pearl Lions Club. The Mount Pearl Lions Club is now in the district of Waterford - Kenmount. This is amazing, wonderful. And so is the Mount Pearl Legion and the Park Avenue School.

MR. SIMMS: Where is the Kinsmen Club?

MR. WINDSOR: The Kinsmen do not have a club yet.

MR. WINDSOR: It is extremely active, one of the best Kinsmen Clubs in the Province, one of the best Kinsmen Clubs anywhere in Canada, for that matter. In fact, recently I had the honour of attending dinner with them and I have an invitation here which I have just accepted.

MR. SIMMS: They think highly of the hon. member, too.

MR. WINDSOR: They certainly do. We are great friends, they are very supportive and we work very closely together.

So, Mr. Speaker, what this commission has recommended and what subsequently government has accepted, and I support, as I said in my opening statement, the decision of government to accept what has been put forward to them and put in front of them by this independent commission, but that does not mean I like what the commission does. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I object strenuously to the changes that have been suggested for the district of Mount Pearl. I feel very strongly that it will have an extremely negative impact on the town of Mount Pearl. That, Mr. Speaker, was also made very strongly to the commission by an independent and separate representation with a very well presented, well written brief that was presented to the commission by the town council of the town of Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, which was done, and I say this without any hesitation, without any consultation with myself but it just shows how much we think in parallel, that that representation was very, very similar to my own, though not in every respect. There were some different suggestions made which were of really no consequence, but the basic principals underlining their presentation was very strongly parallel with my own presentation, Mr. Speaker, and again that reflects the degree of co-operation that we have seen between the town and myself over the years.

Mr. Speaker, having said all of that, having recognized the fact that the decision has been



MR. WINDSOR: made by the commission, the decision has been accepted by government and no doubt it will be approved by this hon. House, as regrettable as that is, there is no doubt that that will take place.

Mr. Speaker, again in recognizing particularly that the heart and the historic part of the town of Mount Pearl will now be in the district of Waterford - Kenmount, I will at the appropriate time, and I am not quite sure what the procedure will be, but I am proposing that whatever the appropriate procedures are to make a name change, that the district of Waterford - Kenmount be renamed the district of Mount Pearl - Waterford in recognition of the fact that some one-third of the residents of the town of Mount Pearl are living within that district and then, of course, the traditional concerns of the district of Waterford - Kenmount are kept as well.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that that be done by whatever procedure is appropriate.

I do not know if it is an amendment, or if it could perhaps just be done by regulation or by decree of Cabinet.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, let me again say that I support the decision of government. I am deeply disappointed with many of the recommendations of the Commission and the fact that they failed miserably to consider the representations that were made to them by myself and other hon. members.

Thank you.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Before recognizing the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), it is almost 5:00 p.m. I would like to inform hon. members there are no questions for the Late Show at 5:30 p.m.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Pearl when he got up to speak, said he would not be nearly as long as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and that he would say a lot more in a shorter time than his constituent, the member for Torngat said in a half hour. However, I do not intend to take very long. I will be brief, and I will give the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) a chance to have a few words on this.

I am happy to see, Mr. Speaker, that the district of Bellevue has not been changed. It was listed among the districts having changes, but there are no changes in the district of Bellevue. If there are changes they are in the wilderness, they are internal, they have nothing to do with the constituents who live

MR. CALLAN: in the district of Bellevue. The district still starts, Mr. Speaker, down at Adeytown or Adeyton, depending on how you want to pronounce it.

MR. BUTT: That is Adeytown, boy.

MR. CALLAN: Adeyton, Adeytown - a beautiful little town, mostly senior citizens. They still do not have their paved road, though.

MR. PATTERSON: All Tories.

MR. CALLAN: Still do not have their paved road. If they are all Tories, I do not know why they do not have it, but they did not get it. They did not get it, of course, when the member for Trinity North brought pavement to the last house in Deep Bight, which is on that same little stretch of highway off the TCH. It stopped at the last house. The member for Trinity North at that time, Mr. Speaker, left an awfully bad taste in the mouths of a lot of people in his own district as well, in Deep Bight, in Clarendville, in Hillview and all around. People thought it was the worst demonstration of rank politics, rank political games that they had ever seen. And I see on the map that I have in front of me, not far from Deep Bight there is a place out there called Bluff Point.

MR. SIMMS: Do you represent that?

MR. CALLAN: No, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett). That is why it is in Trinity North. What a bluff, Mr. Speaker! What a bluff! You know, it is a terrible thing to do, to pave to the last house in Deep Bight and then to let his former constituents - and the member for Trinity North is standing in the doorway now, let his former constituents suffer, mostly all senior citizens - their tax dollars.

MR. SIMMS: What does that have to do with the boundaries?

MR. CALLAN: But anyway, I am glad to see that Adeyton is still within the boundaries.

You know, if the Commission had wanted to do something, they could have put Adeyton in Trinity North. I think it would have been a good idea.

MR. BRETT: They would have gotten it then, would they not?

MR. CALLAN: Perhaps before the Summer is out they would have got their pavement, as the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) said before I had a chance to say it.

MR. CALLAN: But anyway, the Commission decided not to make any changes and, of course, we still go down to Swift Current on the other side, Woody Island and Sound Island. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), his member in the House of Assembly, of course, is the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) who just spoke. I have the honour of representing in Swift Current and out on Sound Island where he has a Summer place, the hon. Don Jamieson when he is home. And, of course, he will be back in a few years, when he gets his term as High Commissioner served. But all through the district, Mr. Speaker, there are people who I am very proud to represent in the House of Assembly. One gentleman I have to mention, a former member of the House, died recently, a gentleman from Queen's Cove, the late Max Button. But there is still a former MHA who lives in Hodge's Cove by the name of Sam Drover. He is still there. And, of course, as I said, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to represent the people in the district, it is an historic district. The last President of Memorial University was born in Blaketown, in the district, and, of course, our present Premier was born in Whitbourne, which is also in the district of Bellevue. And I have the honour of going out to Whitbourne on June 1st, that is next Friday, I believe. It is the 100th anniversary of the town of Whitbourne and I have the honour to go out there and share with them the celebrations of their 100th anniversary. I assume the Premier will be there. I assume he was invited. He was born at the

MR. CALLAN: Markland hospital, which, of course, is not an hospital now, it was closed by the same Premier who was born there. But in spite of all the setbacks we have seen and the dirty tricks and the bluff points that have been pulled on the people in the district of Bellevue, we are still surviving. I have to go down to Come By Chance next week for a meeting of the employees down there who will soon be out of work once the refinery is scrapped and that is a terrible tragedy.

MR. PATTERSON: That is your federal friends.

MR. CALLAN: No, the member knows different than that, Mr. Speaker. It was this government that washed their hands of Come By Chance. It was this government and it is still this government who can now bring in legislation which will effectively stop the scrapping of the oil refinery. So the member for Placentia knows different than that, Mr. Speaker. But I do not want to talk about these things, I want to talk about the electoral boundaries of Bellevue. It goes down to Dildo and, of course, that is where it always ended, and New Harbour is in Trinity-Bay de Verde. And New Harbour can stay in Trinity-Bay de Verde. As long as the town of Dildo stays in the district of Bellevue, then I am happy with that. They are wonderful people and they show how smart they are. As I said, myself and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) were out in South Dildo about a year ago, when the new fire truck had arrived. Of course, the hon. minister was



MR. CALLAN: then we went over to a dinner and a banquet and in her remarks the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) remarked that the people in that area, the Old Shop - South Dildo area, were smart people, they had done their homework well. You know, they formed themselves into a local service district and they raised their share of the funds to pay for the fire truck, they made sure that there was a place to house the fire truck long before they got it, they applied under Canada Works and got some funding and built themselves a fire hall and a library. And the minister in her remarks mentioned that and, of course, when I stood to speak I reminded the Minister of Municipal Affairs that I had learned a long time ago how smart the people were in that area; they had re-elected me three times I told her. and, of course, that was good for a laugh. But they are good people. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, as I said, to see that there are no changes in the district of Bellevue and I will be there the next time an election is called, whether that is tomorrow or the next day. By the way, it seems as though there might be an election very imminent, there are a lot of things pointing to it. The President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), said today that there will be something said or done within the next twenty-four to forty-eight hours - that pointed to an election call. You know, the issue, obviously, in the next election will not be offshore oil and gas, the issue will be 'A bad old Quebec against good old Newfoundland' just as 'bad old Ottawa against good old Newfoundland' was the issue in the last one. Of course, as long as you can get a bit of emotional stuff in there and get people to stand up and wave their flag and be patriotic Newfoundlanders fighting that bad old Ottawa, or that bad old Quebec, you know, it is a



MR. CALLAN: good election theme, it is good election bait and, of course, it gets people to vote with their emotions rather than their minds, with their hearts rather than their heads, and perhaps the Premier will try it. Perhaps there is an election on the go but one thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, and I have to say this before I sit down, one thing is certain - if the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) will pay attention to this -

MR. SIMMS: I am talking colleague. Sorry! He asked me a question.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing for certain, whether the election is called tomorrow or next week or whether it is two years time, as the member for Mount Pearl suggested - 'Well, the next election will not be called for another two years', perhaps he was just trying to catch us off guard, but whatever it was, whenever it is called, one thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, and I want to stress this

MR. CALLAN: because I have seen too much of it, of Tories in my area, for example, and all over the Province, who glory in the fact that they have formed the government. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, the Tories have never formed a government in this Province. Never! Not in 1972, or 1975, or 1979, or 1981— in 1982, rather, 1981 was the by-election, I cannot forget that. Tories have never formed the governments here, it was Liberals who voted Tory. And once the Liberals come back into the fold where they belong then, of course, the Liberals will form the Liberal Governments that they formed from 1949 until 1971. But it is not the Tories who form governments. You see, Mr. Speaker, there is a hard-core of Tories in this Province, about 25 per cent to 35 per cent— about 30 per cent hard-core Tories. And, of course, you have the same thing in the Liberal camp, you have about 25 per cent to 35 per cent hard-core Liberals, All of the other people in between, you see, Mr. Speaker, they were Liberals up until 1971. It was the Liberals who changed their vote and elected a Tory Government. But now, thanks be to goodness, Mr. Speaker, they have seen the error of their ways they know now, And, of course, I have said it before in this House, in 1972 I voted for the member who now represents Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. J. Reid). He represented Trinity South then and I voted for the man.

MR. TOBIN: You are forgiven for that.

MR. CALLAN: I voted for him in 1972 but I did not vote for him in 1975. Of course, I did not have a chance, I was not in his district. But even if I were he would never have gotten a vote from me, because I knew the man too well and I knew how effective he was in the Moores Cabinet in trying to help us

MR. CALLAN: get a stadium at Whitbourne.

MR. REID: I never had the wallet.

MR. CALLAN: So it was the Liberals who voted in Tory Governments in the last four elections, Mr.

Speaker. I saw the error of my ways within a year after I cast a ballot for the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), I saw the error almost immediately. But some Liberals are slower than others in seeing the error of their ways, and thanks be to goodness when the next election comes they will all be back voting for the party that they really and truly believe in, which is the Liberal Party, the Party, of course, that gave them everything, and the Party that gives everything to everybody in this country. Not just this Province, but in this country, you see.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) is back in his seat now, that is about ten minutes I took and that is long enough. I am glad that the district is not changed. I commend the members of the Commission and I would not say anything about the Commission members anyway, like the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) did, and the main reason for that is because one of the members of the Commission, his son is here in the House of Assembly and I do not think it would be nice to talk about the Commission members.

So that is fine, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad that the district of Bellevue is not changed.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to be very long in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I do wish to have a few words on the Electoral Boundaries Commission Report which was tabled in this House some time ago.

First of all, I find it difficult to accept the criticism of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and particularly of the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), of the Commission's performance.

MR. WARREN: Oh, oh, dissension in the ranks.

MR. AYLWARD: The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) mentioned that the son of one of the Commission members is in the gallery, we also have a Commission member in the gallery today.

MR. CALLAN: He is not in the gallery, he is in the House.

MR. AYLWARD: He is in the House of Assembly, yes. We also have a Commission member in the gallery today whom I would like to recognize, Mr. Frank Shortall. I would like to commend the Commission for the great job that they did. If there is any criticizing to be done, we should be criticizing ourselves because we handcuffed the Commission in what they could do.

When the first report came out from the Commission there were some changes made in my district that I did not agree with. Unfortunately, before the Commission was set I did not go and study the Electoral Boundaries Act. I did not look at it and that is a criticism of myself. Had I gone and noticed that some considerable time

MR. AYLWARD: before the Commission was appointed, I could have recommended to this House of Assembly that first we should look at the act that the commission was governed by. This act states quite clearly, Section 14 (1), that the Commission had to divide the Province into fifty-two proposed one-member districts, retaining where possible the names of the districts. The (b) part of that, the Commission had to establish a quotient for the proposed district in the Province by dividing the total population of the Province by fifty-two. I mean, how more restricted could any Commission be? That is the law they had to operate under. There are some changes from that. There are some provisions made for Labrador within the act which I think are very good, because it would be extremely hard to have the Labrador districts stick to this quotient.

The act also goes on in more detail after it deals with the Labrador seats, and it says, "The quotient established under Section 14 cannot differ any more than 25 per cent more or less." So that left the Commission with a spread in population in all these seats, from 8,100 people, approximately, to 13,000 people. So they had very little leeway.

The criticisms, if there are any, should be directed to ourselves. If we did not like the way the act was written, we should have changed it before we appointed the Commission.

I personally think that the Commission did an excellent job on the report. There was a

MR. AYLWARD: comment made by a member during this debate, that he was sorry to see that the Commission did not listen to the representations made. I say that the Commission listened quite attentively to the proposal that I made to them. They did make some changes which I recommended, because the recommendations I made were within the limits of the act. It was the only way that the Commission could operate. If any of the members who went to the Commission made proposals or recommendations to them, they had to consider them under this act, and I am sure that the Commission listened to all proposals that were made in conjunction with the act that they had to operate under.

I am sorry that I am going to lose a part of my district, a part of the district that I have developed some very close friendships in since I was elected in 1979. When I sought the nomination in 1979, I will admit that one part of the district, and the only part of the district at the time that I did not know was Shea Heights I would not say I knew ten people in this specific area of Shea Heights when I was seeking the nomination, but since that time I have had very good co-operation from the citizens committees, the recreation committees and the clinic committees on Shea Heights, and I have established some lifetime friendships, I would say. I am sorry to lose them, but it is not the Commission's fault that I am going to lose them. They could not leave all of this area within my district because I happen to have one of the districts that had a population above the allowable limits that the Commission had to operate under.

I have already indicated to people on Shea Heights, whom I know very well, that as long as I am in here, as the member for any district, I will be very happy to help them. They will probably do a lot better than they

MR. AYLWARD: were, because after the changes are made they will have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) representing them, who is certainly more experienced and probably much more capable than I am. I am sure that it will be very beneficial to the Shea Heights area to have the Minister of Finance as their member. And I have indicated that I will work very closely with the Minister of Finance to see that Shea Heights is represented well.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) completely surprised me when he made the statement that if he ever became a member of government, or his party came into power that he would gerrymander the report of this Commission. I am very proud that government, although all the members are not completely happy with the report, that government took the stand that this is an independent report and they accepted the report as presented.

AN HON. MEMBER: There was gerrymandering before.

MR. AYLWARD: If there was never gerrymandering, this is the first time in history, as far as I understood, the first time in the history of the Province that a report on electoral boundaries was presented and accepted in total.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains would gerrymander the seats in the City of St. John's. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains may not think that the people in this city deserve the same representation as everyone else within the Province, but I think they do. They deserve to have an equal voice in the provincial government and on provincial affairs, the same as any other person within this Province. And I would certainly not reduce any of the seats in the City of St. John's. Maybe I would even increase them, if it was possible.

MR. AYLWARD: It was suggested by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that he wanted to reduce seats in the area yet he wanted to have two seats for Mount Pearl, he wanted two seats, East and West. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot create new seats and reduce seats at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, as for the new area which comes into my district, the area on Brookfield Road, I am very happy to have that in my district. I worked extremely hard on this agricultural area, which is most of my area, the Goulds and Kilbride, and this Brookfield Road area will tie in very closely with the work that I have already done and some of the changes that I hope to see implemented in this agricultural zone sometime in the near future.

As for representing a part of the Town of Mount Pearl, I am very happy to be able to represent them. I do not see what the member's complaint is, now they have three excellent members representing them. So they will get three times the representation on any provincial issues.

Another thing that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, he insinuated that the Commission was cajoled in some way into putting a certain part of the Baie Verte-White Bay district in the Strait of Belle Isle district. That recommendaton, as the hon. member does not know, he probably did not do his homework on this thing, that recommendation comes from the Higgins Report which was done before 1975.

MR. SIMMS: The first Commission.



MR. AYLWARD: Well, the Higgins Report was not followed as this one here is followed. It was not the Commission who recommended this. They did in this report, but it came from the Higgins Report in the first place. So I commend the Commission for making such a change. I am sure it would not have any great effect on the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), who is not here today to speak on it. He could win that district if they put all the Strait of Belle Isle in it, I am sure he could, he is a very capable man.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say once more before I sit down that I am sorry to lose the area of Shea Heights from my district, but I can assure the people in that area that while I am an elected representative, from any district, if they wish to contact me I will be quite willing to help them at any time. And I welcome the new areas, particularly that area in Mount Pearl, to my district, and the area on the Brookfield Road. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like some of the other members here today I have a few brief comments to make on this Commission's report. It is certainly a bit of a disappointment to me that the district of Conception Bay South was affected more by this Commission report than any other single district.

Now, of course, at the outset I knew that the district of Conception Bay South would be affected because of the large number of people out there. But, nevertheless, with the support of the town council, the churches and service clubs in the area, we made a number of proposals to the Commission down at the Colonial Building and made some recommendations to them to reflect some changes that we saw fitting for the district.

MR. BUTT:

I might add as well,

I concur with the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), that the commission itself was operating under tight restraints, the legislation itself was not very broad and they were very confined to what they could do, and that mostly based on population. Nevertheless, there was a considerable effort put forth by a number of people in Conception Bay South who did not want, in the first instance, to see that large town, which makes up the major part of the district of Conception Bay South, further divided into two different political entities, I guess, one being now Conception Bay South and the other part which will make up part of the district of Harbour Main. I understand as well that in that area there will be some name changes recommended to reflect that region. Suffice it to say now, Mr. Speaker, that the Foxtrap Access Road is the dividing line in Conception Bay South; therefore a large part of the town of Conception Bay South will be no longer in the district of Conception Bay South.

MR. TULK:

I hear you want to represent both districts.

MR. BUTT:

Well, I would not mind, you know,

I really would not. I feel very comfortable there. But anyway, suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that now part of Foxtrap, Kelligrews, Upper Gullies, Lawrence Pond and Seal Cove will make up a large part, I might add, of the district of Harbour Main. On the Eastern end, in Topsail area, Topsail Road is the dividing line, so the communities or the towns of St. Philips and St. Thomas and Paradise will no longer be in the district of Conception Bay South, as well as the area of St. John's - Kenmount Road, Thorburn Road, Blackmarsh Road, that area and I had a small portion in Mount Pearl.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, these changes have had a dramatic effect on a lot of people in Conception Bay South and there is genuine concern out there that the two political entities in the town of Conception Bay South could further divide a fairly large town, geographically a large town. It has another distinguished dividing mechanism in the center in that the community of Foxtrap, an unincorporated area, is there right now, and this further divides it. So I really do not think that it does any good for the town of Conception Bay South as was reflected in the commission's report. Like the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), I recommended as well that my district be divided into two distinct districts, one being the town of Conception Bay South, even though it would have a slightly larger population than is provided for under the act, the other areas, outside of the town, would have another member. In fact, that has really happened in large part because the new district of Mount Scio - Bell Island will now take in what was traditionally Conception Bay South territory - Paradise, St. Thomas, St. Philips and the Thorburn Road area.

MR. TULK: If they created two districts which one do you want to run in?

MR. BUTT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite comfortable in either one of them, three of them, in fact, Mount Scio- Bell Island, Conception Bay South or Harbour Main. I will probably stay in Conception Bay South because I live right in the centre.

I wanted to make those few comments, Mr. Speaker, and get it on the public record once again. If I could make a recommendation, perhaps when legislation comes up for review, when you look at a town, wherever possible it should be represented by one individual, if it is not a big town, and there should be some flexibility in the area of population. I think my hon. colleague for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) made a good point on that. It certainly would have been very good for the Town of Conception Bay South. Obviously there are some people who are disappointed because of these changes, so I just wanted to express my disappointment in it also.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the question?

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, there are a few comments I would like to make on this bill. Now that it is 5:30 I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the hon. member for St. John's Centre has adjourned the debate.

It being Thursday, a motion to adjourn has deemed to have been made. I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 17, 1984

Tabled by Hon. Min  
of Health (Acting)  
17 May '84

QUESTION #40

Mr. Roberts (Strait of Belle Isle) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

List the number of medical doctors in practice in Newfoundland and Labrador, their average salaries by classification, experience and area of expertise for the years 1975-1983.

ANSWER

The attached list contains the number of salaried physicians, the average salary and classification for year 1975-1983.

SALARIED  
MEDICAL DOCTORS  
NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR

<u>Year</u>	<u>General Practitioner</u>	<u>General Surgery</u>	<u>Anaesthesia</u>	<u>Internal Medicine</u>	<u>Obst./Gyn.</u>	<u>Ophthalmology</u>	<u>Otolaryngology</u>	<u>Paediatrics</u>	<u>Physical Medicine</u>	<u>Psychiatry</u>	<u>Emergency Medicine</u>	<u>Community Medicine</u>	<u>Orthopaedic Surgery</u>
1975	129 \$27,900	4 42,000	5 38,000	1 38,000	2 40,000	3 40,000	1 38,000	1 32,000	1 32,000	11 35,000			
1976	138 \$31,288	4 46,600	7 37,400	2 38,800	5 40,400	4 42,000	1 41,000	3 35,500	1 35,000	12 40,100			
1977	138 \$32,235	5 43,100	6 39,700	2 41,700	3 44,600	2 42,200	1 43,000	3 40,500	1 37,000	10 39,000			
1978	136 \$34,976	4 46,000	10 38,100	2 39,200	3 42,300	3 42,600	1 44,400	3 37,100	1 38,500	13 37,400		1 39,400	1 50,000
1979	143 \$35,674	5 45,500	12 42,000	1 49,000	3 42,600	5 44,800	1 47,400	3 42,600	1 41,000	15 40,800		1 42,400	1 52,400
1980	146 \$36,213	5 49,100	13 47,400	1 55,500	2 51,000	4 48,300	1 53,900	5 44,900	1 47,500	15 47,400		1 48,900	1 58,900
1981	155 \$42,893	4 55,300	15 51,100	1 63,400	3 53,300	4 55,200	1 60,300	6 50,600	1 51,200	12 53,500		1 54,000	1 65,500
1982	143 \$52,213	5 64,400	12 58,700	1 72,000	3 59,900	3 63,700	1 66,700	7 59,800	1 58,900	14 61,200		1 61,200	1 72,200
1983	135 \$56,081	7 68,000	13 63,000	1 76,000	3 64,000	4 66,000	1 71,000	7 64,000	1 64,700	11 65,000	1 63,000		1 75,600