

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1978

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker - oh, go ahead.

I presume it is Dr. Collingwood you are going to -

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Right. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Department of Health, and I am sure all members of this hon. House were deeply saddened to learn yesterday of the death of Dr. Bill Collingwood of St. John's.

Dr. Collingwood retired, as all hon. members recall, in February of last year after a career of spending nearly forty years in the public service. As we all know, prior to practicing in Newfoundland he served in the Royal Navy where he attained the rank of Surgeon Lieutenant-Commander.

Dr. Collingwood was an outstanding person, an institution, almost, in terms of health care in Newfoundland, a man who was involved in the pioneering of the rural medical practices. I would like, on behalf of the hon. House, to extend all of our deep affection and sympathy to his wife and family.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, Sir, we second the motion that a letter of sympathy and condolence be forwarded to the family of the late Dr. Collingwood who passed away yesterday, Sir.

The late Dr. Collingwood, as members know, was an outstanding public servant who served the people of Newfoundland well down through the years, Sir, and at times under the most difficult circumstances.

MR. NEARY: The late Dr. Collingwood served as a medical doctor in various communities throughout Newfoundland, including Placentia.

He was born in St. John's and received his early education at the Prince of Wales College and at Memorial University. Following that he went on to obtain a degree in medicine from the University of Edinburgh. After graduation he served on the staff of Edinburgh Royal Infirmary and the Leicester Royal Infirmary. As my hon. colleague pointed out, in 1940, I think it was, Dr. Collingwood joined the Royal Navy as surgeon Lieutenant - Commander and after his discharge in 1945 he joined the medical staff of the Department of Health where he served for sixteen years in rural medical practice.

He served one as medical officer in charge of the Bloomfield Cottage Hospital following which he moved to Placentia where he served for fifteen years.

In 1960, Dr. Collingwood accepted the position of medical consultant to the Health Insurance Division of the Department of Health in St. John's and later he was appointed Director of the Cottage Hospital Medical Services, a position he held until his retirement back in 1977. I think it was in February, 1977 the late Dr. Collingood retired.

So he was indeed, Sir, an outstanding public servant. He served Newfoundland well and it is only right and proper that this House should extend a letter of sympathy to the family. I think the late Dr. Collingwood is survived by a wife and one son I believe - is it?

MR. HICKMAN: Two sons, one of whom is a doctor.

MR. NEARY: Two sons, one of whom is a doctor. So we on this side of the House, Sir, would second

MR. NEARY:

the motion.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be in order, Sir, to, as this is Senior Citizens' Week, say a brief word in congratulations to all those who have organized Senior Citizens' Week. This week some 45,000 to 50,000 Newfoundlanders sixty-five years and older are observing, I believe it is the first Senior Citizens' Week in the Province. It began yesterday on the 18th. and will continue on until Saturday, June 24th.

I understand, Sir, from the organizers of Senior Citizens' Week, that they have organized one of the most extensive programmes that has ever been thought of in this Province to draw attention to senior citizens and Senior Citizens' Week.

It started off a few moments ago - hon. members might have heard the motorcade go by Confederation Building here, with the balloons on the cars and the slogans and so forth in this motorcade that just went past Confederation Building.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that at the moment there are some 230 senior citizens' clubs in this Province. It is a movement that is growing very rapidly due, I guess, in large measure to the New Horizons programme that was undertaken

MR. NEARY:

a few years ago by the Government of Canada. I was out on the West Coast over the weekend, Sir, and I heard some complaints on the radio that the media on the East Coast were giving tremendous play to Senior Citizens' Week but in the Western part of the Province they were finding it very difficult to get their message across. So I hope as a result today, I hope somebody on the government side will also speak on this matter, that the media right across this whole Province will recognize, Sir, that this is a very, very important week for the senior citizens of this Province. And I hope, Sir, that they have good weather. I hope that they will enjoy themselves during the week and that their first real senior citizens week in this Province will be a huge success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would obviously like to associate ourselves with the remarks by my hon. friend, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) insofar as the Senior Citizens' Week is concerned.

My department is involved in this particular effort, not to the greatest degree and not a degree that we would like. However, some months ago we wrote all the mayors of the municipalities throughout the Province reminding them of Senior Citizens' Week and asking them to organize functions to honour the elderly of the Province. Certainly I am sure that the people involved will appreciate the fact that we give recognition to it in the people's House and so we should, all of us, I for my own part will be visiting a number of areas during the week and participating in the various events. I hope that all hon. members, if they find themselves in areas where there are events taking place, do go and show up and do their bit to share with the elderly of this Province.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 210 residents of the community of Ming's Bight in my district. The petition is addressed to the House of Assembly and I will read the prayer but I think it is pretty straightforward and to the point.

It says, "To the House of Assembly, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Petition: Whereas Mr. Joseph Rousseau, Minister of Highways previously, and Mr. James Morgan, Minister of Highways previously, wrote the Council of Ming's Bight stating that upgrading of the road to Ming's Bight began when the LaScie Highway was paved, and whereas the LaScie Highway has been completed for two years, and whereas the road to Ming's Bight is dangerously narrow in places, high embankments exists without railing, ditching non-existent causing flooding, large boulders preventing proper grading, we, the undersigned of this community of Ming's Bight, hereby petition the government to start upgrading of this road to and around the community."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition, let me say that there is only, I believe approximately five miles of road involved from the main highway to LaScie Highway, out to the community of Ming's Bight, a community of 400 or 500 people. I have seen with my own eyes a letter that was written by the former Minister of Transportation, the hon. member for Bonavista South, to the community council at Ming's Bight in 1976, explicitly and without mincing words telling them that they could expect that Summer, the letter was written in June of '76, telling them that Summer that there would be very specific improvements carried out on the road out to their community. Paving was not promised but they were told that substantial upgrading would be done, that the road would be widened as it needs to be in a number of places along the five mile stretch going out to

MR. RIDEOUT: the community. They were told that a number of the worst hills, a number of the worst grades would be cut down in efforts to make the road more safe and they were told that they could expect crushed stone to be placed on the surface of the road to make it a little bit better to drive on.

Mr. Speaker, that was two years ago and none of these written promised improvements have been carried out to this date. The Community Council of Ming's Bight has that letter. I have a copy of it and while we have made representation again last Summer and again this previous Winter, we do not know whether or not that two year old commitment is about to be lived up to yet or not.

Mr. Ridéout: Mr. Speaker, the petition, I believe, is a reasonable one, the community of Ming's Bight. From the community of Ming's Bight you will find that 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the men, the working population of the community, are working in and around Baie Verte so there is daily traffic every day from that community to and from the workplace in the mines at Baie Verte or in the servicing industry in and around the town of Baie Verte.

Also, of course, the high school students must traverse that road twice daily to the community of Baie Verte for educational purposes. So I would hope that the present Minister of Transportation and Communications would dig out his files showing the correspondence previously between his department or between the minister of that department and the Community Council of Ming's Bight. He will find a letter there written in June of 1976 expressly stating what work was to be done on that road that Summer. And I would hope that even though the commitment is a couple of years old, that the very reasonable request made in this petition will be taken care of and will be attended to this Summer. It is sort of sad, Mr. Speaker, that after two years of waiting and two years of promises that the people have to go to the trouble of circulating a petition and sending it to the House in the hope that some action will be forthcoming on a promise that was made to a reasonable request made a couple of years ago.

I do hope that the minister will ensure that something is done, the road is in desperate need of reconstruction. We know it cannot all be done at one time, but we would hope that some work will be done, some improvements will be made so that those people will know that the government of this Province has their best interest at heart, and while not being able to do everything at once are doing all they can to improve the situation, and to improve the road that they have to drive over.

Mr. Speaker, I whole-heartedly support the prayer of this petition. I table it, and I would like for it to be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting this petition once more so ably presented by my friend and colleague, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I take pleasure especially, Sir, because it comes from the community of Ming's Bight, a delightful, lovely community of hard working, persevering men and women which used to be in the district formally known as White Bay South which I had the honour and privilege of representing for eight continuous years in this House of Assembly, in the government and on the Opposition side.

Ming's Bight, Mr. Speaker, is a community which is not far away from the Rambler Mine operations. And if ever there was any justice, Sir, to the claim that people who are nearby or in close proximity to natural resources should get the greatest priority of benefit from those natural resources, and, Sir, that should apply to Ming's Bight. I suppose my hon. friend can correct me, I do not know now what the proportion would be since there has been some decline in that operation, but I suppose just about every able-bodied man in the place had a job in the mines at some point or other, probably still do at this moment in time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Between the two mines.

MR. W. ROWE: Between the two ^{mines}, of course, Advocate and Rambler, but I am thinking more of Rambler now because Rambler is right there. As a matter of fact, one part of the mine is right on this road of which we are now speaking and concerning which a petition has been sent to the House from 210 residents of Ming's Bight. It is shameful in a way, Mr. Speaker, that a community which had the fortune of being in such close proximity to this natural resource, as in so many other cases particularly in the Labrador part of our Province, did not benefit more from that resource. The very least that could have been done over the last number of years would be to have a half decent road from the community to the mining operation. I think that the mine itself, the company itself, should have borne a very large, if not the total responsibility for making sure that that road was in fact upgraded to a very high level.

MR. W. ROWE: These improvements have been promised by succeeding ministers over the last number of years; the names of the minister even were mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the petition. There were three ministers, I believe, or perhaps two, in any event, who apparently— I have not seen the correspondence, but my hon. friend obviously is correct when he says from his own experience that two or three ministers, succeeding ministers promised, in writing, the people of Ming's Bight to upgrade this road to an acceptable level.

I will not get into any partisan politics on the matter, Mr. Speaker, but I would say that if this is the case— and I would assume it is the case; I have no reason to doubt that it is the case— then

MR. W. ROWE: in all justice, Sir, the present Minister of Transportation and Minister of Highways should see to it that this Summer now, this construction season which we are now in and which will be ongoing for another couple of months, Sir, he should see to it that this road is upgraded to a half decent level. It was supposed to be done after the LaScie Highway was done. The LaScie Highway was paved, thanks to the largess and generosity of Ottawa and the great federal member they have, Bill Rompkey, and our great minister in Ottawa, Don Jamieson, able to get DREE funds and so on, Mr. Speaker. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Province can take the few dollars that is necessary out of their own coffers and have this road upgraded to a half decent standard to allow the people to travel over it in some comfort.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I stand, Mr. Speaker, to support the petition from Ming's Bight. Although the hon. member, and in fact the people who sent in the petition state that two previous ministers committed themselves in writing, I would assume therefore that it was not just a promise or a commitment on behalf of a minister, any one single individual or two in this particular case, but also they were representing the views of the government, the government of which they are members.

These people now are asking that the present Minister of Transportation and Communications, _

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: - and I am sure with his research staff and so on he can find copies of the correspondence -

MR. RIDEOUT: : I can give it to him.

MR. NOLAN: - if not we will arrange to get it for him.

MR. RIDEOUT: I will give him a copy.

MR. NOLAN: And that commitment by the present Minister of Manpower and the present Minister of Tourism will be honoured for the people of Ming's Bight. There is no reason why it should not be done

MR. NOLAN: almost right away. In fact, the present minister, it seems to me, it is about time that he outlined what his plans are for the Province. Is he going to wait until the frost sets in before we find what roads are going to be done in this Province this year? Now is the time for him to do it. This is what the House of Assembly is for, to bring in programmes to be discussed and be debated.

The minister at the moment has had his problems, I realize, with his airforce and so on but now is the time to get down to the roads. These are things that people want to know about now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come back to earth.

MR. NOLAN: So I hope that the minister will come back down to earth and will take a look at some of the roads, Ming's Bight being the one specifically in the petition just presented that the minister should address himself to. I assume that he will take the word of the hon. member and of the people who presented the petition. His two predecessors committed themselves to doing work in writing to the Community Council of Ming's Bight and surely he is not going to ignore such a commitment. I am sure that the commitment was not made frivolously, not by my friend the Minister of Manpower and so on so I look to the minister now in this petition, in rising to speak to it which is the least that he can do.

MR. RIDEOUT: This commitment came during the 1975 election.

MR. NOLAN: The Minister of Manpower's commitment came during the 1975 election.

MR. RIDEOUT: He was Minister of Highways then.

MR. NOLAN: He was Minister of Highways. So I hope that the present Minister of Highways will not have this lying on his conscience. He cannot bury it in his files; it is something that has been done and I am sure that there is hardly a single individual in this House that does not have road problems within their community.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very definitely.

MR. NOLAN: But for some reason the minister has decided to keep everybody in the dark other than what has come through Ottawa, through federal committees and so on. So it is time now that the minister outlined

MR. NOLAN: exactly what his plans are for the various areas of the Province, not wait until the House of Assembly is closed because it may not close as soon as he thinks. But now is the time. We are going to give him lots of time to do. I am sure members will give him unanimous support so that he can outline his programme in great detail which he apparently likes to do.

So I certainly support the plea of this - Pardon!

AN HON. MEMBER: Before Regatta Day.

MR. NOLAN: Before Regatta Day we will be out. But I certainly support the prayer of the petition as presented by my hon. friend and I would hope that Ming's Bight road, the minister may even announce it this afternoon sometime or certainly tomorrow without fail, and those people will not think that they are being used frivolously by people who come in here to the House of Assembly and the moment they leave the community that they forget where they came from. So it is up to the minister to speak to this petition and not ignore it.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the

MR. NEARY:

petition, Sir, presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) on behalf of 200 of his constituents in the community of Ming's Bight who would like to have their road paved. I believe there are about five miles of road involved here. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in support of this petition that when the Liberals were in power, Sir, we built that piece of road and when we got kicked out in 1972, on January 18th, that road was in excellent condition from the information of my hon. friend. It was in excellent condition. It has deteriorated over the last five or six years. It was a beautiful piece of road, Sir, in 1972, but like everything else in the Province, Sir, it is going down; it is either closed up, going down or deteriorated.

MR. W. ROWE: Wrack and ruin.

MR. NEARY: Wrack and ruin. And this piece of highway has deteriorated so badly that now some parts of it are a safety hazard, listening to the description given by my hon. friend.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It is washed away. The culverts are bad and the road -

MR. RIDEOUT: Sunk in the bog.

MR. NEARY: And the road is sunk down into the bog so my hon. colleague told us there introducing the petition. So it is a very serious matter, Sir. It is more serious than hon. members may realize. And, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman indicated, there was a promise made by two ministers by the names mentioned in the petition, Mr. Rousseau and Mr. Morgan - they were not mentioned as ministers, they were mentioned by name - who had promised the people in writing that that road would be upgraded.

MR. NEARY: So here we have an example of another broken promise similar to the one we have in Grand Falls where my hon. colleague got into a racket with his colleague the other night over the hospital out there and told him to shut up and sit down and not be embarrassing him in a public racket. The hon. gentleman got up on a point of order. The hon. member thought he was in the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the road.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: Excerpts from the Mifflin report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Would you like me to read a paragraph from that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly would. Go ahead, read it! Read away! We have not heard yet about the fires, and we have not heard about A. B. Walsh, and we have not heard about Scrivener, but we have heard about that one. Justice has been done in that case, but the other ones are covered up.

MR. W. ROWE: The Dobbin affair.

MR. NEARY: The Dobbin affair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to hon. gentlemen on both sides, right and left, that they must confine their remarks to the road under consideration or at least a branch of that road, but something closely connected to it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, the only way that I can connect it is to say that this is an example of another broken promise by the administration, and when they were accused, Sir, recently of a broken promise in Grand Falls

MR. NEARY: they said that the government had got down - they were prepared to get down and roll in the muck and the mud and the mire, but they are not prepared to keep their promises. I suppose we could say the same thing about this piece of road, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Authority.

MR. NEARY: Yes, so? Anything else the hon. gentleman wants to say now?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. Mullaly will come up now in due course when we get the Auditor General cracking and the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members on both sides are seriously abusing the rules with respect to petitions.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I do hope that - not because two ministers, Sir, have retired from that department or got flicked out of that department that the other minister does not have to keep their promise, because my understanding of the way the parliamentary system works, Sir, is that when a minister makes a commitment he makes it on behalf of government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: So the promise is being made on behalf of government and the succeeding minister then has to fulfil that commitment. He has to carry out that commitment or that promise that was made by his predecessor. So I would hope, Sir, that the present minister, being an hon. gentleman and a decent, respectable citizen, a man who keeps his word, the only man who gives us straight answers here in the House of Assembly, that this gentleman will see to it that

June 19, 1978

Tape 4543

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: the promise made by the two previous ministers on behalf of the government will be kept and that the people in the community of Ming's Bight will get their road upgraded this year to the extent that it will no longer be a safety hazard.

So, Sir, I support the prayer of the petition wholeheartedly and I would expect now to hear a few words from the minister telling the House, telling the people and the member for the district that a few dollars will be found this year in the department to do something with this five mile stretch of road that is in such bad shape.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague and good friend from Baie Verte - White Bay district and I support most of the things that have been said already and support the petition. One thing the present Minister of Tourism is going - one legacy he is going to leave with the Department of Highways is a litany of broken promises.

We just heard from the petition that the minister promised to upgrade that road to a decent standard. I can confirm that he made the same kind of promises to the people in Buchans, that he would look at the route of the Buchans - Howley Road and see that an agreement was struck between Hydro and the Department of Highways. That never materialized. And every other day we get petitions indicating now that that minister promised to do certain things that were not done. And maybe that is the reason that the minister is no longer in that particular department. There are enough people. The Premier found out that he was making promises that he could not keep and probably had no intention of keeping. I do not know.

But, Mr. Speaker, another thing that fascinates me is that in the three sessions I have been here, petition after petition after petition have come in for the upgrading of roads and it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has not built a mile of new road in this Province in seven years. All the petitions are asking for the upgrading of roads that were built prior to these hon. people taking office.

The great hue and cry, Mr. Speaker, about the condition the Trans-Canada is in, the previous minister tried to tell the people of Newfoundland that the reason the Trans-Canada is in such a bad shape is because it was built to lesser than national standards and that is a crock of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The reason the Trans-Canada is in so bad a shape, and all the

MR. FLIGHT: access roads in this Province, all the roads under control of the government, is there is practically no maintenance, no upkeep of the roads at all, not only did they not build roads in the Province this past seven years, Mr. Speaker, they have not maintained roads. They have allowed the roads to deteriorate to the point we see them today and as a result we have petitions coming in from Ming's Bight and communities all over Newfoundland.

I am of the community myself,

Mr. Speaker. Seven years ago the road from Buchans Junction to Millertown was in ideal, excellent condition. And now it is not fit to walk over let alone drive over, and we have over 100 children every day on that road in a school bus. So not only has this administration in Ming's Bight case but in other communities, not only do they have no great regard for the people who drive over the roads, but they have not got that high a regard for the safety of the children by their own programme now are forced to use those roads and get them into high schools and regional high schools.

There is a bus route in my district,

Mr. Speaker, twenty-one miles, in which kindergarten children drive twenty-one miles on a school bus and there are stretches on that road that are hazardous, Mr. Speaker. The pavement is broken up, shoulders washed away and still the Department of Highways - never mind, let them drive over it, no maintenance.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a good question and it is a good point to make. But this administration has built no roads and they have not even had the compassion for the people of Newfoundland to maintain the roads that they inherited. The Trans-Canada Highway today is in a mess and one of the reasons it is in a mess is because this administration has refused to do the maintenance and the upgrading and the upkeep that would have kept

MR. FLIGHT: the road in a decent passable condition and that applies to most of the roads in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition so ably presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague on behalf of the 210 residents of Ming's Bight in his district, the district of Baie Verte - White Bay. And again, Mr. Speaker, we have more evidence of broken promises.

MR. CALLAN: Bad thing.

MR. LUSH: And one wonders just how many promises were broken by this particular administration, how many promises and how many commitments were not lived up to and that is the frustrating part to the citizens, Mr. Speaker, to the citizens right throughout this Province. I know that it is a matter of grave concern in my own district were similar commitments and similar promises were made regarding the upgrading, the construction and paving of certain sections of road. And, Mr. Speaker, it is an absolute human misery and torture of having to drive over some of these poorly maintained gravel roads in this Province. The tremendous

Mr. Lush: inconvenience, that it causes people in driving over bad roads, the extra expense that it entails to a motorist getting springs busted and shocks busted and tires punctured, absolute misery, Mr. Speaker, absolute torture, and when hon. members feel, when people living in the areas concerned see promises and commitments broken in this way it causes them to lose faith in their own government.

And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the minister will be able to honour those commitments made by his two predecessors and give the people of Ming's Bight some consolation, some hope that the road concerned will be upgraded and paved in this fiscal year.

Another point of concern, Mr. Speaker, when people observe areas around the Province where roads are being paved, because I am sure that people wonder from time to time what criteria is used in deciding which roads are going to be upgraded, which roads are going to be reconstructed because a close study of the situation defies in many cases all logic as to why certain roads are upgraded and paved as opposed to other roads. And I would hope that this new minister, the present Minister of Transportation and Communications will be governed by the criteria that was so clearly and so explicitly put forward in the blueprint for development. That we are going to look at those areas where there is a resource, a natural resource, and that all of such areas are going to be given high priority in the allocation of funds in this present fiscal year. And I am sure our people would understand much more readily than what they now do if such criteria was used in allocating funds for the upgrading and the reconstruction and the paving of roads in a particular area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the minister and the government will become more sensitive to the torture and to the misery of driving over poorly maintained roads. There are students, Mr. Speaker, in this Province who in the morning before they leave to go to school they have got to take some sort of medicine, some sort of pills to stabilize, stabilizers, I suppose, to stabilize their heads and to stabilize their stomachs so that they are going to be able to make the trip and get to the school as healthy as possible.

MR. NEARY: Not tranquilizers! Not tranquilizers!

MR. LUSH: Not tranquilizers, no, stabilizers.

MR. W. ROWE: Gravel.

MR. LUSH: Gravel, that is what I am looking for, Gravel.

I know in several areas in my district -

MR. RIDEOUT: They call them gravel pills.

MR. LUSH: Right. In several areas in my district that parents tell me that their children have to take these Gravel pills to ensure that they will get to school in good shape, as they prepare to bounce and float over the terrible roads throughout this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this petition I would hope that the minister will keep these things in mind, the torture, and the misery caused to all sections of driving over these terrible, terrible gravel roads in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Gravel roads.

MR. LUSH: Gravel roads. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support the petition in behalf of the people in Ming's Bight, I cannot help but remark on the amount of money that has been spent on road reconstruction, and maintenance, and improvements over the past five or six years. I guess we have been spending \$50 million to \$60 million a year; the various levels of government, \$300 million, \$400 million. We have got about 2,500 miles of unpaved road and about 2,900 miles of paved road, and it would appear that we are only about half way there. I realize that the needs are great and that there is no such thing as a good gravel road any more, unless it is asphalted and up to the standard of the Trans-Canada or what we would like the Trans-Canada to be, and it is indeed not a good road.

One must also keep mind the fact that there are parts of this Province still which have no road connections at all after all of these years of progress under the Confederation system. So, Sir, needless to say that we in the department and government will be doing everything we can for the people in Ming's Bight and all these

Mr. Doody: other parts of the Province that so desperately need improved road conditions, and improved communications and transportation

MR. DOODY:

conditions. It is not an unusual thing, unfortunately, for people to sometimes promise more than they are in a position to provide.

It was only recently that there was a road in Buchans Junction that needed to be done and which we approved this year and managed to find the funds for. The file on that one went back to - 1958 was the first time that was promised and I do not think the Tories were too thick in the House of Assembly at that particular time, Your Honour. But nevertheless, out of the largesse and goodness and the hearts of the people of this Province we have decided to at long last fulfil and honour the obligation and commitment made by that minister in 1958, and we will be putting a road into Buchans Junction this year.

Sir, I can only say that the -

MR. NEARY:

You can thank the present

Minister of Justice for that -

MR. DOODY:

Well, if he did he forged

somebody's signature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY:

If he did he forged somebody's signature to the letter and I am not about to name that particular person, I have too much respect for the Senator.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) man up in Ottawa.

MR. DOODY:

Your Honour, as I speak in support of the petition, I can promise the people in Ming's Bight that we will do everything we possibly can within the fiscal limitations of the Province and hopefully, Sir, we will be able to show some improvement in the pretty near future in that particular road section.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I just have to say

MR. LUNDRIGAN: one or two words. First of all, I believe the minister's comment about the number of miles of roads that are still unpaved, and the number of miles of road still unconstructed, the kinds of concerns for the monies we will need in the future is the reason I want to say a word on behalf of the hon. gentleman.

For about seven or eight years the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) and myself, like the present member, who is very concerned and one of the better members in the Legislature, in my opinion, one of the future leaders of his party, we championed the cause of many of the communities on the Northeast coast in trying to get roadwork done.

At that time the present Leader of the Opposition was a Minister of the Crown and he tells me he was the member for that particular community for eight years, which sort of suggests that the problem has existed for quite some time under both governments. But in any event, Your Honour, the question remains, the fact that we have spent \$300 million in the last six years on road work in the Province, and that we still have some 2,900 miles of road, if I can quote the minister, unpaved -

MR. DOODY: Twenty-nine hundred done and twenty-five hundred to do.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Twenty-nine done and twenty-five to do. We have no Labrador Highway which is one of the great needs in this Province, which is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars. We have a community like Fogo, Fogo Island, with twelve communities, one of the most progressive fishing parts of our Province with one string of pavement, a very high priority which I will give support to. unpaved.

I can go right around the Province and bring into focus questions like the hon. gentleman raised. The important question is, How or when are we going

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

to be able to raise the monies, get the monies to necessarily complete these types of projects? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most clear questions that has not been attacked this year in the Legislature is the question of the renegotiation of our Terms of Union, Term 29. - I will continue to harp on this until I get some debate on it - which if we have term 29 translated into 1978 dollars, it will result in \$35 million coming into the Province annually compared with \$8 million today, resulting in \$27 million or \$28 million more coming into the Province which could be used for public services.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that maybe in addressing ourselves to that type of question which was raised again today by the member, we should get into the business of where the monies are coming from. I grant you it is good politics to stand up and present petitions, to support petitions as we are all doing, but I think we have to get on to the more refined question as to the resolution of the problem. I think we should definitely, all members, get involved in some kind of a resolution which can be presented to the federal government asking for renegotiation of the terms, because that is the source of much of the funds.

The Leader of the Opposition,
the former Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I do not know why the two gentlemen are so sensitive today. After a weekend of holidaying I thought the Leader of the Opposition would be relaxed. I can understand why the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is under a bit of tension today, but let him keep quiet for just a minute.

MR. NEARY:

Why am I under a bit of tension?

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I thought I heard quite a number of people around the street talking today. There is a

MR. LUNDRIGAN: good reason why the member
should be under a bit of tension, He does not like the
press today. I am surprised he did not rise on a question
of privilege.

 But in any event, Your Honour,
I believe quite seriously that we

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

should address ourselves to where we are going to get the money, because the Leader of the Opposition the other day took off on the government about the fact that we are something like \$2.2 billion in debt, \$1.6 million of it a direct debt. The former Leader of the Opposition made the same observation that one of the critical problems facing the Province today is the inability of the Province to finance the necessary level of services. And I feel that it is our obligation, particularly the Leader of the Opposition who can ask a dozen questions on it today, to focus on that type of problem. I contend that we have to look at Ottawa bearing in mind Term 29 which gave us a guarantee that we would have a level of services equal to that of the rest of the Atlantic Provinces in order to justify the \$8 million, that that was the basis for a special term which gave us some financial support from the federal government. I believe the term is inadequate, the services are still not up to scratch and we need to approach the federal government to look at that particular term again. I think that is the area that we should focus on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and speak in support of the prayer of the petition from the residents of Ming's Bight who are asking for an improved road to their community - pavement, I believe, they were asking for.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Upgrading.

MR. CALLAN:

Upgrading. They were not even asking for pavement, I see - upgrading.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of this petition, what I would like to say first of all is I would like to make a comment. I hope that it is in order. Since the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who was named as chairman of a committee on Standing Orders of this House has no intentions of calling that committee together, perhaps I might make an observation here. If the committee had ever met, being a member I would have suggested that perhaps if there are any petitions a couple of points should be kept in mind: one, perhaps the number of people who support a petition would be governed partially by the number of names on that petition; in other words, if you have 4,000 names against the spruce budworm spraying programme you would expect a lot of people to support it because it concerns a lot of people. If you have 200 names about a road or something then perhaps half a dozen people who know something about what they are talking about; this is why, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this petition. I do know something about the rural areas of this Province and about dusty roads - gravel roads the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) talked about - gravel and dusty roads. And, Mr. Speaker, perhaps another guideline that could be kept in mind for people who speak in support of a petition is, perhaps that member, the member who is supporting the petition know something about what he is talking about, perhaps that he represent a district which does have gravel roads, unlike, I would imagine, the roads in Grand Falls. To hear the member for Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, standing in support of this petition, to me I think it is a waste of time of this House. If it were parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the member for Grand Falls could be termed a bit hypocritical, but that is unparliamentary so therefore I cannot say that, but for the same hon.

MR. CALLAN: gentleman to stand and talk about Term 29 when one of the finest friends that he ever had in Ottawa -

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - was the man who tried to take it away from this Province, it is a little bit hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition, as I said, I speak from experience. I know what it is to represent a district where there are miles and miles and miles of dirt road.

Mr. Speaker, some of the people who spoke in support of this petition mentioned that this new minister is pretty fair, pretty impartial and so on and perhaps a big improvement over the former Minister of T. and C. I think that probably is a fair statement, Mr. Speaker; at least we do have some road work going on this year on the T.C.H., some of it between Chance Cove, which is in my district and also down as far as the Welcome Inn at Goobies. And I am very happy for two reasons, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Trans-Canada Highway in that particular section of the Province is being upgraded,

Number one, of course, the road is badly in need of upgrading, the T.C.H., and at the same time

MR. CALLAN: it means probably between eighty and one hundred jobs for the people who live in that particular areas of my district and of course no doubt the people will be hired from that particular area. The eight or ten people that have been hired so far have come from that area and no doubt when the contractors move in they will do the same thing, they will bring their supervisors and so on but the others no doubt will be taken from the local area.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding in the last minutes that I have I might say - the minister is not there now but he is probably listening - I might say that I was happy to hear him say that he will have his officials and he will take a look at the request. The minister did not come out and say, "I am sorry to inform the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) that monies have all been committed this year and therefore we will have to wait until next year to see what can be done." The minister, and I remember quite vividly what he said, "We will have a look at this request and see what can be done about it." I am happy to hear that, Mr. Speaker, because it was only an hour ago that I finished writing a letter to the Minister of Transportation and Communications asking in view of the fact that only funds for one and a half miles of reconstruction, these are the only funds that have been allocated for the whole district of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: -Bellevue, I ask that another \$50,000 or \$75,000 be allocated. I know that that request will be granted since the funds have not been all extended.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition tabled by my colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) on behalf of 211 people who would like to have commitments made by the two former Ministers of Transportation, the present Minister of Manpower who made a commitment on the subject and whose word is something that we take pretty

MR. SIMMONS: seriously normally and the now Minister of Tourism, both these made commitments in writing, I remind the ministers, to have this road upgraded once the LaScie road has been paved. Well that has been done for two or three years now, as I understand it. The business, Mr. Speaker, of presenting petitions is something we had better be very careful off because there are certain people who are chipping away at it, chipping away at the right. And I had to go back a few minutes ago to the Parliamentary Rule Book to see if somehow we were off base here and I find as I read it that it says "The right of petitioning parliament is acknowledged as a fundamental principle and has been uninterrupted from very early times." I wish the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) would read that, Mr. Speaker, because he is chipping away at this to the point that he has become a source of embarrassment and indeed a source of abuse to the people of Newfoundland who are exercising today, Mr. Speaker, a very basic right, let us not forget that, the right of petitioning is the most basic under our constitution, the right to petition parliament for the redress of grievances. I hear the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) talking about good politics to present petitions. Yes, it happens to be good politics to do what is the basic right of people, that happens to be good politics, we make no apologies for that, Mr. Speaker. Also though, Mr. Speaker, it happens to be the duty of us and the obligation to present petitions and whether or not the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) likes it or not of course it is there in the law book, in the rule book and we intend to exercise it on behalf of the people of Newfoundland who take time to send in these petitions, not thinking for a minute they are going to be scoffed at by people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the hon. member is in the realm of debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, three of a kind, he says. I would rather be three of this kind than any number of his kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if he is concerned about Term 29, why was he not in the House when I talked about it for an hour instead of out writing up his silly points of order to try and interrupt me. He says Term 29 has not been debated here. I talked about it for an hour and a half, Mr. Speaker, last week. He did not hear it because he was out with his nose in a rule book trying to find some warped little point, to come in and exercise his grade seven knowledge on.

MR. SIMMONS: Stunned boy! You are too stunned. Why do you not talk to your buddy Diefenbaker who wanted to take it all away from us under Term 29. He was going to give us nothing, your great buddy Diefenbaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Too much of your -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He spent less time out dressing up his silly points of order, Mr. Speaker, more time talking to his buddy Diefenbaker who fouled this thing up in the first place, perhaps we would have more money under Term 29 than we are getting right now thanks to his crowd up in Ottawa. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, thank God he is not lose. Thank God he can only talk about it. If he tried to do something about it he would probably fool it up like Diefenbaker did.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You had a bad day today.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I had a good day today until I saw the member for Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, a very good day.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I am trying hard to speak.

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

MR. NEARY: A lovely day. Justice is being done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask all hon. members on my right and left to please refrain from interrupting the speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A beautiful day, boy. Now all we have to do is get -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, was indeed their member for eight years and I want to pay tribute to him, Mr. Speaker, for getting the road built. He did not deteriorate the road. He got it built and it was in

MR. SIMMONS: good shape in the days I used to travel over in in 1971 and '72, in good shape when I was a superintendent down there. It is since then it deteriorated. Can we get that through their stunned skulls over there, Mr. Speaker? And they talk about a five year road plan and now they are going to talk about a five year hospital plan. Well, I hope the hospital plan has more success than the five year road plan this crowd announced two years ago, Mr. Speaker. And then the member for Grand Falls tells us the Labrador Road is going to cost hundreds of millions. Give us \$10 million and \$12 million, Mr. Speaker, and we will be satisfied.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: If the member for Grand Falls would just shut up for a minute. If he could just shut up. He is the fellow -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - who is always crying in his beer because we are interrupting him. Well now I would like to say a word or two, if the member for Grand Falls would shut up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Of course I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. ISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a couple of words in support of the petition presented by my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). We do not have that many gravel roads in our area. Thank God it is just about all paved but we still have some that I would like to see done. But I am concerned about this stretch of road in the Baie Verte area, particularly because it - well, I am not familiar with Ming's Bight and do not know just how far it is from Baie Verte, but the thing is, if it is very close to the Baie Verte area it is probably getting a little bit of gravel or fill from that area and my concern is that that stretch of road may contain some asbestos fibres and with school children driving over it every day, as well

MRS. MCISAAC: as other people having to drive over it and beat up their cars and everything, my main concern is how far is it from Baie Verte and whether or not it is getting the same type of fill that was used on the Baie Verte road and whether or not it could be hazardous. Maybe Dr. Selikoff when he was there looked at this area too. It may be something for the minister to think about if there is any fill that has been put on it in recent years, where did the fill come from. And I cannot say too much more about it because I am not familiar with it except that that is my main concern. Any fill that was put on it, where did it come from? Is there a possibility of asbestos fibres in it and is it a hazard as well as being a nuisance for people to drive over.

I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the petition presented by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Sir, as it happens this is approximately the second anniversary of the written promises from two hon. ministers opposite, who now do not have that particular portfolio but who did make a written commitment to the Council of Ming's Bight for the - nothing big, Sir, a simple little request for the upgrading of a road, a written promise and in the provincial election of course we had the verbal promise, as was the case in many other districts in the Province.

Sir, I was a little bit disappointed in my friend from Grand Falls with whom I taught with the university. We were professors together in the faculty of Education. I expected much more from him, Sir, and if I am allowed the same latitude as the hon. member was given, Sir, I note that the hon. member for Grand Falls

Mr. F. Rowe: in supposedly supporting the petition, Sir, questioned the very fact that, you know, last week or a few weeks ago it was a waste of time to present petitions. This week it is good politics to present petitions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, I suggest to the hon. member for Grand Falls that it is much better politics to keep promises, it is much better politics to keep promises.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will find that out in the next election.

MR. F. ROWE: And they will find that out when the next election rolls around, Sir.

The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, got on with \$300 million for highways his administration spent without mentioning what portion of that came from Ottawa, was talking about paving on Fogo Island, and talking about the Labrador Highway, was talking about the terms of union, talking about the debt, Sir, practically everything but the subject at hand. Sir, it seems that the hon. member does not know whether he is punch or board or where he is these days since he got flicked out of the Cabinet, or decided to leave the Cabinet, standing up in Grand Falls at a public meeting on points of order, not realizing whether he is in the House of Assembly or at a public meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: What kind of a state are you in at all?

MR. F. ROWE: What kind of a state, Sir? The member is obviously suffering from political rabies -

MR. NEARY: Did he get the blues? Does he get depressed?

MR. F. ROWE: - when he gets up, Sir, and gets on with the kind of partisan statements that he makes in the House of Assembly in supposedly supporting the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I recommend that the hon. member read Beauchesne, read the Standing Orders, and think what he can say in the best interest

Mr. F. Rowe: of his district and the best interest of this Province whether it comes through the Address in Reply, the Budget Speech, or the support of petitions, instead of trying to score cheap political points at whatever opportunity, Sir, he gets. And I am being completely relevant, Sir, because Your Honour is giving me exactly the same latitude as was given, afforded the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are not suppose to get out -

MR. F. ROWE: What is wrong with the hon. member, Sir? There he is frothing at the mouth, Sir, wild-eyed, political rabies taking over again, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Have you had your valium today yet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: This is becoming obnoxious, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I do not mind -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if this is a point of order, I will yield -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: - but if it is just plain obnoxious to the hon. gentleman, I have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman on a point of order?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order. Maybe I can kill the hon. member's minute that he has left, and also kill the pain and the agony that the House has had to suffer. But, Mr. Speaker, talking about political rabies, did I take my valium today? comments coming from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I do not mind this kind of cat-calling back and forth, but, Sir, this is getting a little bit abusive. Now I know there are no rules which cover political abuse but that is a little bit below the belt, and I would like for the hon. member, in view of the fact that it is not a fact, and it has nothing to do with me in the world. I do not know if he is talking about himself or if he is reflecting on his own personal behaviour, but if he is going to do that, Sir, I ask for

Mr. Lundrigan : your protection against the abuse and the kinds of things that are emanating from the mouth of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary): That is hitting below the belt and it is very obnoxious to say the very least, and I wonder why he is allowed to get away with that kind of abuse, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Obviously the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) provoked whatever ruckus that has been in the House this afternoon, getting on with his cat calls and this sort of a thing. And if the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was darting back, sparing off with the hon. member for Grand Falls, and he finds it obnoxious, and he cannot take it, I suggest that if he cannot stand the heat he should get out of the kitchen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: There is no point of order whatsoever, Sir, the most it is is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think I should point out to hon. members that personal references are usually or frequently irrelevant to the subject matter, and almost always provocative of debate, and it is, I think, good parliamentary practice to attack the arguments although here obviously there is not even supposed to be a debate. But I do think that personal references rather than references to the ideas of an hon. member do frequently lead to a deterioration, I would ask hon. members to refrain from them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the minus thirty seconds at my disposal I would like to say that I do indeed support the petition, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port followed by the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) on behalf of 211 residents of Ming's Bight.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition I might say that I had no intention of saying anything about the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). I have seen him here in the House for the last month and a half changing his stands from day to day and grabbing the press whenever he can, and obviously he is only trying to make himself better known for when the leadership comes up amongst the members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! When a certain amount of irrelevance or unparliamentary procedure creeps in imperceptibly then I think the sense of equity allows perhaps or suggests some reasonable balance thereof. I think that that balance has been achieved and that all hon. members now should stick to the rules without deviating from them. If not, what can be a slip of procedure will then in fact, become a regular procedure.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the road that has been referred to by the hon. member in his petition is five miles of road, and I believe the petition referred to the fact that on two occasions by two separate ministers promises had been made that the road would be upgraded and paved. Mr. Speaker, this is something that I know an awful lot about because I represent a district which has a couple of dirt roads over which students travel each day, and in most cases very young students, and on those particular roads the former Minister of Transportation and Communications came out to visit, had a meeting with the people and promised them in no uncertain terms that the road would be upgraded - not paved, but just upgraded - and that certain types of stone would go on it. And his officials were there. And then Mr. Speaker, that minister left: half the road was done,

MR. HODDER: the season was over, The following season the rest of the road was not done, and it surprised me when the Minister of Transportation and Communications in speaking to the petition said that it is sometimes normal to promise what the government cannot provide. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is not normal to promise what the government cannot provide.

And before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that I would like to say. I would like to know why in this Province as I travel through this Province that some districts have very good roads going to small communities, very well graded roads, while in other districts there are nothing but cow paths. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time that this government had some sort of a plan where they look at all the roads in this Province, particularly roads that are being used industrially, roads which lead to fisheries areas and that sort of thing and came up with a plan and told the people of Newfoundland where the roads are going to be paved and when they are going to be paved and when they are going to be upgraded and when they are going to be built, because, Mr. Speaker, there are no priorities in this government. It is just a matter of pressure here or there or who happens to be the minister in a certain district and that is the way the roads are paved or upgraded in this Province. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that the government took the time to sit down and do a little planning.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. And, Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me about this petition and

CAPT. E. WINSOR: other petitions as well, when we find that the petitioners stated that a promise or promises had been made by various ministers that this particular piece of road would be upgraded. Now, Sir, to me a promise unkept is like a debt unpaid and surely, if it is true, and I have no reason to doubt the member or the people of Ming's Bight through the member, who stated that this piece of road had been promised to be upgraded-and I do not know whether pavement was brought into it - by two previous ministers. So this is very, very serious. And I would just like to remind the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) when he mentioned about Term 29, he must realize that it was the former P.C. Government or Tory Government of Ottawa who put a limit to the amount of money that Newfoundland was to receive from Ottawa through Term 29.

AN HON. MEMBER: They did not want to do it at all.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well, they wanted to cancel it; however, he must remember also that it was over Term 29 that certain members of the Conservative Party or the P.C. Party at that time resigned from the party and formed the Newfoundland Party. Two members, if I recall correctly, remained with the party;

CAPT. WINSOR: just two members out of a total of five, I believe, members of the Opposition at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the monies coming in from Ottawa, where Ottawa today is paying 90 per cent of most of the roads that are upgraded and paved in Newfoundland, because it was the former administration who had built the roads through Newfoundland and, as I have said many times here, who broke the curse of isolation in Newfoundland.

So, when we were moved out of office we passed over the roads, well built, well constructed, the same as we passed over schools, the same as we passed over hospitals and other modern facilities.

So, Sir, this administration came in and it was all there for them. All they had to do was concentrate on improving and developing those services further. This they have failed to do.

We see the public debt increasing all of the time. It has increased now \$2.5 billion beyond what it was when the previous administration governed this Province, and yet we find that there are miles and miles of road not fit to drive over, more or less, for heavy traffic.

Mr. Speaker, where are the government priorities? This is a question we have to ask. Sir, I support the petition presented by my colleague and would request that genial member, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who has, I think, a soft spot in his heart for the isolated places in this Province, and I think a little persuasion, a little co-operation from his colleagues and most of the roads will be done with the next couple of years, and I hope and trust that he will not be overlooking the roads on Fogo Island.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the

MR. MCNEIL: petition of 211 people from Ming's Bight. Mr. Speaker, it amazes me to hear the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) suggest that Term 29 is the cause of a lot of our ills in this Province.

If he is suggesting that then I will say that maybe it was because the Federal Tory Party at that time did us wrong.

MR. J. WINSOR: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that instead of referring to term 29, we should be referring to co-operation. I can point to my own district where for the last five years or so we have been trying to put forward an industrial access road. We have had the road begun by the heavy equipment school, which is funded by the federal government, federal funds. They started off the road and when they approached the government for funds for blasting, which at that time was stated as being over \$200,000; this year when checked again, the minister's own people stated it was under \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker, if we are trying to save money and trying to give service, here is a way we could use the facilities of that school, the heavy equipment training school. We are paying for training. We could have them actually constructing our roads. So, Mr. Speaker, we must have co-operation and use the existing facilities that we have to get the maximum in road repairs and rebuilding. Mr. Speaker, I gladly support the petition of my colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 281 persons from Gaultois, Hermitage and Seal Cove schools. The prayer of the petition reads:

"To the hon. House of Assembly:

MR. J. WINSOR: we the undersigned disagree with the government's inflexible stand on the implementation of twenty-six to one pupil-teacher ratio beginning September 1978.

"We would like government to reinstate the programme of allowing boards with declining enrollments to retain the number of teachers that they would have been entitled to had the twenty-five to one teacher-pupil ratio been introduced.

"We feel that a twenty-five to one pupil-teacher ratio is not only necessary, but should even be lowered in order to maintain the programme we currently have in our schools and hence to maintain the present quality of education in schools."

As I said, this is signed by 281 signatures. If you multiply that by the number of kids they have in school, an average of maybe three or four, you have quite a number of pupils represented.

Mr. J. Winsor: The parents of children attending schools at Gaultois, Hermitage, and Seal Cove are very much dissatisfied with the implacable stand. There has been quite a stir up even before September comes, because when I was in my district, - it must be three weeks ago now - there was quite a stir up. There are teachers moving their trailers from one place to another; some are living in trailers and this is going to cause quite a stir up in the rural areas, and I think most of the members in the House have spoken about it, the stir up that they have, the changes that have to be taken, and placed in their schools. They are losing the extra-curricular things, not extra-curricular really, the things that should be standard curriculum, guidance counsellors, music, art, and other things. Now what kind of a chaotic situation are we going to be into when they start moving these around? They are going to have to double up on their classes, they will have multipurpose classes instead of the tremendous strides that were being made by the Integrated Board in our area. The schools were looking up, the kids were getting a much better system of education than they ever had before, and now they are let down. And I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition and ask that it be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. gentleman for Port au Port.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague on behalf of 281 people from the Gaultois-Seal Cove schools. The people concerned about the teacher cutbacks and more precisely concerned about the student-teacher ratio, concerned about the formula which the government are so vigorously pursuing this fiscal year, the twenty-six to one, the ratio of twenty-six to one, that is the ratio that is being used by the government this year right across the Province, which is resulting in many school boards losing some of their teachers - some more, some less - and obviously or quite logically hurting some areas more than others.

Mr. Lush: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned several times while speaking to these petitions here in the House of Assembly that if the government were to aim towards the national student-teacher average, that is, taking all of the provinces together and coming up with an average, if we were to do this that instead of laying off 120 teachers in this Province in this fiscal year, that we would have to hire somewhere in the vicinity of 600 teachers. I think the figure is somewhere around 570, that is how many teachers this Province would be hiring to meet the national average. And, Mr. Speaker, I think if we are to improve the education within this Province, if we are to offer equality of educational opportunity to our students then that is the direction in which we must be going to try and get as close to the national average as possible. The government have been using the excuse that the student enrollment is declining right across Canada, so since this sort of thing is happening right across Canada they are losing teachers then we must follow suit.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have been further behind, we have never had the frills nor the opportunity that our Mainland counterparts have had, so this would have been the time to try and bridge the gap. This would have been the time for this government to stop this movement of laying off teachers, and over a couple of years without hiring any additional teachers, but keeping, maintaining the status quo that over a period of a couple of years we could have bridged this gap with respect to numbers of teachers, and with respect to quality education and the equality of educational opportunity throughout

MR. LUSH: this land. But we use the argument very effectively that this is a trend right across Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, we can use this where it is advantageous. If we were to look at other areas of expenditure to make other comparisons we would find that if we were to try to meet equality with other Canadian provinces that we would have to up the expenditures in education right around. For example, the total amount of expenditures in the fiscal year, the total amount of budgetary expenditures, is far less than the Canadian average, the total of the Budget. So here is an area, if we were aiming at equality throughout the country, that we would have to up our expenditures tremendously. The same with the amount of money spent per student throughout Canada. We fall far short of that. We fall far short of the amount of money spent per person on education. So these are all areas that to see the picture clearly we have to make the total comparison. So looking at these expenditures there is no question about it at all that this Province is not making the effort in the field of education that other provinces are making and no doubt these are the comparisons that we have to make.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that I support the petition of people concerned about the high student-teacher ratio that the government is now applying to decide the number of teachers that each board should have. And by way of clueing up, if we were to meet the national average across this country, instead of laying off 120 teachers this Province would find itself in the position of hiring close to 600 teachers. The minister says it is wrong, Sir, but that comes from

MR. LUSH: Statistics Canada in this year and that is what this Province would have to do.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to support the petition presented by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) on behalf of 281 residents of Gaultois, Hermitage and Seal Cove.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying last Friday when a quorum call interfered with my support of another petition by that hon. gentleman, there are certain misconceptions on the government side of the House as to the effects that the cutbacks will have on education in Newfoundland schools. Now while it seems that while you have fewer students you can have fewer teachers and education will not suffer, the fact is that students do not leave schools in any set pattern and a school could lose students from every classroom with only a small drop in the enrolment of each class and yet would lose one teacher for the whole school. And when this happens then the school board or the principal, whichever case it might be, has to decide whether it is a physical education teacher, whether it is a specialist that must go or whether it is a classroom teacher that must go, and in many cases it has been the specialist.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. HODDER: In the primary and elementary school where there are cutbacks in the same way, it is very often that students who are in the smaller classes, the more disadvantaged students who did not have the opportunity of an academic environment and had been put into smaller classes for reading skills or math skills or whatever they might be, these are the students that will be lumped in with

MR. HODDER: larger classes and these are the students who will suffer. So, Mr. Speaker, it is the disadvantaged student and the specialist who are suffering. And as the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said, there are no frills in our schools in Newfoundland today, no frills at all. And when you start losing guidance counsellors and when you start having one class instead of three for mathematics and that sort of thing, then the quality of education is deteriorating in Newfoundland schools.

Now I believe the prayer of that petition said something to the effect that they would like the pupil-teacher ratio to be decreased. Now in the past, the official excuse for not decreasing the pupil-teacher ratio was the fact that it would cost the government a lot of money to provide classrooms and to build high school buildings. And, Mr. Speaker, now that we have declining enrolments throughout the Province, this is an excellent time to decrease the pupil-teacher ratio.

Mr. Speaker, in the past five or six years this Province has been suffering economic

MR. HODDER:

pressures. These economic pressures steam from many things, the most important, I think, possibly things like the takeover of Churchill Falls and blowing the tops of mountains for the Lower Churchill and that asinine, stupid move with no planning to start the transmission line on the Lower Churchill across and now they have decided to go the other way. But blunders of that sort have caused economic pressures to go in this government and economic pressures on the people of Newfoundland. And now the children of Newfoundland are suffering for the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen opposite. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government must decide what its priorities are, they must decide what the economic needs of this Province are and what the social needs are. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, the social needs of this Province are great. In some cases possibly we can cut back on social programmes, but at the same time we must not forget education. The greatest resource that Newfoundland has is the Newfoundland people and it is on those people that we must spend out money if we are to look to the future. I think that the announced cutbacks by this government in the last budget in teachers, and the problems that this has caused in Newfoundland schools, has set the schools in this Province back many years. I believe that the government must change its stand, I know it is too late for next year, but I do hope that when the Task Force brings in its recommendations, and I am sure that they will bring in the right recommendations, that the minister will change his mind and reverse the trend and the stand that he has taken previously.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I would like to say a brief word in support of the petition presented by my hon. friend from the communities of Gaultois, Hermitage and Seal Cove, I believe, three communities in the district of Fortune - Hermitage, a petition, Sir, which we have seen many times presented to this House during this session. I would say there have been twenty or thirty similar petitions presented from all over Newfoundland and Labrador which have had the effect of decrying the cutbacks in the

MR. W. ROWE: quality of education, the decreasing of the quality of education by this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the statistics in education in Newfoundland are not reassuring. We have, as has been mentioned many times before, one half of the rate of graduates from trade school that they have across Canada generally, one quarter of the rate from trade school, say, in Alberta or Ontario and the same figures apply to university. As far as grade 11 graduates are concerned, the rate of graduation is even worse; it is something below fifty per cent. of the national rate found across Canada. Now how can any government, Mr. Speaker, or any Minister of Education in all conscience unilaterally take moves or make moves or take decisions which at the very least may have a further adverse effect on our education system without adequate study, enquiry, research into the whole problem of our relatively low educational standards. I do not mean the standards of what is taught in school or the standards of the teachers that are teaching in school; I am referring to the appalling, the abysmally low statistics of graduation from high school, from university, from trade school school as compared to the average which is obtained across the rest of Canada; that is what I am talking about.

Before any moves are made, Sir, this hon. minister and this administration should have had a fullfledged enquiry conducted, not by a couple of university professors in education and in one small field of education at that, but a fullfledged enquiry, an investigation headed up by perhaps say professional educators certainly but with all kinds of input from every aspect of society in Newfoundland and Labrador to determine what is wrong with our education system. What is wrong with the curriculum? Why are young people losing and why have they lost interest in continuing on in school? Where have we gone wrong, Mr. Speaker, as far as our education is concerned?

MR. W. ROWE:

But not a word said about that, Mr. Speaker, not a word by anybody, by the minister, by anyone on that side of the House, not a word, Sir, not one syllable of concern uttered about the appalling state of this situation in our Province, and the need to bring -

MR. HOUSE: Appalling state of our schools?

MR. W. ROWE: I am talking about the appalling state, the net result of our education system. That is what I am talking about.

MR. HOUSE: The net result.

MR. W. ROWE: The net result. I do not care about schools. I am concerned about the fifteen, sixteen, seventeen year olds, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Watch your blood pressure now.

MR. W. ROWE: The seventeen year olds who are getting out of school for some reason or other at the grade seven or eight level, fifteen year olds, sixteen year olds. I am worried about the young people who either will not or cannot go to trade school or will not or cannot go to university, or cannot go to university, or cannot or will not graduate from grade eleven. That is what I am talking about. What is wrong with the minister, Sir?

MR. NEARY: He is getting bug eyed.

MR. W. ROWE: I am not concerned about his little vested interest, whatever that may be, the bricks and lumber and mortar made to build a school, I am not concerned about that in the least, as long as the plant is adequate, as long as the curriculum is adequate, as long as the teachers are adequate. That is what I am concerned about, all these things. As long as the net result, Mr. Speaker, from our overall education system is good and comparable to at least the rest of Canada, it should be beyond the rest of Canada by rights because we have had so many centuries of neglect in that very important area.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister should not get all hot and bothered about this. He should try to do something about it.

MR. NEARY: The worst Minister of Education we had in our whole history.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, that may be so. We have had some good ones. We have had some bad ones. I do not know where the hon. minister will stand on the scale when history reports it.

MR. NEARY: Very low, Low on the totem pole.

MR. W. ROWE: But I know this, Sir, that while our net result from our education system is so appallingly low that we should not be taking measures, which may, I do not even say will, which may have the effect of ever further adversely affecting that overall system.

I say, Sir, let us have a full fledged enquiry which will cover up nothing and which will uncover everything and find out what has gone wrong, what we need to do in order to bring our system, the net result of our system. I am talking about the individual boys and girls, young men and young women, Sir, what we can do to encourage them to stay in school, to encourage them to get training and further education and so on so that they can have a life of more quality than they might otherwise have whether it is economic or otherwise. That is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. I do hope that the minister has perhaps changed his mind somewhat as a result of the incredible public pressure which has been brought on him over the last number of months.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: I rise to support with great privilege the petition so very ably presented by my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage. 281 parents, I presume; probably includes a few teachers but my bet is that it includes ninety-eight per cent parents. Mr. Speaker, that has been the case with the two petitions that I have presented in

MR. R. MOORES: this House on this same topic and I believe it is the case in more than three-quarters of all the petitions presented by all my colleagues on either side of the House on this topic. And that is the trend, Mr. Speaker, all over this province - parents, not the teachers, parents, not the school boards, and parents, not the students who are petitioning this government through their elected members to reverse this atrocious decision made by the Minister of Education on behalf of his government. We have tried until we are almost blue in the face. We have gotten up here in this House and told the Minister of Education, we have mimicked, parrotted, mouthed, all the arguments affecting the student-teacher cutbacks in this Province that it will have a very negative and a very adverse and a very detrimental effect upon students, their course curriculum, the drop out rate and inevitably, Mr. Speaker, upon the economy of this Province.

I have also said on previous occasions that the Minister of Education solely is not responsible for this particular policy. He has promoted it and perpetrated it on behalf of his government, but he is not solely nor is he the most aggressive defender

MR. R. MOORES: of this particular policy. He has to uphold his end of the party line, his end of his Cabinet responsibility to his colleagues and the government and in fact to his party in this Province. But I have heard it said from one end of this Province to the other that this Minister of Education from the point of view of his credentials was supposed to be and still can be the best Minister of Education this Province has ever had. What went wrong? Why is this minister illogically and almost irrationally supporting a policy that is detrimental to his very profession to the very mind-set that he has been brought up through for the last fifteen or twenty years as a school superintendent and a supervisor of education, school principal, teacher - why?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of my colleagues could go on for an hour on this topic because I believe here on this side of the House we have quite a few teachers. Some of us, like myself, have only had minimal experience in the teaching field and perhaps would not wave any particular banner to say that the teaching profession is my profession. But I do have enough knowledge of the profession to know, and of course enough friends in that profession to tell me that unless this government reverses, puts the lid on, flings out this ridiculous teacher cutback policy, September 5th. or September 6th. when the schools open is going to be a day of reckoning.

I understand that the NTA through its various branch offices are starting now. They were fair enough and honest, and decent enough and responsible enough not to start the programme now that they are envisioning for September 6th. And it would not surprise me at all, Mr. Speaker, in fact I would predict that on September 6th. when the schools re-open there may not be any teachers to teach the students. And if that occurs I say that this government and this Minister of Education deserves it.

To this point he has turned a deaf ear, a blind eye on the profession, he has turned a deaf ear and a blind eye on this House of Assembly and all of the remarks we have been

MR. R. MOORES: making, the sensible, sound-minded defences or condemnations of his defence of this programme, and he has not listened. He has turned his back on almost every public meeting in this Province apart from one or two in St. John's that he was forced by shame and embarrassment to go to, and he has - Mr. Speaker, words cannot describe my feelings on the way that this Minister and his Government have acted on this particular policy. It is shameful. It is an embarrassment particularly to the educators outside of this Province in Mainland Canada in view of our student dropout rate, in view of our educational system status, its backwardness, its awkwardness in providing training in the industrial economy of the future of this Province. It is shameful and embarrassing, and I urge the Minister for the third time that I have spoken in this House, I urge the Minister, for the love of God, boy, reverse the policy, will you? Fling it out.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition presented by the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). This is, I believe, about the twenty-fifth petition, Sir, that has been presented in this House on the quality of education, and I think, Sir, rightly so. It is the only opportunity we have had to debate the net result of our educational - Beg your pardon!

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

That is all we talked about (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY:

That is all we talked about. That is right, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, or my hon. friend from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) - I am not sure which one - said the Minister had a golden opportunity to make a name for himself. Well on paper, Sir, the Minister looks good, but unfortunately in front of his Cabinet colleagues the Minister is very weak and has shown, Sir, beyond any doubt that he has succumbed, that he caved in from pressure from his colleagues and went out to do a hatchet job on education in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Neary: my hon. colleague here was talking about the net result of our educational system. Well the net result today is, Sir, that we have the highest rate of unemployment among young people in all the ten provinces of Canada, and yet every day, Mr. Speaker, you can pick up The Evening Telegram or The Daily News especially on the weekends, and you will see all kinds of jobs advertised in this Province and jobs advertised for outside of this Province for professional people, for technical people. And despite the fact, Sir, that we spend one-third of our Budget on education we do not have - we cannot train certain professions and technical people in this Province. We have to go outside of the Province to bring in professional people and technical people, and not only that, Sir, we have to go outside of Canada to bring people into Newfoundland where we have the highest unemployment in Canada, the highest among young people. The 50 per cent of our unemployment in this Province, Sir, is in the age bracket between sixteen and twenty-five years of age. And yet every time you pick up The Evening Telegram you see jobs advertised.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an indication to me that there is something wrong with our educational system. Why should we have to go off and bring in Come-From-Aways? I am told up in Toronto and Ottawa there are more jobs advertised in the Canada Manpower Centres in Toronto and Ottawa, and probably in Montreal for people to work in Newfoundland than there are in the Canada Manpower Centres here in this Province. Now how can the minister explain that? The minister runs the Manpower Training Programmes as well as the high schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a shameful decision.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says it is a shameful decision, Sir. Well I think it is. But here we had an opportunity to do something about it. We could have gone out and we could have set up an independent inquiry into our educational system in this Province to find out why we had the highest dropout of any other

Mr. Neary: . province of Canada. Why is it our young people cannot get jobs? Are they being trained for the right things? Are we headed in the right direction in education in this Province? Are we getting the best value for our educational dollar? What about the curriculum, should it be changed? What about student aid? Should the students have to get themselves head and heels in debt before they come out of the university? What about all of these things?

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the pupil-teacher ratio that is a problem here, but the whole system needs to be examined. We need to scrutinize the whole system, and the only way to do it, Sir, is not with a couple of academics, a couple of professors over at Memorial University who have a vested interest; it should be done by the parents, by the taxpayers, by the elected representatives, and we can throw in one or two academics, not too many. They should not dominate the inquiry. I would like to see, Sir, - what about Grade XII, Mr. Speaker? Should we not have Grade XII in our high school system? The minister has already agreed that we should.

So, Sir, we need an examination. We need to take stock of our whole educational system. And, I believe, Sir, that there is still time for the minister to reconsider and wipe out this two man task force that he has appointed and set up a full-fledged independent inquiry in our whole educational system in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being personally atused again I will have another word on this particular petition, because I believe this is one of the more useful petitions or types of petitions, I said some time ago, that has been presented because it has allowed the House for the first time in recent years to focus on the question of education which frequently gets overlooked except for the estimate period, and it is very useful, and I do not know if we will ever get a complete conclusion from the minister on what steps he would like to take, but I believe that it will help the minister to sort of make up his mind on what he will accept from the task force when it does report.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have had one concern that I have tried to highlight and that is the business of the dropout rate or the retention rate, the business of the fact that we have only a third of our students who start Kindergarten and complete school. And consequently one-third of our students, according to Dr. Art Sullivan, 34 per cent of the students who started Kindergarten in 1964 successfully completed Grade XI, not completed, successfully completed Grade XI, and that is about half of the level of retention that you have in the Province of Ontario, and the Province of British Columbia, and the Province of Alberta. And that is a critical problem.

I have raised the question about the university in terms of the foundation year, whether it would not be better for us to reassess our commitment to

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the foundation year and look at the reinforcement of the secondary school system with that kind of expenditure. I raise the question about the Medical School at Memorial, which this year will drain \$8 million from the provincial Treasury at a time when we will be producing doctors for export from this very poor Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point that sort of bothers me more than anything is I just listened to the Leader of the Opposition stand in his place today and give a five minute dissertation on his great commitment to Education in this Province, his great commitment to having the pupil-teacher ratio reduced to twenty-five to one. That is a core issue, a core concern. He belittled the minister, whom he said is only concerned with the mortar and the bricks and the physical plant and he is worried about programmes and young children and drop-outs and the like. Mr. Speaker, six years ago when the present leader left the Cabinet and left the Assembly, there was a thirty-five to one ratio in the Province. I believe at that time he and his father, who was then the Minister of Education, were pretty prominent in the field of Education. Thirty-five to one was the pupil-teacher ratio at the time. Now they are belittling the minister because it is not twenty-five to one. At the same time, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Rubbish. Character assassination!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Would you shut up!

Mr. Speaker, would you shut up that member? I am on the issue, not on character assassination. I am suggesting that if I were able to use the term 'political hypocrisy' it would very well categorize the statements which were made, Mr. Speaker, here in this

MR. LUNDRIGAN: House today. Thirty-five to one six years ago, twenty-six to one today and this Leader of the Opposition gets up and talk about his great concern about the downgrading of the education system and I am supposed to believe it as a Newfoundlander.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr.Collins) Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that during petitions, interjections are out of order and should not be pursued, and also that the material allegation in the committee can be discussed but that debate should not be entered into, that is, taking points that have already been alluded to and taking an opposite view of them and commenting on them. I think the comments should be concerned with the material allegations of the petition.

The hon. the member for
Grand Falls.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker has well taken care of the matter of the vicious personal attacks. I will not get into that aspect, but there is another important issue, Mr. Speaker, which is being abused by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). It is a well understood fact, indeed, Mr. Speaker ruled on the matter just a few days ago that when one is speaking at this particular juncture he ought to be speaking in support of a petition. Now it is clear, apart from the fact he is entering into a debate with my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and setting himself up in the contrary position, the opposite position, it is clear that he must be against the petition. There can be no doubt about that, that he is against the petition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now I would love to hear his views at the appropriate time in debate somewhere but this is not the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker. He is abusing the rules of the House and he should take his seat and at the appropriate time give us the benefit of his views. But they are obviously contrary to the petition. That is very clear, Mr. Speaker. And I think if we could expedite the business of the House and get on with the Question Period without having people getting up and speaking against the petition it would serve the interests of all concerned and particularly the people who presented the petition looking to members like the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to support it, not to talk against it, Mr. Speaker, support it if he wants to.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that point of order, Your Honour. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that anyone would accuse me of being personal in my presentation. I have been totally on the issue. But on that point of order, I have spoken about seven times in this House so far on the petition on education always concerning myself very sincerely with the quality of education, with the programme and with the pupil-teacher ratio. There is no indication on my part here today that I spoke against the petition. I tried to broaden the arena of debate a little bit and this is what I spoke on.

Now if you are talking about the heat and getting out of the kitchen, Mr. Speaker, the minute anyone differs from that clique on the other side there is something abnormal about the member on this side. We are supposed to stay here, sweat it out, be abused all day long by this hon. colleagues across the way. We

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

cannot get up and express an opinion, differ not at all, Mr. Speaker, or there is something wrong with the members on this side of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Sit down, boy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And that belligerent member, Mr. Speaker, who spoke sixteen hours on one bill should be the last one to talk about relevancy of debate in this legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The issue is one of support for a petition and as a ruling was made a few days ago, the measure of support may vary considerably between members and in my recollection the hon. member who rose did indicate initially his support for the petition. He did comment on certain features which may have indicated his support was in a different direction than other forms of support but I do not think, I would say, he wandered outside the guidelines which we have accepted by precedent for petitions.

I might also point out that his time has now elapsed.

Is the hon. member speaking on the petition?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh yes.

MR. NEARY: The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) will allow my colleague -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was about to rise to speak to the petition but was not recognized at that point so I am on a point of order at the moment, the member for Grand Falls said that he could see the reason for my previous point of order. Now, if he knows some reasons, Mr. Speaker, let him tell the House. He cannot sit over there and assign all kinds of motives. My reason was simple and it was stated, Mr. Speaker; the member was abusing the rules of the House, He was using the opportunity to get a few shots off whilst speaking against a petition. Now that is against the rules of the House. As a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, it is my responsibility to draw to Mr. Speaker's attention any occasion when a member is abusing the rules of the House, and I did that, Mr. Speaker. And by exercising my right and my obligation to the Chair,

MR. SIMMONS: I do not want to be abused by the member for Grand Falls who then assigns a reason as to why I rose. I tell him. I tell him why I rose; I rose because he was abusing the rules of the House and it was my obligation to draw it to the attention of Mr. Speaker. That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please!

I think that one need not pursue this too much further. The comment in question was not audible to the Chair, but even if it were I do not think the comment was such that the Chair would have to make a ruling on it. It was presumably a belief that a member has and the Chair cannot rule in terms of beliefs.

Are there further petitions?

MR. SIMMONS: I rise to support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: And in so doing I say to the member for Grand Falls that certainly the Chair on any occasion can prevent a member from questioning the motives of a member and that was my point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is twice in a row now.

MR. SIMMONS: It might be twice in a row, Mr. Speaker. I will do it ten times in a row if I have to. I am not having the sometimes member for Grand Falls accuse me of improper motives and I expect the protection of the Chair on that particular matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please!

I do have to point out that in rising in support of a petition the comments should be confined to the statement in the petition, the number of

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): signatures and a comment, perhaps, on the statement made by the original petitioner.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the member who can count to three - he has just proven that he can count to three - I would hope he just heard Mr. Speaker admonition about sticking to the subject under discussion.

The number of petitioners, Mr. Speaker, 281; the places involved, Gaultois, Seal Cove, Hermitage; the subject, education cutbacks; the prayer, stated in other words but the prayer, that the Minister of Education would start earning his salary.

MR. HOUSE: No, that is not the same prayer.

MR. SIMMONS: That the Minister of Education would start earning his salary, that is the prayer.

MR. HOUSE: That is not in there.

MR. SIMMONS: That is the prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education, at least, would do the teachers and parents of this Province the courtesy of a letter that makes some sense instead of the form letter for which he got rapped over the knuckles at Holy Heart a few weeks ago, the same form letter the Premier himself was sending out. A form letter, Mr. Speaker, on this subject of flexibility - the prayer of the petition - which says in part, the form letter the minister and the Premier send out, "I should point out however, that the reduction is in accordance with the decline in student enrollment in the Province," and other things. That is what the letter says. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against form letters if they told the truth, but when they tell direct untruths that is another issue.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the 128 teaching positions. The minister knows and I know and others around this Province know that off these 128, Mr. Speaker, 54 of them

MR SIMMONS: would have disappeared, I understand, if the government had not cut back fifty-four, which means, Mr. Speaker, that seventy four would not have. Now I ask the minister to contradict me on that one if he can. Seventy-four of the positions would still be there, Mr. Speaker, if the minister and his buddies had not taken this very regressive step. Now in the light of that, Mr. Speaker, why is the minister in dozens and dozens of form letters - and I say to the minister I got most of them back because every day I get three or four in the mail from people who are very, very disgusted with the minister for not only doing something that is unpopular and ill-advised but something that is untruthful too. He writes and tells them that the reduction is in accordance with the decline in the student enrollment. That is partly true and he is playing with words. About one third of it or something of that nature, fifty-four is in accordance with the decline in student enrollments and the other seventy-four is not. Now why is the minister spreading this untruth all around the Province? Why is he spreading it, Mr. Speaker? Using his office, the office of the Minister of Education to spread that untruth among teachers and parents and the Premier is party to the crime with him, Mr. Speaker, spreading that blatant untruth around this Province that the move, the reduction is in accordance with the decline in student enrollment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: It is totally and absolutely out of order for any hon. gentleman to say that a minister of the Crown is blatantly spreading untruth around the Province. It is absolutely untrue, It not only indicates motive, it is the sort of thing that you would not even find in a beer garden even if there were no rules, even if we had to go on the rules of decency. But fortunately we do have parliamentary rules that protect us. That kind of thing would not be uttered by anyone who subscribed to the rules of decency.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, it is well known. I do not have the citations from Beauchesne in front of me now, but if we are going to get into a fullfledged debate on this very important point of order, Sir, because it is important, Sir, we can certainly look up the various references-- but, Sir, it is well known certainly by every member of this House, or at least it should be and it is certainly known by Your Honour, that although it is very, extremely unparliamentary to call a minister or a member a liar or dishonest or to use that kind of a characterization, very unparliamentary, it is not unparliamentary to say that what a minister has said was not true or inaccurate or not exact.

MR. SIMMONS: Even stunned 'Alec' knows that.

MR. W. ROWE: It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement of a minister is not true. It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement uttered by a minister was not the true state of facts or was not the truth. Only, Sir, when the minister's honesty, honour and so on are brought into play, Sir, does it become unparliamentary. There was no attempt on the part of my hon. friend and colleague to say that the minister was a liar or that he was dishonest. He was simply saying that the minister's statement contained in a letter was not true, it was untrue and that this untruth was being spread throughout the land, Sir. And I would submit, Sir, that there is nothing unparliamentary in that kind of a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is reasonably clear what I was doing. I was choosing very carefully my language to be parliamentary and at the same time convey to the House that what the minister is telling the people of the Province in his form letter is untrue and that is clearly parliamentary. If something is untrue it is untrue and I demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, by entering the figures that it is untrue. There is no question about it that the minister when he says that the reduction is in accordance with the decline in enrollment is not telling the truth. It is blatantly untrue. Now whether he does it deliberately I have not said but he is doing it, Mr. Speaker, in form letter after form letter after hundreds

MR. SIMMONS: of form letters despite the fact that he was rapped on the knuckles for this point at Holy Heart at a well attended meeting two or three or four weeks ago. He is spreading blatant untruth, that is my point, Mr. Speaker, and I submit I have said that in very, very parliamentary terms because I choose my terms well because that is what I wanted to convey, that he is saying untrue statements to the people of the Province in form letters, hundreds and hundreds of form letters.

MR. HICKMAN: I just want to direct Your Honour's attention to paragraph -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, he spoke once.

MR. HICKMAN: Imagine, he spoke once. He spoke once, Mr. Speaker. I did, I spoke once but I am now going to, with the indulgence of Mr. Speaker, speak again and draw -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For clarification -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For clarification, it is well recognized that the Chair may entertain arguments in assisting a ruling and in doing so although there is no set pattern, it is customary to allow a fairly

MR. SPEAKER:

equal number of comments from both sides of the House.

The hon. House leader.

MR. HICKMAN: I am most grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the assistance of the Chair. I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to paragraph 155 (3). There are certain statements that are not parliamentary as set forth there. One is that it is unparliamentary to tell a member that he went about the country telling palpable lies. Two, that a Minister has stated what he knew not to be correct. And in looking at both of these may I point out that the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) when chastizing the Minister of Education for a letter at one point said that the hon. the Premier is condoning or the word 'crime' was mentioned. Now Your Honour has to, I submit, in deciding whether or not statements and innuendos are parliamentary or unparliamentary very carefully ascertain the context in which they were said and not some carefully worded, sneaky little statement.

MR. W. ROWE: To the point of that, Mr. Speaker, very briefly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, the whole point - I do not know what is wrong with the government House leader, Sir. The whole point of what preceded his latest outburst on this point of order, Sir, is contained in section 155 or paragraph 155 or 130, Sir. The whole point is that he did not say that the minister went about the country telling lies, palpable or otherwise. What he said was that the minister's statement was untrue.

MR. HICKMAN: He said letters which are untrue.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, letters which are untrue. Nobody is saying, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister is

MR. W. ROWE:

deliberately spreading untruths or that he is deliberately telling lies or anything else. The statements are untrue, are factually incorrect. The minister may in fact believe what he is doing to be true or be a fact or to be accurate. That is not the point. The point is that the statement made by my hon. colleague is that the letters contain untrue statements, factually incorrect statements. That at most, Sir, is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. And you notice as you go through paragraph 155 that the statements which were made by my hon. colleague are not anywhere in that paragraph noted or mentioned as being unparliamentary. As a matter of fact, Sir, the language which has been characterized as unparliamentary is language which in every case goes far beyond in imputation and assigning of motives and assigning of dishonourable conduct or telling lies or falsehoods, Sir. It goes far beyond anything uttered by my hon. friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have heard representation from both sides and I thank hon. members. I will not cite Beauchesne to any great extent but I think a few citations are necessary to clarify this. On page 130 in my edition, section 154, subsection (5) it says, "It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House." And as hon. members pointed out another part there it says that, "To tell a member that he went around the country telling palpable lies." My recollection is that the hon. member said that certain statements in a letter being circulated were untrue but that he did not say that they were untrue to the knowledge

MR. SPEAKER:

of the hon. member nor that they were lies. 'Palpable lies,' I think is different from saying an untruth. So on that score I think one can say that no unparliamentary word was uttered.

On the other hand, I think one can refer to Beauchesne, section 155, subsection (2) where in part it says that he acted basely and from base motives. My recollection is that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) equated the action with a crime and I would have to rule therefore that a crime is equivalent to acting basely. So I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw the imputation that a crime was committed in carrying out this.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the word 'crime' is a vernacular we use very often to say something is a pitiful crime. I think what is being done is a crime against the youngsters, not in the criminal, cold sense of the term but it is certainly a crime. That was the context in which I used it. If we want to narrow the useage of the term I will withdraw it if it makes everybody happy, Mr. Speaker, if it is unparliamentary. But of course any native born Newfoundlander knows fully well that the term 'crime' is often used, Mr. Speaker, when something that is not very palatable is going on, a crime against youngsters, it is a real crime what you are doing. It was in that context I used it, Mr. Speaker. If that offends the House in any way I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I understand the hon. member has withdrawn any imputation of criminal act or crime in the legal sense.

The hon. member's time, I am afraid, has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition, assuming that everybody who wanted to speak has spoken. Does the minister intend to speak on that petition?

MR. HOUSE: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: If so, I can bow and present mine after, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister wants to speak.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Will we revert to the previous petition by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): By leave. The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words to the petition, I guess everybody can support a petition that asks that the education quality be not tampered with, and I do not think it has in this particular case. There are, I think, in that particular district three teachers being laid off as a result of declining enrollments, incidentally, because the letter was telling exactly the truth, was in line with the policy of the government because we had said that we would not take teachers away in the implementation period, and, of course, the implementation period had passed and we did not see where we were able to bring in the one to twenty-five ratio at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

The other thing that I want to point out, of course, I spoke from a form letter and I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time that I was not castigated in that meeting for sending out a form letter. I think there was some other reference to other people, but it was not to me. The fact was I replied by a form letter to the form letters that I had from teachers all over the Province. Exactly that is what happened, and I could not sit down and write individually 3,000 or 4,000 people.

I just want to point out that our pupil-teacher ratio is not the worst in Canada. Our pupil-teacher ratio is far better, say,

Mr. House: than New Brunswick, it is about on a par with - close to a par with Nova Scotia. One of the things that I would like, Mr. Speaker, to see petitions addressing, and that is why I can support any petition talking about the quality of education, is to talk about the quality and not, you know, in addition to the fact of teacher cutbacks. And I think we will be hearing something about this, and this is why I would to report that the task force - I met with them this morning - and the task force will be submitting their report by the end of this month, their first report, and they are going into substantial depth in education, and I question whether we could have done that with the kind of a task force that the hon. member talked about.

One of the things, too, Mr. Speaker, that we should bear in mind that the same group who are talking about cutbacks now are saying that we are treating the children criminally, are the same people who six years ago, seven years ago -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) disgusted.

MR. HOUSE: - seven years ago who were quite happy to have a teacher salary bill for \$44 million, it is \$150 million now; better qualified teachers, 1,400 more; 6,000 less pupils, and then they talk about the lack of quality. Now I ask this question, if we are saying that the quality is going down, if we are saying that the quality of education is going down, we are saying one thing, we are saying that the more and better teachers we have, and the more and better schools we have the worse quality gets. And that is a great whack at the teachers today; as a matter of fact it is an insult to teachers. Because I know the difference, that the education quality is not going down and we will have statistics to prove that when the task force report comes in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: One other thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker, The other day we heard over across the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Yes. The other day we heard reports on the Budget Speech talking about this 13th. Clause whatever it was down in the States how they are cutting back.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: And they were saying let us cutback on taxes here. We have got one of the highest costs in education in Canada; as a matter of fact in percentage budget, we are making a very, very noble effort. The percentage of our budget spent on education equals or is better than that of the rest of Canada. And I submit when we are talking about cutting back on taxes and improving the quality of education, somebody is going to have some explaining to do to the public when it gets to them.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing I want to speak about, in regard to the public meeting, I have gone to public meetings all over this Province and have defended our action very well, as a matter of fact, very well. The only meetings I have not attended, and I want this on the record, is somebody phoned me the night before and asked me to get to a meeting; I could not get there for the simple reason I had another commitment.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR HOUSE: And I have seen other members, including the Leader of the Opposition not able to get to meetings also.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HOUSE: I am finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, in that case I was going to draw to Your Honour's attention that the hon. gentleman can only stand to support a petition, not to speak against it.

MR. HOUSE: It is important that we talk about the quality of education.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen on both sides have finished with that petition I have another petition.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Carry on, boy!

MR. CALLAN: Carry on. Okay.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of petitions in the last couple of months. We just finished with one asking that the government

MR. W. CALLAN:

reconsider the educational cutbacks in this Province, presented dozens on the spruce budworm. We have asked the government in view of the fact that the spruce budworm egg mass is down, we asked the government to get cracking and cut out the spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, the petition I have here is, the answer to it, the solution to it, I think, is rather simple indeed and that the prayer of the petition which is - The petition, by the way, has 166 names on it, Mr. Speaker, 166 names and the prayer of the petition is self-explanatory, it gets right to the heart of the matter. It says, " We the undersigned residents of Hodges Cove and Caplin Cove in the Southwest Arm of Trinity Bay hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for a solution either through legislation or the provision of a community pasture, a solution to a problem presently being created by free running horses in our area," Free running horses in our area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say that these communities are unincorporated. Hodges Cove was incorporated but their charter was removed a while back so right now it has the status of unincorporated like all the nine communities in the Southwest Arm area of the district of Bellevue. Mr. Speaker, the prayer goes on to say, " We realize that in an energy conscious age a horse can be very helpful in obtaining firewood. A lot of people have reverted to wood stoves. So a horse can be very helpful in obtaining firewood. However, our age is also one of inflation and where people have cultivated gardens for food there should be some protection. There should also be protection for someone who attempts to add some beauty to their particular corner of this earth." Very eloquently expressed, I might say, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Beautiful language.

MR. W. CALLAN: It is. I might say that this petition was unsolicited as far as I am concerned. A lady from Hodges Cove phoned me last week and ask me if there was a law regulating or governing free running horses and so on. The province has gone to the dogs, we have heard that more than once. Mr. Speaker, it has gone to the horses as well. Anyway this lady

MR. W. CALLAN: who phoned me asked me if I knew of a law and I said well I do not think there is a law for unincorporated areas but I would check and of course I did check. Some hon. gentleman checked for me and the result was that I was told, no, there is no law against free running horses but there is a law that if a horse is free running you are compelled as a property owner to have a fence up to keep that horse off your own property. So there was no law against the horses running but there was a law that said that because the horses are running then you have to have a fence to protect yourself against these horses.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I might say that the problem is serious for these people. Two communities are mentioned here, Hodges Cove and Caplin Cove, and these two communities, Mr. Speaker, kind of work hand in hand. They have a Lions Club down there which has membership from both communities and they work hand in hand. Here they have a problem which is common to these communities. I would say, Mr. Speaker, not only is it common to these communities but it is common to hundreds of communities in this Province and there is nothing worse than a woman, or a man for that matter, having nice flowers planted out front on the lawn and so on in front of the house and to wake up some morning with a dozen horses and some of these horses, Mr. Speaker, are well trained in opening gates. They can open gates, they can lift up the rope and they can unhatch the gates and so on.

MR. W. CALLAN: I have seen them do it. Mr. Speaker, in incorporated areas the problem is simple. I was at a town council meeting last week and while we were waiting to get on with the topic that I was invited for they went through some routine business. They were waiting for another gentleman to arrive, as a matter of fact from the Department of Health. But among that routine business was a problem with horses and of course they had the act there to regulate a municipality but not so in unincorporated areas. As the prayer of the petition says, Mr. Speaker, the solution is to bring in a little bit of legislation so that the people who are harrassed, tormented, benighted with horses that roam around their potato gardens and their lawns and so on, a little piece of legislation needs to be introduced into this House to say that of course these people can take action. The people from Clarenville, Mr. Speaker, are bringing their horses down to Southwest Arm to torment the people down there because they know they cannot have them in Clarenville and I say that because I have been told that some of the horses do come from as far away as Clarenville.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up and I wholeheartedly support the prayer of this petition. I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates, and which department that is I do not know. Someone at the table will know, I guess. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, perhaps, can look after it; the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Justice or Forestry who is not here.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition, Sir, so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Bellevue, Sir. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we stopped horsing around in this House and got down to brass tacks and did something about these problems, Sir. I was interested in hearing the hon. gentleman's description of the intelligence of these horses, Sir. They have to be the most educated horses in the Province when they -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pick a lock.

MR. NEARY: Well I do not know about picking locks but they can open gates, according to the hon. gentleman. But, Mr. Speaker, this can become a bit of a nuisance, Sir, and 166 citizens of Hodges Cove and Caplin Cove feel that there is a bit of legislation needed or perhaps a community pasture in the area, Sir, to do something about these free running horses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me, Sir, that from travelling around this Province that there are an awful lot of wild horses and ponies in Newfoundland. I would think, Sir, that if you went out on the barrens and out in the countryside that you would find an awful lot of ponies and horses roaming around that nobody seems to own.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Sable Islands.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, the horses were turned loose years ago, especially down around Trinity Bay down in Hants Harbour in that area and you will find them up the Great Northern Peninsula out in the road everywhere, at night you see them there and nobody seems to own them.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says if you took one home, Sir, well that maybe so but it would seem to me that you could go out and catch half of these horses and nobody would know the difference or I do not think they would ever miss them because I do not believe anybody claims them. So we cannot say, Sir, that we have empty saddles in the old corral in this province when we have so many horses running around. My hon. colleague indicated that more people are using horses now to go and get firewood. It may sound crazy, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age for us in this House in such a technological age when you are talking about rockets to the moon and all that sort of thing and here we are with a problem involving horses that we thought had been outdated years ago, that horses had become obsolete and tractors had taken over and all sorts of other pieces of equipment, ski-doo's and everything else but apparently we still have a considerable horse population in this Province.

June 19, 1978

Tape No. 4565

JM - 3

MR. NEARY: and there are people who live in certain communities who think that something should be done about it.

So I would hope, Sir, that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture when we can get him back in the House, back off the line of fire in the spruce budworm spray programme, that he could take five minutes and devote to this problem apparently that has developed in Hodges Cove and in Caplin Cove, a problem that I know exists in other parts of Newfoundland, Trinity, Bay de Verde, up the Great Northern Peninsula, Central Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY:

A couple of times I almost had an accident myself running into a group of horses out in the middle of the road. And so it is a bit of a problem, Sir, and I would like to find out from the minister or from some government spokesman just what the horse population is in this Province at the present time. Are there any wild horses in Newfoundland? Can anybody go out and catch these horses? If somebody wanted to go out and catch one and bring it home for his kids, could you do it? There are all kinds of ponies running around wild everywhere.

MR. HICKMAN: You would not get the rope around them before out of the woods would appear the owner.

MR. NEARY: Is that right? Is the minister speaking from experience? There are quite a few horses down the minister's way, by the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberals or the Conservatives?

MR. NEARY: Well I am not sure which end is Liberal and which end is Conservative. But I would suggest that the back part is P.C.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter. The people who circulated the petition were very genuine and very sincere, Sir, and I wish I had more time to talk about this subject but my time is up and I would hope that somebody would pass -

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. NEARY: No, I love horses. I like horses myself. I used to do a lot of horseback riding riding years ago down on my uncle's farm in Neary's Pond there in Portugal Cove. And I tell you many is the blister I had on my rear end from horseback riding, bare back. I never could adapt myself to saddle riding.

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: You know, getting or galloping is the key to your success.

MR. HICKMAN: Stopping is the key to your success, not getting on.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that somebody will pass the information along to the minister so he will do something about this.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition on behalf of 166 people of Hodge's Cove and Caplin Cove and I can understand their problem very well, Mr. Speaker, people concerned with keeping their property clean and tidy and trying to develop their property. It is rather difficult when you have got roaming horses. Also it is a hazard to traffic. Mr. Speaker, I presented a similiar petition to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture last Summer when it became such an aggravated problem in my own district that the residents could not wait for the House of Assembly to open. We presented it immediately to the minister concerning roaming animals, particularly in Bloomfield, not only horses but cows. And when you get both, Mr. Speaker, it is a very aggravating problem to say the least.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned about the number of horses going around, wild horses and wondered whether or not you could go and catch one and bring it home. In talking to the minister I found out that a difficulty is, say, finding ownership is difficult with respect to Mounties. When Mounties come to a person's door and ask who owns a certain animal in a certain place, nobody owns it. But if you were to go and take it, some individual, then you would find out that there was an owner. But when the

MR. LUSH:

Mounties go checking they find out that nobody owns them and that is the difficulty of enforcing the rule. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that something can be done about it to get rid of this nuisance, of roaming animals. I would like to see it covering roaming animals, cows and horses.

And a very particular problem in my own district, and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), while speaking to the petition alluded to it in his last few sentences, he was talking about the animals from incorporated areas being taken to unincorporated areas. And this is a thing I find in my own district. Nobody knows how many horses are brought to Bloomfield because Bloomfield in my district is an unincorporated area and the incorporated areas realizing that there is a law against roaming animals bring them up and dump them all on Bloomfield. So in the Summer you have got hundreds of horses really around the environs of Musgrave Town, Bloomfield, roaming around getting into peoples yards and tearing up their lawns and eating their vegetables. A real nuisance, Mr. Speaker, and a very concern.

I certainly hope that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture under whose jurisdiction I think this matter falls, I would hope that the minister could do something about this to relieve this nuisance not only to the development of personal property but also a hazard to traffic. Indeed last year an ambulance in my area, in the town of Bloomfield

MR. LUSH: ran into a cow, an ambulance that was, as far as I can understand, taking somebody sick to the hospital and had the misfortune of running into this cow. Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious problem, a most serious problem and I would hope for the reasons advances, for the reasons put forward that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture or some other minister would certainly initiate action in this respect so that we can get rid of those roaming animals. They are a real nuisance to the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very serious topic, very serious in my district, a lot more serious than certain members opposite would like to think.

I rise to support my hon. colleague from Bellvue in his presentation of that petition. In my district, Mr. Speaker, like most rural districts in the Province, I have a very large area, I would say from Victoria down to Lower Island Cove, which is approximately twenty-five miles by road; all of these people are involved in some type of agriculture from planting their own potatoes to sheep herding or dairy cattle or what have you. To some degree they are all involved with roaming animals.

There are two aspects of the problem that we have to look at, First of all there is the owner of the animal who quite often over the years, traditionally, has been permitted, quite rightfully, I suspect, in most cases, has been permitted to allow his animals to go in over the hills to graze. In the 1950's and 1960's my father had about 150 head of sheep and we used to let them out on the hills to graze all Summer, bring them in the Winter and so on. I suspect that this is the case with quite a few people, particularly in my district. Now that is the owners

MR. R. MOORES: point of view.

The second point of view is the person who does not own them, the driver of a vehicle, the resident of a community who has a few flowers or a few vegetables in the back garden into which, more often than not, the roaming animal will get and do a lot of damage, eat the crops or beat down the fences or kills the flowers or what have you.

Whose responsibility is it? Where does the responsibility lie to clear up the problem? In my opinion it rests directly -

MR. MORGAN: With the horses.

MR. R. MOORES: or indirectly with the Government of the Province. Let me give you an example: In Victoria last year, with some help from me and with some help from the Member of Parliament for the Federal Riding, we gave \$50,000 in Canada works.

MR. MORGAN: His buddy.

MR. R. MOORES: If I could only be as profound as I want to be, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: And \$50,000 went into that community from Canada Works to build a community pasture under the jurisdiction of the town council. That town council went to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, this competent minister representing the district of Pleasantville -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: - and also went to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, another competent minister, and they asked, "Look, we have \$50,000 from Canada Works and we would like some money from the Province to finish this project so that we can keep our animals off the road and keep cars from being beaten up." In one case, just two years ago a

June 19, 1978

Tape No. 4568

RT-1

MR. R. MOORES: none at all, and particularly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism might take note of this. We have a lot of tourists coming in from the Mainland and from the United States who are not capable of dealing with roving animals on highways, who are not used to it, and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there are quite a few accidents incurred by tourists every year because of this problem. Maybe the Minister of Tourism will want to take the smirk off his face and put some seriousness into some policies relating to this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. H. MCISAAC:

Sir, I would just like to say a word in support of this petition because I had the problem in my district. But I also have a problem with roaming moose so if the Minister of Tourism is in good frame today maybe he can control the moose on the highway because I saw three on my way in last Sunday. So it is left for you to control the moose. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where were they?

MRS. H. MCISAAC:

I cannot tell you, you will go get them. Mr. Speaker, the problem with roaming animals is really a problem. There is no question about it. We have it and we have two incorporated areas in my district, St. George's and Stephenville Crossing and even in those areas they cannot control it, because the horses come in and the animals come in from any areas. Now it is not only horses but there are horses, cows and sheep, and they are causing accidents.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Goats?

MRS. H. MCISAAC:

No goats - I saw a goat somewhere last week but I do not remember where. I believe it was near the House of Assembly. But anyway, it is a problem. We have had accidents - there was an accident in the Codroy Valley last year with a young fellow who hit a cow, I think, anyway he ended up in hospital for months. And a couple of times now in Robinsons, a couple of horses have been killed

MRS. H. MCISAAC: because, apparently, they tell me it does not take much to kill a horse. You can hit them on the rump with a stick and you can kill them so they say. But, you know, this is the problem. They are all over the road. School children and small children are on the road and the animals are there, and some of those animals are saucy. I know. I have seen people have to take those animals and just drive them down the road or get rid of them so that the children could get by and I saw a man - I actually witnessed this - a man had to - a cow attacked him - now this was a cow and he had to wrestle that cow to the ground because it probably could have killed the man if it had really gotten at him. And we have the horses out there that definitely should not be on the road. I do not know if any of the members across the way are familiar with animals; maybe they are not being in the City, but I am. And there is a bunch even out in my area - there is a bunch of stallions on the road. It is something fierce to have the like of this going on in communities. Even in the incorporated areas it cannot be controlled for the simple reason that - well, the law is there that says you hire an impounder to take care of it but nobody wants to be the impounder. In the incorporated areas, at least, you can fall on the town council for it, you can blame them, but in the unincorporated areas there is not a thing you can do. And the people are screaming their heads off about it. If they let their children out they just have to watch them and like what was said before by some hon. member there is not that much point in putting vegetables in because the vegetables get eaten, or ruined, or destroyed, and flowers, too. I am not as concerned about the flowers as I am about the vegetables. In my area most of it is fenced anyway, but some of those horses will go over fences, fences do not mean a thing to them.

So I think that the Minister of Agriculture is going to have to do something. He is going to have to bring in some legislation to control roaming animals and until such time as he does that there is nothing that can be done. There is no law that can be enforced.

June 19, 1978

Tape No. 4568

RT-3

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are going to keep on roaming.

MRS. H. MCISAAC:

They are going to keep on roaming and
you can call - They are all Romans - and you can call in the R.C.M.P.
if you want to but there is nothing they can do about it. It is the same
as the problem

MRS. MCISAAC: with roaming dogs. But I know the minister cannot do much about the moose and that is fine, but I certainly would like to see the Minister of Agriculture do something about the roaming animals. Thank you.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem, and that is why I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). The problem of horses, cows, sheep, I suppose exist in all -

MR. PECKFORD: Goats.

MR. HODDER: No, not in the district of Port au Port, there are no goats in the district of Port au Port.

MRS. MCISAAC: There are goats in St. George's.

MR. F. ROWE: All the goats are over there.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago a horse - just after I was elected - was knocked down and partially crippled by a motorist in my district. I guess the poor thing wandered away and sort of fell down beside somebody's well. The mounties came out and finished it off, but would not remove the carcass. Of course people started to complain. I got in touch with the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment or got in touch with his department but by that time the snow had come and the thing had frozen so it remained there all winter. Finally in the Spring, when the place thawed out again, we finally got someone out there to dispose of the remains. I think that sort of points out some of the problems that people in rural communities must put up with which, perhaps, members who represent urban areas might find strange.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious problem. As far as the cattle are concerned what has happened in my particular district is that the community pasture is not big enough to hold all the cattle that are in the area, and it is sort of first come first served, or people who have been there before get on again. I am not quite sure how it works, but there are certain people who cannot get there animals on the community pastures. And I think that would solve an awful lot of the problems because, you know, I think people would

Mr. Hodder: prefer to put their animals in the community pasture, but they cannot, and I feel that perhaps in some of the areas that might solve the problem.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious problem, and I believe it is one that the government must grapple with, because it creates a nuisance. It is a nuisance to motorists, it is a nuisance to people who are trying to grow vegetables, it is a nuisance to people walking along the road, and it is one that seems to exist right across the Island. And somehow or other we must come to grips with it, and try to solve the problem whichever way we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I Table the Report Of The Workmen's Compensation Review Committee Of The Department Of Labour And Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

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

Is the Premier expected in this afternoon, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. W. ROWE: I do have one or two questions for him.

MR. NEARY: No. It is a fine day, he is down at Bally Haly.

MR. W. ROWE: He is not going to come in. Okay, Sir, well -

MRS. MCISAAC: He is spraying.

MR. W. ROWE: - that is his right, Sir.

MR. NEARY: He is not out where the spraying is I can tell you that.

MR. W. ROWE: That is his right.

MRS. MCISAAC: Spraying.

MR. W. ROWE: But I do wish he would come in now, Sir, so we could direct a few questions at him, and get some answers.

MR. W. ROWE: I will ask the House Leader on the Government side to send that message along to him.

MR. NEARY: Gone with Craig.

MR. W. ROWE: A gilt invitation to come back to the House, all is forgiven.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Let me see, Mr. Speaker, I will ask a question of the Minister of Health in that case.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Has the programme being changed, the programme regarding the spruce budworm spray? Has it now been changed in any particular, and I am referring especially to what I saw reported in the paper there, and heard on the news concerning a minister's statement, the Minister of Health's statement, Mr. Speaker, that there was some change regarding the spray around Gander Lake or Gander Town. Could the minister give us some information on that?

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

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was advised on Friday afternoon by my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, after talking with him on several occasions, that in addition to the two mile buffer zone in terms of distance from water intakes to Gander, Glenwood, and Appleton, and in addition to the two mile buffer zone in regard to populated areas, that it was agreed that they would move back one mile

MR. COLLINS: from the shores of the lake where it had been planned to stay close to the shores, they would move back one mile from there.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: What is the change now? Rather than spraying right up to the shores of Gander Lake the spray programme is going to stop one mile from the shores of Gander Lake. Is that correct?

MR. COLLINS: As I understand it, yes.

MR. W. ROWE: As he understands it, Mr. Speaker. Is this a government decision, or a decision made by the minister, or it is a firm policy or what is it? Would the minister tell us? In other words, has the programme as enunciated clearly and firmly by the minister concerning which he said there was going to be no change, has that programme now been changed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to spend all the afternoon defending the spruce budworm spray programme because it is not my programme. However I can -

MR. NEARY: You are a minister. It is a government programme. You all hang together.

MR. W. ROWE: Or you hang separately.

MR. NEARY: Or you hang separately.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will.

MR. COLLINS: Some people might hang before all this is over over on that side of the House. There could be some hangings alright or pretty close to it. There could be some tarring and burning and that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I said that the spruce budworm spray programme in the first instance in Gander Lake was that no spraying would be done within two miles of community water intakes, and no spraying would be done within two miles of populated areas.

MR. W. ROWE: It was three miles from Gander Lake.

MR. COLLINS: If you know all the answers what are you asking for it for?

MR. W. ROWE: I can ask questions.

MR. COLLINS: Okay be quite. You have been talking ever since we came in here at two o'clock this afternoon.

The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture advised me on Friday afternoon that arrangements had been made to move back one mile from the edge of Gander Lake, from the beaches of Gander Lake or the last tree out in the lake. That is the programme, Mr. Speaker. We are after looking at the co-ordinates which they had come up with and it was decided that it would not impair the effectiveness of the programme and one mile from Gander Lake was established as a buffer line.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: "What is truth?" says Pontius Pilate, Mr. Speaker, and would not stay for an answer. It is not his programme he says, Sir. I never heard the like of it. It is not his programme, the spruce budworm programme. The minister just said, Sir, - I say this by way of a preliminary to the question in order to make sure that I have it clear - the minister said that the original plan was not to spray within two miles of water intakes or communities or towns' water supplies, drinking water, does that mean that previously the plan, the programme was that the spray would come up to within two miles of Gander Lake and that this mile the minister is now talking about is an extra mile so that there is now a three mile buffer zone between the shores of Gander Lake and where the spray will stop? Is that not the situation? Well, is Gander Lake a water supply for Gander town or not?

MR. COLLINS: Yes it is.

MR. W. ROWE: It is.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon minister.

MR. COLLINS: I will repeat it again. The original plan was that the spray guidelines would be such that there would be no spray permitted

MR. COLLINS: in an area two miles from the water intake, not the water supply, the water intake, in Glenwood, in Appleton and in Gander. Now there were areas of the lake - if the hon. member does not know where, he did not learn anything in Paris about Gander obviously, if he wants to go out and have a look at Gander Lake I can show him where the water intakes are because this government built the line and built the pump house in all three places. There is a water intake in Glenwood, one in Appleton and one in Gander and the spraying programme is designed so that there will be no spraying take place within two miles of the water intakes and no spraying to take place within two miles of any populated community, and Gander is a populated community and so is Glenwood and so is Appleton. The change made on Friday by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture is that there would be a one mile buffer zone around the lake up around Hunts Brook, Northwest Gander, Southwest Gander, Curtis Cove Brook and all of that area, one mile back from the beaches of the lake. That is the change that was made.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: What a pitiful spectacle, Sir, a minister of the Crown disowning a programme first and now having said that they were not going to change the programme, the spray was going ahead, having changed it now he admits. Well let the Minister of Health answer this. Would he advise members, for example, my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) district to get his constituents to pressure the government a little more in order to get a greater buffer zone between say the town of Port Blandford where the spray is taking place? In other words, what I am asking the minister is, is the government

MR. W. ROWE: now amenable to changing the spray programme? They have changed in respect of Gander Lake, for Gander town and the residents in the communities around Gander. The Government is now obviously conducive, or amenable, or will allow changes to take place in that programme if the people will protest to the Government. Is that a statement of the Government's policy? Changes will take place if people will get in touch with the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will remember, and I am sure he does, that when I made the statement on Friday I started off by saying that although I am convinced from all of the medical evidence which I have been able to receive from medical doctors and from other health experts, there is no danger in the spray programme in terms of human health. That was the preliminary sentence. And I went on to say that in view of the fact that there were some very real concerns being expressed by -

MR. S. NEARY: Political pressure.

MR. H. COLLINS: Political pressure, Mr. Speaker, that is it. The hon. member has his foot into it now. Political pressure by -

MR. S. NEARY: So you are afraid to put your political life on the line -

MR. H. COLLINS: A few has-beens out there, you know, who would think that they are on to a good thing here and they might be able to get the knife in me, or in the Conservative Party, or the Government.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, no!

MR. H. COLLINS: Real dirty, lowdown, the smallest kind of politics is being played out there.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is this? Pontius Pilate!

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

I must direct the hon. gentlemen not to get into a debate during the Question Period.

MR. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. H. COLLINS: There is some hon. member on that side of the House who referred to someone over here, I do not know who, as Pontius Pilate. Now that hon. member should be identified. That hon. member should be identified and not only asked to withdraw that statement but he should have to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to be clear procedurally here. I am not sure if the hon. gentleman did raise it as a point of order, the Pontius Pilate allusion, or not.

MR. H. COLLINS: On the raising of a point of order - On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, while I was talking an hon. member on that side of the House was heard to call someone over here, Pontius Pilate. It might have been me. I do not know who it might have been. But whoever it was, I request Your Honour to have that hon. member withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know who called whom, or alluded to whom, or made any 'Pontius Pilate' reference, but I have in the past few days heard a couple of references to that gentleman, I think. And I think what I will just say is that it is better for references to Pontius Pilate probably to left out and we will leave it at that.

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to change the subject for a moment, I want to get over to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, in connection with an extension to the thermo-generating plant at Holyrood. I wonder if the hon. gentleman can tell us what stage the expansion -

MR. SIMMONS: Who are you talking about?

MR. S. NEARY: Do you have a point of order?

MR. W. ROWE: He is out of order.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. Minister will be out of order after the next election.

MR. R. SIMMONS: It is not a point of order he needs; it is a pint of something else.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy what -

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

It is a pint of valium we need.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I must ask both hon.

gentlemen to restrain from carrying on their conversation -

MR. F. ROWE:

Boy, oh boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

-and the hon. member as well.

MR. SIMMONS:

We are the experts, not the grub.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could we get some tranquilizers

for the two hon. gentlemen, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member as well.

I must point out that we cannot continue having members interrupting and remarks made back and forth. I think probably - I do not know - I may be speculating here but hon. members see in the House of Commons, you know, quite this uproar but I think they are dealing with over 200 people and is not as personalized, and perhaps it is all lost in the roar. But in a smaller Chamber with smaller numbers of people I think the few snide remarks back and forth can have a quite different kind of effect than they do when you are dealing with over 250 people. So I would point out to hon. members on both sides that I think what would appear to be the same thing here and in a larger chamber could have a quite different effect in a smaller area where almost everybody hears everything and it is much more personalized. So I would ask hon. members on both sides to desist from further interruptions.

Hon. member,

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: I want to find out from the hon. Minister of Mines, Sir, if public tenders have been let for all the various contracts involved in the expansion to the thermo generating plant at Holyrood where they are installing one new generator I think it is, have all the contracts been let yet and were public tenders called for all these contracts?

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

MR. PECKFORD: To my knowledge all contracts for work at Holyrood were called by public tender, number one. Number two, whether in fact all work has now been contracted. I cannot give a firm answer to that. I will have to take it under advisement and get the answer for the hon. member tomorrow. I suspect that all the work has not been tendered yet or all the work has not been let as of yet on the Holyrood Generating Station. But before giving a final position on that I would like to check and get the details for the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague asked me if I was reaching my arm down in the sewer to look for a handful of dirt well, Sir, I assure the hon. gentleman I am not. The hon. gentleman indicated that he assumed that all the contracts had been let for tenders that have been called so far, is this correct?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I never said that. You were too busy listening to your cohort.

MR. NEARY: Well could the hon. gentleman tell me whether all the tenders that had been opened publicly if all the contracts have yet been awarded.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not think so. I think there is one that I am aware of to do with the switch yard. There is a contract and tenders were called for work at the switch yard which has to be readjusted because of the additional generating capacity going on and I do not know if that one has been awarded yet or not. I just do not know because I only got back this morning and therefore have not had a chance to check that out.

MR. NEARY: Well, a supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell me if the electrical contract is awarded yet?

MR. PECKFORD: I guess that is the one the hon. member - the switch yard is electrical, Mr. Speaker, and -

MR. NEARY: No, it could be separate.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, the hon. gentleman never asked me if they were separate and I can only assume, it is not definitive on my part, I can only say that I assume or presume that the hon. gentleman in asking the question and in saying it is an electrical contract, and that I only knowing about the switch contract, that I am linking the two which might not necessarily be correct. But for the sake of my answer and for my knowledge I can only conclude that it is correct but I will not give a firm position on it until I get information from the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. But to my knowledge there is a contract dealing with the switch yard on which tenders were called and for which there has not been an award.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman indicate then if in all cases contracts will be awarded to the lowest bidder?

MR. PECKFORD: Naturally.

MR. NEARY: Naturally. Oh is that so now? The hon. gentleman might be surprised to find out that that is not the case. I am asking the hon. minister to find out if in all cases contracts will be awarded both past and present to the lowest bidder and if not would the minister find out why contracts cannot be awarded to the lowest bidder. And will the minister also find out if the preference rule will apply to Newfoundland contractors in the case of this project up here, the Thermo Generating Plant in Holyrood?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the question of lowest bidder I do not know if that is the way everything reads when you call tenders. It is the best bid that is in and I guess there is a difference between being the lowest. So I would not want to respond and say that in every case from here on that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will award to the lowest bidder even though that lowest bidder is not the best bidder, number one. Number two, I cannot respond that way because local preference does enter the picture and local preference would be given that is a mainland company verses a local company where the local company, everything else being equal, would get preference. So I would have to qualify any response. In a general response obviously it is true that we do, the government's policy is to award to the lowest bidder everything else being equal.

MR. NEARY: You are going to get me all that information?

MR. PECKFORD: If the hon. gentleman has any specifics to ask as it relates to a particular contract -

MR. NEARY: Do I have to draw pictures? I just indicated to the hon. gentleman, I do not have to draw pictures, do I?

MR. PECKFORD: Well you mentioned electrical and you did not want me to conclude that it was the switch yard one so that, therefore, I am not sure which one it is. But if

MR. PECKFORD:

the hon. member has some specific questions that he wants to pose as it relates to contracts at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. I would be only too happy to answer them now to the best of my ability and defer any additional responses as it relates to contracts at Hydro until I get the additional information.

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

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Some time ago while we were debating the estimates the minister was talking about oil storage, underground storage at Bell Island and he mentioned that there was competition from Nova Scotia. The fact that the Home Oil Company of Calgary have now announced that they are going to go ahead and store oil in the Strait of Canso area, does this mean that we have lost our bid for oil storage on Bell Island?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I am not aware of Home Oil's proposal and I do not know what crude they are going to store at the Strait of Canso. The proposal as it relates to Wabana has to do with the United States government's ongoing programme of strategic oil storage throughout North America, primarily in the United States. So the Wabana proposal only relates to storage by the United States government and not as it relates to Home Oil.

I am also aware that the Government of Nova Scotia are eager to get under the programme that the United States government is proposing and is or has been up until the hon. member just spoke, a rival with Wabana's proposal through Wabanex, the corporation that was formed to pursue this. From indications that I have had in the last week and a half or two weeks

MR. PECKFORD:

especially as it relates to our intervention at the National Energy Board hearings, our proposal is given priority over the Nova Scotia proposal as it relates to storage of crude by the United States government. But as it relates to the Home Oil proposal I am not aware of it and would have to defer a final position until I read what in actual fact this means.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Original questioner.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that when the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Mandell visited Canada he talked about extra-territorial storage of oil. And I had conversation with a senior official in Home Oil who is the Halifax company that is developing the salt mines in Nova Scotia is Murphy Oil but they are the parent. My understanding from conversation with that company was that this company had been daily over the past five years, sort of rubbing shoulders with Wabanex, the power corporation people in the United States and this is for storage of crude outside the United States and that this particular proposal which they are going through with in the Straits of Canso is predicated on the United States storage of oil. And I ask the minister again does this not mean that our bid is perhaps negated?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: As I understand what the hon. member has now told me, new information that I did not have previously is that Home Oil, the company Home Oil if the United States decides to store crude outside of its own boundaries will be the company that will be trying to get storage for Nova Scotia and the Strait of Canso area in the same way that

MR. PECKFORD:

Wabanex is trying to get oil storage for Newfoundland at Wabana. So I do not perceive that as in any way negating the ongoing initiatives that we are making in Washington as it relates to oil storage in Wabana but simply that there is now an identifiable vehicle and company which is going to try to expedite oil storage in Nova Scotia.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister got my question wrong because at the very beginning I stated that the Home Oil people have announced, and this is a story from the Halifax paper, development of underground storage in the Strait of Canso should take place immediately, an official of Murphy Oil Company told the National Energy Board in Halifax. Then the story goes on to say just what they are going to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conversation with the Home Oil Company I have been told that this was predicated on storage of oil outside the United States for the United States. So again does this mean that we have lost our opportunity?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the hon. member is saying obviously because I am not getting - if on the one hand the hon. member is saying that Home Oil intends to store

MR. PECKFORD: oil in Nova Scotia if and when the United States Government decides to store outside its boundaries. that is one thing. And if that is what the hon. gentleman is saying, then I can only say that the Nova Scotian people in consultation with Home Oil will be trying to get some of that oil that the United States agrees to store outside of its boundaries in the same way as Wabanex is working for the Province of Newfoundland to do the same thing.

This is before the National Energy Board and he made that statement - one of the gentlemen made that statement in the paper that the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) just quoted. I would just like to know some more of the specifics because as the hon. gentleman says himself, if it is based on a decision by the United States Government it is too early to say where the oil is going to be stored that the United States will decide it wants to put somewhere else other than within its own boundaries.

One can only say that we have a very strong rival in Nova Scotia. Now, if - and that is the only way I can interpret the hon. member's questions - Home Oil says they are going to store oil in Nova Scotia, but it will be oil that the United States Government sometime in the future decides to store outside its boundaries. my information up to today is simply that our initiatives through Wabanex put us in a priority position as it relates to storing oil for the United States Government outside its boundaries.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Has the minister or his department had any contacts with the Home Oil people to interest them in the Bell Island storage or has it just been with the

MR. HODDER: Wabanex people?

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

MR. PECKFORD: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any discussions with Home Oil as it relates to oil storage at Wabana.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo followed by Windsor - Buchans then Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I hear that a new DREE agreement will be signed in Ottawa, or between the Province and the federal government within the next day or so, or maybe within this week. My question to the minister is: Can he inform the House whether Fogo Island will be included in that DREE agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we are in a position to sign an extension of the highway subagreement with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. If it is next week it is a piece of information that has not reached us yet. But I guess we will probably be reading about it in the papers.

When the Government of Canada is ready to sign an agreement they will so announce. I hesitate to comment on the contents of the proposed agreement publicly at this time. There is a very strong tradition in Ottawa of opposition to what they term premature announcements of joint programmes, particularly when the Government of Canada is paying the major portion of the shot.

I should say in all honesty that it is my impression that the proposed transportation package that we are trying to put together for Fogo Island will not be in that particular agreement. Hopefully, we

MR. DOODY: will be able to get it into a subsequent amendment. Other than that, Sir, I prefer not to comment on the upcoming amendment to the Highways agreement for the reasons that I have already outlined.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Is the hon. gentleman rising on a supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: I did not get the hon. minister clearly. Did I understand the hon. minister to say that Fogo Island is not included in this agreement which is to be signed within a few days?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: To the best of my knowledge, at this time, Mr. Speaker, the Transportation package that we are preparing, updating and getting into the hands of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for Fogo Island will not be included in this upcoming amendment which, hopefully, we will be in a position to sign during the next couple of weeks. Hopefully, as I say, we will be able to get it into a subsequent amendment.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary. The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder if the minister could tell us - I know he cannot say too much before the agreement is signed - whether or not his department has any detailed planning under this agreement that hopefully will be signed within the next week or so, for

MR. W. CALLAN: the expenditure on projects this Summer? Is the Minister anticipating that a great deal of work will be able to be done this Summer under this special sub-agreement with the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. W. DOODY: I would anticipate, Your Honour, that the series of tenders will be called for work within a few days after the successful signing of the agreement. A great deal of work has been done in some of the areas which we hope to cover and I think that once the agreement is signed and the announcement made then we can very quickly get on with the actual construction work. I would hope that we would be able to do a substantial amount of work during the present season.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Can the Minister confirm for the House whether or not the recalling of tenders on the Hinds Lake project will affect the start-up schedule, or will the fact that Hydro has to recall tenders - will that delay the scheduled start-up of the Hinds Lake project?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Obviously it will delay the start-up, hopefully by no more than two or three weeks, but it will delay the start-up because if all things had been equal the award of the contract would have taken place a few days ago. Now we are back into a recall situation, so it does delay start-up. We hope that it will not delay it any more than two or three weeks. Additionally, of course, there is also the idea that we can now include some additional work into the new tender call which was not into the previous one which will help move the project along, but it will not be major new inclusions, it will be minor new inclusions. There is still a need for a lot of additional contracts to be called, for example, the various canals and dams that have to be built and the wood that has to be cut and the temporary access roads that have to be built.

MR. B. PECKFORD: But there is obviously a delay in start-up. Whether there will be a delay in the whole construction schedule will depend upon how quickly the contractors who get the jobs can do the work so that they will have to pick up somewhere in the order of two to four weeks because of the delay in start-up, but that might not necessarily mean that the construction schedule is out of kilter because they might be able to pick it up in the normal expeditious manner of two to four weeks out of a construction schedule of eighteen or twenty-five months.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, original questioner.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I am going to put a couple of questions in my supplementary, Mr. Speaker, so as to save time. Number one, we have to take for granted that Lundrigans, for argument's sake, will get the ten per cent preferential treatment with regard to tender. Does the same thing apply to Callivino? Is Callivino for the purpose of that preferential ten per cent considered to be a local Newfoundland company? The second part of the question is:- Since the recalling of tenders is going to put off the start-up of the project by two to three weeks, and that well may be a month, how come Callivino was allowed to withdraw their tender and re-tender it? Why did they not just lose their bid bond the way we would have done in any other project in this Province and demand the contract be given to the next lowest tender?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister for Mines and Energy.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the number of alternatives the Government had at its disposal in considering the whole thing after tenders were opened, and one of the alternatives was the one just hinted to by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I have done a fair amount of research and talked to a lot of people across Canada in the Canadian Construction Association as well as the Newfoundland Construction Association, and also the American Construction Association on Wednesday past, and the normal procedure if it can be demonstrated that

Mr. B. PECKFORD: a legitimate error occurred is that the lowest bidder does not necessarily have his bid bond called, if it can be demonstrated that it is a legitimate error. The normal practice in the construction industry throughout North America once you can demonstrate a legitimate error is that the bid bond is not called.

We could have, as the hon. member rightly points out, just then said to the lowest bidder of the time, Callivino Brothers, that you have made a legitimate error, your bid is no longer valid, you will not lose your bid bond because the normal construction practice now in North America when you can demonstrate legitimacy in your error is that you just eliminate it and then you can go on and accept the next lowest bidder, Loran Lundrigans, which could have been done. It was Government's view that the best way to handle the situation was to recall tenders to all the contractors who bid, McNamara's and the other, rather than go the route I just suggested which was the next lowest one which would have been Loran Lundrigans.

As it relates to local preference, local preference does apply to work undertaken by Newfoundland Hydro as it does directly to Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." Carried. (Bill No. 83).

On motion, Bill No. 83, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Require The Provision Of Facilities In Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons." carried. (Bill No. 84).

On motion, Bill No. 84, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 11.

Motion, the hon. the President Of The Treasury Board to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act, " carried. (Bill No. 85).

On motion, Bill No. 85, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 12.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Forestry and Agriculture Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 71).

On motion, Bill No. 71, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 13.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games, " carried. (Bill No. 74).

On motion, Bill No. 74, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 14

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," carried. (Bill No. 68).

On motion, Bill No. 68 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 15.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act, " carried. (Bill No. 70).

On motion, Bill No. 70 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 16.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and The Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, " carried. (Bill No. 67).

On motion, Bill No. 67 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 17.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and The Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act, " carried. (Bill No. 73).

On motion, Bill No. 73 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 18.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospital Insurance (Agreement) Act, " carried. (Bill No. 86).

On motion, Bill No. 86 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 19.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Dispensing Opticians," carried. (Bill No. 34)

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 20.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," carried.

(Bill No. 76).

On motion, Bill No. 76 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 21.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Respecting School Attendance," carried.

(Bill No. 89).

On motion, Bill No. 89 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 22.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce, a bill, "An Act To Amend The College of Fisheries Act, The College Of Trades And Technology Act And The Polytechnical Institute Act," carried.

(Bill No. 69).

On motion, Bill No. 69 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 23.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," carried. (Bill No. 78).

On motion, Bill No. 78 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 24.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act, carried. (Bill No. 87).

On motion, Bill No. 87 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 25.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act," Carried. (Bill No. 75).

On motion, Bill No. 75 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 26.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," carried. (Bill No. 77).

On motion, Bill No. 77 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 27.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Accelerated Pensions To Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland Transferred To Services Of The Government Of Canada At The Date Of Union," Carried. (Bill No. 82).

On motion, Bill No. 82 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 28.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 65).

On motion, Bill No. 65 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 29.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Clarify The Nature Of A Payment Made In 1974 To Certain Mining Companies," carried. (Bill No. 80).

On motion, Bill No. 80 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 30.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act," carried. (Bill No. 79).

On motion, Bill No. 79 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

June 19, 1978

Tape No. 4578

RT-1

MR. A. HICKMAN:

Motion 31.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a Bill - "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act, 1975, The Electrical Power Control Act, The Newfoundland And Labrador (Loan And Guarantee Limitation) Act, 1975, The Newfoundland And Labrador Rural Electricity Act, And The British Newfoundland Corporation Limited (Lower Churchill River Lease) Act, 1966-67." Carried. (No. 88).

On motion, Bill No. 88 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. A. HICKMAN:

Motion 32.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a Bill - "An Act To Revise The Newfoundland Architects Act." Carried. (No. 72).

On motion, Bill No. 72 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. A. HICKMAN:

Order 7.

Motion, second reading of a bill - "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region." (No. 50).

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN:

Today is a particularly proud day for me not only as a member of a district in St. John's but also representing all the people of Newfoundland with respect to local government in Newfoundland, and today, the 19th day of June, 1978, will go down as one of the great days in Newfoundland with respect to local government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been a long time coming. In the St. John's or Northeast Avalon Urban Region we started in 1972 to (1) develop a plan, develop a method by which we could provide regional services for the St. John's urban region and the Northeast Avalon urban region and it started in 1972 with the commissioning of a study commissioned by this Government to ask Proctor and Redfern to investigate, to find out, to inform, to plan, to tell us what the feasibility was

MR. J. DINN: of provisioning regional services and basically provisioning services in the Northeast Avalon Urban Region. So it started in 1972. It is not the bill that has been talked about in the media and has been talked about by other hon. gentlemen with respect to 'pushing it down people's throats'. It started in 1972. That report came in and it spoke volumes about what the problems were in the Northeast Avalon Urban Region.

The problems pointed out by that report indicated that the capital city of this Province, that the Northeast Avalon Urban Region was going to (a) run short of water, (b) that there was a need for a regional plan because we had sporadic development throughout the region, (c) that there were many other things that were not being planned in the Northeast Avalon area that needed to be planned, and from then on they said, get on with the planning, get on with the feasibility and let us see what we can do because we did not want another Newfie joke on our hands. Mr. Speaker, I lived outside the Province for ten years listening to Newfie jokes that emanated from Newfoundland. I was not proud of them and now we are going to eliminate them if we have anything to do with it with respect to the Northeast Avalon Urban Region.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it started in 1972 with Proctor and Redfern doing the study. Then in 1973 this Administration asked Mr. Alex Henley to enquire into, to find out about, how we would do with respect to provisioning services with respect to local government in the Northeast Avalon Urban Region and this took two and one-half years.

MR. DINN:

and it was investigated by going into the communities, by talking to the local municipalities, by talking to concerned citizens who brought in their reports, who made recommendations, who basically said that there is a need in the Northeast Avalon urban region for something, for a regional plan, for regional services to get underway so that we would not in the future ever cause the situation that arose here in 1976 when the city, the capital city of this Province was into an emergency situation with respect to basic water.

So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henley, having worked on this for two and one half years and his commissioners whom I would recommend to be put on any commission with respect to local government because they did a fantastic job, they came in in January of 1977 with fifty-one recommendations respecting the Northeast Avalon urban region. Some of these recommendations centered around the fact that some areas in the Northeast Avalon urban region should over a period of time be incorporated. We could note from that that Portugal Cove, for example, was one area a group of people of which had been looking for incorporation for eight years. When the recommendations were made to government, government accepted the report and we started to get on with the job with respect to local municipalities.

We have since incorporated Portugal Cove, St. Phillip's and St. Thomas and we are right now looking into the possibility of the incorporation as a rural district council of Logy Bay, Middle Cove and Outer Cove. With respect to regional government, the recommendation of Mr. Henley was very strong in support of regional government and indeed most of those people, most of

MR. DINN:

those councillors who talked to Mr. Henley and made recommendations and made submissions, presented briefs indicated that they were indeed in favour of some form of regional government for the Northeast Avalon urban region.

Now, Mr. Speaker, regional government is one thing. The other thing is how were we going to provision a regional service. How were we going to provide a service, for example, so that the capital city of St. John's did not run short of water? Well, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government through the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and through my hon. colleague who led that department for a year and a half to a year and eight months, I believe, started out to do something about the region. It was basically started, I believe, by the hon. member for St. John's West, the member of parliament for St. John's West, who was concerned about the Northeast Avalon urban region and the members from the city of St. John's and from the region who were concerned when they found out that the Northeast Avalon urban region, that the city of St. John's, the capital of this Province, that Mount Pearl and that the people who had water were basically running out of water and he felt he had to do something about it. And he got concurrence from all of his colleagues and they went about and started to do the job.

Then there was the problem of where do we get the money to do the job. What needed to be done was identified first from a water point of view of providing \$35 million. That is quite a thing to take on as a task but it needed to be done for the capital city of this Province and not only did it need to be done but it

MR. DINN:

had to be done. We could not see the capital city of this Province turn out to be another Newfie joke.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion was approached. CMHC was approached and they came up with a plan to get this regional water system done. I am happy to say, contrary to popular opinion, where credit is due credit should be given and the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion came through with a major portion of the money, the Province came through with \$8.3 million and right now that facility is a reality. Last year it was opened, this year the final treatment plant will be finished and we will have in the Northeast Avalon urban region a service that needed to be provided to this region, paid for by the federal government and paid for by the province for the people in the Northeast Avalon urban region.

MR. STRACHAN:

Paid for by the federal government.

MR. DINN: Paid for by the federal government, yes. They have contributed some \$25 million and they are proud of it also. They were out to open it last year with us and they had representatives from CMHC and DREE.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we have it. We had, just to go back over how local government was operated in the unincorporated areas, we had for some fifteen years now a Metro Board that did what I consider to be an excellent job with respect to local government in the area but there was some concern raised because of the fact that all of this board was not appointed - they were political appointments. Obviously, if they are appointed by politicians they are political appointees, but they did an excellent job.

Last year, just to bring to note, as a result of fine management and good administration from the St. John's Metropolitan Board, that board had a surplus on account of some \$240 million to \$250 million. They did an excellent job.

MR. DOODY: Thousand dollars.

MR. DINN: \$240,000 to \$250,000. What did I say?

MR. DOODY: Million.

MR. DINN: Million? Well, that is pretty good. That is the odd naught. The odd naught came in there. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is \$240,000 to \$250,000. So I have to say as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board certainly did us justice, did us well and operated as a local municipality for all of the unincorporated areas in the Metro region and they are to be complimented on it. But I think we have to now move forward to an election of at least two-thirds of the people on the new, proposed regional

MR. DINN: council and get on with the job of providing regional services to the regions.

MR. CANNING: They were 100 per cent appointed -

MR. DINN: They were 100 per cent appointed, they operated for some fifteen years as Metro Board, they have done a good job, but I think now it is time that we at least elect two-thirds. The recommendation of the Henley Commission with respect to that specifically said that we should elect ten elected representatives and five, including the chairman, to be appointed by the provincial government, by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

So we agreed with Mr. Henley's report. Last year the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities held four meetings in the St. John's Area and they invited all of the municipalities to come talk about the Henley Royal Commission Report, talk about regional government and make recommendations to them at which point in time they made their recommendations to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and having made them we came into the Legislature last year with bill 101.

Now, from January to June it was moving quite fast even though the study started in 1972 the Henley Commission started in 1973-74. When the Henley Report was presented to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and to government, from January to June, having even discussed it with the municipalities, we felt that it was maybe a little bit too fast to bring it upon the people in the region and we decided in our wisdom to hold it off for one year to allow people to make representations to government and to make their feelings known with respect to regional government and with respect to bill 101.

Also, some of my colleagues on this side of the House expressed concern about some of the

MR. DINN: provisions that were in bill
101. They also expressed concern, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: I would like to have silence
from the hon. animated larynx from LaPoile (Mr. Neary)
if it is possible at all.

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen to buggy-eyes
there.

MR. DINN: May I have the protection of
the Chair, Mr. Speaker, to see if we can, under the rules
of the House, get this animated larynx to stop. He has
been babbling all day.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) in this House.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!

I understand the hon. minister
wishes to exercise his right that he be heard in silence.
This, of course, would apply to all members of the House on
both sides.

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

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon.
member for LaPoile is obviously trying to throw me off. But
many people have tried to throw me off and they have not been
able to throw me off yet and they will not be able to throw
me off. Mr. Speaker, I intend to be around for a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we operated
from 1949 to 1971 and

MR. DINN: nothing was done in the Northeast Avalon urban region. I came, Mr. Speaker, and I can see it from here, from a place known as the Battery and hon. members opposite may not know where it is but there are people out there today in the capital city of St. John's who do not have water and sewer and we intend to change that and keep working on that. The hon. member for St. John's East is the first man who ever tried to do anything about it. He got NIP to move into St. John's East and now he is getting it to move into the Battery area and one of the first priorities of that NIP committee is to provide water and sewer to those people out there who have waited since 1949 and got nothing but lip service and studies and nothing was done about them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another area of St. John's to that I have to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do have to remind hon. members that the minister has asked for silence and the Chair therefore will be required to order that.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously they are babbling on in an uncontrolled manner and we obviously cannot control this kind of stuff. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other areas of St. John's that need service. The Southside, Mr. Speaker, an area that you are quite familiar with, is still operating today having waited since 1949 for a little water and sewer are still waiting today for water and sewer to be put out there. The capital city of the Province of Newfoundland and still they do not have the basic services of water and sewer in this Province. It is a disgrace but, Mr. Speaker, we will working with the City Council of St. John's hopefully do something about that situation this year.

MR. NEARY: With Federal funds.

MR. DINN: Not Federal funds, not Federal funds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well what are you going to do it by?

AN HON. MEMBER: Courage.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the region I would also

MR. DINN: like to talk about Pleasantville because I am very interested in Pleasantville and I would like to do something about that. I just do not want to turn over a piece of land and say you can operate that as a land fill site. I would like to be able to do something about it. I would like to ask the hon. member if he cannot keep quiet to go down some night and have a look over in the little valley that runs between the Janeway Hospital and the Robin Hood Bay dump and just have a look at it, just have a look at the parade of rats that are running up and down there now and we intend to do something about that to, Mr. Speaker, and we intend to do something about it by operating, by putting into place the vehicle whereby we can operate that as a regional facility because, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do have to ask hon. members if they would pay attention to the admonition from the Chair. It does place the Chair in a very awkward position if in applying the rules which are there in black and white and which the Chair has no option but to enforce if the occasion arises, the Chair is in a awkward position if the hon. members do not co-operate.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if it is possible to control that kind of thing that has been operating, been happening in the House ever since we opened this session. Obviously what we need on the other side is the return of the old leader because he had some control at least of what went on over there anyway.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to do something about that facility called Robin Hood Bay and we hope to do it by virtue of the fact that we bring in regional government in this area and by virtue of the fact that the people over there need it. They do not need rats crawling around, down that valley and we intend to do something about it. We hope to do something about it and we are going to do something about it, and we will do it one way or the other.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of red herrings pulled out with respect to Bill No. 50. Last year there may have been a few things in there that the red herrings could have been dragged out on. Some of them were identified by hon. members on this side of the House and I commend them for having the patience with me, and the patience to go from last June until this June, almost every two weeks, at each individual member's residence, we held meetings there, we discussed different sections of the bill and we put down what we think, Mr. Speaker, is the start of regional government in Newfoundland.

We have, Mr. Speaker, in the paper today, in the paper last week, "The joint towns and community councils on the Burin Peninsula take exception to the MHA's remark about regional government." They are talking to me about regional government. They want to get

MR. DINN:

involved in regional government. They want me to now commission a study to have a look at the possibility of regional government for the Burin Peninsula. Mr. Speaker, they have been talking about it down in Labrador for years. They have been talking about it out in Corner Brook for years and they are talking to me daily about it. They are talking about it in the area of Windsor, Grand Falls, Bishop's, etc., about regional government. We are going to do something about regional government. But what we are going to do first is we are going to do it where we can provide regional services. We are going to do it after we consult with the people. There has been more consultation, Mr. Speaker, I submit on Bill 50 since we have started to talk about regional government since we have started to talk about commissioning the study in 1972, there has been more discussion about regional government in this region than I would suspect on any bill that was ever brought before this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And we do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to cut it off at that. We do not intend to just pass Bill 50 and say, that is it, that is dead and now we have regional government and forget about it. What we intend to do is ask these councils if they have objections or if they have recommendations for revising or changing or improving this bill. We ask them to bring their recommendations to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, come in and sit down at any time that they want their meeting, come in and sit down and discuss with me or discuss with any one of the members in the region, I am sure, would be willing to sit down with any group, any council, any community of concerned citizens and discuss Bill 50 and discuss

MR. DINN:

the possibility of revisions or any recommendations that they would like to make.

We think that it is necessary to have regional government now. We think that regional government, that this bill like many other bills - Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members opposite know but the Local Government Act was passed in 1972. It was revised and changed in 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977. So it was not perfect when it was brought in. It is not perfect now. The Local Government Act by the way has many, many inconsistencies and problems in it right now and we down at the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing are currently working on a new municipalities act that will allow more autonomy to the municipalities, for example, Gander and the major towns in this Province so that they do not have to come in and get approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to get a loan of \$5,000 as interim financing for this item or that item. We think it is time that they are responsible, we know that they are responsible and we think it is time they get a little more autonomy and that will be one of the other bills that we intend to bring into the House, hopefully, in the next year or so if not in the Fall session.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to progress, we have to go forward. We cannot stagnate. We have to do something for our people. The people expect us to do it and we are going to do it with Bill No. 50 in the Northeast Avalon. We are going to talk to the people of the joint town and community councils of the Burin Peninsula and hopefully do something for them if they wish after consultation like we consulted, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill No. 50.

MR. NEARY:

Who did you consult with?

MR. DINN: On Bill No. 50? We consulted with every municipality in the region. And, Mr. Speaker, those councils in their wisdom recommended regional government. And I have talked in the past week to five more councils, some of them new - some of them new councillors, some of them old councillors that have a few young people on there, some new councillors on there who are not sure or are not quite aware of what is going on with respect to regional government.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we were absolutely delighted -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please!

On both sides of the House there are remarks which make it difficult for the hon. minister in completing his remarks.

The hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see in today's Metro report, the Mayor of Mount Pearl supporting Bill No. 50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hodder, the Mayor of Mount Pearl, who was previously the Deputy Mayor of Mount Pearl, made submissions on behalf of the town of Mount Pearl, attended all of the meetings held by the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities, presented briefs, listened to things, made recommendations -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, are we going to have some order here?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - who went to

Mr. Dinn: all of the meetings, sat down, discussed regional government, discussed the Henley Report, made recommendations based on the Henley Report, made submissions to the Henley Royal Commission when they were set up, and, Mr. Speaker, was involved almost from day one with respect to local government in the Northeast Avalon Urban area, came out today, a man who has been with it from day one almost, came out today in support of Bill 50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: But he did not get the bill, come into the House, get a copy of it, one to one hundred and forty-nine sections, and the next day rush out and say, "I am against Bill 50." He sat down waited for a few days, he went through each individual section. He called up and he said, what does this mean? What does this particular section mean?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: He went in and received the advice of some legal people to interpret the legalities of this thing. And he said, after having gone through that, after having consulted and found out and investigated, he came back, and today, I am happy to say, that he came out today in support of Bill 50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And I expect all of the Town Council of Mount Pearl to come out and support this Bill, because, I think, they will do it after, only after they go through and start at section one, and go through and read all 149 sections. They will not shoot from the lip before they read and find out and investigate what is going on with respect to this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the City of St. John's came in last year when we had Bill 101 and they said, Please defer Bill 101; we would like to consult, we would like to discuss and so on. They did not attend any of the federation meetings, they sent some officials to the last one, I feel sorry about that, but the fact is they came in - and they are the City of St. John's. And I have got respect for people who run for office for the City of St. John's because I am aware of all the problems

Mr. Dinn: that they have within the City of St. John's - so they came in and they asked me, would I please defer the Bill for a year or so, so that they could have a look at it, so that they could make representation. They had from last June to this June, they made two representations to me, we had two meetings.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two meetings!

MR. DINN: Two meetings. only. I met with several of the councillors on two different occasions, and met with them individually and a couple came in one afternoon to discuss the possibility of regional government, and so on. But their main objections -

AN HON. MEMBER: Two meetings.

MR. DINN: Two meetings they came in and had, that is all, the only two meetings, the only time they came in was two times, the only two times they asked me for a meeting were twice, and I met with them on both occasions. They did not come in after that. But they did come in twice, and the last time they came in they had, I believe, six items that they wanted to discuss.

The basic item, the basic objection to regional government from the point of view of the City of St. John's, the very basic objection was, was that they wanted the boundaries of the City expanded. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to expanding the boundaries of the City of St. John's, but I am certainly not going to ram it down the throats of the people outside if they do not want to become part of the City of St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I have gotten petitions from the area of Kilbride, petitions from Mount Pearl, petitions from Wedgewood Park, petitions from and individual letters from Wedgewood Park, some 130 or 140 letters I got from Wedgewood Park with the letter filled out and in some cases eight or nine names on the bottom of the letter saying they do not want to become part of St. John's. Well, St. John's would not work if you were to force them into St. John's. So this is not the kind of government that should forcing things upon people. We should do it

Mr. Dinn: after consultation, if the people do not want it, they should not have it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And they did not want it. Almost to a man they expressed the opinion that they did not want to become part of the City of St. John's, and, as I said to the City and I say it here in this House of Assembly publicly that if the City can make it more amenable for the people outside, more acceptable for the people outside to join the City then I think the people outside will join the City, and then and only then should that happen, because you cannot force a government on people, especially the people in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: You cannot force it on people, they have to accept it, they have to want it, and in this case, and in the case of Bill 50 everybody wants Bill 50 except those people who are not aware of or do not understand what is going on in the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, now let us not talk about Portugal Cove. We do not want to get into individualities, individual people. I talked to Portugal Cove last night, I finished a meeting with them at 11:00 o'clock last night, and we talked to them,

MR. DINN: and they had some concerns. Basically they believe in Regional Government but they have some concerns about the bill. We could not cover it from one to one hundred and forty-nine, we intend to have more meetings. Any meetings that they would like for me to sit in on to discuss certain sections of the bill I am perfectly willing to do that as I did with St. Phillips yesterday afternoon from three to six thirty and last night from eight to eleven with the town council of Portugal Cove.

They expressed concerns about certain sections of the bill and I think they need a little time, they need a little time to have a look at it and make sure and to come in and discuss and so on. But the fact of the matter is that if we pass Bill 50 today and it is proclaimed that there will be an election within six months and we will have Regional Government. Right now they can make recommendations to me as I had them in yesterday, they made several recommendations to me. I did not particularly agree with some of the recommendations they had,

I explained my side and they explained their side but we have Regional Government in this bill here and we think it is a good bill, we think that in Sections 1 to 149, we think there are some items in there where people would feel that there may be some encroachment on power of another municipality which is not contained within this bill, we think that they have fears about double taxation and there is no provision in the bill for double taxation, and they have fears about many, many other things. We think that what we have here will eliminate all of those fears. We do not think that they quite understand but we will continue to sit and talk with any council that wants to talk, come in and sit down and -

AN HON. MEMBER : They do not understand.

MR. DINN: Some of them do not understand. The councillors, for example, in Torbay; I talked to the Mayor of Torbay. You might wish to call the Mayor of Torbay. You might wish to call the Mayor of Flatrock who is involved with Regional Council from its inception. I talked to him the other

MR. DINN: day and he said we are basically in agreement with Regional Government, we have no objections to Bill 50.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a dictatorship.

MR. DINN: We have no -

MR. SIMMONS: The O'Dea vacation plan.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, here we go. A man who cannot come into this House and defend himself and the hon. member, the hon. boil gets in and casts aspersions on a gentleman that cannot come into this House and defend himself. Mr. John R. O'Dea happens to be one of the greatest individuals in this area, and I take exception -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: A disgraceful display, attacking individuals that cannot defend themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow the House to erupt into discord? I rose on a point of order about five minutes ago.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to some of the language used by the hon. minister in referring to my colleague here as a 'boil,' I think this was the name he characterized him as. Sir, are we going to allow the House to degenerate into the status of a beer parlour if we wish or we can use parliamentary language. The hon. member has not used parliamentary language in referring to my hon. colleague. I would ask him to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, or we can carry on and we will let the whole thing degenerate. We can do that, too.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I find myself on all fours with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and I wish he had put the same position and agreed with me earlier this afternoon when there was language used in this House.

MR. W. ROWE: I was talking about unparliamentary language.

MR. HICKMAN: Unparliamentary language used in this House and

MR. HICKMAN: when the beer garden philosophy was abounding and I said, Mr. Speaker, -

MR.W. ROWE: Thank the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) for that.

MR. HICKMAN: -what my hon. colleague was drawing attention to was the insidious, unpardonable approach of attacking by innuendo or comment people outside of this House who are not in a position to defend themselves within the immunity of this House.

MR.W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that different point that was raised by my hon. friend?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is a point of order before the Chair. Does the hon. Leader wish to speak to that?

MR.W. ROWE: Yes, Sir, by way of defence to the scurrilous remarks by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he referred to some remarks made by my colleague concerning Mr. O'Dea, I believe, a man he says who cannot make a defence of himself, Sir. I have here a file, Mr. Speaker, which I will be referring to a little later on in the debate where Mr. O'Dea is quite capable of defending himself. And Mr. O'Dea better know this since the minister is his protector that when he gets into the public forum and starts defending, Mr. Speaker, defending something which his political masters are putting out

MR. W. ROWE: by way of Bill 50, then Mr. O'Dea can expect to have his name referred to and his arguments shot down in this House. Now he had better know that, Mr. Speaker, and his political masters had better refer this simple fact to him. If he is going to get into the public forum, if he is going to descend into the battle, then he can expect to have battle done with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order. A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: If I may respond.

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

I would like to bring to hon. members attention that my understanding of the point of order is a certain term and I think that the matter will become confused if I did not deal with that certain term. If hon. members have any further remarks to enlighten the Chair in regard to the certain term which is the point of order I certainly will be willing to hear them. But otherwise I would be willing to rule on that point.

The term used, I believe, was 'boil' and without going to Beauchesne I think it is clear that hon. members should not refer derisively to other members. In the heat of debate sometimes words are said which perhaps slip out rather than being pointedly meant. I am not in a position to judge whether this is the case here, but I would think that the Chair would have to rule that the word 'boil' is a derisive term and I would ask the hon. minister if he would withdraw that term.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. The hon. gentleman is not an hon. boil.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has withdrawn.

MR. MORGAN: Not honourable at all, he is just a boil.

MR. DINN: Do not go saying stuff like that.

Mr. Speaker, I was provoked and I apologize to the House. I do not normally get involved in that kind of thing. I was provoked by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) with respect to an hon. gentleman who was not in this House, who could defend himself in the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. SIMMONS: I think perhaps just a point of explanation.

I think the member misunderstood. I was not in any way attacking anybody. I was calling this bill what it is, the O'Dea vacation plan and, Mr. Speaker, my point of attack is against the document and I will have more to say about that later. But I just want the minister to understand that it is against the document. This has nothing to do with regional government, Mr. Speaker. This has to do with making some people comfortable. That is all this is and that I was saying and I would like the minister to understand it in that context, not Mr. O'Dea. If I got a set up as good as this I would grab it too, Mr. Speaker. It is not Mr. O'Dea who is to blame; the government is to blame for this vile scheme, Mr. Speaker, and that is the whole point of my remark. Just a point of explanation, no point of order. No point of order, Mr. Speaker, just a point of explanation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of explanation, if there is such a thing in the rule book, Mr. Speaker, as a point of explanation. We have just heard again the hon. gentleman repeat what he said a few minutes ago and he has now repeated it since we have heard the threat from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that if anyone dare defend that bill

MR. HICKMAN: outside of this House then he or she better be ready for attack within this House with all the immunities that it provides. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that attitude is unprecedented in parliament.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I do not recognize that a point of order is before the Chair. There have been certain interjections which have come up and I think that at this point in time there is not a matter that the Chair has to rule on.

It is now six o'clock and I will leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

VOL. 3

NO. 95

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Easy now! Easy! Down!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not mean to interrupt the minister but I tried to, as Your Honour will recall, I tried to raise it just before the House rose at 6:00 o'clock, Sir. It is not a very important matter but it does have something to do with the decorum of the House, especially coming as it did from a man for whom I have the utmost respect and esteem, the hon. House Leader on the Government side of the House.

During the course of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the fact that Mr. O'Dea, Chairman of Metro, had involved himself in a public way in the debate concerning regional government, that if a man did that he could not expect to have his name mentioned, and if he has joined the fight he has got to take it like anyone else. Upon hearing that the Government House Leader, Sir, rose and intimated, or I think directly stated that I was issuing threats or threatening Mr. O'Dea. Now, Sir, I have no intention of threatening anybody. I did mention in strong language that anybody who gets involved in public debate has to take the consequences, and has to expect his arguments to be attacked and so on, but I am not involved -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible). Captain Piercey.

MR. W. ROWE: - in threatening anyone, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was attributing to myself unworthy motives and unavowed motives when the hon. Government House Leader stood up today and said that I was threatening somebody. I think it lowers the dignity of members of the House and the House itself, Sir, when a member would accuse another member of issuing threats to somebody outside of the House. Sir, I had no intention of threatening anyone. My language did not import a threat

Mr. W. Rowe: to anyone, and I would ask the hon. House Leader if he has the courtesy, which I know he has, to withdraw that imputation to myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not intend to avow any ulterior motives to the hon. gentleman who is the Leader of the Opposition. What I said was this, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has stated very categorically, if any one person outside of this House -

MR. W. ROWE: Or inside, I said.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, or inside; well obviously inside- but outside of this House make statements on this bill supporting for or against this bill that he has to expect that he may be the subject matter of debate in this House. And I say that: there is no other conceivable way that one could interpret that with a threat if you open your mouth your name may come up in the House, and you may be the subject matter of criticism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Now if the hon. gentleman thinks that I am attributing motives to him, I certainly do not attribute any motive. But I cannot resist in saying that if I was listening outside or if I was in the gallery and I heard that statement, I would only come to the conclusion that I had better be quite, but that is a matter of interpretation.

MR. W. ROWE: What nonsense! Utter foolishness! Beneath your dignity.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is that the Minister of Justice in this Province, the Attorney General talking like that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The point of order raised concern the interpretation of remarks or the understanding of remarks. I think that this is clearly a difference between the two hon. members concerned. I

Mr. Speaker (Dr. Collins): do not think it is a matter that the Chair can usefully make any comment on.

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What we are discussing is regional government for the Northeast Avalon Urban Region, the purpose of which is to provide a framework for regional government in the Northeast Avalon region in order to provide certain municipal services of a regional nature throughout the region as delegated by the regional council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I started this debate I went back to 1972, I could have gone beyond that, and said that there had been studies done before. I could have gone back to 1957 when Canadian British was commissioned by the government of the day to study the region, to do a study into the St. John's Urban Region or The Northeast Avalon Urban Region and make a report. And, Mr. Speaker, that was done at that time. The study was commissioned, the study was completed and a report was made to government. Nothing was done.

Now the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we provided a forum, we appointed a Royal Commission, the Commission headed by Mr. Alex Henley, and on that Commission we had gentlemen of the stature of Professor Merv Andrews, we had Judge Morgan, and the Secretary of the Commission was Mr. Gerry Greene, and they did a study. Albeit years later they did a study to find out what were the needs of the region with respect to service, and what were the needs of the region with respect to regional and local government, and they made a report, and in their summation of the report

MR. DINN:

they said that there is a need for action, the time had long passed. What should have happened in 1957 was action should have been taken, but they summarized the report by saying that right now there was a need for action. And to quote that report - hon. members opposite, I am sure hon. members on this side, with respect all the hon. members in the St. John's urban region have gone through this report with a finetoothed comb and have come to the conclusion that regional government is the way that we have to go. But the Commission, having studied for 2½ years, said that there was a need for action.

Now we could have taken that report as was done in 1957 and we could have said, 'Put it in the basket.' And the Opposition, if we had done that in 1977, would say, 'Here we go, another report chucked into the garbage, chucked into file thirteen.' But not so with us, Mr. Speaker.

The Commission said in their final report that there was a need for action. To quote exactly what the commission said, "The Commission is concerned that the necessary steps be taken to reform the local government structure as soon as possible. It is to be hoped that the projected reforms could be implemented in time for them to become operative for the general municipal elections in November, 1977." Well, we introduced the bill in June and because of representations that were made and because of concerns of hon. members on this side of the House, we deferred the bill.

In chapter one of the report, the Commission made reference to comments in the Canadian British Engineering study of 1957 concerning the danger of allowing growth in the urban area in and around St. John's to continue to develop unplanned in the following twenty

MR. DINN: and having read that report from cover to cover at least five or six times, this government concluded that it could no longer go on and, indeed, it was a time for action. And, Mr. Speaker, the result of that was that the St. John's urban region water supply was started. The St. John's urban region water supply feeds right now,

MR. DINN: today, Conception Bay South. The provincial government has approved this year \$2 million for the people in Conception Bay South for infrastructure, for water and sewer and for a sewage treatment plant start which the people deserve.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) the money.

MR. DINN: And the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is shooting off and should wait until his turn comes, should be up lauding the government for hooking up this year, for allowing \$640,000 to be approved this year to hook up Windsor to another regional water system and that should have been done. And he does not appreciate it and he worms around -

MR. STRACHAN: Is that a threat?

MR. DINN: That is not a threat. No, I am proud of the fact that this government decided to do something for Windsor. It was the second municipality ever incorporated in Newfoundland, and nothing was done, absolutely nothing was done for Windsor. It was allowed to -

MR. FLIGHT: What has that got to do with the bill?

MR. DINN: It has to do with you interrupting when I am speaking on a very important piece of legislation. If you cannot stand the heat get out of the kitchen, as was stated by one of your colleagues today to one of the hon. members on this side of the House. The fact of the matter is that nothing was done and you will attest that nothing was done for Windsor and we have, since we have become the administration, approved a NIP area for Windsor which includes half of the town, and we also included this year in provincial funds, not federal, we did not wait for DREE, provincial funds, \$640,000, so that we could provide Windsor with an adequate water system so that they could be hooked up to the regional system.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Relax!

MR. DINN: I relax when I decide to relax. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will not get me to relax. He had his time, he had his day in hell and that is what you were

MR. DINN: in for eight years, you announced today when the people at Ming's Bight never got the few miles of road that they wanted, and you jumped on this Minister of Transportation and Communications and previous Ministers of Transportation and Communications. So if you cannot take the heat -

MR. FLIGHT: What is going on?

MR. DINN: What we need on the Opposition is the former leader back. He is not that great but he is a long ways ahead of what comes second or third.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Heave it out of you, Jerry; heave it out of you.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the Northeast Avalon urban region because that is what we are talking about right now, one of the most important pieces of legislation brought into the House with respect to that region, that was ever brought into the House -

MR. SIMMONS: Who pushed you (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - and the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is now shooting across again because he cannot keep quiet. He cannot take the truth. It is obvious he cannot take the truth. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is over there fairly low today because we had The Daily News come out and the third page of The Daily News frightened the hair off him. He will be whiter than he is now when he reads the further reports that are going to come out.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) Department of Public Works (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - if the hon. members opposite would stop interrupting me I would like to get back to the bill at hand, and the bill at hand is the Northeast Avalon Urban Region regional council and regional government that are going to do the things that should have been done in 1957 and the things things that will be done

MR. DINN: in 1978 and 1979 despite what the hon. members opposite say and despite what they do to try to prevent this thing from coming in because she is going to come whether they like it or not. She is going to come because everybody over here says it is going to come and it is going to come and they are going to love it. They are going to absolutely love that in the St. John's urban region. Absolutely love it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: The people of the Battery, through the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who is not in his seat right now, and is outside listening hopefully, the people of the Battery are going to get water and sewer despite what you did to the people of the Battery for twenty-five years. Despite it! And the people of the Southside are going to get water and sewer in the twentieth century despite what you did to the people of the Southside for not voting for you and they will never vote you. Never!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: They are going to get their water and sewer and you are not going to stop it. We did it through NIP and we did it through DREE and we did it through the provincial government. And not only that, we are going to do more. And the people of Pleasantville are going to profit a little bit from this too because

MR. DINN: years ago when I was going to school I used to go down to Quidi Vidi Lake and swim in it. But after I finished swimming in Quidi Vidi Lake in 1949 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - on comes the boys who did nothing only pollute, all you did for twenty-five years was pollute the lake. and right now you cannot swim in Quidi Vidi Lake - you were in France, I am sorry, monsieur, pardonnez-moi. The fact of the matter is that in two years or in two and one half years I will swim in Quidi Vidi Lake whether you like it or not. You will not swim in Quidi Vidi Lake because you had to have somebody hold you up when you were going to school, but I jumped in the middle and I swam across and I made it. They will swim in Quidi Vidi Lake in a couple of years. The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), who is standing on both sides of the issue right now and is waiting, and we are all waiting for the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) to make his feelings known -

MR. NOLAN: Try ballet (inaudible)

MR. DINN: - who did nothing for Conception Bay South, the sewer is running into the ditches out there, and we are going to do it not because it is Liberal or not because it is PC but because the people need it and the people should have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: To my hon. colleagues on this side, save it to the end. Now, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to wait until the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) says a few words too, because he is not sure whether he is for or against, He is in the Daily News this morning. He does not know if he is for or against, he is going to take a little time and he is going to consider and he is going to read articles one and two and three up to 149 and he is going to say whether he likes it or not. But whether he likes it or not St. John's is going to get what they deserve, what they have deserved since 1949 and the hon. member for

MR. DINN: St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) is not going to prevent it whether he likes it or not, whether he likes it or not he is not going to prevent it. In 1976 we ran short of water because in 1957 the hon. members opposite did nothing about it and in 1957 they should have done something about it, and Mr. Henley said they should have done something about it, and all the people of St. John's said they should have done something about it. But they did not do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, what we are speaking about tonight is the principle, what we are speaking about is not only the principle of regional government in St. John's, we are talking about the principle of what has happened here since 1949 and what should have happened since 1949 but did not happen because we had the wee Willies and the wee Freddie's and the wee everybodies who did nothing for the St. John's area because they voted Tory. That was why they did nothing. I listened during the Municipal Affairs and Housing estimates in the House of Assembly and I listened to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) stand up in this House and talk about political pork barreling. That has never happened and I laid it on the table of this House, what was done water and sewer wise and what was done with water and sewer subsidies and what was done with respect to special grants and I never heard anything come back from the hon. members opposite then.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, we approved some \$22 million for water and sewer for the people of this Province. I did not hear too many members opposite squawk when I gave them a copy of the memo that I sent to councils. The hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) who got Bay de Verde, after years when they got nothing, who got Bay de Verde approved water and sewer wise, who got Old Perlican approved water and sewer wise, I do not hear him standing up in the House of Assembly right now and talking about political port barreling.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. minister that I did not have to announce the water and sewerage projects

MR. F. ROWE: for Day de Verde and Old Perlican because the Executive Assistant for the Minister of Tourism, Bren Howard, who has been campaigning for me since the last election announced it for me before I had a chance to announce it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this, probably somebody would like to get in and find out where the Cabinet secrets are being leaked in this particular administration.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Cabinet secrets the hon. member for LaPoile displayed where Cabinet secrets are leaked, he laid one on the table of the House. I do not know where Cabinet secrets are leaked, but we do not care because we have nothing to hide. There is nothing to hide here.

MR. DINN: We laid on the table of the House - we told you - we laid on the table of the House where the dollars went for water and sewer for the past seven years. We laid on the table of the House where the special grants went and I did not hear it about the political pork barrelling then from any hon. member. And the hon. member for Bay de Verde should thank his lucky stars that Bay de Verde eventually, after twenty-five years of nothing, got water and sewer, and he should be lauding the government.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Just for the record, I would say that there is no point of order that the Chair has to consider. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. HOUSE: Do not lose your voice, now.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of voice left and the hon. Minister of Education is concerned about my voice but I have a lot of voice.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of things come up in the past couple of weeks about regional government. There have been fear tactics and scare tactics and smear tactics used with respect to regional government in this region.

MR. W. ROWE: Never a dictatorship before.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, dictatorship! We heard about the meeting down in front of the London, New York and Paris. He talks about dictatorship. We heard about the hon. the former Premier down in front of the London, New York and Paris talking to himself and he was holding an outdoor Cabinet meeting. He talks about dictatorship

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to if I could go through some of the objections that we have heard, not from, not generally from the elected councillors who started off and got the information on this bill. We did not even hear from

MR. DINN: hon. members opposite. And, Mr. Speaker, we heard from some little councillors, The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) would like for me to flip on this, well the fact of the matter is the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir should be informed right now that the people of St. John's, and the people in the region, are going to elect thirteen instead of eleven next year and just wait for it. Because you thought you had your teeth into something. You know, you thought you had your teeth into something but you had your teeth into - It was a paper elephant, a paper tiger.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through some of the objections if I can -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) Public Works Department.

MR. DINN: - speak, if I am allowed to speak in the people's House without being interrupted by hon. members opposite, I will go through some of the queries that have been made and some of the answers to questions for which notice was not given, but I mean we will go through some of them because I think that it is important. I think that the people of the Northeast Avalon urban region need to be informed about certain things with respect to this piece of legislation.

One of the gentlemen complained bitterly that the boundaries are defined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, He said, "Oh my God, the Government of the Province should not define boundaries of municipalities." That was a complaint. So he said, "Now I am going to have to investigate this." I looked at the Local Government Act. I looked at how the municipal boundaries are defined. I looked at the Community Councils Act and found out how that was supposed to be defined and I looked at the City of St. John's, one of the most autonomous councils, if not the most, it is one of the most autonomous councils in this Ireland, and I said, How are the boundaries of St. John's defined? The boundaries of

MR. DINN: the City of St. John's are defined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So we made a great big barge in, we took over and we said the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is going to define the boundaries of the region, Is that not a terrible disgrace? I think that is shocking. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the next thing is the alleged encroachment on powers of municipalities in the region. Well now, we went through that. I went through that for a half an hour on open line and two hours this morning on open line.

A certain hon. gentleman, and I will not mention names because I do not like to attack people who cannot defend themselves in the House, I will do that in public, I will not take a little snide remark at him in the House of Assembly, I will do that on the open air waves because I can take it there as well as in here and give it there as well as in here. But some hon. member mentioned about the encroachment on the powers of a municipality last week. We had about a half an hour to three-quarters of an hour last week but this morning I went on for two hours and there was no mention about the encroachment on the powers of a municipality

Mr. Dinn: because it is just not there. Because the only encroachment is if the Lieutenant-Governor in Council says that the Bay Bulls Big Pond is a regional system, that if they want to cure, if they want to fix, if they want to maintain that regional system, they may have to fix it within the boundaries of Mount Pearl. Mount Pearl does not care. They may have to fix that within the boundaries of St. John's. St. John's is not going to complain. They need somebody to fix it, and they want somebody to fix it, and they need the water. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no encroachment on the powers of a municipality except where a regional function is designated regional by the government of the Province; when it is designated regional, for example, the regional water system-and the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) says, "Ah, ha!" If the regional water system -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: If the regional water system breaks between New Town and Conception Bay South he will soon say, "Ah, ha!" because he will want the regional council to fix it. That is what he will say, "Ah, ha!" about then. And the regional council should fix it, they should be responsible, and it should be, Mr. Speaker, let us face it, it should be a regional water system.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has talked himself out.

MR. DINN: I am only getting warmed up. That is only point one. There is another little snide remark over there about something else, but I will not answer it right now, but I will not listen to too many more, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Appointment of a third of the membership of the regional council including the Chairman: And, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of red herrings dragged across, there has been more red herrings dragged across that! I would venture to say that the Newfoundland fishery will be in good shape if they just listened to the number of red herrings that was dragged across on the two-thirds elected and the one-third appointed issue.

Mr. Dinn: The hon. members opposite were party to and made Metro Board, all of whom were appointed, and they have operated for some fifteen years. Right now we hope to change that. We believe in elected representation. We believe so strongly in elected representation that we were almost, we were almost ready to say elect them all. The hon. gentleman in the Chair, and the hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) and the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), and I talked about this since last June, and we decided that since we have made approximately \$50 million of public money available to a regional system - not only water, but regional sewer, and I will get into that a little later also; not only water, but regional sewer - since we made that available, and plans are in place and design has been done for approximately another \$50 million, which might shock a few hon. members opposite, but plans are in place for another \$50 million to do the job that is necessary for our Capital City, that we feel that we should have some input to that regional council.

Now Mr. Henley in his report, if any hon. member opposite cared to take the time to read it, Mr. Henley said it should be five members appointed, four and the Chairman appointed all of the time, for no end. They should always be appointed because there should be, there is a need for input to that regional council. But I say, no. I say they should be all elected eventually. But for the first election -

DR. KITCHEN: It is not in the Bill.

MR. DINN: That it right, it is not in the Bill.

DR. KITCHEN: Why is it not in?

MR. DINN: And The Local Government Act was put in in 1972, was amended in 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, and that was put in, and there have been a lot of changes made. But right now, right now we are going to have a look at how it operates, to see how it operates, to learn from experience, to listen to the people, and then maybe we will make the decision that they should all be elected. But let us give it an opportunity to work first. Let us give it an opportunity to work. We think that it will work. We think that by appointing we will have some input, and hopefully the \$50 million that is planned will be spent

Mr. Dinn: in the way that the past \$50 million was spent,

Mr. Speaker, which was very, very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: 'Bubble eyes' you called me. Look at the bubble eyes there.

You are burned out.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DINN: what we have planned is not only a regional water system, I spent some time on that as a regional facility. But for example the Waterford Valley trunk sewer, it was noted in the report, was overloaded and that something needed to be done because there were developments out in the Mount Pearl area, there was the New Town development, there was one I opened about a month ago, Mr. Speaker, capital estates. There were other housing developments, Kilbride, several housing developments in Kilbride and they needed - there was a demand, there was an over - the present sewer system was over filled, there was a need for something to be done. So they looked at that. They did a feasibility study and they did a design, when that design was completed the requirement was for \$7 million to do a Waterford Valley trunk sewer and a Mount Pearl by-pass sewer and that is presently under construction and that will be completed whether the hon. members opposite like it or not, that is going to be done and the people of St. John's, and the people of Mount Pearl, and the people of New Town and the people of Paradise, and all those people are going to praise the people who had the guts and the initiative to take a report and do something about it rather than what happened in 1957 when the report was presented and nothing was done. It was put in the old file thirteen.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to go for another twenty years in this region. We are not going to go for another twenty years. If you want to talk about that, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is pointing something else to me, if you want to talk about that there is another time and place, but if you want to talk about it now I can talk about it. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans pointed to a little something there that he is not - he cannot debate with me. I challenge you to get up and debate with me in Windsor that report, or in Grand Falls or anywhere else that report. Because I am willing to debate that anywhere because I am proud of what this government did.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: In Buchans? In my department in Buchans? My department in Buchans? The people never had a house?

MR. FLIGHT: You had nothing to do with it.

MR. DINN: The people never had a house in Buchans. You are absolutely 100 per cent incorrect.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: You are misinforming the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: This is really ridiculous.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, what we have over here

is the normal circus. I do not mind speaking through you to the people of this Province because I think they want to be informed.

But what we have over here is what we have had over here for many

years and the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) now

is worming his way out through the door. But what we have over

here on the opposite side of the House is something that we have

had here since we moved into this House, since we got a new Leader

of the Opposition who cannot lead, who cannot control his people,

who cannot lead like even -

MR. W. ROWE: Charge.

MR. DINN: - the low leader that they had before.

He was not that great but at least he was number one, he was not number three.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: He was not number three on the totem pole.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, for the last hour or more

the hon. minister has been speaking to second reading to the principle of second reading of this Bill. I think he has broken every rule in the

MR. CANNING: book

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: For the last half hour he is addressing this side of the House saying, "You did this and you did this," when he was up in Buchans. And this act is an act to establish a Northeast Avalon urban region. He is doing anything but speaking on the principle of the bill. He has been out of order continuously. He caused an uproar in the House by pointing his finger and saying, "You on the other side of the House," and Mr. Speaker, you know yourself that he is supposed to address the members on this side of the House as the hon. member for somewhere. So he is continuously breaking the rules of the House. He has it in an uproar and I would like to try to bring some order to this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: If I had broken any rules of the House I have enough respect for the Chair to know that the Chair would have interrupted me at any point that I would have broken the rules.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it is the hon. member opposite who is interrupting and the hon. members in front of him, his Leader who is interrupting, and the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who is interrupting, cannot take the truth. But they are going to get it anyway.

MR. CANNING: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order to the original -

MR. CANNING: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, in this House I have the protection of the Chair and I am quite at liberty to rise at any time to rise and call order. I do not have to wait for the Speaker to call order. When I see order is not carried out, and the House is in the state that it has been in for the last hour I think it is my duty to get up.

MR. W. ROWE:

He does not know.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): Order, please! The two points

in two have been raised in the point of order, one is whether

the tenor of events have created disorder in the House and

secondly whether

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) the hon. minister's remarks and possibly other remarks have been relevant to the principle of the bill.

On the first point, as hon. members know, according to strict interpretation of the rule, all interjections are out of order, only one member may address the House, but our precedents tell us that as long as the Chair does not feel that the House is in grave danger of disorder and as long as an hon. member while speaking does not insist on his rights, then the discretion is left to the Chair as to whether or not to intervene. Up to this point I have not felt that the hon. minister who is speaking felt that he needed the protection of the Chair specifically nor did I feel that the House was getting to such a state as to bring it into grave danger.

On the point of relevance - this is perhaps the more difficult point - I think that in any discussion on the principle of a bill there are times when speakers wander a little, but again this is up to the discretion of the Chair according to the way we have operated, and if the wandering is not too far so as not to interfere too frequently, the Chair will merely keep a watching brief on it. Again, I think that up to this point in time there have not been serious wanderings from the principle of the bill.

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: In the interest of allowing hon. members opposite to get the full impact of what I am attempting to say, I will not incite the hon. member to get up on points of order if he can control the hon. members opposite from interrupting.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members on this side of the House are very quiet. They are listening

MR. DINN: to the debate in the common room. Hon. members opposite are the guys who seem to be a little bit up-tight today. For some reason they are up-tight, I do not know what it is. It is not matabail because we have not started to spray yet.

Mr. Speaker, let us go back over some of the things that Mr. Henley and his Commission got into when they talked about discussing local government in the region. What did the St. John's City Council have to say? I mean, everybody should be interested in what they presented as a brief and what they would have to say. "The St. John's City Council favoured adoption of Scheme A as the form of regional government," so obviously we are in favour of regional government. "It suggested, however, that the expanded city should include Mount Pearl, but only if the residents of Mount Pearl were in agreement with amalgamation. Again, the separation of the city and county problems appeared to be of major concern. The council felt that much could be accomplished through the liaison committee but boards with authority to administer the water and sewer and garbage disposal in the region would be necessary."

Well, we looked at the possibility of setting up a corporation to look after the water and sewer systems in the St. John's urban region and we got into even going so far as to say, 'Let us see what expertise we need and let us see what people we need to operate and maintain this system.' And we put advertisements in the paper for a manager for the corporation to look after the regional water system. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had several applicants. The applicant who was most favoured by people was a gentleman from Halifax who was the assistant manager of the regional water system in Halifax.

MR. DINN:

Well, now, being a pretty fair Newfoundlander, I said to myself, 'Why do we need somebody from Nova Scotia to come over here and manage a water system?' I did not think that was necessary. And as a matter of fact, the price that he wanted to be paid was \$45,000. I did not think that was necessary. I thought, we had the expertise here in Newfoundland to do exactly what that manager would have to do. And indeed, we have a person who has managed Metro for some fifteen years - I do not think for all of the fifteen, but he has managed for the past few years, and

Mr. Dinn: last year came out of Metro with the surplus as I indicated to hon. gentlemen opposite today, some \$240,000 surplus he managed what he had to manage, he picks up now, if you will, he provides garbage collection for Kilbride, he takes that garbage from there to Robin Hood Bay. He does all of this within the designated service areas in the region that are taxed. He provides lighting and water and sewer, and he does all of this and comes out at the end of the year with the surplus.

MR. DOODY: What is the comparative cost of garbage collections?

MR. DINN: The comparative cost - the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications my good colleague asked me what are the comparative costs that the Metro Board has with respect to garbage collection in Metro, in the designated service areas that they serve, with respect to the garbage costs in the City of St. John's? That should be a good comparison, and maybe that is the reason why people are not so enthusiastic about going in the city. But the comparison goes something like this, and I may be faulted for going a penny or two either way, but the fact of the matter is that the per capita cost for garbage collection I am happy to say was about \$6.50 last year per capita. In the City of St. John's it was \$16.50 to collect garbage. Now we have to consider that the City has to collect more garbage but we are talking about a per capita thing. They have a condensed area. Metro Board has to collect from East Meadows to the end of Kilbride. So we think they did an excellent job. We do not like to hear hon. members opposite say that regional government which is a progression, a futuristic look at what the region needs, we do not like to hear hon. members opposite say, that this is a scheme.

What we think we have here is a progression, a futuristic approach to government in the region. And we will have designated areas as these areas are serviced and they will be taxed and they will pay for their services.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a quorum call.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: And the hon. member wants to delay the House as he did this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young)

I will ask the Assistant Law Clerk to count

the House.

Order, please! We have a quorum.

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have gone through

some of the objections that have been expressed by certain people. Not all of the people that have expressed opinions on the bill have been elected but we still have to operate and we still have to answer any criticisms with respect to Bill 50. One of the other criticisms that was expressed was the power of the minister to defer elections of regional council. Now, Mr. Speaker, as most hon. gentleman in this House of Assembly know the minister has the power to defer elections in any municipality in Newfoundland. Last year, Mr. Speaker, you will recall and hon. members will recall that based on the fact that there was some possibility that New Town may want to join the town of Mount Pearl, we deferred the election from November until April. That was power taken by the minister to determine the wishes of the people. Several years back, Mr. Speaker, there was another election, there was a federal election held at about the same time as the local government council elections in Newfoundland, so at that point in time the government of the day deferred the elections in all municipalities until the federal election was over so that we would not have confusion and that we would have reasonable and responsible elections. So, Mr. Speaker, that provision is in every piece of legislation with respect to local government in Newfoundland today. The minister exercised his authority last year to defer the election in Mount Pearl for the purpose of attempting to determine what the wishes of the people of New Town were. We heard by plebiscite what the people preferred and we decided on that and we said that is fine now we will have the election in the town of Mount Pearl. We had the election and we got an excellent council I must say because I spoke to them some three or four times now since they got elected. We had an excellent council elected, so the fears that have been expressed by people with respect to deferring elections are fears that are unfounded, have no foundation. In fact, the piece of legislation with respect to town councils and local governments in Newfoundland has that provision in

MR. DINN: there and it is exactly the same provision that was put into the regional government bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, if Regional Government is passed by this House, if the House decides that this is a good thing and I think the House will decide that it is a good thing, then six months from the time that that act is proclaimed we will have an election for regional council for two thirds of the councils to be elected, no more. We have had fifteen years of a totally appointed board, we think now that we should go to two thirds elected and we think the time has come, the time is now and it should happen as soon as we can possibly do it.

There is another concern concerning the appointment of councillors by the minister where an insufficient number of candidates are nominated or elected. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could talk about that for a long time. Hon. members opposite, the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) had a time when his council resigned and needed somebody to be appointed in his community to look after local government in his community and the minister at that time appointed four people until such time as we could have an election and he did not complain about that. Hon. members on that side of the House and on this side should realize that if that situation happens, that a council and a town is left derelict, that a water system can go for nought, millions of dollars could be spent to put in a water system and that water system could flounder, could fall apart if we do not have somebody in place to operate local governments and to operate and maintain the systems that are put into those towns.

MR. DINN:

Another objection with respect to clause 21. It is suggested that the appointed members of the regional council could dominate council meetings where only a bare quorum is in attendance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I say to that is this, if people run for a position on the regional council they should have enough interest to attend those meetings and to make sure that they represent the people that they were elected to represent. That is what I attempt to do in this House of Assembly and I can say attendance-wise I have been here as long, if not longer, than anybody in here with respect to attendance and I would expect a person who runs for the regional council to attend all meetings unless there is some very serious extenuating circumstances. They should attend and, I submit, will attend those meetings and, therefore, there will be two-thirds elected people overrule if they so decide what the non-elected members wish to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fear that should not be there. We started out with a metro board that had all appointed members and we are going to a position where we have two-thirds elected and we have five appointed to look after the public dollars, to allow the provincial government to have some input in the control of the public dollars that basically the government of this Province is responsible for, the public purse. So that protection what we are asking for, is to have some input to the non-elected representatives of the regional council.

The power of a regional council to call off public meeting and to convert to privilege meeting, that provision is in the Local Government Act, is in the City of St. John's Act, is in the City of Corner Brook Act, it is in the Community Councils Act to hold meetings, private, privileged,

MR. DINN: of public and Mr. Speaker, there are times when that is necessary, apparently, and it is done even though we hear councillors sometimes campaign on the fact that they should not have privileged meetings. When the campaign is over the privileged meetings go on because if you have a developer who, for example, wants to develop in your community and does not want to give all the information and make it public because of competition from other sides you have to have privileged meetings to discuss these kinds of items. And so, Mr. Speaker, the provision is put in there for the regional council to have the same kind of provision put in their act.

Acquisition of municipal facilities required for the operation of regional services without compensation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I give as an example the City of St. John's: If you read sections thirty through thirty-four, that is what we are talking about there, thirty-two, thirty-three, thirty and thirty-four cover basically how assets are acquired. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the items that hon. members on this side of the House discussed for some time and the decision was not made on that item until very late in the day, because we had a full round of debate, a full round of discussion to determine what we were talking about when we talked about that concept and what we are talking about basically is this; for example, Robin Hood Bay is a regional facility. It is operated right now by the City of St. John's, given to it by the former Premier to the former Mayor of the City, Mr. Mews, and at that time land fill was the thing, land fill, the only place in the region was the Robin Hood Bay area where they had sufficient fill for St. John's City but that eventually ended up to be a regional land fill site for solid waste disposal.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are now entering into a new era. We are going from land fill - the hon. the Minister of the Environment has talked to regions, not designated regions but regions with respect to the provisioning of incinerators, instead of the land fill site, the modern thing to do is to go to incinerators for the

Mr. Dinn: regional solid waste disposal. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not think that the City of St. John's should have to operate a regional facility. Now we do not think that. We do not think that they should have to. We think that is regional. Since the region is using it, we think that it is regional and should be a regional responsibility. We intend to do something about that. We intend to ask the regional council when it is elected to have a chat with the City and see if they can reach an agreement that we have to get away from land fill for Robin Hood Bay and we have to go towards incineration.

The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) may not have travelled down in my district very much, but I am down there quite a bit and I can tell you that Pleasantville, and I can tell you that Logy Bay, Middle Cove, Outer Cove that we have complaints from people down there with respect to rodents and rats -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they Liberals or P.C.s?

MR. DINN: I am not going to get into that - coming off the dump because there is, I have found out from talking to the people who work down at Robin Hood Bay, that there is a procedure that is followed that I believe it is Tuesdays and Thursdays, what they do is, they cover in all of the garbage, everything goes to work and they cover all of it in, it is because of the schedule they have for picking up the garbage, they bring it down to Robin Hood Bay, and two days of the week it is an all-out effort to cover all of it in. When it is all covered in the rodents have nothing to eat and they start going down through the Valley, and I can take the hon. the Leader of the Opposition out at the end of White Hill Road on Wednesday and he will see almost a parade of these rodents going down through the Valley towards my people. And I think that is a disgrace in this day and age. And I think we should go towards incineration, and I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition when he see what should be done and what is done and will be done -

MR. W. ROWE: I watched the last Tory Convention -

MR. DINN: Yes, and what will be done - whatever he says about Tory Conventions - the hon. member behind me just said, Were the rats Liberal or P.C.? I would not even get into that kind of a discussion with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I would think he would be trying to talk to his people and raise the level of debate instead of going down with the two other hon. members on either side to lower the level of debate in this House of Assembly, but he continually, he just cannot seem to get away from.

The former Leader, by the way, just to give the hon. the Leader of the Opposition a little bit of advice put the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) down in that seat down there and he would control this House a little better than he is right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The fact of the matter is, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DINN: - does not have any control over several hon. members over there and until he does he will be recognized for what he is recognized for today, and I need not comment any further on that, Mr. Speaker:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, it has a lot to do with it because if the hon. member had read Sections 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: -it deals with how we can cure a problem. If the city of St. John's cannot cure a problem how the regional council can, by getting all of the people in the region to contribute towards the operation and maintenance of a regional system, and that is how it relates to Robin Hood Bay, and that is how it relates to rats, although I could relate other things to rats but I will not get into it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on. Do.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, - no, I am tempted but I will not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The power of the regional council to lever user charges on municipalities for regional services. And we heard a lot about that, Mr. Speaker, in the press and otherwise with respect to a double taxation. What we are talking about here is the fact that in 1976 the City of St. John's was in an emergency state and they had no water, you could not water your lawns in the City of St. John's, in some cases, the water pressure was so low there was nothing came out of the taps. And, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 that situation was amplified. The city of St. John's got pumps together and they pumped from all the little ponds around Windsor Lake to try to get enough water so that the Lake would not go down so far as to shut the water off almost entirely. And there was a Committee set up, made up of Councillors of the City and a Technical Advisory Committee to advise on what the status of Windsor Lake was and everybody in the City were made well aware of the fact that this emergency existed and something had to be done. We had something coming, the plan started a little bit late but we had something coming and the regional water system is there now and that will not happen for another fifty years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:
fifty years.

That will not happen for another

Now, Mr. Speaker, did we say to the people of the region, pay for that water system? Take that capital debt and have the people of the region pay for that over the years? No. We did not say that, we felt we owed it to the Capital City of the Province of Newfoundland. We recognized our responsibility and we did it and we say to the people in the region, "Would you mind paying for the operation and maintenance of that system?" And the people in the city and the people in Mount Pearl and the people who know what they are getting will say, "We do not mind paying twenty-five cents per thousand." The City of St. John's is charging sixty cents per thousand to Wedgewood Park and I do not hear too many hon. members complain about that. But they are doing it. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we have -

AN HON. MEMBER:
will not give them a bill.

That is because the -

MR. DINN:
we have to proceed and progress and we are not going to be held back in the City of St. John's and the St. John's urban region. And I just heard another little grunt from the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) but he is not going to stop us from doing it in Windsor either. We are going to do it in Windsor whether he likes it or not, Mr. Speaker. \$640,000, they will be connected to a regional system.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Regional system. Regional system. Regional.

Let us address ourselves to that problem. The hon. member now is comparing \$640,000 this year, plus the NIP and plus the RAP to \$30 million in St. John's, a fantastic comparison. The fact of the matter is what we are talking about here, is we are talking about a quarter of the population of this Province and what we spent in

MR. DINN: all the municipalities in this Province over the past seven years amounts to \$165 million and that does not count this year, I have not added the \$22 million onto that, but \$165 million was the bill for the other areas in this Province and if you want to divide thirty into that you will come up with approximately one quarter which is what St. John's deserved and which is what they did not get in '57 and which is what they got because we got in. We started the plan, and we did what should have been done for the Capital City of this Province and we apologize to no one for it, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to do it.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: I will never have to go to Windsor and apologize, I say to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), I will never have to go. He may have to apologize for his former colleagues, for twenty-five years of nothing, but I will never. I will walk proudly in Windsor. I will walk into Windsor any day of this week, any day of this month and any day of the next ten years because they know for twenty-five years nothing was done. They know for twenty-five years nothing was done and this year they are going to be connected to that regional system and you will not hear the Mayor of Windsor complaining next year about lead poisoning because he knows that there is somebody - there was nobody there for twenty-five years but he knows now that there is somebody who is concerned about doing something for his town, Mr. Speaker, and I will probably be invited to Windsor Day again this year. I was invited last year and the hon. member had better watch it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I may provide more services to

MR. DINN: Windsor and he will be on more dangerous ground.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not apologize for the City of St. John's. I do not apologize for what this government did for the City and I do not apologize for what this government did for Windsor, and I do not apologize for Bay de Verde or Old Perlican or any of the others, and I do not apologize for Little Bay, and I do not apologize for Rushoon, and I do not apologize for Musgrave Town, and I do not apologize for Glovertown.

MR. CALLAN: What about Piccadilly?

MR. DINN: Piccadilly will be looked after also. It was not looked after for a long time but it will get it too, because there will be a plan unfolded fairly soon that will surprise, it will take the hair out of your head boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to get to regional government. I am attempting to talk about the principle of bill 50. I am being constantly interrupted by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder), but that is all right. I can answer their questions because I can stand proud of what I have done in a year and a half, what the hon. former minister did, what the Minister of Transportation is attempting to do and so on. Done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dinn.

MR. DINN: Done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dinn.

MR. DINN: Dinn done.

AN HON. MEMBER: And done, Dinn and done.

MR. DINN: That is right, and will continue to do.

Mr. Dinn: We will not take the report like in 1957 and shove it into file 13. File 13, by the way, is an old airforce term; it means you put it in the basket and chuck it out with all the rest of the garbage. What should have happened for twenty-five years is hon. members who associate themselves with that twenty-five years should jump into the basket themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: And we will provide the incinerator in Robin Hood Bay to look after the rest of the refuge.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) would love for it to be time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The hon. member better look at the clock there is lots of time. I have got lots of time. Look at the Rule Book and you will see how much time I got. And I am going to talk about St. John's because I was elected for St. John's and I will talk about St. John's until hell freezes over -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: -until you go blue in the face. The hon. member for Carbonear goes blue in the face. But we will do other things too. Hospitals for Carbonear we will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet begun. The power of the regional council in unincorporated areas. Mr. Speaker, in the Local Government Act it says, that you can levy a tax on the people in that municipality. If you do levy that tax you have to levy that tax uniformly whether the people in that municipality get service or not. Not so in the Regional Government Bill. If you levy a tax you have the option of levying a tax in a designated service area. What we are trying to say there, what we are attempting to do, and attempting to say is, that if East Meadows got water and sewer, if they got garbage collection, and street lighting, they should pay a tax, they should pay for the service they get, but if the people in Foxtrap do not want water and sewer and do not get it, do not want

Mr. Dinn: street lighting and do not get it, do not want garbage collection and do not get it they should not have to pay. So in The Regional Government Bill you will find that in designated service areas you can charge a tax, in the other areas you do not. And the Metro Board for the past fifteen years have operated on exactly that principle, the only difference is, that in this Regional Government Bill that provision was made for them so that they could make those decisions, they could vary the taxation, and we feel that they should do it that way.

For example, in the Henley Report it refers to, 'in an urban area, and some areas are urban areas, East Meadows is an urban area, you should pay an urban kind of tax. But if you are living in Kilbride and you got a huge farm and you are a farmer you should not have to pay tax on all of that land, you should have -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) never got burnt enough yet today, he wants to get burnt a little bit more.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: He wants to talk about some other things. He wants to have a little bit of debate with me. Well get up on your feet, when your time comes get up on your feet and we will have a chat about it. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans never saw the day that he will be able to do it.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there are urban areas but there are also areas where we have huge farms. Now they should not be -

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Labrador there - Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), the hon. member for Eagle River he should go to Labrador and talk to his councils and they would not be calling for his

Mr. Dinn: resignation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Should go and talk to his people like I did last year and visited most of the communities along the coast, I visited Cartwright, and I saw the deplorable condition of the streets, but the hon. member never ever came down to my office and said, Look what we got in Cartwright. We need some assistance in Cartwright. The hon. member never ever mentioned the needs of his constituents especially with respect to Cartwright. But I visited there and I saw the bus go to its axles in mud and I did something about it.

MR. STRACHAN: Is that right?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: That is right. The hon. member never ever came down to my office. I challenge the hon. member -

MR. STRACHAN: Did they get more money from you?

MR. DINN: I challenge you - lies - talk to the people of Cartwright.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. DINN: I challenge the hon. member to say that he came down and even -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please!

I think the hon. member for Eagle River would like to retract the word used which is unparliamentary in our House.

MR. STRACHAN: I believe it to be true, Mr. Speaker, but I will withdraw it.

MR. DINN: What we normally consider it to be amongst

MR. DINN: hon. gentleman to
withdraw, but I will accept it from the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member
never mentioned Cartwright to me, ever. He never sent
a letter on their behalf.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible) and give them
nothing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we went down
there last year and we visited all those communities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: If the hon. member did not
interrupt, you see, he would not get burned. But if
the hon. member continues to interrupt he is going to
get a little bit burnt. If the hon. member wants to
parlez with me he is going to get a little bit burnt.
Whether he likes it or not I have been in Labrador and
I have been in most of the communities on the coast of
Labrador and the biggest complaint is that the people
are saying, "Where is our member?" That is what they are
saying. And those councils are calling for the hon.
member's resignation. And if the hon. member wants to
continue I will continue. But if the hon. member will
follow the rules of the House - when a member gets up to
speak and calls for silence the hon. member should
observe the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please! Order, please!
I think that the interjections
now are tending to give rise to some disorder which may get
out of hand. I call upon the hon. minister to continue
his remarks.

MR. DINN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker,
for your protection from hon. members opposite.

My colleagues on this side of
the House, have discussed this piece of legislation, Mr.
Speaker, for some twelve months and believe in that piece

MR. DINN: of legislation and support me to the teeth, 100 per cent support me on every section of this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. members cannot control themselves so I do not expect the hon. House to try to control them. They cannot control themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will not get on to the alleged encroachment on private rights. Now we saw a gentleman on T.V., and again, I do not attack people outside this House, but we saw a gentleman on T.V. who allegedly represents people. He has never been elected but he allegedly represents people and he said about the encroachment - the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) wants me to name names but I will not do it, I will hold myself back and I cannot do it - and alleged encroachment on private rights. The provisions in the Regional Government Bill with respect to entering private property are the same provisions that are contained in the Local Government Act, the exact same. Sections 41 and 42 can be found in the Local Government Act and they are needed. They are needed. These provisions are needed, for example, with respect to shut-off valves for water and so on. These are needed. They are provided in the Local Government Act and they are provided in this piece of legislation under sections 41 and 42.

That does not have to be defended. It should not have to be defended. It is in every piece of legislation in this Province with respect to local government and it is in this piece of legislation, you will find it in sections 41 and 42. And if hon. members want to check the Local Government Act, check the City of St. John's Act, check the Community Councils Act, the same provisions are in there because they are absolutely necessary in order for a regional council, a town council,

MR. DINN: a local improvement district or a community council to carry out their functions as a council.

DR. KITCHEN: All right for the next one.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker -

DR. KITCHEN: It is dictatorship! Too much power.

MR. DINN: There is the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen). See, Mr. Speaker, I am normally a very kind person and I do not normally interject when people are up speaking. I do not normally interject but the hon. members, here they are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Hear it? Listen to it. Keep doing it. Keep doing it. They cannot be controlled by the House. They will be controlled in about a year or so from now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ha, ha! Ha, ha!

MR. DINN: They will be controlled. There is no question about that. We do not have to worry about the time has come and the time is now routine because the people of this Province -

MR. NEARY: What date is it?

MR. DINN: Do not interrupt, please! Take your Standing Orders and see what they say about gentlemanly conduct in the House. It is how hon. members are normally so you cannot enforce gentlemanly conduct. You cannot make laws against it but it is in the Standing Orders, it is in Beauchesne, it is in May, it tells you how to operate within the House and how you are supposed to act.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Keep interrupting. Look!
Do you want to say something? Do you want leave to say something? Is there something you want

MR. DINN: to say? I will yield to the hon. member.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps talking about the big event next year and I was wondering what it has to do with the bill. I am a kind of curious as to what exactly he is talking about. If it is the general election probably he could be a little more specific and give us a hint as to the date and this sort of thing so that we could all get geared up. But it is the hon. minister,

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, who keeps bringing up what is going to happen next year, and I was wondering what relevancy it has for this particular bill and the only reason I have not gotten up on a point of order is because he is arousing my curiosity. I thought he was going to inform the House as to exactly what is going to happen next year.

MR. DINN: The hon. member would not have to worry about what is going to happen next year -

MR. F. ROWE: I am not worried, I am curious.

MR. DINN: - if he was not interrupting all the time, if he would only sit in his seat and listen for a little while as I have listened to him on many, many occasions, presenting his petitions and asking his questions. I never ever interrupted the hon. member. I never ever interrupted him, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot seem to control himself tonight. There is some kind of pangs of conscience or something that his predecessors did nothing in 1957. It bothers him. It bothers him, eating away at him that they did nothing in 1957 when the responsibility was put forth to the previous administration, nothing was done. He feels pangs of conscience because he is associated with that kind of a crew.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will get on with some of the other objections that have been expressed by people, concerned people too by the way, Mr. Speaker. Possible abuse of power, Mr. Speaker, this showed up in one of the publications, one of the ones that I respect, one of the news media. It showed up, "Possible abuse of power of the regional council with ministerial approval, to sell or otherwise dispose of land or property acquired by expropriation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not funny because what that did was it scared people, that a council could come in and expropriate land and then give it to their friends or someone. It scared people. They did not know what was coming off.

MR. DINN: The fact that it was in the Local Government Act, and the Community Councils Act and the City of St. John's Act and the City of Corner Brook Act did not matter. We had somebody going to the media and saying, "The minister's approval, they can, after they expropriate land, sell it." So you are sitting in your house, Mr. Speaker, and along comes the regional council and grabs your house and expropriates it, and chucks you out, and then soon after they sell it because they like that piece of land for their friend. That is the impression that was left in people's minds, Mr. Speaker. That is the impression. And I do not say that it was done purposefully, I do not say that it was done with an intent to deceive, I say that the person who mentioned that, the person who said that to the media, was just not informed, they just did not read, they just did not understand what was going on in local government in this Province.

The fact of the matter is that every council in this Province expropriates for one reason or another when the need arises.

AN HON. MEMBER: For water and sewer projects.

MR. DINN: For water and sewer projects, just as an example, for a community council building, for a fire department. They do it for many, many reasons but they have that power of expropriation and nothing in this bill with respect to expropriation gives any more power to the regional council. If they want to put the water and sewer systems through they have the power to expropriate it.

Now, for example, when the water and sewer goes through the middle of the house and it is through there and they do not need that land any more they can sell it. Once they get their job done they can sell it. But it is not a devious plot by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the people on this side of the House to give powers to a regional council to creep in

MR. DINN: . . . and take a house and then sell it to their friends. But that is what is put across, that is the kind of fear that is engendered in our people by people who are not even elected, and I do not hear elected representatives get up and defend that kind of a situation.

I spent four hours, Mr. Speaker, on TV and radio trying to allay the fears of people who should not be scared at all, who should have no fear at all about those kinds of provisions in this piece of legislation because they have been contained for years in the Local Government Act since 1972, and Metro Board operated under the Local Government Act, as a local improvement district, It has been contained in the City of St. John's Act, the Community Councils Act and the City of Corner Brook Act, the exact, Mr. Speaker, the exact same provision but we had people go on the media, go on TV with an attempt to scare our people

MR. DINN: to frighten them into saying, "My God somebody is going to take my house and give it to their friends". Mr. Speaker there is no such provision in this Act. There is no such provision in this bill. That piece of legislation was passed, was put in the Local Government Act, the City of St. John's Act and the City of Corner Brook Act. It has been there for years required by councils in order for them to provide water and sewer systems, to provide a community council office or to provide a fire department in their municipalities been there for years but that is not the way it was handled. Regional Government was approved through the Henley Commission by just about every council in this region including the City of St. John's. And what they have done, including the City of St. John's and the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) may want me to read what I read earlier tonight with respect to the City of St. John's because the hon. member was not here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

Yes. Maybe the hon. member would look at page fifty-four, Mr. Speaker, and I read it before, the St. John's Municipal Council favoured the adoption of scheme A as a form of Regional Government. They were in favour of it, of Regional Government. Maybe they do not like it in the form we have. Maybe they did not like B or C, they liked A. But the fact of the matter is they were in favour of Regional Government.

And not only that, contrary to what they apparently are saying now, what apparently is alleged by the media that they are saying to them in the press, that they want the expanded city. But that is not what they said here in their submission to the Henley Report. They said, "It is suggested however that the expanded city should include Mount Pearl but only if the residents of Mount Pearl were in agreement with amalgamation". The residents of Mount Pearl are not in agreement with amalgamation, so the city should not expand into Mount Pearl until they are ready for it and that is what the city, and hopefully that is what the city meant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: But that is not what is said now when we come to zero hour again - we came to the eleventh hour last year. We are here again in the House of Assembly with a piece of legislation that has been improved considerably. That is not what is going on now. What we have now is a group of individuals who are not elected and we have a group of frightened young counsellors who never had the opportunity of input to Regional Government and it is very difficult to cover that ground. But the hon. member I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member -

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. DINN: That is right. That the hon. member for St. John's West is basically in favour of Regional Government. There may be some provisions in this Bill that the hon. member - and we are going to discuss this clause by clause in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Third reading.

MR. DINN: - third reading but basically the hon. member is in favour of Regional Government. There may be some items in there that he is not quite on-board with and that is fine. The hon. member never came down to discuss it with me and maybe he does not think discussing it with me is going to help. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that has been discussed by eleven people and we came up with that and we think that is a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker I could go on to many other things, I could go to the other things and I will I will go on to a couple of other things because people have been frightened, and if there is one thing I cannot stand is people, some of them not elected, that are going around attempting to frighten people with incorrect statements and things that have been contained in previous legislation that are the norm and trying to frighten the people by saying that it is not the norm that this is what this devious scheme is going to do.

Mr. Speaker, there was a gentleman on T.V. one night and talked about the invasion of the rights of the courts. Now, Mr. Speaker, this got to the worst of it, I mean, this got to one of its lowest ebbs and the fact of the matter is

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. DINN:

I will not dignify that with a comment.

I spent a lot of time looking through this piece of legislation but that I will not dignify it with a comment, Mr. Speaker.

I have not gone through all of the items that I would like to go through and should go through I want to give opportunity to all members of this House of Assembly to discuss this thing because this is, in my opinion,

MR. DINN: a thing of the future in Newfoundland. I have talked to the joint town and community councils in the Burin Peninsula and the Great Humber joint councils. I have talked to people in Labrador about Regional Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. DINN: Yes I have talked about Regional Government for years down there. I have talked to people in Conception Bay North with respect to regional facilities and basically Regional Government. We had the Whelan Royal Commission which is going to be another topic some other time. We might be given an opportunity to debate, but basically they come up with the same premise, Windsor, Bishop's, Grand Falls - the possibility of that kind of thing, these people working together for the same purpose for the provisioning of service to their people. And I think that that, down the road, will come because I think Windsor will reach a day when they can look across the tracks and not consider themselves to be on the wrong side, they can look across the tracks and say we are equal. I have given a commitment that I will work towards that and I will do all that is humanly possible. Mr. Speaker, I do care care basically what these people or how these people vote because I think it is a disgrace that it should go on in this day and age and I think that we should all work towards these kinds of things. I will work towards these kinds of things whether they vote PC or whether they vote Liberal. The fact of the matter is that they are all Newfoundlanders and that is what I am and I hope to work towards helping these people.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister is his own worst enemy. His speech reminded me, the last two minutes of his speech as one of my colleagues said made a little bit of sense, his speech reminded me of someone upon a high hill. If you get upon a high cliff and look down at a nice green valley with a little brook running down the middle of it, a sort of a trickle of sense, a trickle of common sense there with a meadow, a great vast meadow of bluster and nonsense and bombast coming out of the

MR. W. ROWE: minister for the last two hours. It is too bad he did not start off his speech in introducing this bill in the same way he ended it because we could have a debate, a good debate on Municipal Government generally and Regional Government and the relationship between the Provincial Government and the municipalities and Regional Government. We could have a good, hard-hitting, fullfledged debate but unfortunately he got off on the wrong footing and has displayed here tonight, Sir, the reason why nearly every elected municipal politician in the area which is believed to be covered by this Regional Council is against Bill 50. We have seen why, Sir, because we have seen a minister who has shown the greatest amount of arrogance and lack of concern for people's feelings and arguments and thoughts on these matters. Stiff-necked, Sir, with his back up, will go down fighting, skuttle the ship just as long, Sir, as we can say to ourselves or say to somebody that we did not give one inch.-a rear guard action, Mr. Speaker. But the only unfortunate thing about it is that it is people's lives and people's rights and people's welfare that is involved in this. It is not just a matter of political expediency, it is not just a matter of laying a political life on the line, as the Minister of Forestry has said time and time again about the poison chemical matacil, that is not the issue. Whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs has taken a wise political decision or not, whether he survives or goes down in political defeat, that is not important. Who cares? I cannot think of a more boring topic. It maybe of interest to the minister but I cannot think of one other person, Mr. Speaker, who would be the least bit concerned or has the remotest interest as to whether he survives politically or not.

MR. W. ROWE: But there are a lot of people who are concerned about the concept of regional government, a regional council, the management of people's affairs in a whole area and a whole region of this Province or several areas and regions of this Province.

Years ago, back in 1972, I guess, when the Liberal Party first went into opposition, we were making statements about regional government and how we were in favour of the concept of regional government, Mr. Speaker. I doubt very much if there is one thinking person in this Province who is against the concept of regional government of some sort. Now what we are talking about is the management of people's public affairs in an area, and we are talking about the provision of public services in a given area for the benefit of the people. Now who is against that? And we are talking about the provision of these services at the least possible cost with the greatest possible convenience for people and the least duplication of bureaucracies, the least possible duplication of elected members for that matter. Somebody, I believe it was Ray O'Neil I read in the paper some time ago, talked about there being some 800 elected members of various kinds, councils and MPs and MHAs and so on in the particular area concerned. I do not know how he knows what the area is because nobody else seems to know. We will get into that later. But we have to make sure that we do the thing right, Mr. Speaker, and we have to make sure in a democracy, unfortunately for the minister we are living in a democracy, Sir, we are living under an open political system where people's voices are going to be heard, they are going to be heard whether the minister likes it or not, whether the minister thinks everybody else except him is stupid or not is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, people are going to be heard and I for one will encourage people to be heard and say their piece and speak out. But who is to say whether it is stupid or not?

MR. W. ROWE: The wisdom of ten years ago is the idiocy of today, Mr. Speaker. The radicals and lunatic fringes of ten or fifteen years ago are conventional wisdom today. So for the hon. minister to get up and in a contemptable, arrogant way talk in terms of ramming this regional government concept of his as envisaged by Bill 50, not the concept of regional government per se or in itself but as envisaged in Bill 50, to ram that down people's throats careless and heedless of whether they like it or not, if they do not like it let them lump it, Mr. Speaker, that is hardly a way for a government to carry on. And once more, it is becoming a cliché now, but once more one can only come to the conclusion that it is a government which is in the last gasp, a government which is desperate. Everything it turns its hands to turns to mud or dust in its hands, the reverse Midas complex, instead of turning to gold they take gold in their hands and it turns to dust in their hands, Mr. Speaker, everything they touch. And now they are becoming desperate and their backs are up and come hell or high water this is what we are going to do.

That is no way to govern, Mr. Speaker, for the next year or two or whatever is left of this government in office and the people of the Province and the fifty-one districts will decide that, what if they try at least to accommodate public opinion, informed public opinion too, Mr. Speaker, not ignorant and stupid public opinion as this hon. minister tries to pretend is merely existing with regard to Bill 50.

He opens up his speech, Mr. Speaker, with a proclamation that he is ashamed of Newfoundland, or at least that is the only reasonable interpretation. "For ten years," he said, "I lived on the Mainland of Canada and I was embarrassed at Newfie jokes."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. W. ROWE:

Well if anyone on the Mainland of Canada had seen his action tonight, Mr. Speaker, they would have seen a Newfie joke in action, not in the telling but in action. But, Mr. Speaker, that is a dangerous attitude as well. It is not an attitude which my hon. friend from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) would express, because he is a man who makes a fetish out of being proud of things Newfoundland, and whether somebody in urban Toronto likes it or not or finds it funny or not or quaint or peculiar

MR. W.N. ROWE: is of no interest of his and I must say I share his views in that regard. Who cares? Newfie joke! And this is what worries me about this hon. minister he is somehow ashamed of his origin, somehow ashamed of what Newfoundland represents or has perceived as representing in the eye of the golden triangle up there in Ontario. Who cares, Mr. Speaker? We have done it our way for 480-odd years, we will do it our way for a long time to come. I do not know if this is the hon. minister's idea, this Bill 50 is the hon. minister's idea of somehow making Newfoundland and Labrador respectable in the eyes of the rest of Canada or not. He talked about the capital city being a Newfie joke - St. John's being a Newfie joke, Mr. Speaker. Totally ridiculous!

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the wrong approach which this hon. minister is taking. It is a policy - I do not know - it is policy of meddle and muddle, meddling into things that he does not seem to have a clear understanding of and a muddled idea of what he is doing or where he is going but expressed in strong terms mind you. I did not hear him explain the Bill tonight - Did anybody on this side of the House hear an explanation of the Bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Partisan attacks.

MR. S. NEARY: Right down the line.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Partisan attacks, Mr. Speaker? Meddle and muddle. Meddle into these things he does not appear to understand I do not know if he is in the grip of some mad planner down there in the Department of Municipal Affairs. They have been known to exist. Some mad planner with these fantasies of grandeur. I remember one time we got in the grips of a mad planner and we are living to rue that day now and I am referring to - my hon. member may recall with his keen sense of history - I am referring to the Bay d'Espoir development down there where I sat down at a meeting of about 500 or 1,000 residents of the Bay d'Espoir area and heard this mad planner with his sheets on the wall with planetariums here and stadia there, Mr. Speaker, and super

MR. W.N. ROWE: highways zooming in here not straight but in circular fashion to blend in with the aesthetics of the landscape, six lane highways and so on, and I said we are in the grip of a madman. Now after those hopes were raised down there in Bay d'Espoir, and we have seen the fruits of that in the last number of days as my hon. friend the member for district well knows, people's hopes raised and they were not raised by politicians necessarily either. I did not hear any great political promises made at the meeting I was in down there but the former Premier was there I was at university at the time and happened to be there along for the ride more or less.

But the mad planner he had great visions and great concepts and great fantasies, perhaps, of what was going to happen here. I am wondering if the minister may not have also had his mind invaded by the visions of a similar type of gentleman? I do not know, but I do know, Sir, that there is room for reason and argument and a realization that is strong-minded. And intelligent men and women are going to differ on these big concepts and therefore we should not talk in terms of ramming it down peoples throats or everybody who is against me is stupid and ignorant and does not know what they are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: They can do it one way or another.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, that is right. There are a number of little gems as far as quotes are concerned there, Mr. Speaker. You know, dragging red herrings over, and I will get into the bill a little later on. I do want to deal with one or two of the things that the minister mentioned. He tried to convey to this House at the beginning of his speech, Mr. Speaker, that somehow Regional Government would have overcome the problem that the city of St. John's and the environs experienced last year and the year before before the regional water supply came into effect. Now, Sir, I remember what happened with regard to that regional water supply. We were in the government at the time the thing was conceived and an agreement was entered into with DREE for many millions of dollars for Bay Bulls Big Pond and so on, a regional water supply. I remember, Sir, there was no lack of planning involved, there was a lack of money on the part of the government, the provincial government and

MR. W.N. ROWE:

the city, Mr. Speaker. That is true.

To say there was lack of planning involved there is like saying that
there is lack of planning because Bay de Verde had no

MR. W. ROWE: water and sewer system.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lack of money.

MR. W. ROWE: It is not lack of planning, Sir, but sometimes it is very difficult to get the money for these multimillion dollar projects. And at the time we signed the DREE agreement - and I was the minister at the time responsible for it, we knew, Sir, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs then was my friend and colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and a great Minister of Municipal Affairs he was too, he spoke and talked to and consulted with councils left, right and center and he was appreciated for it, Sir. To this day, Mr. Speaker, whenever I go out around the countryside in this Province I still hear glowing reports about that hon. minister and the way he talked and consulted. Now, we signed this agreement and at the time we signed it, Sir, we knew there was likely to be a short-fall of a year or two by the time this thing came on stream and that St. John's and other people depending on that water were going to be in very difficult straits. As it happened, Mr. Speaker, I believe instead of the two years which I think was the fear at the time when it was signed it was only one year because, Sir, the city of St. John's and the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada did such a magnificent job in pushing that job through, that system through so our shortage was about for one year I think. There was a certain amount of hysteria involved no doubt about that but I believe our problem, the red herring which the hon. minister dragged over a moment ago, the problem with regard to water shortage and so on lasted for one year before it was solved which, as I would say, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what is going on in Newfoundland today and Canada today and the world today, that is not bad planning. That problem would not have been solved, Sir, by any number of regional councils, You could have piled fifty regional councils one on top of the other and that problem would not have been solved. It had nothing to do with the regional council and for that hon. minister to stand up here and to heap coals of calumny and contempt on the heads of the St. John's Municipal Council for lack of planning in that regard is, Sir, getting very, very close to deception.

MR. NOLAN:

We were bankrupt remember. We should not have been doing the things we were doing.

MR. W. ROWE:

That is right. Mr. Speaker, to try and blame the parade of rats, the parade of rats between Robin Hood Bay and the Janeway Hospital on the lack of a Regional Government is to me, Sir, the most mealy-mouthed, scurrilous, red herring that anyone could drag over anything. No wonder, Sir, everyone is in an uproar, 165,000 people going to burn the hon. minister in effigy according to one fellow, were going to burn the hon. minister in effigy. I hope he will listen to us then someone said. No wonder, Sir. Nobody can condone even token violence. Mr. Speaker, when you see the hon. minister in action here and see how he twists things about and tangles things up and drags red herrings across and evades the issue and does not attack the thing head-on at all. He talks about a parade of rats across as if Regional Government is going to solve that problem, Mr. Speaker, when it is within the capacity of this government today to solve that problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE:

It probably was.

MR. F. ROWE:

They are increasing.

MR. W. ROWE:

The only similarity between it as my hon. colleague said, Sir, the minister seemed to say that the rats were on the increase, but the only similarity that I would say is an increase in support for another political party as well. But, Sir, I do not want to get into that, I do not want to play the minister's game. What I so want to do though is to point out that the hon. minister has got everyone in an uproar, nearly 200,000 people in St. John's and environs, I suppose 165,000 would probably be a fair estimate of the people that would be affected by this regional council. How do we know? We do not even know where -

AN HON. MEMBER:

More than 200,000.

MR. W. ROWE:

Well that may be so. I do not know because I look at the bill here that I am supposed to be debating intelligently and with all facts and so on and we do not even know, nobody knows where the Regional Council is going to end, what its boundaries are going to extend

MR. W. ROWE: to, what its boundaries are and we will get to that, Mr. Speaker, so I am assuming that it is between 170 and 240 or something around there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: I see, Sir, That is another great advance in municipal government. All people who commute into work shall be hereby covered by this act.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible)

once they get the services -

MR. DOODY: Bay Roberts and Carbonear.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: I have people in my district -

MR. W. ROWE: Swift Current, sure Swift Current is a dormitory town

Mr. W. Rowe: in that regard. Trinity-Bay de Verde is a -
MR. F. ROWE: Brought in from Whiteway, Cavendish, Hearts -
MR. W. ROWE: Sure I had a fellow building a fence for me, a great
carpenter he used to drive in every morning and night back to Sunnyside.
MR. NOLAN: How about the money they spent?
MR. W. ROWE: - commuting back and forth. So I mean is that what
the hon. minister is saying to me, the hon. member that regional
government will extend as far as the stone can be thrown or the
arrow shot and the commuter extends? I mean, what is it?

Why does not the minister come in here and tell us
what the boundaries are of this Regional Council?

AN HON. MEMBER: Holyrood is going to be in it.
MR. NOLAN: No Holyrood is out.
MR. W. ROWE: Holyrood is out is it?
MR. NOLAN: Yes, that is the Doody plan.
MR. W. ROWE: Oh, I see. I see it is a certain amount
of political preference, Sir, lack thereof being exercised maybe.
MR. DOODY: What?
MR. W. ROWE: I can only go by my highly reliable source here.
MR. NOLAN: Deny it! Deny it!
MR. W. ROWE: I did not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon.
minister to tell the truth now, to tell the honest to God truth watching
the hon. minister there now whether he was outlining his programmes, Mr.
Speaker, or crying for help.
AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).
MR. W. ROWE: I did not know. There seemed to be a note
of hysteria and desperation about him there. He used to seem to seize
upon every opportunity to get away from the main thrust of whatever
argument he had to try to get involved in political crossfire and
so on and so forth. He seemed to welcome every opportunity because
I believe that his mind has been sickened and turned away from this
whole idea of regional government as a result of the fouled-up way the
government has gone about trying to bring this about, as far as the people

Mr. W. Rowe: are concerned in this area.

I was saying earlier, Mr. Speaker, regional government is an excellent concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: We have to have some form of management and control in various areas particularly those which are presently unorganized or not organized, I should say, into municipalities. And to allow some co-operation and, if necessary, some arbitration to take place between communities which are presently organized with regard to public services, and hopefully also to get rid of duplications, if that is possible, nobody, Sir, can deny that the idea of regional government of some sort, the concept is a good concept, and one which should come and one which we should be trying to implement now at this time.

But, Mr. Speaker, Bill 50 both in the way it is being presented by the hon. minister and his colleagues and as far as the contents of Bill 50 are concerned, Sir, Bill 50 takes a good concept, takes an excellent concept, Sir, and perverts the concept, twists it, and turns it into a mishmash, and something monstrous, and something rather dangerous. When I get to the Bill we will certainly have some specifics on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: More specifics than -

MR. W. ROWE: Because I intend, contrary to what the minister did, I intend to look at the Bill that he is trying to get through the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I intend to do something novel.

MR. DOODY: A brilliant concept.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, a brilliant concept in legislative procedure, I intend to mention the Bill, I intend to look at some of the major items in the Bill on second reading. And then it should be, perhaps, unparliamentary because the more this government governs the worse off we are. I think

MR. W. ROWE: experience has proven that, Sir, that contrary to what should be the case everybody in the Province wants this government to stay as far away as possible from doing anything, because every time they do anything, every time they put their hand to anything we end up with something like this Bill 50 or the matacil programme or something like that or we end up in some kind of hanky-panky or skulduggery like the Dobbin-Moores affair, for example, or the Public Works affair every time this government does anything, Sir.

So I would say, although I am not a laissez-faire type of politician or a person who thinks that the least government the better, I think that government should get involved in more and more things, I would make an exception in terms of this government, Sir, this government the less it gets involved in the better off the people are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Because the government as I said earlier have muddled and meddled, meddled where they should not be and where they get into something it turns out to be a complete mishmash and muddle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: So they have taken a good concept, Mr. Speaker, regional government, regional management, the provision of services to people, they have taken a good concept and they have perverted this concept into something

MR. W. ROWE: beyond recognition, something dangerous, a monster. And the methodology, the method used by this government, Sir, has been something which is reminiscent of medieval times. The minister tries to pretend that there was consultation on this bill. There was no consultation, Sir. He brought in a bill in haste last year, Bill 101 it was then I guess, I was not here at the time, was forced to withdraw it, timorously and so on and then instead of using that time, from this time last year until now to consult widely with people, elected people particularly in municipalities, they busily squirrelled themselves down there in the Department of Justice, I suppose, or Legislative Council's Office, drafted up a bill, and then sprang it on the people. And because nobody in elected councils went to the considerable effort, or very few people went through the considerable effort of dragging around Confederation Building looking for a copy of the bill so that they could study it in all its -

MR. F. ROWE: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, fifty-six pages, and trying to pretend, Sir, because people did not do that, busy people, volunteers in community councils and so on, because they did not come in here with alacrity and seize this bill and go home and study it and everything, this is supposed to be a default on their part. If this minister was doing it properly, Sir, assuming that the bill itself has good laws and good ideas in it, if he was doing it properly he would send a copy of this bill, Sir, to every single municipal councillor in this Province, or in the area concerned, every single one of them. He would have sent them along to other areas which are perhaps going to I think the Burin Peninsula, the Humber Valley, the Windsor, - Grand Falls-Bishop's Falls area, these areas, send it out to them as well for their thoughts and their input, put with it some explanatory notes of an objective unbiased nature, explaining

MR. W. ROWE: the problems, the difficulties, the weaknesses and so on and why we could not solve a certain problem at this time and so on and so forth like that, a reasonable view. In fact, this minister, if he did the thing right, and if he wanted to get through this bill, assuming this bill was all right and we will see that in a moment whether it is all right or not, I am talking about the method at the moment, the mad method the minister chose to try to ram this down people's throats, he would have had briefing sessions, he would have invited people to come and hear what he had to say, what his officials had to say, what MHAs had to say, what the MPs had to say to members in the Parliament of Canada up there, hear what councillors had to say, and who knows, Mr. Speaker, who knows maybe the people are not as stupid as the minister thinks, maybe somebody would have come up with some good ideas or at least he would not have been able to say that people did not understand it and nobody would be able to say that there was not adequate consultation. But the minister did not choose to do that. The minister chose another tack, he chose the tack, Sir, of treating publicly with the utmost contempt anybody who deigned, who dared to raise any doubts whatsoever about Bill 50, call people ignorant and stupid if they do not agree with Bill 50 as it stands in principle or any of the sections or clauses of Bill 50.

"I have not heard one objection raised to date that has been backed by sound argument."
Mr. Speaker, who on the face of the earth, aside from the hon. minister, would have the unmitigated gall, the brass, the brazenness to stand up in a public forum and think that he has such a corner on all the wisdom and experience and intelligence in the world, that he can say, "I have not heard one objection that has been backed by sound argument." What kind of a minister would say that?

MR. W. ROWE:

If I was the Premier of the Province and I heard a minister, a colleague of mine saying that, I would certainly caution him not to say it again. And if I heard it twice that would be the end of him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: Because Newfoundland cannot afford or can ill afford ministers with that kind of arrogance and contempt for the intelligence of their fellow man in the trying times that we are going through today.

"Opposition to the bill is coming from people who know little or nothing about it," he says. What kind of arrogance is it? Do not listen to what people are saying, if there is opposition to what you are trying to do, ram this bill through the House, then anybody who opposes it knows little or nothing about it, automatically. It goes without saying -

MR. F. ROWE: It might be accidentally true.

MR. W. ROWE: It could be. In fact, as my colleague reminds me, it could in fact be accidentally true because the minister managed to keep these documents secret. I thought it was some kind of a state secret. I thought it was subject to the thirty years rule, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was like the secret trial going on up there with our friend Tru, all you hear is that a guy is convicted. You do not hear about why or what happened or anything else. I thought the minister was trying the same technique with his bill because once the people of the area realized what was being rammed through the House, or that something was being rammed through the House that may not be to their benefit and in their best interests completely, then they tried to get a hold of the legislation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I understand that one of the most difficult things to obtain was a copy of this bill.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Your friends in Conception Bay South would certainly confirm that.

MR. NOLAN: We did not get a copy from them.

MR. DOODY: The only document we have that -

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, the only document, Sir, that was not leaked out broad and wide was this. They must have made a mistake, Sir. You know what I think happened, Sir, I think somebody -

MR. NEARY: Did not want to be the bearer of bad comments.

MR. W. ROWE: That might have been it. I think, Sir, that this bill must have - by mistake the bill must have had written across the top of it Moores - Dobbin agreement. That is what happened there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRACHAN: Helicopters - like the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He is so used to helicopters.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, or maybe Sealand Helicopters was written across it by mistake and therefore was taken and put in a vault and nobody could get into it except the Premier.

MR. STRACHAN: Only suitcases.

MR. W. ROWE: Or Moores - Dobbin agreement number five.

MR. DOODY: Do not get nasty now, you have had a good year.

MR. STRACHAN: You will get nasty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: I am not nasty. No, Sir! I am not nasty by nature, but the truth will out. I am a lovable fellow by nature, Sir. It is quite against my nature, Sir, to administer these broad sides to that minister over there, especially that minister because he is such a harmless looking individual. But, Sir, when he is coming in with things which are not in the best interest of the people we do not have any choice but to expose the bill for what it is and the method for what it is.

What is he saying, the minister?

People do not understand the provisions. Right. He said that. Only he understands it. This is the Mayan priests or something,

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, with their hieroglyphics, only they understood what was in it, everybody else was ignorant, and therefore they hoped to maintain great power over the people. Is this what the minister is trying? Only I understand the import of this bill and this legislation. Everybody else cannot understand it and therefore do not even question it, I will just ram it through. It is all in your best interest. Take your medicine.

"I must take a small amount of blame for the fact that people do not understand the provision," says the minister. "They had some trouble getting copies and I had trouble getting copies made." Now, Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard a more lame and weaker excuse for falling down completely on the job of informing the people than that one, by this hon. minister?

MR. F. ROWE: No problem with -
of the Norma and Gladys.

MR. W. ROWE: Could not get, Mr. Speaker, could not get copies to the people.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Every day, Sir, in the mail you are flooded with stuff. Our great case on the offshore oil. Glossy. Hundreds of thousands of copies. Norma and Gladys: every school child in the Province has no trouble 'getting a copy of the Norma and Gladys escapades.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) constitution for Canada.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Or the budworm propaganda.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Budworm propaganda, Mr. Speaker, spend a half million dollars on that. Get that out to the people. Action Groups spent \$2 million getting that nonsensical blurb out to the people Sir. but when we come to something substantial, something that affects the people, Sir, we suddenly run into hitches in getting copies out to the people. And the minister in his magnanimity comes down off his high horse a little tiny bit for a moment and says, 'I may be a small bit to blame for that'. Totally ridiculous! A botched job of selling this programme to the people from start to finish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so what does he try to do then, the minister? What does the minister try to do then? He comes out and he says, 'The only opposition to Bill 50 is St. John's, the St. John's City Council', in what I would characterize, Mr. Speaker, as the typical Tory attempt to divide St. John's from rural Newfoundland. Trying to pretend now, Mr. Speaker, that St. John's is against this therefore the people of suburb or rural communities in the area should be forced.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. G. FLIGHT: He cannot take it look, he is going to leave.

MR. W.N. ROWE: You should stay in and listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say if I was the hon. minister and I had botched up this job so badly and had done such really low things and made such low statements about individuals and areas of this Province I would feel a little bit bad about it as well. I am for a bill all the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: I can really count on this bill. There is not very much more you can count on in political life, Sir. Mr. Speaker, there is another "Bill" over there, Sir, and I am glad I am facing him let me put it that way.

Mr. Speaker, a blatant attempt to try to poison the minds of suburban and the environment of St. John's and the more rural parts of the region, this region we are talking about, to poison their minds, Sir, with the propaganda that St. John's is the only one against it therefore it must be good. And what a surprise the hon. minister got.

MR. S. NEARY: I thought I saw his second cousin down to St. Thomas's cutting down signs and (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: There is something to geniality in other words.

MR. S. NEARY: I am only trying to give you a bit of ammunition now do not get dirty with me.

MR. W.N. ROWE: How could you get dirty with the hon. member? The hon. member sitting here by my side every day. Great boy! Really good! Team work, strategy, tactics flying out of us. Great fellow, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member.

MR. S. NEARY: Great team work.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Great team work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: When he and I went arm and arm through the Arts and Culture Centre there, what a moving spectacle that was to all (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: What a moving spectacle, Sir! The people of the Province knew that something new and wonderful was happening in the political life of our Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. J. NOLAN:

MR. W.N. ROWE: My hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) made mention of some other hon. gentleman over there - Who were you referring to when you said if he had been alive in Caesar's time Caesar would have been assassinated fourteen years earlier. I think it was the hon. minister - it was the hon. minister. The lean and hungry look. I would say Cassius, Sir, Cassius would have been out of a job if the hon. minister had been around. around 46 B.C. I would say around what no 56 B.C. Caesar would have met his end.

But, Sir, that has very little to do with this bill on Regional Government. But, Sir, it all makes mention of the fact that this minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir, has tried to divide and rule in this case and it has blown up in his face because not only are all the members on the St. John's City Council, Mr. Speaker, in a very, if not unique then unusual display of unanimous action - Mr. Speaker, will you tell me how a minister can get all the members of the St. John's Council working together on something.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are Tories.

Mr. W. Rowe: Mr. Speaker, what a marvelous job this hon. minister has done to combine these. What are there, none of them including the Mayor?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: To be able to do something which nobody would have dreamed possible to have all of the city councillors united unanimously against you.

MR. DOODY: Go against it. I thought

MR. W. ROWE: No united. The City Council is united, four square against the minister, Sir. It takes a lot, you really have to be, you have to reach an apex, an apanage in blundering.

MR. F. B. ROWE: A first is it not?

MR. W. ROWE: It must be a first in the history of St. John's, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOLAN: Aldo Moro could not figure it out.

MR. FLIGHT: It will be a last as far as that goes.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Aldo Moro, right! Kissenger, Mr. Speaker, would not have been able to do that. But this minister can do it. He can do it. And then, Sir, what a start he got. What a surprise he got when in his attempt to divide St. John's and the other areas in the region one against the other and have them at each others throats, hopefully, and he could escape, squeeze through when there is an uprising, Mr. Speaker, in suburban and rural parts of the area, almost unanimous in their opposition to this bill going through in its present form at this time, rammed through the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: All except the Mayor of Mount Pearl.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: The Mayor of Mount Pearl, he was the head of that Tory slate. He was the only one who got elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) tried to put forward a Tory slate, Sir, to get elected in the elections.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: And when it was - Oh, yes, when it was finished, Sir, I do not know what it looked like this slate, it was in about forty-five pieces, and the only one, I suppose, one of the only ones to sneak through was this particular gentleman who is hueing to the party line.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Is that why you approved of him?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Who?

MR. N. WINDSOR: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: I would not know him from Adam.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Is that right?

MR. W. N. ROWE: I would not know him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: His brother now might be a good Liberal out in Central Newfoundland.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is that his brother out there?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Out in Grand Falls. I do not know. Is it?

MR. N. WINDSOR: A great -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, oh, he is a great fellow! Yes, Mr. Speaker, a wonderful man! If it is Dr. Hodder, if it is the same one? Oh, yes, Sir, he knows what is good for the Province. He knows.

MR. NEARY: That is right. brother.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I do not know his brother, probably he is a good fellow too. But he is hueing to the party line.

Mr. Speaker, the spectacle of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs trying to paint the St. John's Municipal Council for whom I hold no particular brief, I know several of them personally, some of them are good, but for him to try to paint the St. John's Municipal Council as a bunch of blunderers, as lacking in planning ability, as having in some way not the best interest of the City at heart in their opposition of this bill, Sir, Mr. Speaker, that hurts because the City of St. John's, a city by the way which has never been particularly kind to the Liberal Party, but that is neither here nor there, the City of St. John's has shown itself for decade after decade to be -

MR. DINN: It is changing now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Pardon?

MR. DINN: It is changing now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: But it is changing now is right - has shown itself, Sir, to be the single most responsible government in this Province. When the affairs of this Province, Sir, were put into a form of dictatorship, which the minister is now trying to emulate under the Commission of Government, the City of St. John's was, I believe, the one form of democratic government which was left.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: They were to the right, but they were left. That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They might have had a far away -

MR. W. N. ROWE: The one form - oh they have had their quirks and so on over the years, and, you know, political quirks but that is changing.

MR. NEARY: They might go down with a sackful of votes on polling day.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right. But the point I am making, Sir, is that here is a City Council with a glorious democratic history behind it -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is funny you do not choke on that one.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A City Council -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh the City of St. John's has elected some really superb members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Here is one right here.

MR. W. N. ROWE: There is one right there.

MR. W. N. WINDSOR: I was never on the Council.

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, but I mean I am talking in terms of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the minister to have the gall,

Mr. W. N. Rowe: really, to try to look down his nose at the City Council of St. John's, a Council I suppose if you look at the financial responsibility of that body over the years as second to none in this Province, and as I say I am not carrying a brief for the St. John's City Council, but I am pointing out this

MR. W. ROWE: grave discrepancy in reason and common sense that this minister who is part of this disreputable government, unpopular government, a government which has shown itself to be totally irresponsible in its dealings with the people and the commitments it has made and its financial arrangements and borrowings and spendings, a minister, Mr. Speaker, squandering, extravagance, scandals, corruption, you name it and for that minister to stand in his place and look down his nose at the St. John's City Council, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder he did not cramp up in his place there.

MR. NEARY: It is a wonder he did not have the Summer complaint.

MR. W. ROWE: It is a wonder, Mr. Speaker, he was not struck down, because, Sir, the St. John's City Council by and large it has had its freakish aberrations from time to time, I am not referring to the hon. minister who used to be a member or to John Crosbie who used to be a member or my brother-in-law who used to be a member, these are examples of excellence, I am talking about one or two little freakish aberrations but by and large, Mr. Speaker, the St. John's city council has served its people well and I for one cannot sit in this House and listen to a Minister of Municipal Affairs call down that council, look down his nose at that council, speak condescendingly, patronizingly about that council, Sir. When I say here for the record, Mr. Speaker, that there is hardly anybody probably with one or two exceptions, I would choose either, anyone of those members of the city council, Sir, over that minister if I was to entrust my public affairs to them, I would choose all but one or two, Mr. Speaker, I would choose all of them or any of them over that minister any day when it came to urban planning and developing an urban area in the best interests of the citizens it is supposed to serve.

AN HON. MEMBER: Kublai Khan (inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: It makes Kublai Khan look like a socialist, left wing. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister got an awful start when councils representing at least one hundred and sixty-five or seventy thousand people in this area indicated clearly and squarely that they

MR. W. ROWE: want this bill deferred. And the irony of it, Mr. Speaker, and the measure of desperation of this government and that minister is seen from this, the irony of it, Sir, is that if they had not protested so greatly and so loudly we probably would have seen this bill deferred until the Fall of the year. But when the people started to exercise their voices and their rights to protest and to make their feelings known this minister, Sir, this hon. minister got his back up, got stiff-necked and got stubborn about it, got mulish about it and decided to try and ram it through the House. He will not even meet with them. This association of the Northeast Avalon Communities who had a meeting set for June 13th to meet with the minister deferred their meeting until June 21st because the minister had gone to Toronto somewhere, they deferred their meeting, Sir, and here is the bill going through now on the 19th of June. He would not even wait and hear the councillors and people concerned at a meeting and see if what they had to say made any sense, he would not even do that. Ram it through, Mr. Speaker, who cares about the people? It is a terrible way to govern and only a government, Sir, which knew that it is finished - that is the problem with our particular form of government, we do not have proposition thirteens and so on we can use and I am not so sure

MR. W.N. ROWE: we should have them but, Sir, here is a government which knows it is on the rocks, knows it is finished and therefore is not too careful of what the people believe or want when it is ramming through things for whatever motives they may have because they know it makes no difference anyway. If they brought in a good Regional Government Bill or a bad Regional Government Bill, the end result is going to be the same anyway, Mr. Speaker. That is, at least, the way they think, defeat at the next election, so why really bother? Why bother trying to accommodate people? Why bother trying to incorporate into your thinking the views of other people? It becomes painful, as a matter of fact, because you take too much criticism while you are doing it so what you do is envelop yourself in this callous and look inward and do not bother meeting with people or seeing people, just sort of cannibalize your own ideas together and put something out and ram it through.

One of the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Be specific.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

I will be specific. I will be specific, Sir, when I come to the bill but there are a few preliminaries I want to get over with.

One of the other fearful things about what this government is doing with bill 50 derives from the fact that this government's history over the past six or seven years, Sir, is one of passing the buck of responsibility back to the community councils and the councils. Now the hon. minister knows this is true. The hon. minister knows that when a council comes in to see him, or his predecessors in office, they will tell that council anything. My friends and colleagues here on this side know that this is so. When a council comes in to visit the minister, tell them anything. Tell them, 'Oh yes, you are going to have

MR. W.N. ROWE: your \$4 million water system, yes, you are going to have your industrial park, yes, you are going to have this, yes, you are going to have your roads all paved.'

MR. F.B. ROWE: Top of the priority list.

MR. W.N. ROWE: "You are right up there on the priority list, number 3 on the priority list and we are going to do fourteen this year so have no fear you are there." That council goes back, Mr. Speaker, informs - remember now what we are talking about, we are talking about councils who are serving the people with no recompense, voluntarily for the good of the community, sacrificing themselves, their time, their businesses, in many cases their contented and happy family life because people are right on their doorsteps all the time - these councils go back, inform the people of what they heard from the government expecting them to have the work proceed within a reasonable time only to have nothing happen and the government takes glee, or at least takes some perverse satisfaction of the fact that the heat is now off them and the heat is on the community council or the town council, the people are looking to the town council to keep the commitment which they made to the people as a result of what they were told by the government. That is what has been going on for the past six years.

I know of hundreds of communities who have told me the same thing and my friends here know of others as well. Pass the buck, try to get the blame over in a very, very deceiving sort of way, get the blame over on the town councils and the community councils. Now we have a case where this government is trying to ram in the middle there, interpose between themselves and the people and the communities another form of government, a regional council, a regional council which will be designed to act as a buffer, Mr. Speaker, a

MR. W. ROWE: will merely serve to be a creature, a tame creature of this administration, another buffer zone. First of all it will do their bidding when the government wants its bidding done but it is another body to lay the blame on or to take the flak, or to take the criticism when things are not done in accordance with the wishes of the people. And I fear that that is probably the motive of this administration, Sir. And it is a motive. Usually you would not attribute that motive to an administration, but this government's history, Sir, the history of this government's operations and dealings with municipal councils and with unincorporated communities for that matter, the various committees set up, the history is not a very edifying one, it is not a very good one, it is not a very pleasant one, it is one of pass the buck. It is one of lay the blame on the councils. It is one of ducking responsibility, it is one of trying to squeeze out as best you can and have another body take the responsibility for this government's lack of action and lack of funds. And now we see the same attempt being made again. And I am afraid, Sir, that this regional government as envisaged under this act is another example of this government's intention to default to the people of this Province, as far as providing services and so on to them is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before getting to the bill itself again let me say a word about Mr. John O'Dea, who is a gentleman whose name came up in the debate earlier this afternoon. And we had four or five ministers jump up and protect this gentleman. We had the Minister of Justice, in one of the few occasions he stoops to low blows, jump up and accuse me of threatening or uttering threats against John O'Dea. John O'Dea is a man I would say who served this Province well, served the

MR. W. ROWE: governments well, a man who served the business community well, a man who has got nothing but respect and a good reputation in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, before a bill is even passed through this House, announces with his usual contempt for the democratic processes, that the present Chairman of the Metro Board is going to be ~~the~~ named chairman by this government of the regional council, and when that same gentleman, Mr. O'Dea, is seen in newspapers, picture front and centre, Metro Chairman defends government, and enters into a spirited public debate on the virtues of Bill 50, which will set up an institution of which he will be chairman of, Mr. Speaker, if any gentleman who takes that position and puts himself into that kind of conflict of interest, I am not talking obviously financially, I am talking in terms of being seen to be the tool of a government on the one hand and being appointed by the government in a position as chairman of this regional council on the other hand, appears to be the mouthpiece of the government -

MR. MORGAN: He used to be a Liberal candidate.

MR. W. ROWE: That was a long time ago.

MR. F. ROWE: So what?

MR. W. ROWE: What has that got to do with anything?

MR. F. ROWE: It is that legalistic gymnastics you are getting on with again.

MR. W. ROWE: What has that got to do with anything, Sir? The point I am making is that if a man puts himself in that position I hope he is not going to be heard to complain if he enters the fray, I hope he is not going to be heard to complain if he gets the odd little smack. I think it was very unseemingly for that gentleman to enter the fray in the first place. How can communities, St. John's or any of the other communities concerned have a feeling that this man who

MR. W. ROWE:

is going to represent their best interests objectively, take on the government if necessary when already he has given the appearance of being the mouthpiece of the minister and the willing tool of the same minister with regard to Bill No. 50.

Now I do not want to say anything that will hurt the feelings of Mr. O'Dea. I have not spoken to him I suppose for five or six or seven years. But, Sir, I do say that the wishes of the people in the area and the best interests of the people in the area have to come before the best interests of that gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before just getting into the bill let me say one or two other general things.

The whole attitude of the minister has been a very disastrous one from the point of view of regional government and from the point of view of this government, this administration, but I am not too concerned about that - I am thinking in terms of regional government - because he has poisoned the atmosphere with his statements like whether anybody wants it or not they are going to get it, to stand up in this House, Sir, and make that kind of a statement, 'whether anybody wants it or not they are going to get it'; whether any members of this House want it or not they are going to get this bill; it is going to come ultimately; we are going to do it one way or the other - it is going to be rammed through, Sir. Even if I were one hundred per cent behind this Bill No. 50 and every single clause in the bill the minister would put you off, Mr. Speaker, would turn you away from the bill with his attitude. And what his arrogant attitude has achieved, what he has achieved, Sir, with his arrogance and his contempt for other people's opinions is that he has probably set back the healthy workings of regional government a number of years. Because what he has done is turn ordinary, reasonable people into people who are savage in their opposition against this bill. People who ordinarily would have been prepared to sit down and listen to reason and have some give and take and perhaps argue strenuously in favour of some provisions of this bill to be removed or changed or amended, you now have them coming out, Mr. Speaker, elected councillors coming out and saying, 'We are totally opposed to regional government', something that

MR. W. ROWE:

I would say two or three months ago you would not have found one councillor who would have said that. But what he has done, he has polarized it, Mr. Speaker. What should have been something reasonable and sensible and the implementation of a wise policy of regional government he has now turned into a polarized, partisan affair and he has poisoned the atmosphere and he has made people take strong, opposing stands which they would not have taken two or three months ago if this thing had been approached right and properly. And he has got the guts taken out of the possibility of regional government operating in a healthy, rational, sensible method and way for the next couple of years. That is what this minister has achieved. This bill will go through because the government majority in their inward looking way and their arrogant way will ram it through. That is what they will do so the bill will go through, but it will go through, Sir, over strenuous debate from this side of the House because there are many provisions which are wrong. This bill is going to go through and it is going to become the law of the land, and it is going to be passed, Mr. Speaker, in an atmosphere of mistrust, of poison and spleen in people's minds and thoughts about the operation of this bill, fears and suspicions about the motivations of the minister and the government, all because the minister in his arrogance and his lack of desire to consult with ordinary human beings who do

MR. W. ROWE: have some genuine concerns and feelings and doubts about this bill and questions. All because of his lack of compassion, I suppose, or lack of empathy, lack of sense is probably the way to put it, lack of sense because I must say when the minister got up there today and made his speech, Sir, he could not have impressed any onlooker in this House or in the press or in the galleries or anywhere, as being a man who was totally in control of himself. He looked like a man who was hysterical. A man who - I would not put him in charge of a three seater myself. Because he does not give the impression of solidity, stability, sense of direction, where he is going, what he wants to do. He gives the impression of a man who is easily peaked, a man whose spleen is always there ready to come out, a man who is eager to polarize opinion against him, a man who is ready to scrap no matter how trivial or unimportant the scrap may be, just so that he can say, "I stood up to them. I would not bow down or I would not give in or I would not take backwater." Well, Mr. Speaker, that minister has done untold damage to the concept and the reasonable implementation of regional government, because I do not think that the protests are going to stop merely because the bill goes through. I think that people are going to continue to show their discontent. And as I said earlier, I do not condone any kind of violence whatsoever, or even token violence, or even symbolic violence, but when you have a minister, Sir, who has done something which no other government or minister has succeeded in doing in the last thirty years in this Province, namely make a group of councillors go out and chop down a sign to show their symbolic contempt and their symbolic distrust and dislike for the administration and that minister, Sir, then you have to be fearful about whether this minister should have the conduct of public affairs in his hands.

MR. W. ROWE: You have to be frightened because is he going to drive normally reasonable and rational people to do irrational and stupid things? And many things once they are done may be regretted but they are done. And I fear that unless the Premier—I wish the Premier would come into the House every now and then and get involved in these important issues, not a word out of him in the Throne Speech, not a word out of him in the Budget Speech, I wish he would come in, Mr. Speaker, and either tell the House he is going to direct the affairs in this Province or get out and let somebody else take over - and I say to the Premier and I hope it is reported to him that if he is concerned about regional government going ahead and flourishing in Newfoundland and Labrador, if he is concerned about the concept having any reasonable chance of successful implementation and operation thereafter, come in here and get a grip on his government and on that minister and fling him out of that portfolio and stick somebody sensible and conciliatory and reasonable there. I would suggest the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I would say give him another chance, Sir. He was thrown out ignominiously once, flung out, Sir, grabbed by the scruff of the neck and the slack of the pants and flung out once for making a botch of the Department of Education, complete and utter bungling of the Department of Education but I say, Sir, give him another chance to redeem himself. My colleagues do not agree with me, Sir.

MR. NOLAN: No.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. W. ROWE: We will have to have a caucus on the question.

MR. F. ROWE: There is not much — you know they are reaching the bottom of the barrel.

MR. W. ROWE:

But, Sir, when I cast my jaundiced eye over the scraps and crumbs and residual remnants of what was once a great parliamentary party, I must say I despair. I despair, Sir, as to whether there is any possibility of putting anyone in charge of that department who could in fact do a better job. And when you realize what a botched up bundle this minister has made of this regional government to date, you can realize, Sir, the force of what I have just said. There is nobody else,

MR. W.N. ROWE: nobody else who can take over and do a better job than that hon. minister and that is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the state of government and the administration of government in this Province today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him he cannot afford to have a Cabinet shuffle.

MR. G. FLIGHT: You missed the minister speaking.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: The hon. member was downtown practicing law or something, I suppose, this afternoon and he did not hear what the minister had to say.

MR. G. FLIGHT: He missed the minister's speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: I wish, Mr. Speaker, I did not have to say what I just said over the last hour or so. But, Sir, the most important aspect of this bill is not what is contained in the bill itself but the method which is being employed by the government to implement it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: If the hon. member does not realize that, Sir, then I would say that he too has probably outlived his usefulness in political life.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) an hour and ten minutes.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Where was the member when the minister was speaking?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Because the incredible ineptitude of the minister and the government takes an hour or two hours - you could spend a week, Mr. Speaker, documenting chapter and verse of this government in the field of municipal government or regional government. And every now and then, Sir, of course when you are talking into your mind comes a flurry of other parallel examples of ineptitude and blundering and bungling and scandals. It is pretty hard to resist making mention of it, Sir, if you have any interest in the proper government of the Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not permit a question. There was a time - basically I am a nice fellow but, Sir, tonight I am not in the mood for a question from the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) because what you will get, you see, Sir, - well, we will wait for what we will get because we will hear the hon. minister on this.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: I have unlimited time. Did you know that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: What did the minister say?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Who said that?

MR. A. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: I was wondering if one of the leadership candidates said it.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: At least he made it that is more than the Minister of Justice can say.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, I must say, Sir, the quality of the wit that emanates from outside of the House, Mr. Speaker, is not such -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: If I were the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), Sir, I would be worried there. Whenever I saw the hon. member for Grand Falls not in his seat I would say, 'Now what is he doing? He is out there garnering a few more votes for that leadership convention.'

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Tourism.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Minister of Tourism? Even the Tory Party would not sink so low as to make that leader although you never know. But there he is the Minister of Fisheries sitting there like a sphinx waiting for Friday to come along to make his statement for the weekend news.

MR. S. NEARY: Friday minister.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Friday minister. He does not realize, the Minister of Fisheries, it is no longer necessary to eat or talk fish only on Friday's, Mr. Speaker. He can do it other days of the week, that change was made. He can make a statement tomorrow, Tuesday.

But, in any event, Sir, I would submit in all seriousness that for the good of regional government as a concept and as a programme that the hon. the Premier, if we can get him to leave the Salmon rivers, Sir, for a half an hour or so, come in here and see the shambles that this government is in and try to do something about it. What a powerful weapon the hon. the Premier has. One person asked me there one time he said, "How does 'Moore's' he referred to him as but I will call him the hon. the Premier "How does the Premier keep this crowd together, they are in such disarray they are in such - they are always at each others throats you cannot get one minister to agree with the other." You get programmes announced one day as firm policy and the next day a minister totally reverses it. "But how does he get them to hang together on that side of the House"? And of course it does not take too long, too much speculation, or too much profundity of thought to come up with the answer, Mr. Speaker. Every now and then when there is a callous

MR. W. ROWE: revolt in the offing. The Premier walks into the caucus and says, 'One more word out of you and we will call an election.' And like that, Mr. Speaker, they are all jumping up and down frightened to death, because the Premier knows - he has crude political cunning you see - he knows that that threat of using that ultimate power which he has of going down and advising an election would be enough to keep any P.C. member firmly in his seat and aligned with the party line for the next year or two.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. gentleman like to come in to St. John's and try to (inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: What would you advise me to do - go around with my platform being 'Give me one more chance to get a pension'?

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: I understand the hon. member's platform last time was 'I only need to get elected once more to get a pension.' Lower the price of beer? Would that be it?

MR. MURPHY: I do not think you have to.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what would you advise me to use as a platform - I am going to lower the price of beer?

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: The hon. member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy), Sir, will not be running next time he tells us. I am sorry to hear that because he graces the House.

MR. MURPHY: I would suggest the hon. the Leader of the Opposition run against me (inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: My God! There is a challenge! There is a challenge, Sir!

MR. MURPHY: There is a challenge now! (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The hon. the member for Twillingate will never find his way out.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Smallwood said that he could not be bought. He said that in 1966.

MR. W. ROWE: I will take the hon. member, Sir, outside the Overpass one of these days and turn him around a couple of times and he

MR. W. ROWE: will be lost for three weeks trying to get back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: That is the problem with the corner boy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) in 1949 the hon. gentleman -

MR. W. ROWE: What is he saying over there, Sir? - our great environmental defender, a man who knows about as much about the environment -

MR. MURPHY: And the rats in Carter's Cove. Now do you want that?

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, yes. Do you have it solved?

MR. MURPHY: No, after the House closes I am going (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) Order, please! Order, please! I believe we are drifting away from Bill No. 50 and I would ask the hon. member to -

MR. W. ROWE: Well, I tell you the truth now, it is quarter to eleven -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) perfect record.

MR. W. ROWE: - and I am going to get into the sum and substance of this bill. So I am going to commence that now, Mr. Speaker, any moment at all. So I did want to make sure that it was impressed on hon. members opposite that this minister has proved to be an unmitigated disaster and has set back regional government in Newfoundland and Labrador by at least a decade. And all the careful fertilizing of the ground, Sir, bringing it along, nurturing the idea, the concept of regional government, Royal Commissions of inquiries, meeting with people, getting ideas and so on, all that, Sir, has now been completely thrown out the window and shattered, because, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that people have now grown distrustful and suspicious about this government and the minister.

Now, Sir, let us have a look at the bill, the famous Bill No. 50, "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region".

MR. W. ROWE: Part (1), Section (3): The purposes and application of this Act. The attitude of the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would you mind asking the assistant to the deputy chairman of committees - Sir, he is a man who is supposed to be upholding the rules and procedures of the House. You would not expect the man there, Sir, to be gabbing away, interrupting you when you are speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: He is supposed to set an example, Mr. Speaker, not an example of discourtesy, but an example of rules and orders and good procedure.

"The purpose of this Act, Section (3) is to provide a framework for regional government in the Northeast Avalon region in order to provide certain municipal services of a regional nature throughout the region as delegated to the regional council by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and to provide local government in the unincorporated areas of the region." So right off the bat, right at the beginning, we see the concept of this government when it comes to regional government.

MR. W. ROWE: What they see, Mr. Speaker, what this minister sees and what this government sees is a regional council which in no way is independent, which in no way is supposed to be objective and represent the interests of the people in the region, a council, Sir, which is not supposed to be a strong bulwark for the people against the government if necessary but a council, Mr. Speaker, which exercises the framework, provides the framework and exercises or puts in services and exercises various authorities and controls and powers as delegated to the regional council by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council which, of course, is the government, the Cabinet. That is what we have, Mr. Speaker. This concept of Regional Government as envisaged in this act is killed aborning, Sir, because it starts out on completely the wrong footing as far as the attitude is concerned and as far as the psychology of the situation is concerned. It starts out the wrong way. It should start out, Mr. Speaker, to set up a Regional Government which is responsive to the people's needs, which represents the people's interest in the area and not, Sir, conceived and perceived as a body which is simply put into effect by the government, by the Cabinet here, by that minister, that is what it means, Sir. That arrogant minister you just saw speaking is going to have the power - there he goes now, Sir, strutting along -

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: What did the hon. Minister of Fisheries say? You have to wait until Friday, it is not Friday yet, before you make your statement. The hon Minister of Fisheries is making a statement on Monday night, Sir, that is wrong.

MR. W. CARTER: The arrogance -

MR. W. ROWE: Who is this now? What is the hon. Minister of Fisheries making a statement on Monday night? A brilliant statement too.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Asks questions, Ministerial Statements against the feds.

AN HON. MEMBER: - twelve questions so far.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right. And you know how many more you are going to get?

MR. W. ROWE: And what kind of answers do we get, Sir, from that hon. minister? We get no information, we get no government policy, what we get is a Ministerial Statement, another broad side against Romeo Le Blanc and the government of Canada. We know the minister's policy, Sir, the minister's policy is no co-operation with Ottawa, no development of plans except a few ad hoc things flung around right, left and center and attack Ottawa, that is the minister's policy, We do not have to hear that every day of the week. when you stand up and ask him a question. Why should we hear that again? What I would like to hear is what he has in store, what the plans are for the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another sleepless night.

MR. W. ROWE: Well it would not be like the sleepless night the hon. Minister of Fisheries had when he had his resignation all written out and given to members of the press and then at seven o'clock in the morning called up all the stations and said, do not use it, do not use it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Call a cox meeting.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, kill it, Mr. Speaker. I hope it is not another night like that I would not wish that on anybody. That must have been a terrible night, nightmarish, grappling, agonizing reappraisals, grappling with his conscience and finally, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. W. CARTER: At least I have a conscience.

MR. W. ROWE: That is wit, boy, That is wit. That passes as wit. When you are dealing with dimwits that passes as wit. Do you not understand? Halfwits that is wit.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: I notice he is all guts here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and in his place.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Frightened to come back.

MR. W. ROWE: - and frightened to death.

AN HON. MEMBER: They would not let him come back.

MR. F. ROWE: So Morgan is the hatchet man.

MR. W. ROWE: When I saw the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) over there in the corner looking with complete disbelief and

June 19, 1978

Tape No. 4619 (Night)

Alt-3

MR.W. ROWE: dismay at one of his own colleagues' freaking
out before his very eyes, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR.W. ROWE: Well stick around and watch the hon.
Minister of Tourism, the member

Mr. W. N. Rowe: for Bonavista South if you want an example.

MR. RIDEOUT: Like the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs the other night.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, well the Minister of Municipal Affairs gave a fair facsimile but nothing like the real thing. But in any event, Sir, the tone and attitude of regional government as perceived and conceived by this government as seen in Section 3. The purpose of the Act is to provide a framework of regional government etc., etc., as delegated to the regional council by the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well what is wrong with it?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well there is nothing wrong with it, except what it does it sets the tone for a council which seems to be, appears to be and is a slavish creation of the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of the Environment.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is all it does, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing wrong with it at all. But the government should call a spade a spade. What the government should do, Sir, and what we want is a group mostly appointed by us or a sizeable proportion appointed by us who can implement our policies when need be, not give us any trouble, implement our policies when need be, take the flak when need be, take the heat off us, all right, as for example the government tried to do, Mr. Speaker, unsuccessfully by putting responsibility for hearing rate increases in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro before the Public Utility Commission. Take the flak away from the government, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Let me suggest to the Leader of the Opposition Party when you were a member of that party sitting in this House -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, but, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister of Justice does not add in his usual way is that if you are going to have a body which has powers to make decisions like that then give them the power to make the decision.

MR. HICKMAN: The power to recommend.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Give them the power to make the decision as they see it, Mr. Speaker, based on the evidence before them.

MR. HICKMAN: No that is a new philosophy.

MR. W. N. ROWE: All right. Based on the evidence before them. Do not, Mr. Speaker, set them up in the one hand and render them impotent in the other hand. All you have is a Public Utility Commission, Sir, All it can do now and my hon. friend knows this, he sat in as did I, sat in on scores of meetings, my hon. friend has as well, what you have now, Sir, what you have now is the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation going down, going through the farce, the facade, really, that is all it is, of presenting their evidence and then you have the Public Utilities Committee who must do it under the law because they are forced to do it, those gentlemen are first-class gentlemen, coming up with a recommendation and giving it to the government, and then the government has the power to implement that or not. But, Sir, what the government tries to do as it is trying to do with this regional council as conceived here, what the government tries to do, Sir, is pretend that the Public Utilities Commission is the one that is really imposing this rate increase - all right? - and hide from the people the fact that the government has the right to overturn that or to increase it or decrease it or throw it out.

MR. HICKMAN: Now I understand the hon. member -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Right, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKMAN: - that the government has a right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I beg your pardon?

MR. F. ROWE: He is twisting things. Boy you are some -

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman -

MR. F. ROWE: You should have gone into gymnastics.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Listen, boy! Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Justice if he wanted a debate -

MR. HICKMAN: No, no seriously.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - on the Public Utilities Commission and so on -

MR. HICKMAN: But the hon. the Leader did say -

MR. W. N. ROWE: - should have brought in something, right?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, you did -

MR. W. N. ROWE: I read there in one of the editorials something which echoed my thoughts completely it was to this effect, Sir, that two pieces of legislation of any consequence have originated with this government in this session. Two pieces of legislation, one was the Occupational Health and Safety Act and that was emasculated when it came to mining industries and so on.

MR. HICKMAN: No it really was not -

MR. W. N. ROWE: And -

MR. PECKFORD: Now that is not fair.

MR. W. N. ROWE: the regional council.

MR. PECKFORD: Do not say that.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The regional council, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: You are doing all right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Two pieces of legislation.

MR. HICKMAN: You tried to emasculate it, but these are no changes made remember in Committee.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the only other good pieces of legislation, and there are several originated from the outside.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or from this side.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Or from this side.

MR. HICKMAN: Such as what from that side?

MR. PECKFORD: That is all right. That is a good -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making, Sir, I am trying to draw the parallel, and if the hon. the Minister of Justice wants a full-fledged debate on energy policy and the distribution of power, and so on and so forth let him bring something in and we will gladly accommodate him on that score. But, Mr. Speaker, the

MR. W. ROWE: parallel that I want to make is that in the same way as they have tried to pass the blame for power increases over onto the backs of the Public Utilities Commission when they know they have the right and the power to refuse to implement it, in the same way, Mr. Speaker, this regional council as perceived and conceived in this act here, is a mere creature of the government, both by way of attitude and by way of operation because of the appointments they are going to make. It is a body which will stand as a buffer between the people and the government and allow the government to slough off their responsibility once more, a body which will do their slavish duty for the government when need be and when there is an uprising or kerfuffle or dissatisfaction as a result of the non-provision of vital services, this government can say, "Well that is your regional council letting you down there, and take the heat off the government."

Mr. Speaker, it is four minutes to, I do not know if the hon. - I will move the adjournment of the debate if the hon. House Leader will consent to that and then get back at it again tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: I move the adjournment, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I have to ask Mr. Speaker this, why is it that every time I get up on my feet I get this loud applause from the Opposition benches? It has got to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that the House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at two o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved that the House adjourn.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

This House is now adjourned until tomorrow at two of the clock.