

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1978

June 27, 1978

Tape 4824

DW - 1

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask all members of the House to join with me on the government side in an expression of deepest sympathy to the families of the men and women who died on Friday morning's tragic plane crash on the Bauline Line. The death of four members of the Historic Monument's Board is undoubtedly the loss for Canada as a whole. All of these individuals were prominent in the study of Canadian history and will I am sure be dearly missed by the associates as well as the public at large.

I would wish to pay special tribute to Mr. William Manning who, as many of you know, was a tireless worker in many community activities, including the Knights of Columbus and the St. John's Regatta Committee. Mr. Manning was elected the first Mayor of Torbay six years ago and worked hard to see improvements made in his hometown. It was only on Thursday past that Mr. Manning saw the realization of one of his lifelong ambitions, the designation of Torbay as a national historic site. I know all members join me in extending deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all the victims of this plane crash during this time of bereavement.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, of course it goes without saying that we on this side of the House would want to associate ourselves very much with the words of sympathy and condolences expressed by the Premier in connection with this very tragic plane crash on Friday. The House will recall, Sir, that it was with a great deal of shock that each member here on Friday heard the news. At that time, of course, it was mere rumour and we did not

11468

MR. W.N. ROWE: know who was involved or what names were involved in the crash. We did not know how many people were killed. Sir, it was a shock and a tragedy not only for the ten individuals involved-it is always a terrible thing when one individual loses his or her life - but, Sir, also in this case we had a group who were dedicated to the preservation of things historical in the Province and that, in addition to the lives lost, will be a sad loss for everybody who treasures and wants to treasure historical monuments and historical sites in this Province. Sir, the ten who died, as the Premier mentioned, were a combination of Newfoundlanders and mainlanders and I too would like to particularly associate myself with his remarks concerning William Manning, the Mayor of Torbay. Sir, everybody who had anything to do with politics, I suppose, municipal or provincial, and certainly anything to do with Signal Hill knew William Manning well and had nothing but respect for him and what he stood for, what he was trying to do for his community and for Newfoundland and Labrador as a whole. Sir, it was a very sad day, one that nobody wants to ever see recur in this Province. Sir, I would like to join with the Premier on behalf of my colleagues here in making certain that a message of sympathy and condolences is sent from this House to the families of each of the individuals who so tragically lost their lives in that crash. I am sorry?

MR. S. NEARY: I would like to know why it crashed.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, of course. Obviously there will be an investigation by the Department of Transport or, if not, and perhaps in addition to a magisterial enquiry so that, as I mentioned earlier, we do not see the recurrence of this sort of thing again for whatever reason it might have been. So, as I say, we join in expressing our sympathy and our condolences to the widows, husbands, widowers and families, children of the people who so tragically and sadly lost their lives in that crash, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker by leave I would like to express a tribute to the pilot, Mr. Gerald Eichel, if that is permitted. He was a very close friend of mine who flew the Labrador Coast for many years, five and a half years, and I would like to pay tribute from everybody on the Labrador Coast since many people have called me. He was the pilot, in fact, who flew me in the last election campaign - flew with us and stayed at our home I would like to pay tribute to him as an excellent pilot. He showed the skills that all bush pilots show and I think that the crash hopefully will not be a reflection on his skills because I know him as a tremendous pilot and I would like to express my appreciation of him.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to turn to another matter, Sir. It is always a very proud moment for Newfoundlanders when anybody in this Province wins a national award or an international award. Well, Sir, over the weekend hon. members have probably heard that two national awards came to Newfoundland, one to Marystown, and one to Corner Brook. VOCM's subsidiary station CHCM in Marystown won another award called the Community Leadership Award for Canadian Radio. The award was presented at The Radio and Television News Directors Association which was held this past weekend in Vancouver, and the award is for efforts of CHCM in Marystown to have the federal government conduct an inquiry into the sinking of the trawler Cape Royal.

Mr. Speaker, the other award was also a national award called the radio Dan McArthur Award this award went to CFCB Radio Station on the West Coast in Corner Brook. And it was won for a documentary in connection with the seal hunt, and I am surprised that the hon. the Premier, who has been so active in the pro-Seal Campaign, did not leap to his feet this afternoon to congratulate Radio Station CFCB in Corner Brook for winning the Dan McArthur Award for a documentary on the Seal Hunt.

As I say, Sir, these are really proud moments for Newfoundlanders. When we can win an award in the Atlantic region we always feel very happy and proud, but when we can take on the rest of Canada, Sir, and beat out the radio stations in the whole of Canada and have two awards come into Newfoundland at that same time - and I believe this is the second award, by the way, for CFCB who also won an award for their coverage of the sinking of The William Carson. They won a couple of Atlantic provinces awards, and this is the second time within a year that they won the national award.

I am sure the House would not want these events, Sir, to go unnoticed and I would hope that somebody on the other side would second my motion to extend our sincerest congratulations to Radio Station VOCM, especially its satellite station CHCM in Marystown, and Radio Station CFCB in Corner Brook, and especially to the particular newsmen who had

Mr. Neary: to do with putting together these documentaries and these community leadership items.

So, I hope, Sir, that both sides of the House will congratulate today these two radio stations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House join with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in firstly congratulating Radio Station CHCM, the first station on the South Coast of Newfoundland, the first radio station to be established on that Coast. And that in itself was a tremendous accomplishment because prior to that the majority of listeners along the South Coast were under a steady barrage from radio stations in Cape Breton and in fact New Carlisle and other places. When I was a boy in Grand Bank we got our news from CFCY, I think it was, in Sydney, or CHNS in Sydney. CHCM has shown a great deal of community leadership, not just in their efforts to persuade the Minister of Transport in Ottawa to initiate an inquiry into The Cape Royal, but practically every worthwhile cause on the South Coast that requires some leadership and organization and one finds CHCM very much in the fore.

CFCB again proves beyond reasonable doubt that the private radio stations, and the private media can, when called upon so to do with much less cost or that much less cost than some other areas, present and provide excellent documentaries on matters of importance and public interest in this Province.

We extend to CHCM and the staff at Marystown our congratulations on a job well done in receiving an award that goes beyond the Provincial scope in its nature, and also we congratulate the management and staff of Radio Station CFCB in Corner Brook again for doing such a good job

MR. HICKMAN: on behalf of this Province in bringing our message to the attention of people beyond our shores.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honour and privilege of presenting today a petition containing some nearly 1,500 names in this one petition. I understand there are several others being circulated or have already been circulated containing many more names from the students at Memorial University. I believe, Sir, we have the honour today of having several students from that university looking in on our proceedings so it is an opportune time, Sir, to present it. I received the petition only a short few minutes ago. The petition reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

"To the hon. House of Assembly: Whereas measures introduced in the 1978 budget concerning changes in student aid will tend to place a tremendous financial burden on graduates from Memorial University, and whereas these changes will cause a substantial decrease in enrolment at the University based on financial rather than academic qualifications, and whereas the increase in the operating budget for Memorial University is insufficient to cover inflation in salaries and costs, and whereas this minimal increase will decrease the quality of education at Memorial University, and whereas tuition and residence fees will be forced to rise, therefore we the undersigned respectfully petition the government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider the allocation of funds in these areas of the budget and respectfully request that the government increase its support of university education."

And as I say, Sir, this one petition, and I think there are several others, this one petition contains about nearly 1,500 names and I have of course appended my own name to it as well.

Sir, we have outlined on this side of the House our policy and our position regarding education in this Province on many occasions. We have done so when we received petitions protesting the cutbacks on teachers in this Province and any other cutbacks in the quality

MR. W. ROWE: of education or anything that even tends towards decreasing the quality of education in this Province. Our position, Sir, has been stated, I have stated it publicly and I do so here again, Sir, that not one student who has the ability to do so, not one student should be turned away from the doors of Memorial University or the Trades School or any other institution of higher education for that matter, but we are talking about the university here, not one student should be turned away, Sir, who has the ability because of financial reasons. If, Sir, we once admit that financial considerations can determine whether a man or a woman or a boy or a girl of talent and skill is going to get the best education possible or not, then, Sir, I do not think we deserve to call ourselves a civilization at all. We have to make sure, Sir, that the best that our young people have to offer get the best in training that can be obtained in Newfoundland or in Canada because, Sir, unless we do so Newfoundland and Labrador will be doomed to deteriorate and go down in quality, the quality of life and the quality of our economy increasingly as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, it has now become a truism and trite to say so but it has to be said: we in this Province are graduating approximately one half the rate of university students that they are graduating across Canada generally and about one quarter the rate, Mr. Speaker, of students graduating from university in provinces like Ontario or Alberta. The same figures apply to Trade School, Technical College and the same figures apply to, I believe, graduation from grade XI itself. Sir, if there is a future for Newfoundland and Labrador, and I firmly believe there is, an economic future, or I would not be in this House today or ever, if there is a future, Sir, and I believe there is, it has to depend on the solid training and education and the gaining of qualifications and skills by our young people. That is why, Sir, I support this petition so adamantly today and have no hesitation to doing so. As I say there may be several more which will come in and we will rise in our places, at least on this side of the House, Sir, and support them wholeheartedly as well. Our future, Sir, is with these

MR. W.N. ROWE: young people who have taken the trouble to sign their names here and have turned out today in these numbers, who marched on the Confederation Building two or three months ago and who, I am sure, will continue to make their feelings known. It is an important issue, an issue which should not be allowed to die because the future of this Province, Sir, depends on the young people of talent and ability getting the training and qualifications that are necessary to make sure our economy carries on in a viable fashion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I rise, Sir, to wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague the Leader of the Opposition, the petition which was signed by 1,500 students at Memorial University condemning measures recently implemented by the government to increase the student aid and which the students rightly point out could conceivably cause a decrease in enrollment at the university.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the government will reconsider this matter, Sir, because it is a very, very serious matter. So often we hear politicians get up and say that the best investment that we have in this Province, the best resource we have is our young people. Yet it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that every time government sees fit to cut back, to tighten their belts, they always cut back on the young people, they cut back on the students at the university. When the government refuses to grant the university additional increases that they request, it reflects on the tuition and the enrollment fees of the students who attend that university.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the situation has been bad enough. Before this year young Newfoundlanders, young men and women in this Province have been discouraged from attending the university already because of the huge debts that they incur while at the university that they have to start paying once they graduate and get out in the world. And usually when they graduate, Mr. Speaker, they go out and they get married and then they are saddled with an \$8,000 or \$10,000, and sometimes much more than that, \$10,000 or \$12,000 debt that they have to start paying back. And if they do not pay it back their names are put on the Credit Bureaus, in the credit agencies downtown and the life is harassed out of them until they make some kind of an arrangement to pay it back, and this is not right, Sir.

It we stay on the course that the government is on now we are going to end up with an elitist university -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - and that is the last thing we want in this world, Sir. I agree with my colleague, that in no way should young men and women in this Province be turned away from our post-secondary educational institutions because of money, because of their financial circumstances. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for these young people to understand government plowing money into all kinds of business and industry that fails, plowing money into things that can be considered to be extravagance and waste like the Norma and Gladys affair, the luxurious helicopter services we have in this Province and paying out money for renting office space in this Province.

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

I as sure the hon, gentleman is aware, as are all other hon. members, that, obviously, one can speak in support of the petition but general areas of

MR. SPEAKER: debate and matters outside of the particular subject matter would not be relevant at this time. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, and I thank Your Honour.

But it is hard for these students to understand, Mr. Speaker, why the government can plow millions piled up on millions of dollars into industries that fail and when they have to cut back because of their mistakes and their extravagance and waste the very first ones they hit are the students in this Province, and that, Sir, is morally wrong.

I would hope that the government - and if the hon. gentleman wishes to get up and have a few words in support of this petition and then go down on the eighth floor and try to persuade his colleagues to reconsider this matter, well we would be very glad to hear from the hon. gentleman. But I hope it does not turn out like the spruce budworm spray programme when the hon. gentleman condemned it one day and got rapped on the knuckles by the Premier the next.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt at all, Sir. The students have already gone to to the Premier, they came and they met with the Liberal Caucus - they had already met with the Premier and the Premier gave some kind of indication, I believe, that there might be a light at the end of the tunnel and in the Fall of the year when we review the situation well, it may not be quite as harsh as was originally outlined in the Budget Speech. Well, I will be curious now and anxious, Sir, to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say. Will he get up now and whip the carpet out from under the feet of the Minister of Finance, the hon. House Leader?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. the Premier does that I will say, "Hear, hear! Well and good!" Because, Mr. Speaker, it would not be the first time that ministers in the hon. gentleman's Cabinet have made fools of themselves and then the matter had to be rectified later on by the hon. the Premier by reversing the decision. This is one time that we would hold with the hon. the Premier, if the hon. the Premier will reverse this decision, reconsider this matter, and not wait until the Fall of the year because these students want to register now. And if the hon. gentleman will get up and say, "We are going to reconsider this matter. We are not going to inflict these huge debts on the students who want to attend post-secondary educational institutions in this Province" he would get probably the unanimous support of the House, Sir. Certainly I can tell the hon. gentleman without even consulting with my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition that we would support that kind of measure, would we not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: I believe the hon. gentleman would get 100 support from this side of the House, but do not try and bluff the students. If the hon. gentleman does not mean it, do not get up and run a bluff, and say we might consider it or we are going to do it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - in the Fall. We are fed up with this government bluffing. So let us hope the Premier will get up and make a firm commitment today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - that these students can go ahead and register at the University that they will not have to pay higher tuition and residence fees in the coming academic year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this petition I never thought I would live long enough in this House to see the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) lecture à la the professor on the subject

Premier Moores: of Memorial University. I think, Sir, it is probably the first positive sign we have seen in that regard, and I would suggest, Sir, his opening remarks, Sir, where he supported the petition of 1,500 people as opposed to the content which he never dwelt upon had more of an impression on the hon. gentleman than did the content itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: However, Sir, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: - having said that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Well, Sir, I do not see where the spruce budworm came into that petition, and the hon. member as he waved that flag and the red flag of the debts of the future, I will strongly recommend once again as playing fair politics as opposed to being reasonable and looking after the petition itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that the Students Union and their Executive have met with me on two occasions. They have made quite an impression because they are a very capable bunch. They put together a pink paper, and as I said at the time I hope it is not philosophically symbolic because the content of it basically was extremely good.

The thing is, Sir, that government on this side or anywhere else, I would suggest, want to make sure that the young people of our country and of our Province have the full advantage of a university or a post-secondary education whether it be in technical, vocational, or the university itself education. At the present time the monetary circumstances we have in this Province for young people attending university is the best in Canada. Obviously we want not to place hardships on people whereby they run up debts that they cannot pay back. We as a government will do our utmost to make sure that all those who want to attend university can do so. However, as in all

Premier Moores: aspects of society there are obligations that one must pay back for the benefits of society.

The fact is, Sir, that the curriculum at the Trade School and at the Vocational School, I think particularly has to be looked at as to what are the opportunities in the future are going to be. Do we just carry on with more of the same? And possibly the same for the university and the emphasis on what courses?

But irrespective of what has come up, Sir, as far as the detail of curriculum is concerned, what comes up regarding monetary policy is concerned, and as I say it is the intent of this government to ensure that any student with the ability who wants a further education will have that opportunity, the fact is also, Sir, that the people who are attending these institutions today are going to be the leaders in the very near future, not the distant future. They are the people who should be given the opportunity not just for education at the academic level, but also the exposure of what the opportunities are going to be in this Province and in this country in the future. And for that reason, Sir, I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the petition supported by 1,500 students at Memorial University. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are in a situation where we are more generous than the rest of Canada, then the rest of Canada is wrong, because for some reason or other -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not true.

MR. HODDER: - since the priorities

MR. HODDER: in education and priorities in the Province seem to be mixed up. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that certain students in this Province can leave high school, spend a year out and go to, say, an adult education institution, be paid to go to school or paid to go to vocational school while a student who decides to go to university to try to learn or to get a higher education must pay the way himself? Now I think that possibly we have gone too far thinking about jobs. The situation now is to try and force people into areas whereby they are being educated in order to find a job when they get out and we have forgotten that we need the university, we must encourage students to obtain a university education and to forget about the job aspect of the university education. Because we need to train students who can come out - I might say this, Mr. Speaker, that we must promote intellectual development so that students can come out and take part in any type of education. From year to year different types of skills, different types of jobs are needed, We must in this Province as in other provinces of Canada encourage more people to go to university so that they can take advantage of the changing society in which we live; we must train students to reason, analyse and to be able to tackle a wide variety of skills. The other thing about this particular situation that has caused students to pay more money at the present time is when I went to university, in 1959 I think it was, there were 700 students at the university; half of those students came from Corner Brook and Grand Falls and another third of them came from St. John's and the rest were people who were lucky enough to get in from the outports to university. Over the last few years this has changed and more and more students from the rural areas are able to get into university even though it costs them more in many cases than it does those people from the Avalon Peninsula area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the more we tax the students, the more we make him pay, the more chance there is that students will drop out of university. I have already seen instances in my district whereby students are not going back to university this year because they cannot afford to go back or they are afraid of the costs and everything else involved.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I think that we must set our priorities. I know that the economic situation is bad in this Province and I know that we have great public debt and I know that we have to have money for water and sewer and all that sort of thing but, Mr. Speaker, we should not cut back on education; this is not the place to cut back. I fear that if this trend continues, where we pay people in the vocational schools and force people to pay to go to university, then I think that in the future you will find less and less people going to university, I think that would be a great detriment to this Province because I believe that the future of this Province is in the university students. As the Premier said, I believe the university students will be the leaders of the very near tomorrow but I will hark back to one thing, what has happened with this last cutback is. and I think it was said in the prayer of the petition, that financial rather than academic considerations will decide which students will attend university and I think, Mr. Speaker, that would be a great disgrace to this Province, that would be a great tragedy.

MR. E. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the petition on behalf of 1,500 students from Memorial University. It is sad really, Sir, I will just take a quote from the budget here, "In 1978-1979 changes will be introduced in the present policy so that students will be required"-

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will spar with any member opposite but not with that hon. member from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) so I will ask for the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to be heard without interruption.

MR. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I will repeat if I can get the silence.

MR. CALLAN: Name him, Mr. Speaker, name him.

MR. F. ROWE: I will repeat, Sir, "In 1978-1979 changes will

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4829

AH-3

MR. F. ROWE: be introduced to the present policy so that students will be required to borrow \$700 per semester under the Canada Student Loan Programme before becoming eligible for the provincial assistance. This change will bring our policy in line with that followed in other Atlantic provinces." Now, Sir, that

11482

MR. F. ROWE: may sound good on the surface, this policy will bring us in line with that followed in the other Atlantic Provinces." Sir, we cannot go along with that \$100 increase per semester that students have to borrow when we know full well that we only have one half the national per capita average of our students attending university and when we know full well, Sir, that we have only had full-fledged university for twenty-eight years compared with the other Atlantic Provinces and other mainland provinces that have had universities for hundreds of years and have the benefit of these universities for their students going into society. Sir, we were at an extreme disadvantage by very virtue of the fact that we did not get a university until 1949. And we have a lot of catching up to do, Sir, and anything that we can do to assist students in a financial way to get through this university, Sir, we should do because we are behind to start off with in that respect.

Now, Sir, one thing that worries and concerns me is this inequity as far as the students at Memorial University are concerned. When I was a spokesman for education I used to bring this topic up many a time that we have too many of our students coming out of high school and attending a post secondary educational institution on the basis of the amount of money he or she can get in the way of a salary or an allowance. For example, I know students who are going to the College of Trades and Technology not because they want to go to the College of Trades and Technology but because they know they can get more money, more allowance to put them through there. And we have inequity, Sir, when we compare the Fisheries College, the Vocational School, the College of Trades and Technology and Memorial University. We do not have any standardization whatsoever of financial assistance to these students. And we have gross inequities existing from one institution to another and I am afraid, Sir, that we have too many people coming out of our high schools and going to the educational institution not of their choice but going to a particular institution because of financial necessity. I am afraid

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, that is not the way to train people and educate people to enter into our society.

Sir, the fact of the matter is that we have too many of our students not going to university, wanting to go to the university but not going because they know full well that when they get out they will have a monumental debt on their hands, a monumental debt. That is one problem that the students have to contend with and they are scared of, but the other problem, Sir, and I would like to - I have to close on this one. I would like to speak to it a little while longer. But I feel very strongly the students who are going to our university should get more guidance in terms of what particular faculty or department they wish to go into. Because I am afraid, Sir, that we are piling students into certain divisions, certain departments, certain faculties and they do not have a job opportunity when they come out. They come out with a huge debt and no job. I do not mean force them into a department or force them out of a department, but they should be made aware of the job potential once they get out of the university and I think that is very, very important, Sir.

So, Sir, I whole-heartedly support this very, very important petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition presented on behalf of 1,500 students, students who are concerned about the direction of education in this Province and concerned about the quality of education and the disastrous results which are apparent from the change in the studentsaid and the student loan structure. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no way that this Province can afford to have its educational development, intellectual development of its young people tied to the wealth of the parents of the young people of this Province. Certainly that should not be a consideration. The consideration for education in this Province should be intellectual ability and any

MR. LUSH: student who has the ability to profit and take advantage of a university education must be afforded that opportunity, must be afforded that right and there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that this Province should agree to a universal application of the Canada Student Loan. It cannot be applied universally because of our special problems, one, the high unemployment rate among young people, the difficulty for young people to get a job in this Province makes it mandatory that there will be

MR. LUSH: special considerations with respect to the loan plan for students of this Province. It is very difficult for young people to get a job, and because of that that they are not going to be able to get back to the university unless there is some flexibility in the student aid programme for the students of this Province.

Secondly, we have less students attending university, a less percentage of our total population than any other province of Canada. That is another reason why that we cannot have the Canada Student Aid applied to this Province as it is in other provinces of Canada. We cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. There must be special consideration for this Province in view of the high unemployment, and in view of the fact that a large percentage or that we do not have the same percentage rate of students attending university as is the case in other provinces of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the new arrangement the government is now proposing is going to put our students head and ears in debt, and that is why our enrollment is falling off at the University because students do not want to saddle themselves with this extra burden. I think in the brief that the students presented to the Premier that they show that under the old system that they would receive - they would have received under the old system a total loan of \$4,500 which meant that when they finished university they would be paying back \$58 a month. Under the new programme, under the new system, under the structure whereby the government is demanding that students borrow \$700 a semester, under this new system it means that the students would accumulate a total loan of \$7,000, just about double the amount under the old system, \$4,500 as opposed to \$7,000, and for a monthly payment of \$91. Just about doubled, Mr. Speaker, and that is a tremendous financial burden to put on the students of this Province to go from \$58 a month to \$91 a month. And there is no wonder, no wonder that students are not going to university when they look at that kind of debt, when they look at that kind of financial burden that is going to be placed upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would reverse this decision immediately to make university accessible to our students, not on the basis of wealth of their parents, not on the

Mr. Lush: basis of money, but on the basis of intellectual ability.

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition signed by, I believe, 1,500 people on behalf of, I am sure, a great many more both presently at Memorial and who would like to go there, but cannot presently afford to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are other petitions, too.

DR. KITCHEN: The fact is that this Province sends very few people to post-secondary institutions. The latest research that I have seen indicates that compared to Nova Scotia one-third of our young people go to university and similar institutions as go from Nova Scotia, and the Nova Scotian average is the Canadian average pretty well. We are well behind in the number of young people who go to university and to vocational schools.

So there is a great need, in my opinion, to encourage more people to go to post-secondary institutions. I would not want to discourage people from going to the College of Trades or the vocational schools or the College of Fisheries because that is very, very important, and for far too long have these institutions borne, in my view, the dirty end of the stick in education, the non-prestigious part, whereas we should be building up these institutions as well as Memorial. But it has got to the point now where Memorial students find it very difficult, and the people who go to Memorial are changing in their nature. There are fewer people from poorer families, fewer rural people, and fewer people from very small communities. They tend now to be, as mentioned by my colleague, very much people who are from larger and larger centres. And the reason is that because people from smaller communities cannot afford to go.

Now then what would this cost? What is being asked really is that - what the government has done is forced people to borrow \$250 more instead of giving a grant for \$250. And this means if a person is suppose to borrow \$250 a semester, say they go two semesters a year for five years, that is ten semesters usually to get a five year degree, that would be \$2,500 that that person

DR. KITCHEN:

has to borrow over and above what he would normally have to borrow if he were given the grants. You are talking about \$2,500 per student. And per year, from the point of view of the government paying it out - the average student, say a couple of semesters \$250, \$500 for each student, \$500 per student that the government would have to give him in grants instead of the student borrowing loans, \$500, and if you have 10,000 students, Memorial has only 8,000, that is about \$2 million a year, \$8000 times 500 that is \$4 million a year, \$4 million and not all of these, of course, would be eligible for the total amount so you are probably talking about a sum considerably less than \$4 million a year, perhaps about \$2 million a year.

MR. SIMMONS:

The same as the Action Group.

DR. KITCHEN:

The same as the Action Group, very good.

About \$2 million a year maybe. I am not sure what the figures are because I do not have the numbers in front of me. But we are not talking about many millions we are talking perhaps about a couple of million dollars per year, at most \$2 million. Now, where could they save this money? Without getting into the Action Group and things like that, I think money could be shaved off the education budget to provide for that.

Let us look at Memorial's budget itself. I believe Memorial University is over-administered. I could save money tomorrow morning if I fired out some of those vice-presidents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

We could do the same thing with the Board of Regents. That huge Board of Regents could be lopped and could meet much more efficiently and it would save travelling expenses and so on. I believe that a university like Memorial could very well be forced

DR. KITCHEN: by this government to disclose its budget so we will know, all of us will know in the House of Assembly, precisely what it is they are wasting or wisely spending their money on. And if the money is not available from Memorial's budget then it might very well be available from some other part of the educational budget other than Memorial.

And believe you me, I can find ways to shave money off the education budget besides doing what the government did by taking it away from the extra teachers. You do not need to do that. You could look at some of the money that is being spent on certain specialist teachers in this Province, some of the specialists - I will not name them as there are some good specialists, but there are some other teachers that this Province cannot afford. I believe we should look at, and look at very carefully the education budget and trim where necessary, and I am sure that we can trim the \$2 million necessary per annum to support this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice followed by the hon. members for Lewisporte and Grand Falls.

MR. HICKMAN: If I may have but a quick word. I am somewhat at a loss in following the hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) because my understanding is that this petition -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you supporting this?

MR. HICKMAN: I am supporting it but I am not quite certain where the hon. the member for St. John's West stands. Because the petition as read by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asks for an increase in the grants to Memorial whereas the hon. member for St. John's West is suggesting that if we want to shave some money off we should cut back further on the grants to Memorial by shaving off the extravagance - and he nods

MR. HICKMAN: his head in agreement. Am I correct in my interpretation of what the hon. gentleman has said?

DR. KITCHEN: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Right!

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very vexing problem and one that does not lend itself to easy solution but there are certain facts that we must bear in mind. The hon. member for St. John's West drew to the attention of the House that we have considerably less number of students attending university than in Nova Scotia. He did not say, and I wish he had, and I think it is very apropos this petition, as to what the cause for it is. It surely is not money because our grants to students are considerably higher than those in Nova Scotia.

For instance, in the three Maritime Province where they have a uniform student loan plan, and a uniform student grant plan as initiated by the Maritime Provinces of Higher Education Committee, the first \$1,400 of need is under the Canada student loan, the next \$1,000 is a provincial grant and the next \$400 is a Canada student loan for a total maximum of \$2,800 to all single and married students. They make no distinction in the Maritime Provinces, the so-called affluent provinces of the Maritimes between married and single. In Newfoundland, what we are proposing in this year's budget commencing in September is the first \$1,400 of need would be a Canada student loan and then a provincial grant of \$2,000, precisely double that of any of the Maritime Provinces, and the next \$400 Canada loan. In addition, in this Province there is a grant of \$500 more for married students which means that the maximum for Newfoundland is \$3,400 for single students and \$3,900 for married students, whereas in the Maritime it is a total of

MR. HICKMAN: \$2800. Yet, that substantial increase that we have in this Province over the Maritimes still leaves us with the problem that the hon. the member for St. John's West has raised, that in the three Provinces where their grants are rather miserly compared to ours,

MR. HICKMAN: they have more students going to university. So I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just addressing ourselves to what this Province has the fiscal capacity to pay but also there have to be some other reasons besides the cost of going to university for the less interest or number of applications we have from Newfoundlanders as compared to our sister provinces. I think it is also worthy of note that the tuition at Memorial is below that of any Maritime university.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: Yet with all of those combined, Mr. Speaker, and bearing in mind our fiscal capacity to pay, the Maritime provinces seem to be attracting more students than we are. Maybe there is a more diversified programme. I do not know. But whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, the student loan one has not helped us even though we are far more generous than it has helped them.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition today signed by 1,500 students. It is a very important matter, Mr. Speaker, and if I might refer to one thing that the Minister of Finance just mentioned: He talked about the number of students attending university in Nova Scotia as compared to Newfoundland and the amounts of money available to each. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that if the unemployment rate in Newfoundland were down to nine per cent as it is in Nova Scotia you would get more people going to university because they could afford to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, if there is ever a time in Newfoundland when we need to pay more attention to the young people today than we ever did before it is now. The population figures will show that the people in the gallery and the people going to university represent fifty per cent, over fifty per cent of the population of this Province is under the age of twenty-two, twenty-three years. Now, is the time Mr. Speaker, when we should be paying attention to those young people

MR. WHITE: because if we do not we are going to be in serious trouble a decade down the road.

Now essentially what has happened in Newfoundland over the last eight or ten years, Mr. Speaker, is that St. John's, the urban area of St. John's has been taken care of in terms of post-secondary education, the urban area of Corner Brook has been taken care of with the Regional College, and what you are left with, Mr. Speaker, is an area in between, essentially the rural area of Newfoundland who has once again been discriminated against, the rural areas once again discriminated against at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the traditional incomes of Newfoundlanders has been reversed, and that in rural areas of the Province is where the economic base of this Province is being stabilized and is being held up. It is the rural areas that are keeping this Province going at the present time, yet at every turn this government gives the rural areas the knife. It is the same with education, Mr. Speaker, and unless we realize that we are going to be in serious trouble in this Province. We do not want to turn it into a university of the rich and urbanites; we want the university to be a place where people can attend from all over this Province and not be sacrificed because of that. So I say, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) that it is not money to the administration that we are talking about, it is money to the students because we must get the students back into the university and stop this declining enrolment that we have going on now because we are faced with a large population of this Province who do not have very much to look forward to unless we deal with it and deal with it seriously in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I could possibly sum up my comments by just associating my remarks with the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) whom I believe made a pretty non-political statement. Now some of us in taking part in our debate today or in response to the petition presentation-

June 27,1978

Tape No. 4833

AH-3

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I hope I am not accused of being sort of associating with the professionals when I say this, but I think they have been more sort of vocal in a negative sense than they have been constructive and I think the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) summed it up when he said, I think this is what he said at least to me, was that we should be looking at the priorities of spending of the dollars that we are spending at the university. Now the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) referred to the unemployment statistics and the unemployment problem. I believe it is a fact that if we had a full compliment of people at the secondary institutions in our Province today, comparable to the national average, and a full compliment of students retained in our pre-secondary system or our primary, elementary and secondary school system

11493

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the national average and on a full compliment of student retained in our pre-secondary system or our primary elementary and secondary school system, that we would see a very substantial difference in the unemployment rate. Because many of the people who are on the unemployment rolls and the unemployment statistics are there by virtue of the fact that they are not properly in secondary institutions or post secondary institutions and that is one of the reasons why the rate is so high in this Province. But more importantly I want to say that we are this year spending \$46,672,000 at the university, \$47 million at Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador. So far this year it is practically gone unnoticed, practically nobody has talked about it, we have not had a debate on it, and maybe it is about time that we had an open commentary on the priorities of the university spending. Now one of the things I have just briefly broached, and I just want to raise it again, is this, that we are spending \$8 million of that \$47 million, \$8 million of that total budget goes to the education of approximately fifty-five to sixty students at Memorial University; that is the Medical School. Now I understand from conversations with professional people that we are pretty well satisfied in this Province with respect to the medical needs in terms of the abundance of doctors. About \$8 million. Now if you will subtract the capital dollars from the \$46 million you are looking at a big large chunk of the education dollar spent in post secondary education going for fifty-five or sixty students. Now I question that. I do not say it is wrong, I do not say we should dump it out, I do not say we should eliminate the Medical School, but I question the priority when the preponderance of the education dollars at Memorial are going to fifty-five or sixty students. Whether they are in the priesthood, the medical system, educators, or whatever the heck they are in, there is something wrong with that kind of a system.

Now there is where I would like to raise my concern and that is that so far the university - and I am a former colleague of two of my colleagues across the way who have spoken this

MR. LUNDRIGAN: afternoon, Trinity-Bay de Verde and St. John's West - I question, despite the fact that I might incur the wrath of some of my administrative colleagues at the university, the people who are in charge of the system, the lieutenants, if you want, I question that we are getting the full value for the education dollar that goes into post secondary education at Memorial. And that is about the type of thing that I think we should air, we should talk about. The students are quite proper in bringing forward their concerns. I have been part of the quiet revolution at the university when I was a student for quite a number of years, and subsequently as a member of the faculty. I was not very shy in speaking out and I think this is quite proper for the students to demonstrate their concerns, bring it forward, articulate it; if they do not do that I think there is something wrong with them if they cannot come forward and pressure Government, pressure society for their concerns and their needs. But the thing I would like to advise them about through the medium of the House of Assembly is to start to question the university as well in terms of what is happening to the education dollar. Perhaps they will discover that it is all being spent quite wisely, that everything is in the proper hierarchy of needs. I doubt it very, very sincerely.

This is why I think the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) raised the question about re-directing the spending patterns at the university. I think maybe that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, misunderstood him somewhat when he responded there a minute ago. But that is the kind of question I would like to raise. I will raise it more vociferously as times goes on and I would to encourage my colleagues to raise the same question.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I recall not that long ago when Memorial University, or a college it was at the time with two to three hundred people enrolled, the feeling outside of St. John's - I found out since that it might have been wrong - but the feeling outside

MR. G. FLIGHT: of St. John's was that it was then an elitist university. Practically every student graduating outside of St. John's in rural Newfoundland went to Mount Allison, Acadia, or Dalhousie, and they believed that the reason they could not get into Memorial was that they could not afford it. Well now we have found out since that apparently Memorial could only accommodate two or three hundred students and therefore we were forced to go to the Mainland to university.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a feeling then that Memorial may have been elitist. Maybe it was not but I agree with the House Leader that there is a danger that it will become an elitist university. Mr. Speaker, I understood that Memorial was conceived and built during the fifties and sixties to take care of the needs of Newfoundland students, our young people graduating from Grade XI all across the Province who had the academic wherewithal to go to university. That supposedly was the purpose. It appears to a lot of people now, Mr. Speaker, that we are starting to compete. We want an international university. We are competing with Cambridge,

MR. FLIGHT: Harvard, Oxford, and whether or not that is necessary, whether we can afford it, and whether or not that approach is what is causing the administration of Memorial to price the students out of the university. Mr. Speaker, it costs \$3,000. Any student from rural Newfoundland today who wants to attend two semesters, do a year in university, it will cost him \$3,000. The maximum student aid they can get is \$1,800 - \$900 per semester. Now, regardless they must come up with \$1,200 and, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of families right at this time who cannot come up with that \$1,000 or \$1,200.

The Premier indicated in his speech of support that no Newfoundlander would be turned away from the doors of the university. Well I do not know where the Premier has been because I can introduce him to dozens of young Newfoundlanders who not only have been turned away because they cannot afford it - they were not turned away, they were not silly enough to apply when they knew what it cost. I can introduce him to young students who have credits towards their degree and have to quit because they could not afford to continue. I can introduce him to students who stayed out for one year to earn enough money to go back. Added to their student aid it would allow them to go back if they worked a year but because they worked a year the bank called the loan, put the student in a position where he was no longer eligible for future student aid and now he is looking at being eight or nine credits short of a degree. No way is he going to go back to the university, he cannot afford it.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that should be remember here, that when a student does go to Memorial and does get a degree, if he is sitting around looking for a job, which he will be doing and he is doing in this Province right now, the interest

MR. FLIGHT: starts to pile up so he comes out with a \$4,500 or \$5,000 debt and by the time he gets into a position to start paying it it is \$6,000 or \$7,000 or \$8,000. Mr. Speaker, we might as well face the fact that there are hundreds and hundreds of young Newfoundlanders in this Province today who cannot, even with the programmes that are available, cannot attend university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And what about the family that has two or three sons and daughters who want to go to university when it costs \$1,000 to subsidize one? Where is that \$3,000 coming from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right. That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: So let us stop this nonsense of saying there are no young Newfoundlanders today who cannot go to university. There are hundreds and if this trend continues there will be thousands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting because I thought the minister was going to want to speak on this one, the Minister of Education.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: I want to hear what he had to say to see if there was anything new on the subject.

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

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier is in a nasty mood. I am sure he is missing Bally Haly but he can go down now that he has punched in his five minutes in the House.

MR. NEARY: We should get a little green carpet on the -

MR. SIMMONS: He can go down any time he wants to now. It must be hard, it must be tough being in the House more than five minutes a day.

PREMIER MOORES:

With you here, yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, with me here especially

since I do not play golf with him.

PREMIER MOORES:

(Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS:

Ah, go back to Bally Haly, boy,

for goodness sake, at least you make some sense down there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker - thank you, Mr.

Dignity from Grand Falls.

MR. WHITE:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from

three -

MR. NEARY:

Advise on who is right and who

is wrong, and what petitions are right and what petitions are wrong.

MR. WHITE:

The people will decide that.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

(Inaudible)

MR. NEARY:

Criticizing everybody now

except the Social Credit.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

(Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS:

You are quite finished, are you?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from

three members of the government side so far. A nice little patronizing speech by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

He is in a nice soft, patronizing mood today; he gave the

children at the university a nice little lecture, a nice

little talk, a nice little talk. Of course, the member for

Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, I wish he would read this pink paper.

I wish he would read it he has his facts all snarled up,

Mr. Speaker. Every university student would like to have a

minute or two with the financial wizard over there to find

out how he gets \$3,400 as the maximum. They would like to

know how he does it because they would like to do it too.

His figures are way off, Mr. Speaker, way off, hundreds and

hundreds and hundreds of dollars off, way off, and it is

MR. SIMMONS:

that kind of misinformation, Mr. Speaker, coupled with a bit of patronizing that makes this problem all the more aggravating. Now the most positive statement made, and it was kind of missed today, Mr. Speaker, the most positive statement made in this entire exchange was by the Premier. I do not know if it escaped people or if it was written off as so many more weasel words or what but I found what he said encouraging. He supported the petition. The other two, Mr. Speaker, actually did not support it and I wish they would not stand up and break the rules of the House because they were not in support of it and they should not have stood, the member from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman). It was clear from what they said that they were against the petition. But the Premier did say, Mr. Speaker, in no uncertain terms that he supports the petition.

I went along to make sure of the words that he was supporting. He supports an increase in government support. He said that. He said he supports the petition. Either he is a man of his word or he is not. He told us today in this House and it is on the record now, he supports the petition. The petition asks for two things, that the allocation be reconsidered as it affects University students and that there be an increased amount of government support. He said he supports that.

So I suppose we can fully expect, Mr. Speaker, that within the next day or so the Minister of Education, and that is why I was waiting because I had hoped he would put into words the concept that the Premier announced. So I suppose in the next day or so if we take the Premier at his word, we can hear an

MR. SIMMONS:

announcement by the Minister of Education or the Premier of the detail of this increased support that the Premier has announced today or am I misreading his support. Is it weasel words he gave us today, Mr. Speaker? Was it a convenient thing to get up and say in words he supported it? Can we read into it what he has said, namely, I support the petition. I, he says or says the Premier support increased government support. If that is what he means then in the next few days, Mr. Speaker, we will hear the details of that and how much this \$700 has been cut back and the entire details to allow students around this Province and potential students, Mr. Speaker, to make their plans for the Fall. So I ask the Premier now to follow through not as he has done in the case of the Grand Falls Hospital with lots of words and no action. But to follow up his words of support today with some action in the next day or so, an announcement, a mailing out to the students, some communications to the University, to the student council over there, to let all concerned know what it is exactly he means by standing in the House today and giving his support to this petition as I certainly do.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I would welcome to the House on behalf of hon. members three gentlemen from the community of Cormack; the Chairman of the Community Council, Mr. Rick Woodford, the Vice Chairman, Mr. Howard Hewitt and an additional member of the council, Mr. Melvin Rideout. I hope hon. members join me in welcoming these three gentlemen to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, as a former student of both campuses of Memorial University, the old and the new, and as a former school teacher but especially, Mr. Speaker, as a former student of the University for several years I want to stand and speak in support of this petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of 1,500 concerned students at the University, a University that was built as a memorial, Mr. Speaker. Well it looks like it is being downgraded in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, these students are asking that government not make it any more difficult for them to attend university by forcing them to borrow more money. Mr. Speaker, I know the plight of these students, I think. As a student there myself I remember going in one year and having to stay out for a couple of years in order to gather up enough money to go back again. During the Summers, because we did not have the semester system at that time, I would find myself working down in the lumber woods to try to get a few dollars or working in provincial parks or marking Grade XI and XII exams in Wolfville, Nova Scotia and doing everything in the world that you could do to scrape a few dollars together so that you did not have to go back to University in the Fall depending on your parents to finance you through another year. I think, Mr. Speaker, I borrowed \$1,000 in a student loan during my time at the University and I did not think the world was going to last long enough for me to pay it back, that

MR. CALLAN: one thousand dollars that dragged on and on and on. I have taught with teachers, a man and his wife just a few years ago who had to delay starting their little family because each of them had gone through university four or five years straight and were burdened with student loans, the man and the wife, which took them, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years of their first couple of years of teaching to live, buy a few groceries and to pay off the loans that they had accumulated.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every Newfoundlander in this Province has the right to a fair and decent chance to get a university education if he or she so decides that is what they want to do. I think, Mr. Speaker, that any attempt by government to make it more difficult for students to attend universities and avail themselves of the opportunity that is there, to perhaps improve their lot in life, perhaps improve it to give them a better chance at life than their parents before them had I think any attempt by government to stifle that opportunity is a backward step. It is not progressive, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination. It is not progressive. It should not come from a Progressive Conservative Government because it is retrogressive. When you look around, Mr. Speaker, and when you listen to the radio and hear the announcements of the few miles of paved road that are going into a few PC districts you wonder why are not these few million dollars being put where they would be best spent, giving the young people of our province the chance that they want and that they deserve, the leaders of tomorrow a chance to get a decent education.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word or two in support of the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of 1,500 or so students at the university especially, Mr. Speaker, coming as it does on the heels of petitions numbering I suppose in 7,000 or 8,000 of our fellow Newfoundlanders who have seen fit over the past

MR. RIDEOUT: number of months since that dreadful day in March when we had the Budget, thousands of people all around the Province who have sent in petitions protesting about cutbacks in educational expenditure in other areas. So this petition, Mr. Speaker, is just another 1,500, and I understand more to come, added on to the 7,000 or 8,000 or 10,000 people who have already shown their displeasure with government policy with regards to spending on education in the Province and if the government does not have the message by now, Mr. Speaker, then I wonder what is wrong that the message has not gotten through already.

Now I sympathize with a number of opinions that have been expressed this afternoon and that is why I think the hour or so that we have spent have been well spent in talking about the cut backs in education and the extra money that students in this Province have been forced to borrow. I sympathize with a number of the points that have been raised by other speakers especially on this side of the House as unfortunately not too many have spoken from the other side. But I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there are names on that petition from every single political district in this Province and therefore I would think that the onus would be on every member to show at least their thoughts or give some form of support to the prayer of the petition. The financial burden, Mr. Speaker, placed on students of this Province - we can compare apples and apples or we can compare apples or oranges which is what the Minister of Justice wants to do when he talks about expenditure and student loan levels in other parts of the Atlantic region. We can talk about that all day but the simple fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that students in this Province have to borrow for an ordinary five year programme upwards to \$10,000 and therefore be \$10,000 in debt by the time they come out of the university. If they get married a couple of years after they come out of university then the family unit is in debt anywhere around \$20,000 and if they get another \$30,000 or \$40,000 mortgage then they are buried before

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4837

JM - 3

MR. RIDEOUT: they are four or five years into their career.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are certainly placing an onerous financial burden on the students of this Province. I know we have to expect them to borrow some but I think

11505

MR. RIDEOUT: that we have to have a careful look at it especially in view of what is happening with regards to Canada Manpower Training Programmes in the vocational schools and the technical colleges and so on. It seems to me that the university students are coming off on the short end of the stick, and this particular policy, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen enunciated in the budget does even worse than that; it puts a student in the rural area of this Province coming off on the shorter end of the stick, if that is possible. Students living in close proximity to St. John's and Corner Brook will not find it as financially severe to go to university as does a student living in Roddickton or anywhere else in White Bay and other rural areas of the Province. These are the students that are going to suffer more financially. Again as I have said on other petitions presented in this House on other educational matters that the inequity between the rural and the urban centers of the Province becomes more severe under the policy announced and followed by this present administration.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I hope that the Minister of Finance will give careful consideration to the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition especially so since I represent a part of this Province where it is extremely difficult for many people to come to university. Many times they are leaving home for the first time and they face fairly high costs. There is a strange mixture in Labrador and we have some people who can be covered by certain grants whereas other people cannot, but what we must guard against is creating an elitist university. I know from my own background having been educated in Britain that there was nothing worse than to have a university which catered only to the five per cent of the country, the very rich, and the ordinary people had to struggle all the time to try and get into university. The demands on their family and the demands on themselves financially are overburdening. The people, the young people, the students, the grade elevens who go on into university should not be burdened by high costs or going into debt right at the

MR. STRACHAN: beginning of their lives, putting themselves seriously in debt. I am sure that the money which is going to be raised by raising the fees cannot be a tremendous amount and I am sure that there are many, many other ways in which the cutbacks or the cutback financially or the raising of money financially can be done rather than taxing the ordinary student. Of course, this very system penalizes those students who can least afford it and therefore it is in essence an elitist tax, an elitist penalty on students. It is a penalty which can only be felt generally by the ordinary people, the ordinary student from the ordinary family. The additional money is no burden to those who are rich and well off so what we are doing in essence, as the budget did in many ways, what we are doing is hurting the ordinary people, the ordinary individual, the ordinary person who does not have a great deal of money, who is trying to struggle to give himself an education. And an education basically is a right to all, Education is not something which is a privilege, it is not something which is only given to the privileged; it is a right to everyone, all should obtain it regardless of financial means or regardless of whatever background they come from, especially those people from Labrador, Many of them who come to university leave Labrador, leave small communities for the first time, they have extreme difficulty in trying to maintain themselves at university. I talk apart from the native people who are covered by a certain other kind of grant and so on although there are many mistakes in that system as we discussed before, where there are brothers and sisters some will obtain a grant and the others will not. But I feel strongly that the method of taxing, and that is exactly what it is, taxing the ordinary student by raising tuition fees and residential fees is a retrograde step in education, it is a step which is not necessary. If we are trying to raise funds from elsewhere then surely there must be other methods of doing it and I also believe that some of the extravagances, the waste, some of the conditions under which the university has been operating in the past could be trimmed. There are many other ways of getting at the source of this rather than hitting the only people that this government wants to hit and that is the ordinary

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4838

AH-3

MR. STRACHAN: student. What we are seeing here is that whenever extra money is to be raised then the ordinary people are going to have to raise it, they are going to be taxed. I think this is totally

17508

MR. STRACHAN: they are going to be taxed and I think this is totally wrong. It may create and is leading down the road towards an elitist system of education which I am totally opposed to, totally against. I think that this is a right that every citizen, every person in this Province should have, to send their children to school or the students themselves go to university and I think that the imposition of such a taxation form on students is totally and absolutely wrong and retrograded.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education followed by the hon. gentleman for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the petition I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Premier at the beginning and for that reason I had not intended to speak to the petition. I think our total philosophy is to assure that no student is prevented from getting an education and that is the total philosophy behind the student aid programme as it is envisaged by the Canadian nation, Canadian Government. We have I think in the past been the Province which have had the best student aid programme because contrary to what people think it is not just a loan programme. The loan programme up to this year was \$900.00 per semester and then students qualified for grants depending on their need and that could go as high as \$1,000 per semester. This year of course that has changed a little as it has gone to \$700.00 to put us in line with the rest of the Maritimes. As far as we are concerned, this is still one of the better student aid programmes although I am assured now that Ontario has a different programme of which I do not have the full details. But apart from that we have one of the better student aid programmes but we do have problems and the problems of course is the fact of employment of our students in the summer where they cannot get adequate funds and then of course they have the parental allowance and some of the poorer students as a matter of fact are better off than the students who are

MR. HOUSE: on the borderline because a student who qualifies for the full grant and loan seems to be better off than those who are borderline, who can just get advantage of the loan which is \$700.00 per semester beginning in the fall.

One of the things was mentioned also by speakers on the other side was the fact of the student aid for people going to various trades programmes and that is true. That is one of the anomalies in the old student aid programme; a student comes out for a year and if he goes to a vocational school or a trade school and can qualify for a Manpower allowance he gets his total way paid or just about; he gets a very substantial grant. We have brought this matter up with the Federal Government on several occasions and of course. They are firm in their status, the status of student aid for university and that they will provide \$900.00, up to \$900.00 per semester in loans. But what we have been trying to do and we still have an active committee and the council of ministers is trying to get them to share in the loan and the grant and of course we are not having very much success with it. We recognize the hardship, Mr. Speaker, that is forced on students and I have been studying the paper that they have presented and of course we will be looking at it in the coming year.

Certainly in principal I do support the petition.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition so ably presented by our leader. The minister says we have one of the better programmes. I do not see any reason why we should not have the best. We are throwing the onus back on the great middle class population who have to pay for everything and without the middle class people where would we be as that is where our gross provincial product comes from really, the efforts of these people. Unfortunately if anything happens the parents are asked to dig down now.

MR. J. WINSOR: I would say without fear of contradiction that the middle class parent today has his back against the wall as much as anybody or more so because he has to pay the most of everything, the most taxes, and you are asking for an extra \$250 on a student's loan for university. I know personally that certain young men and young women who are going to university or who were intending to go to university without asking their parents who really know the financial picture and most families unfortunately have to discuss it over the dinner table and usually the father or the mother says, "I am sorry, you cannot have that new bike and it looks like your sister cannot go to university because we are going to have to dig down a little deeper". So the child, if we can call him a child after they leave Grade XI, says, "Oh well, I will apply to the Trades and Technology School, or Vocational School, go in for beauty culture, or something else, secretarial science or any of the courses that they do give". This is a retrogressive movement as far as I am concerned.

I do think that for the extra - I am guessing at the figures - around \$2,000,000 that it is going to cost the Government to pony up and keep their level at what it was before - \$450, I think - this would be the right move. There are many dollars spent in many ways by the Government that could better be directed in this direction because our future lies with those students out of Memorial University, I am quite sure, for the backbone of our Government and if we want better Government than we have today we have to look to the university. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Premier. It is the same question really that I directed to the hon. Minister of Labour on Friday, and before directing the question, Sir, I want to stress the point that we are not talking about a question of guilt or innocence at this particular stage in proceedings, Sir. What we are talking about, Sir, is a matter of grave allegations of

MR. W. ROWE: impropriety and irregularity having been made in sworn testimony by at least two and maybe several senior civil servants, former and present, in respect of two ministers of the Crown, one happens to be the Minister of Labour now and one happens to be the Minister of Industrial Affairs now, but concerning these ministers when they were ministers of Public Works. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to ask the Premier is, does he not think that it is a proper thing to require that these ministers be suspended at least temporarily from their positions of important public trust until such time as these very serious allegations of impropriety and irregularity are cleared up?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, and I hope the House bears with me because the reply has to be lengthy because of the seriousness of the question and the so-called allegations.

The fact is, Sir, that on Friday, as I understand it, the question was asked of the Minister of Labour regarding his possible resignation due to the testimony given at the enquiry into the Department of Public Works. I would suggest, Sir, that his reply, and I have talked to him about it and I have looked at Hansard as to what he had to say, I would suggest, Sir, that his reply suggested that before any resignation was talked about in this House or elsewhere that he would quite rightly confer with me regarding any such move or if such a move was even necessary, rather than to debate it in this House upon a question from the Opposition.

Sir, as far as I am concerned, I think it is fair to say that the Minister of Labour is not only basically a friendly and courteous person, and even though some members may not understand that, the fact is that last week when this became an issue he was in New York talking to ASARCO about the Buchans situation upon - not instruction, but certainly with my knowledge and others, and since that I have talked to the Minister over the weekend regarding the testimony given at the Public Works enquiry. Well, Sir, at that meeting I had with

June 27, 1978

Tape 4840

RT-3

PREMIER MOORES: the Minister he assured me in no uncertain terms that there was no wrongdoing. Sir, I suggest at this time, what is it that we want in this Province. We have established an enquiry to look into any potential wrongdoing in the Department of Public Works. Sir, possibly the mistake some people would say the Government made was in the establishing of the enquiry itself. But, Sir,

11513

PREMIER MOORES:

the attitude that has taken place for many, many decades in this Province and is starting to get a bit uncomfortable from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Obviously, Sir, he is starting to interrupt again. The fact is, Sir, that the attitude regarding -

MR. NEARY: No, I do not like (inaudible) cover up (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

PREMIER MOORES: - political enquiries and he says, the attitude towards coverup, the reason, Sir, and the difference between this government and the one he was associated with is that we establish enquiries to find the truth and do not hide them under the bushel as was done in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Now, Sir, I do not like the allegations in this House that people are -

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I can appreciate the Premier wants to stonewall this one but the issue he is talking about now is one we would like to debate and if we will allow the same time to this side of the House we would like to debate it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, with all respect the Premier is now way off the question. The question was whether he thought - I believe the word 'thought' or 'think' was used - whether he thought the two ministers ought to be suspended or otherwise vacate the position until the matter has been cleared up. It is a fairly specific question. The answer is either yes or no with some qualification. But this harangue, this lecture about what has gone in the past and what a great government this is and that kind of stuff, this obvious

MR. SIMMONS:

attempt at stonewalling, Mr. Speaker, is beside the point, very much beside the point. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is very irrelevant and he is abusing the rules of the House in a most unprecedented manner. And I think he ought to be called to task, Mr. Speaker, and asked to answer the question or sit down. That is the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker. He is abusing the rules. He is very irrelevant at this point in time and he is reading from a prepared text, I gather, from this side of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: When the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked the question he very responsibly, and I suspect the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) did not hear him or if he did he obviously disagrees with him, very responsibly said that this was a very serious question and the preamble as was again on Friday was reasonably lengthy. When the hon. the Premier stood in response he suggested to the House that again in response to the question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the alleged seriousness of it as put by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that with the leave of the House he would have to be rather lengthy in his reply. And it is precisely and absolutely what the hon. the Premier is doing.

You know, the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir if he does not like the answer that certainly does not, I suggest, give him the right to rise on a point of order and say because I disagree with the answer that I now want to cutoff the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point I will read and then make a brief comment upon section 181 in Beauchesne, subsection (1). "Questions must be answered briefly and distinctly, and be limited to the necessary explanations, though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question." Obviously there is a quite subjective element there, "though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks with a view of clearly explaining the matter in question."

I will point out of course that debate as such is not permitted in the answers or in the questions. Having pointed that out, the question of length is obviously relative and the more important or delicate the matter the more it is capable of perhaps misunderstanding then I suppose to a certain extent the more operative this part becomes and that is that a minister may find it necessary to extend their remarks with a view of clearly explaining same. So with reference to that - but I do emphasize that debate during the question period is out of order.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, possibly, Sir, if I could be heard in silence I might be briefer than I was obviously being in the last part of the reply. The fact is, Sir, that the enquiry was appointed because of

PREMIER MOORES:

allegations that were made, not just against any ministers of the crown but rather against contractors, against people in the department, of possible wrongdoings in the whole structure. For that reason, Sir, we appointed a public enquiry for the public to know what was happening and to get all the evidence before an impartial body to make a decision. Now, Sir, I do not think anyone in this House, even though it seems so on occasion, wants people to be guilty until proven innocent and that seems to be the case not only with individuals but also, I would suggest, Sir, with people outside. I think it is wrong to associate guilt with someone until that is proven. In other words, someone is guilty until proven innocent in the political arena today. I suggest, Sir, that members of the Opposition know what I am talking about as well as people on this side of the House that by innuendo, by bringing up embarrassing political so-called "questions" you are watching families being affected. Whether you like it or not it happens to be true -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the former Premier (Inaudible).

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

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile seems to be very sensitive in this area but that is his problem and not ours. I would suggest, Sir, that the fact is that families are affected by this sort of innuendo, that it is a political smear because, Sir, the enquiry has been set up to find out the truth. The fact is that when the enquiry report is in anyone who is guilty will pay the full consequences whether they be civil servants, contractors or members of this government. That has been stated very clearly. Now, Sir, it may not be understandable to some of the members on the other side but the fact is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Watch your blood pressure.

PREMIER MOORES: I am watching my blood pressure and I suggest, Sir, the member will have - No, I will not say that, Sir. But the fact is that it is only after a member or a person or anybody is proven guilty will this government act, not when their enquiry is going on to find out

PREMIER MOORES: the facts, to find out what is happening. Maybe, Sir, the Opposition would like people to be guilty before the evidence is in and I suggest, Sir, that that is the wrong approach. Any scandal, Sir, if any, that take place in this Province whether they be the member for LaPoile, members on the government side, the Leader of the Opposition, whomever they maybe the fact is, Sir, that if there are any scandals -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sir, to the hon. gentleman there are no scandals involving the member for LaPoile, no scandals at all and if the hon. gentleman wishes to put up evidence to prove otherwise let him do it. Never mind his smear tactics and his character assassination that he has been carrying on in this House for the past several months, the king of the smear tactic in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out that this particular matter is not one on which the Chair has any ruling. If the hon. Premier has not completed, I would express the requirement that he bring his answer to a conclusion.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Sir, I will and the example I just gave is a hypothetical one of anybody in this House or outside -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

PREMIER MOORES: - who are involved and if you read the Hansard you will find exactly what I said. I said any members on the government side, even the member for LaPoile if I may go to that degree, Sir. But the fact is, Sir, that -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is up to his eyeballs in scandal, up to his eyeballs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Who is?

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Sir, I ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman to my left is within his right to require the withdrawal of the allegation of the hon. gentleman to my right and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: Of course, Sir, and I hope the hon. the Premier, Sir, will be asked to withdraw his statement he made -

MR. W.N. ROWE: The same statement as he made.

MR. NEARY: His same statement and apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You cannot say through the back door, Sir, what you -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Any time any hon. member on either side has a point of order to make will they please inform me -

MR. NEARY: I made -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is speaking or at least the person in it and the rules are applied to an equal degree and in an equal manner both to the right and to the left. If there was any allegation made by an hon. gentleman to my left with respect to an hon. member to my right, a direct allegation or an innuendo, because one cannot say indirectly what one cannot say directly then obviously the matter has to be drawn to my attention. Frequently when -

MR. NEARY: I did.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will please permit! Not permit - you know, I do have the right and the House does have the right to require no interruptions. On a point of order then certainly the rule is the

MR. SPEAKER:

same irrespective of which side it is on. With respect to the previous point of order some minutes ago, it was not my understanding at the time that there was an allegation, even an indirect allegation on the part of the hon. gentleman to my left, an allegation of scandal on the part of anybody to my right. That was not my understanding thereof and that was the reason I ruled as I then did. There is no more on that that I can say, but I do wish to repeat that suggestions that the ruling is in any way affected or influenced by which side it originates on that that is inaccurate and hon. members often, perhaps in the heat of debate, may say things but I think that is something that they really should avoid.

The hon. Premier has completed his answer?

PREMIER MOORES: Has there been a withdrawal?

MR. SPEAKER: I had thought the hon. gentleman had but I may have been mistaken. Now if the hon. gentleman has not withdrawn, then I ask him to withdraw.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I was provoked into it, Sir, and if the hon. gentleman keeps it up he will get ten times back for every one thing that he fires across this House. He will get ten back in spades including the ring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I must point out to hon. members that differences of opinion can be very, very sharp and very precise but during the Question Period I really cannot allow, and I do not see how the House can properly function, if members are to shout back and forth at one another and suggest if you say this I will bring this up and that kind of suggestion.

MR. S. NEARY: It started over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am not writing a history of it. Where it starts or not is not my responsibility in that sense in documenting where matters start but what I am endeavouring to do -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) right directly to (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

What I am endeavouring to do is to provide a forum in which the House can progress and in which the rules can have the, at least, minimal acceptance which is, in my opinion at least, absolutely necessary for the House of Assembly.

If the hon. Premier has not completed his answer, I would again repeat the stricture I made earlier and that is to require him to bring it to an end very soon.

PREMIER MOORES:

Right, Sir, I will. The fact is, Sir, what the essence of the question and the reply is that when the enquiry has made its findings that is what should be acted upon by the Government and not any allegations or testimony until such findings have been made.

MR. W. ROWE:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, by way of a preliminary to the supplementary question is to say that I find the Premier's answer totally incredible, Sir. Why was it not delivered by way of a ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker? He had a prepared text there -

MR. S. NEARY:

A Gary Callahan special.

MR. W. ROWE:

using the Question Period like this.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize by way of a preliminary, it is not a matter of guilt, Sir, and if families happen to be dragged in because they happen to be related to a Minister of the Crown then we are all very sorry about that, but ministers have a public trust to uphold and cannot be thought to be influence-peddling or breach of that public trust.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier - I would assume that the Premier has said, "No", but I want clarification of it. Would he not agree, Sir, that if the lowliest clerk in the Government was implicated by an enquiry and that clerk had some responsibility over public funds in any way, shape or form, Sir, would he not agree that that public servant would be suspended, would be suspended not because he is guilty or innocent, or because he has been proved to be guilty and has to go to jail, Sir, but because his integrity

MR. W. ROWE: has been brought into question by sworn testimony, in this particular case of high-ranking, responsible civil servants, Mr. Speaker, and it is for that reason that that clerk in the Civil Service would be required to be suspended until the matter has been cleared up and settled one way or the other. And would he not agree that if that rule applies to the lowliest clerk in the Government, Sir, then it should apply one hundredfold to a Minister of the Crown who has the greatest public trust of any possible public servant, in this case an elected official of the Crown; would he not agree, Sir, that the rule regarding suspensions which would apply to a public servant should apply at least one hundred times as greatly in respect of a Minister of the Crown who has the greatest of public trust to uphold in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in that regard I believe and I believe very sincerely that taking a person at his word, and the ministers and people involved in this particular situation are prepared and will give testimony, I think it is critically important that people are not guilty by association before the actual facts and the judgement has been made in this case by Justice Mahoney. I think, Sir, it is no more wrong in this case - as a matter of fact, probably less so, at least in my opinion - than when the Bell Island enquiry was going on the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not resign in between nor was he suspended from anything.

MR. S. NEARY: I was not a minister.

MR. W. ROWE: And there were no allegations.

MR. S. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow that to stand on the public records. I was not a minister.

MR. NEARY: There were no allegations or charges made against me, I did not break the law in any way, shape or form and if I did the Minister of Justice would have laid charges against me long ago. That is a smear tactic, a typical example of the type of character assassination that we are getting from the Premier. It is a weak defence.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It is a different situation involved.

MR. NEARY: It is a completely different situation. The Premier can put up all the smoke screens he wants, but all he is trying to do is smear, cover-up, weasle his way out of a situation where the dragnet is closing around him and he knows that he is in trouble.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order. The hon. member does not wait until the hon. the Premier finishes his sentence.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He wrote it for him. He knows what he is going to say.

MR. HICKMAN: What I do know is what the hon. the Premier did not say. The hon. the Premier -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) my credibility -

PREMIER MOORES: Listen! Listen! Listen!

MR. NEARY: I will tell you that right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! The hon. Minister of Justice continue.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) before the year is over.

PREMIER MOORES: That is only to stop me from going for you.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I leave the Chair for fifteen minutes.

MR. HICKMAN:

That is the end of Question

Period for today.

MR. SPEAKER:

I adjourn for fifteen minutes.

I cannot really see how I can preside with the kind of language that is going back and forth.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There was a point of order before the Chair which had not been disposed of before I adjourned. The point of order is not one which the Chair can make any ruling on, not like a point or order in the technical parliamentary sense, difference of opinion or a matter of if different members have different views that can be debated under relevant motions but not a matter for the Chair's jurisdiction.

Previous to that the hon. the Premier was giving an answer to a question. Before recognizing him, if he has not concluded his answer, I would point out to hon. members on both sides what I regard as the absolute need for hon. members to co-operate with the Chair in the maintenance of the rules. I have said it before, I will say it again, I know of no other way of putting it, and that is there are fifty-one of us here and one, just by being in this particular seat cannot unaided keep the order and decorum of the House. It requires participation and co-operation of hon. members on both sides collectively.

Having said that, two futher things: Number one, the answers by the hon. the Premier certainly did get into the area of debate and I think that is a factor to be borne in mind; and the interjections of hon. gentlemen to my right were quite out of order and quite improper and if hon. members on both sides will endeavour to restrain their emotions and think what they wish but say only what is permitted to be said, then I would think the entire House would benefit therefrom.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

No, I have finished the reply,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower whom I think we can depend on not to be so tender as the Premier on this subject. What surprises me most of all, I say to the minister as a preamble, is that this line of questioning of the past few minutes has even become necessary. There are all kinds of precedents, Mr. Speaker. The principal of the Vocational School in Burin, Mr. Theo Etchegary, a man who was the subject of a number of allegations, was suspended from his position until such time as he was cleared, and let the record show that he was cleared, Mr. Speaker, and has since been appointed to a federal appointment in the last two or three weeks. So there is no shortage or precedents for what our questions are implying today, Mr. Speaker.

Now we fully expected the lecture on guilt and innocence and the stonewall approach but that is not what I am asking the Minister of Labour and Manpower, What I am asking him, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not he does not feel the need to vacate the position? It is a position of public trust and I would think he is having very real difficulty performing that position now given the public nature of the allegations against him. Could I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, whether he has given thought to the matter of resigning or being asked to be relieved of his responsibilities in Cabinet until such time as this matter has been cleared up?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I guess there are fifty-one of us in the House and fifty heard a lot of things, but I heard a lot of things all weekend too and I am very happy with the things I have heard from people. I think the Premier put the position quite clearly and until I am proven guilty of something, proven guilty of something then I will resign my position. Until I am proven guilty of something it is not my intention to do so, as the Premier suggested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Now they are all part of the stonewall approach over there, Mr. Speaker, they all applaud that kind of thing. We are not talking, Mr. Speaker - let me say once again to a fairly intelligent member on that side of the House, the Minister of Labour - we are not talking about guilt or innocence, and I point again to the Etchegary example I am talking about his ability to perform in his position now. I am not talking about whether he will be vindicated, I hope as a friend of his that he will be vindicated; that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker, far from the issue. The issue is whether he can now, in a position of public trust, whether he can perform adequately his assignment as a Minister of the Crown in view of the public nature of the allegations, due to the fact that he has to work with a number of people on his staff and in view of the fact that he requires public trust to carry out these responsibilities. And I ask the minister, not relating to guilt or innocence, that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker, I ask him whether he feels that he can now just as adequately perform in his role as he could have without the presence of these public allegations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question and I do not know. I know that within the last hour or so that I had a talk, a non-official one, obviously, with one of the heads of one of the largest labour unions in the Province and the first question

MR. ROUSSEAU: he asked me was, "You are not resigning, are you?" and I said, "No" and he said "Good" so until somebody proves that I cannot occupy my position as Minister of Labour without public trust then obviously the Premier is going to have to take some steps. Right now we do not know that. That is a hypothetical question.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower has not been back in the House since - not for any length of time, only on Friday when a couple of questions were asked him with respect to the enquiry that is now under way, and precedents will show that although enquiries are under way questions can be asked in the House with respect to them. I would like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, Mr. Speaker, whether or not when he did give orders that contracts should go to various people or various contractors in St. John's, whether or not he gave specific orders to his officials with the knowledge of other ministers or with the Premier's knowledge? Who knew when the minister was giving those orders who the contract should go to? Who knew about this beside himself or did he do it on his own?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the House on Friday, it was my intention to appear before the enquiry and I will give those answers at that time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be aware that this is the highest court in the land, that any answers to questions should be given to this parliament, to the legislature. The members of the House come first, come before anything else. This public enquiry is appointed by this House, by the Minister of Justice, and the minister should answer to this House. What we are asking is if the minister was acting when he said "Leave it to me", if the minister was acting under instructions from the Premier or if he had consultation with any other

MR. NEARY: ministers in the government in connection with these alleged crimes that have been committed? Was the minister acting under instructions from the Premier of this Province or from any of his colleagues?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated on Friday, again it is not my intention to answer anything in piecemeal. I will stand before the enquiry, sit before the enquiry as long as the enquiry wants me to, I will give the answers as I recall them because some of the things that I have been reading in the newspapers are not my way of recalling certain conversations that are alleged. So I will do that when the time comes at the enquiry but not in piecemeal fashion; I will do it the whole way.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte and then I will recognize the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. It is giving him an opportunity to clarify himself with respect to a previous statement that he made in the House and that was on March 10, 1977.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the minister would check his files and come up with the March 10, 1977 statement when he said that everything was fine and dandy in the Department of Public Works, that there were no problems at all, that no specific instructions had been issued for contracts to go to anyone. He stood up in the House and said that. Now we have his deputy minister at the time making a completely different statement. Mr. Speaker, should we not hear about this? And I ask the minister, a senior official, is he going to let all this just go by with the House expected to close in a week or so? Is he not going to tell the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. Obviously I am not going to let it go by, Mr. Speaker, nor am I going to answer it in piecemeal fashion. I will answer it before the commission that was set up by this government and I will answer as long as the commission wants to stand there and question me. I am prepared to so do. And that is the position I have taken. That is the position I am going to live or die with.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the minister should realize, Sir, that he is responsible to this House as a member of the ministry, as a member of the government. He is responsible to this House. He should not treat the House with contempt, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I will ask the minister this: Is the minister going to make a Ministerial Statement in the next day or so or as quickly as possible once he recollects his thoughts and looks back over the record and

MR. W. ROWE:

so on in order to let this House know whether in fact the allegations which were made against him and his colleague or concerning him and his colleague at the public enquiry, Sir, were they true or were they false as far as he is concerned, Sir? He is a minister of this government responsible to this House, Sir, and it is very important that we, as members of this House and through us, the public, know whether the minister's position is that these statements made by the officials are wrong or whether they are correct, because if they are correct, Sir, then I would submit that we are going beyond mere ministerial responsibility. We are gone into another sphere altogether.

I will ask the minister more for his own good than anyone else's is he going to make a Ministerial Statement fully clarifying his position to this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, on this very serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister has said, Mr. Speaker, for the sixth or seventh time in two sitting sessions the minister intends to appear before the enquiry and the minister intends to speak his piece at the enquiry. The enquiry is set up for that. I think it would be presumptuous, inappropriate and discourteous to the enquiry to speak in the House on an isolated question until the enquiry and the commission and the commissioner have the opportunity to put whatever questions he deems necessary and appropriate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 7, the adjourned debate on Bill no. 50 adjourned by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, when the debate ended in the last sitting I had, I think, ten or twelve minutes left to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifteen.

MR. FLIGHT: Fifteen. I intend to clue up very quickly, Sir. I want to reiterate what I said before. The regional government is not the most important issue in this House as far as I am concerned. It is incidental in a way to my constituency. One day Central Newfoundland may indeed look at regional government but I would assure the minister that he will have more opposition to regional government in Central Newfoundland if regional government is attempted to be brought around with this kind of a bill.

Mr. Speaker, every speaker that has spoken in this debate up to now has indeed supported the concept of regional government. Every member who spoke on the other side of the House supported bill 50. Let me say now, Sir, that regional government and bill 50 have got nothing in common. Regional government and bill 50 are two entirely different things, Sir. Bill 50 is not consistent with the way that regional government should be implemented. There are clauses in bill 50 that would frighten an ordinary citizen away from regional government.

The member for St. John's West Mr. Speaker, said bill 50 was conceived in sin. Well maybe it was conceived in sin, Sir, but it will be accepted and reared and nurtured with distrust and suspicion. It is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Municipal

MR. FLIGHT:

Affairs is bulldozing through this House, a bill which will create a regional government, a bill that had no input at all from the people to whom that regional government will most apply. It was opposed by most of the elected councils, the city of St. John's, all the elected town councils except now this past couple of days we hear of a council or two that are going along with it. And I would suspect that the minister has had some hurried meetings with some of these councils and has probably bulldozed them into accepting regional government or talked them one way or another into relaxing their stand a little.

MR. FLIGHT:

Only one has come out totally in support of regional government and another has given qualified support.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister was smart, Sir, he would realize that his bill is off to a bad start. It has got a strike against it, Mr. Speaker. Regional government will only succeed if the parties involved are prepared to co-operate, the councils of the towns involved. And, Mr. Speaker, with the kind of opposition that we have seen to this bill obviously the minister cannot expect very much co-operation from the various towns, municipalities, that will be under the umbrella of regional government. As a matter of fact the opposition may manifest itself into non co-operation in total non co-operation with the regional government.

I would not be surprised looking at the kind of opposition we have seen in this House and the kind of opposition we have seen coming from all the towns and the people that will be involved in regional government, I would not be surprised if the minister might have a difficult time naming, appointing or getting elected a regional council. They will know what to expect. They will know they are not wanted. They will know that the private citizens of the area that they are expected to govern used every means at their disposal to oppose bill 50, asked to have the bill tabled, deferred until they could have some input. And no, Sir, the minister will not relent. He is going to push this bill through and in pushing it through if indeed he succeeds he may be setting himself into a position where he may not be able to find people.

I do not know why anybody would want to serve on a regional board knowing that the people

MR. FLIGHT:

they are about to serve did not want them. And that has been made very clear in the Northeast Avalon this past two weeks, that the people of the Northeast Avalon and their representatives are not happy and not content with regional government as is proposed to be implemented in bill 50. And the minister may if he does succeed in bulldozing it through, if he does succeed in ramrodding it through and he intends to insist and push it through without any consideration for the requests of the people most affected he may find himself with a can of worms on his hands in the sense that the people involved will not accept regional government by the way it has been legislated onto them. And, Mr. Speaker, I would think that is a fairly healthy concern for the minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will windup my remarks by simply saying that bill 50 is not consistent with ones idea of good democratic government. Bill 50, the clauses in bill 50 are not consistent with the way that regional government should be implemented. There is no way that the people of an area should be deprived, particularly in this case. If the minister was not aware of the opposition, if the people concerned had had no way of getting to the minister and letting him know they were opposed to the bill, then I could understand the minister going ahead and shoving a bill through. But he has had two weeks of total opposition to this bill from every community in the Northeast Avalon and he still insists come hell or high water it is going through. They are going to have it whether they like it or not. Well in most cases they will not like it. And, Mr. Speaker, as I say that kind of legislation, that kind of tactic is not consistent with what one would expect

MR. FLIGHT:

of good, democratic government.

And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot, Sir, support and will not support bill 50 in the state as it is presented to the House under the legislation as we have it.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support bill 50, the bill dealing with regional government in the Northeast Avalon area. And I do not think anyone has commented to date on the change in the name or perhaps if they have I missed it. I think the previous bill was called the regional government for the St. John's area whereas it was thought more appropriate in reviewing the bill over the past year to call it the regional government for the Northeast Avalon. I think that this is certainly acceptable to all peoples in this area. At least I have never heard any comment to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a very strange debate. At least one would have expected it to have gone a different way. I have never really seen a bill get quite the buildup that this one did if one would

DR. COLLINS: go by what was written in the papers, what people were quoted as saying, what the hon. members opposite made remarks about before the bill was actually put up for debate and this was even before it was given first reading and certainly between the first reading and second reading that we are into now. If any bill had star billing this one certainly did. It has not lived up to that expectation. I am sure it must be very disappointing to the people who anticipated a marathon and very vigorous debate in this House. I think in the English slang it turned out to be a damp squid or perhaps in our own vernacular although it is perhaps not a very good term to use in the House but it has turned out to be a bit of a bummer. I think one can certainly see that by the public reaction or one would say the lack of public reaction. I am amazed that there are not more people in the gallery over this bill if not just out of curiosity. But one thing that has been noteworthy are the very few people from the general public who are in the galleries. This is not confined to the public officials in the area, that is officials on councils, officials who might have some impact or this bill have some impact on them, they have been noteworthy by their absence. I think on one occasion the major for Portugal Cove was here briefly. I know Mr. O'Dea, who has been mentioned as the possible chairman of the regional government if this bill goes through - I do not think the bill has been passed yet though there is not or cannot be any such thing as regional government for this area until the bill goes through-but his name has been mentioned and Mr. O'Dea was here for several days and even he felt he could not stay the pace. I do not think it was because of the vigour of debate. I believe he just felt that it just ran out of steam and he may as well go home. The press too, I think we just had a look at the galleries today and I am immodest enough to think that it is not just because I am speaking that they are not there because on many other days they have not been there.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, despite all the fuss and furor about this bill really there has been every little agitation and controversy about it. It has been looked upon clearly by the public

LLS39

DR. COLLINS: by the press, by the officials concerned as just another bill that is the business of this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, in regarding the Opposition in the House, in my view I can only think of the Opposition to this bill as being quite weak really. I do not wish to point to any individual member over this, but I am sure the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans will not mind my mentioning that his remarks were certainly not very condemning of this bill. As a matter of fact he had difficulty really finding very much to say about it and he really talked about his own area, which I think is quite appropriate but really it was not pointed to this bill at all. Most of the objections that had been brought up to the bill had been quite paltry in my view. For instance, the manner of its presentation, that is the minister made a rather vigorous speech in bringing it in. This was taken to be a great objection to the bill. I think he is to be complimented if he makes a vigorous presentation of a bill or if he speaks in anticipation of objections that might come up. I think he would be remiss if he did not take that view. It has also been said that he should not have brought in a bill in draft form, which he elected to do, but he should have brought it in as a white paper. This seemed to me just a minor difference of opinion. I think whichever way it came in, whether it was a draft bill or a white paper, it would have achieved the same objective, that is, it put the points and the position of government before the people and the people most directly concerned and asked the reaction. So that seemed to be a very paltry objection and one, I might say, that I think was picked out of an editorial in the Evening Telegram. It was not even original.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, an objection was brought in that this government could not be trusted with such a bill. Again I find this very strange indeed because what opposition really has given a lot of trust to governments? The very nature of our system is that the opposition says that

DR. COLLINS: they do not think the government will do a good job. So to say that they do not want this bill to go in because they do not like the government, they do not trust the government, well, there is nothing new in that.

The other point that was made much play of was that this region was not delineated in the bill. Now on the surface of it this may seem to be an important point, but if you look at it really is it very important? Supposing Holyrood was going to be in the Northeast Avalon region, or, on the other hand, suppose Holyrood was not to be in the Northeast Avalon region, would that have made crucial critical differences in this bill? If so, it escapes me why it should. I think it certainly would be important to say that if it were just the suburbs of St. John's and nothing else as opposed to saying the whole of the Avalon Peninsula was in. If there were those great differences I think that this would be a big point to bring up. But the actual boundary of the region might vary, I do not know, by a number of square miles I suppose, but I really cannot see the difference that is going to make to the principle and to the essential provisions of the bill. So again, I think that opposing point is quite a paltry one.

Mr. Speaker, as well as being rather paltry many of the points brought up, I thought, were incredibly inconsistent. For instance, and this has been mentioned before, of course, there have been objections brought to the governing authority, the municipal governing authority in this area, it is going to be only two-thirds elected. We are trying to replace it with a totally appointed board. Now the Opposition has said no, we should not do that, we should leave the totally appointed board there for at least six months, we should give this bill a hoist, leave it there for six months because they

DR. COLLINS: do not like a two-thirds elected board. I do not understand why two-thirds elected is bad, but the totally appointed board is good enough to leave there for at least another six months. This is most inconsistent.

It has been stated that the minister and the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council have very great powers under this bill and yet, Mr. Speaker, these identical powers are in almost every other bill dealing with municipal government and the important point is they have not been abused. That is the important point. The powers in the bill are just a mechanism. If the powers are there and they are narrow powers and they are abused, that bill should be changed and all bills related to it. If the powers are there and they are not abused but just used as a mechanism, it does not matter how broad they are; whether they are abused or not is the main point, and there has been no evidence brought forward that such powers are being abused even though they are in the various bills dealing with local government. So that seems to me a very inconsistent position to take.

One hon. member at least, Mr. Speaker, said that the bill should have been the distillate of studies of all such bills elsewhere and yet another hon. member said that this should be a home-grown bill, this should grow out of the natural environment of our Newfoundland situation. Again there is this inconsistency. It has been stated in debate that this bill is much too complex, that a bill like this is being forced down on people, they cannot understand it, this is full - I just forget offhand now how many provisions - but it is a much too complex bill and yet on the other hand it was stated that his bill should have many more details; it should detail the service, it should detail the cost,

MS 40

DR. COLLINS: it should detail the budget. Again there is this terrible inconsistency of argument in regard to the bill.

It has been stated that the St. John's area with the population it has is already overgoverned therefore we do not regional government in this area. Yet, on the other hand it is stated that regional government should be brought in in Labrador, a very sparsely populated area. A very inconsistent approach to the situation.

I could mention other inconsistencies but, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made the point I have been trying to make here and that is that there is supposed to have been a great deal of interest and a great deal of controversy about this bill and there has not been, that there was supposed to have been tremendous defects in this bill and these were supposed to be laid out and they would devastate the bill. In actual fact the objections have been quite paltry and quite inconsistent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask myself, why is that? What has this debate really been so frustrating for anyone trying to attack it or to better it whichever way you want to look at it, whichever side of the House you are on and, Mr. Speaker, I can only come up with this answer; that this bill is a good bill, that the bill has really been too

NS 41

Dr. J. Collins: good for anyone to make other than paltry and inconsistent remarks about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think one can say that this is the only way of bringing regional government into this area. And I will agree with any people who object to this bill in that regard. But as I say that this is the only way of doing it I would have to object and say that this is not the only way. Clearly there are a dozen and one ways. But I would not take exception and say that this is not a good way, because I say that even though this is only one of many ways nevertheless it is one of the good ways of doing it. It is not perfect, as has been mentioned, but nevertheless in the vast balance of things a very good way of bringing it in. Not only good, Mr. Speaker, I think, that this really is quite a unique bill. And I do not think hon. members have triggered to that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unique in this way that whereas we all know that most of the bills that come before this House really come up through the civil service, they are vetted by Cabinet, there is some input perhaps from Caucus even. But by and large the authorship is that of the civil service. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a reverse. I am not saying that the civil service did not have input into this bill, they clearly did. But the authorship, if there is an author to a bill, the authorship of this bill were the MHAs in this House; in other words, this is a bill that really stemmed from this House assisted by the civil service, not from the civil service with a little bit of overlay of this House attached to it. And this, I think, Mr. Speaker, is unique in my rather limited experience in this House of Assembly, and I think it is a blow for freedom or a blow for the parliamentary system anyway, and I think that this a point that has been missed. I think that it is a point that is worth taking note of, and I think it is a point that members on every side of the House should have reason to take heart in, and if they can see their way clear to giving worthy support to this bill.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that this is a good bill, I think there is a message in this for government - and I am a supporter of this government, I am a supporter of this administration - but I say there is a message in this bill for this government. This bill it is so good it should have carried easily. There should have been very little debate on this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: There are many other bills that come before this House which have been given much less preparation which certainly have been as weighty, and nevertheless they have gone through with flying colours. This good bill has not gone that way. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? And I say that this is all the more remarkable in view of all of the background work that has gone into this bill, background work that everyone was aware of, background work that very many people had input into. And it seems to me the answer why this bill has not been given easier passage is that the credibility of this government has not been behind us. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think that people, and I am not only thinking of the Opposition, I am thinking of the public, and I am thinking of the organs of the public, the press and the media, they are inclined to give easy passage where they have a feeling of trust in the government behind the bill or the measure in question. And I think that there has to be a message for government here. There must be less than a good feeling about the government on the basis of this bill.

In other words, the benefit of the doubt is not been given to the government over this. If the government ignores this message, I suggest it would ignore it to its peril, and not only should it not ignore it, but clearly something has to be done about this. Whether it means change in personnel in the government, whether it means change in approach of the government, whether it means actually a difference in how the government presents its programme to this House, whatever it be the lack of credibility that this bill seems to show up has to be grappled with, and something has to be done about it.

Dr. J. Collins: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there is also a message for other people in this bill too, and I think there is a message certainly for the Opposition in this bill. I have mentioned that there has been very little opposition or debate that one could

DR. J. COLLINS: get interested with regard to this bill, but this is not to say that there has been no concern about this whole matter. I suggest that the Opposition have had difficulty in articulating the concern as it should have been articulated. They have been on the wrong track. Now I say there is this concern. One can see this in the papers, in both papers, not only in the journalistic reports but in the editorials. There has been concern, even though The Daily News for instance, one can tend to ignore that because it is so blatantly partisan that one does not put much credence in The Daily News when it is dealing with a government measure, but The Evening Telegram also has expressed concern about this whole issue of regional government in the Northeast Avalon area. Similarly, councils have shown concern about it. Even though when many councils are approached and the matters are explained to them, their concern is more mootive as a result. Nevertheless, we do not find councils coming out jubilant that this bill is going through the House. There is concern even at council level and citizen groups also. Despite the fact, I must say, like the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), I believe, I personally have not had a single 'phone call from any of my constituents about this bill - not a single 'phone call! - and I do not think that this is unique to me. My colleagues in the city of St. John's tell me that is the case with them also. But despite that, the fact that there is a citizen group out there means that there is concern about this matter.

Now how we explain this,

Mr. Speaker? There is a lot of concern, but when the bill is being debated no one gets down to anything very objectionable about it. And I think the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is this that the concern is not about this bill, the concern is about the concept of regional government

11545

DR. J. COLLINS: and the hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) touched on one aspect of this when he spoke. In other words, Mr. Speaker, despite all the studies, despite the regional plan, despite the hearings - and one would have thought that all this would have explained the whole thing so clearly to the people in this area that every question they had in their minds must have been answered - but despite all that, that has not been so. There is still a concern about regional government there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the debate in this House, rather than dealing with the rather paltry and inconsistent points they dealt with, that the debate in this House would have coned in on that, would have ignored the little bits and pieces that were objected to, would have coned in on that, because debate in this House, I think, wonderfully focuses the mind of the public. You can have all the hearings in the world, you can have all the editorials in the world, but nothing quite really grasps the attention of the people involved with an issue as the House of Assembly debating does. And I would have hoped that our debate here would really have dealt with regional government in-depth. And I think it is a great disappointment that the debate today has not done so. Now, I can see why it has not, because the Opposition is on the horns of a dilemma in this. If they seem to be debating whether regional government is a good thing or not, people say, 'Oh, well, they must be against it,' and that is almost like being against Motherhood. So the Opposition have taken, I suppose, a logical move. They said, 'We accept the concept of regional government,' and then they have gone on to other things; and thereby they have really let down the people. They should have really focussed the remarks on the need for educating the public.

11346

DR. J. COLLINS: And as parliamentarians and as politicians we are educators as much as anyone else. They should have taken this opportunity to really reinforce the education given the public by the various hearings and studies and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal just briefly with the question of regional government as such, as it relates to this area. I think that in my own view there is no question that regional government is an absolute necessity. This area is a very beautiful area. I think that we are very fortunate to live in this area of the world and even in this area of the Province, and that is not to say that many other areas of the Province are not beautiful and attractive. Anyone who goes North of here up through the Torbay, Middle Cove, Flatrock areas up to Cape St. Francis, this is magnificent scenery, this is magnificent topography. If you go out the other way over Conception Bay you can find areas there that

115-47

DR. J. COLLINS: would be the envy of almost any other person in the world. We are incredibly fortunate to live in this area. And down further in the Southern region also, not only is it a beautiful area, this is a very historic area. There should be areas of this part of the Province that are repleat with historical reminders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past thirty years or so this area has changed though. I can remember when I was growing up that except for really the St. John's area as such the rest of the Northeast Avalon area had very small populated groups. It was by and large an area in which there were small farms, just what one might call kitchen farms or just farms giving rise to produce for the family or on a small scale commercial basis. But it meant that the people were spread out. They had a lot of land around them. The land was cultivated and therefore kept in good condition and kept attractive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course this has all changed in the last thirty years. We have many areas now where people just live in an area. They have their houses there. The houses have therefore have moved in on one another. They no longer have need for land other than enough for their septic tank. We have now a greater need for areas for that purpose, to get clean water and to dispose of sewage. We also have in this area now a tremendous amount of garbage to get rid of whereas in previous years who had garbage? When you went to a store if you bought anything at all it was in a paper bag which you burned. You did not have all the packages and plastics and so on and so forth. In the last thirty years we have been inundated with garbage in this populated area of the Northeast Avalon. Also in the last thirty years communications have become very important. I can quite clearly remember the only need for communication when I was growing up was a rather narrow potholy, I do not know but it was unpaved road from here out as far as perhaps Holyrood and that is

WS 48

DR. J. COLLINS: about the only communication you needed.

But now we need a communication network all over the area, a communication network that someone has to plan, someone has to take care of, someone has to be responsible for.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to these points we found this whole area is becoming increasingly polluted and it is deteriorating inexorably. We only have to drive around the countryside and despite the efforts of my good friend, the hon. Minister of the Environment, the countryside is a disgrace really. There is garbage, not only rusted out cars but there are tin cans, you name it, and it is just garbage all over the place. It is a very unclean countryside and this is contrasted with many other areas one can visit. Perhaps I should be forgiven if I compare it say with England. Now that is a gross comparison. But England is a picture, the countryside is clean, I am not talking about the industrial areas, and it is tended and well cared for, in comparison to that ours is disshelved and grubby and dirty and unkempt. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but many of the natural features in this area, because I suppose there is so little planning going on, are being lost. Areas of forest are being cut down. Small little hills are being excavated and gotten rid of. There are places put up like piggeries and so on and so forth where they should not by any stretch of the imagination be put up. There has been inappropriate development of many sorts so that, Mr. Speaker, I do not think if one, no matter how much one dislikes the thought of government yet again regulating our lives or asking us to do this or that or not allowing us to do this or that, if you look at the issue very dispassionately and if you look at it with the way the trend of things are going, if we do not get regional government in this area we are in a very great mess in the not too distant future and it has been mentioned it is a great pity

DR. COLLINS: that regional government was not brought in when it was first considered in any depth, something like fifteen or twenty years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if we accept, therefore, that regional government - and I accept it; I respect the people who have second thoughts about it but nevertheless I cannot agree with them - if you accept regional government we have to say what sort of regional government? Well now, the obvious one and the one that has been going on shall we say surreptitiously would be for the City of St. John's to gradually expand, gradually take over. As I mentioned this has been going on, there have been extensions and expansions to the city.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable. Once the issue was put, the voice was very clearly heard that it is unacceptable, people will not go along with that. It is not just the Maverick group in this place, or that group, the statement was too clearly said that they will not go along with just St. John's gradually taking over. And the city, if it still is arguing along those lines should really forget it. The point is long past when that can be taken seriously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only that, in my view, and as a St. John's person, as a person who was born in St. John's, a person who has lived in St. John's, a person who has worked in St. John's, a person who probably will die in St. John's, I think St. John's is a poor model in any case. I say it is a poor model, if I may refer to my own area, that is St. John's South, the city has no reason to be proud of St. John's South. St. John's South comprises of a large part of the old West end of the city, a part of the city that has been neglected, that has been uncared for for as long as,

DR. COLLINS:

I suppose, there has been the city. Not too long ago there were areas in my part of the city where there was not even proper curb and gutter and as a matter of fact, there are still areas in a part of the city that is one of the oldest parts of the city and yet the Municipal Council has not yet gotten around to giving them a proper curb and gutter not to talk of proper sidewalks, not to talk of proper streets, and not to talk of other accoutrements that one should find in a modern city.

I need only point to Fort Amherst also, a part of the city, and I have mentioned this a number of times in this House, without running water and without sewerage. All right, we can still go along without sewerage because the sea is just down there but without running water in this day and age? Now I know that the Municipal Council have got it in their capital works programme this year and at last! That is all I can say to that, at last! And they have only done that through special assistance given to them by this government, through the minister's department.

The city also, of course, does not take care of fire, does not give fire protection, that is provincial. The city does not give police protection, the city has no jurisdiction over the harbour, the city has no jurisdiction over the large CN area and indeed, the city cannot even take care of its own streets in many respects. Just outside this building the Province has to reconstruct some of the streets in the city.

In other words, the City of St. John's really is a rather limited thing. Now, I suppose historically one can justify all this, but by facing that fact you do not have any great confidence that the way to go for the rest of this area is to say, City carry carry on! The city just does not have the record to

11531

DR. COLLINS: back up and to give confidence for the future.

MR. MURPHY: Especially our older areas.

DR. COLLINS: Especially the older areas.

So, Mr. Speaker, we look to the other example we have in this area, the Metropolitan Board, this model. I think that this bill, this bill 50 takes the Metropolitan Board as its model and I think takes it quite rightly. I am sure the Metropolitan Board is not a perfect instrument either, but it seems to have worked, it seems to be more efficient, it seems to be more effective in the areas that it was given to deal with than the city has been in ours. Now, those are harsh words but in my view I think it is just a fact.

Now, the bill, of course, has to do more than just say we are going to extend the Metropolitan Board's jurisdiction, the bill has to improve the democratic and the elected aspect of the Metropolitan Board and it has done this to a very large measure and it will do so in the future. And certainly, if I have the honour to represent part of this area this is one of the things

DR. J. COLLINS: that I will do my best to ensure that as time goes by, as this whole large question is brought into active operation that there will be an increasing amount of elected representation and hopefully in the not too distant future full elected representation on the new governing body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of messages, in my view, in this debate, and I think there is one more message there and that is the message for the city of St. John's. I think it is about time that the Municipal Council in St. John's give up resistance to the implementation of regional government in this area. They have made their case. I think they have to accept now that their case is lost. They have to accept what is going to happen because this House in its right mindedness is going to accept it, I feel sure, and not only should they accept it but the city now, the city council - and I have said this to a number of councillors that I have been speaking to recently - the city council now should take their rightful place in being a guide and take their rightful place in a leadership role in regional government in this area; that the city of St. John's despite all its faults, despite its rather mediocre past history, nevertheless must have great influence, must give a lot of guidance, must get behind regional government in this area and I hope that this message will get through to the city council also.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to some further words when clause by clause consideration of this bill is given, and I think that there might well be adjustments made in the bill at that time, as it would not be unusual in this House, and will possibly if they do it might even strengthen the bill further. But I reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, that this is an excellent bill, not perfect but excellent; this is a unique bill because it arose out of this House, it was not just presented to this House and this asked to give a rubber stamp to it, and that this bill has taken

DR. J. COLLINS: the right route, it has listened to the people who have made studies and held hearings and it has culled out of those the best things and put it into this bill and I would hope that the people who tend to resist somewhat change in this area will through the debate going on in this House see the benefit that regional government will bring to them. And finally, I hope the city of St. John's will now give the support it should to regional government so it can make life better for all of us.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, since I have been in the House, about three years, I do not think I have heard such a vicious attack on a municipal government in this Province as we have just heard from the hon. gentleman for St. John's South (Dr. Collins). Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a vicious attack on the city of St. John's and I hope that every single member of the St. John's city council, I hope that Mayor Wyatt and I hope that all those people involved with the city of St. John's reads the remarks made by the hon. gentleman for St. John's South. Such a vicious attack on the city council! He even talked about past city councils in terms of their mediocre past, he said, and he sort of indicated that they are going to be raped, they are going to be raped by Bill 50 and they might as well lie down and take it. Now that is the situation we find ourselves in, Mr. Speaker, in this Province. The hon. gentleman for St. John's South talked about the Opposition taking a position on everything that comes up in this House and deciding beforehand that they are going to vote against it. The hon. gentleman should either pay more attention to what goes on in the House, Mr. Speaker, or go through the bills that have been introduced and passed in this House so far this year. I cannot recall at the moment another bill that we decided we were

June 27, 1978

Tape 4855

DW - 3

MR. F. WHITE: not going to support and decided to hold out on it, which we are going to do in this particular case. The Occupational Health and Safety Bill which came in concerned us very much in a number of matters but because it was not overly all-encompassing, as this bill is, this bill is the reverse of the Occupational Health and Safety Bill. The

11555

Mr. White: Occupational Health and Safety Bill did not have enough in it, did not have enough in it and that is why we made our point so strongly with respect to that, Mr. Speaker, But Bill 50 has too much in it, and we are opposed to that particular Bill.

I will say first off, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are not opposed, not against regional government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of regional government and very strongly in favour of regional government. But we are not in favour of this kind of legislation that puts a blanket over a major part of this Province, and gives a board, because it is going to be practically a board, an non-elected group of people, carte blanche, carte blanche, Mr. Speaker, to do what they want with the areas of the Northeast Avalon area, not only St. John's but all the communities out around to do what they want with respect to those communities. They will do what they want with them, force taxes to go up, Mr. Speaker, impose things that the communities do not want. And during the next few minutes I will try to illustrate some of the things that I am talking about with respect to that.

We are also very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, We thought that when this bill came in that the government would make a determined effort to put their best foot forward, to really put their best face out, and to try and make the points that need to be made with respect to regional government. Not only have they failed to force the points of the government across to us, Mr. Speaker, but they have been wishy-washy. All the St. John's members who have spoken have been wishy-washy to a man, Mr. Speaker, to a man. They want to see amendments brought in, they know now and they are admitting already, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not what they want, yet for the sake of unity on the other side they are determined to push it through. Now that has been the case, and I can document it right down; the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), now the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins), they have all had reservations to this bill. The last speaker even talked of amendments before the bill is passed in Committee stage. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to amend the

Mr. White: bill before it even gets to Committee stage, and I will be doing that a little later on in my remarks.

Now the minister when he introduced the bill, and I took his speech - and I was not in the House that day and I said I better read exactly what the minister said with respect to the bill - and I took his speech and I went through it a couple of times. Now the tone of his speech -

AN HON. MEMBER: He went off his head.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I went through this particular speech of the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs very, very carefully because I wanted to see all of the points that he was making. I wanted to see his explanations of all of the clauses in the bill. I sort of assumed that when a minister introduces the bill he goes down through it very carefully and deals with each section of the bill, and explains what it is going to do, and what it is going to cost the Treasury of the Province, and so on. But the minister when he introduced this bill failed to do it, failed to do that, Mr. Speaker. I could not believe what I was reading because after I finished reading the minister's speech I was no better informed with respect to Bill 50 than if I had not read it at all. He took an antagonistic point of view when he rose to speak, and he continued to dwell on it. He did not go into any details, Mr. Speaker, he did not go into any details on the bill itself or give us any explanation of what the bill was going to cost, and what the taxpayers of this Province, the Northeast Avalon region would have to pay with respect to it.

All during this debate, Mr. Speaker, all during this debate the government has been hanging its hat on the pegs of the Henley Commission. They say that all of this is being done because it has been recommended by the St. John's Urban Region study, recommended by the Henley Commission and that is why they are pushing this Bill 50 through and making points with respect to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you do as I did, and I am sure Mr. Speaker will since he is concerned about this, and go down through

WSSJ

Mr. White: the recommendations of the Henley Commission Report you will find that very few, very few of the recommendations of the Henley Commission Report are embodied in this bill. As a matter of fact, almost none of them are embodied in this bill. Yet when the government feels it is convenient to talk about the Henley Commission, and use the Henley Commission as an excuse for some of the things in this bill, then that is what they do. But they have not followed the Henley Commission Report, Mr. Speaker, and they have drifted miles and miles away from it. You take whatever recommendation you want, Mr. Speaker, and I can go down

MR. F. WHITE: through all the recommendations of the Henley Commission report, and you will find that none of them are embodied in this legislation. Some of them are, maybe: The enlarged city concept, the first recommendation in the final report of the Henley Commission, is being thrown out the window, gone completely. St. John's is forever more to remain as it is and is going to be stagnated from now on - gone completely, no enlarged city. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Henley Commission went on to talk about increased members for the city of St. John's. They talked about a large council, a much larger council than they had previously, and what did we see? Nothing! Nothing in Bill No. 50 to go along with that recommendation, Mr. Speaker. That recommendation was thrown out like recommendation number one was thrown out; and you can come on down, number three, Conception Bay South to be enlarged - no, nothing in the bill for that; you can come on down, unincorporated communities to be organized - no; Recommendation number four, there is nothing in that; amalgamation of communities - nothing in that; recommendation number five, there is nothing dealing with that; recommendation number six, a two-tier form of government - no, that is being thrown out the window, that recommendation is gone; then you come down to takeover boards within the regions - maybe; maybe they will take over all the boards within the region. You can put a 'maybe' after that recommendation; when they recommended that the council would have fifteen members in St. John's - no, that recommendation gone out the window. And we come on down, Mr. Speaker, to the appointment of the regional government, The concept as envisaged by Mr. Henley when he was doing this report, and it is easy to follow the report through in its philosophical way, the way it is done, that the city of St. John's would be enlarged, the

MR. F. WHITE: communities outside St. John's would be incorporated, and from that would come one umbrella regional government. And on the basis of that, Mr. Henley recommended that there be appointments to the board, but he only recommended that there be appointments to the regional government as we see it coming through from Bill No. 50. He only recommended that there be appointments to the board after the enlarged city took place in St. John's, after the two-tier form of government came about. And then I can see a case being made, Mr. Speaker, for appointments to a regional government after all the other recommendations of the Henley Commission are put in place, or at least some of them. Then there is some logic in the appointment of a regional government, some logic, I say, Mr. Speaker. But the government are saying, 'Oh, Mr. Henley recommended that we appoint people to it.'

So this is the point that I am trying to make, that only where the government sees fit to hang its hat on a peg do they take from the Henley study. The only time that they relate to the Henley study is when they want to take something from it to back up their own argument. Mr. Henley did not recommend that this huge council be elected with five members appointed including the chairman, but they take that from the Henley study and say, 'This is what Mr. Henley recommended so this is what we will do.' And I can go on down through the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, of the Henley study. I do not need to, but I just did the exercise of checking out all the recommendations, comparing them to the bill and I find that they just do not jibe and they just do not coincide. You can talk about recommendation eleven, of course, and they are going to put that in effect so that all the appointments to the board and those elected will be paid; authority to take over whatever they want to take over, they are going to

MR. F. WHITE: be given that authority, of course, they are going to see that in the bill. And right on down, Mr. Speaker, you can look at the various points of the Henley Commission study and the various recommendations and they were all thrown out the window. I do not know why, and I am sure the minister will address himself to this. And I am sure the people of St. John's and the urban region that we are talking about are not aware of this. A lot of the people think that it is being done because Mr. Henley, after a great deal of study, brings in some recommendations and the government says, 'Well, it has been studied for two or three years. We should bring in a bill based on what Mr. Henley said,' but instead they threw all the recommendations of the Henley study out the window, started off at square one again and put their heads together and came up with a bill. And I do not know what time they had on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to come up with a bill. The hon. gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) said that the bill was drafted outside of Cabinet. There are three members from St. John's in Cabinet. I assume they had some influence, but outside of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, the members that you have from the St. John's area, just look at them and tell me what time they had to get together and put this bill together, or for that matter, what time to seek out the interest of the people being affected? You have two lawyers over there who are working full-time, Mr. Speaker; you have two doctors over there who are working full-time, you have three ministers in the Cabinet who are working full-time, you have one executive assistant to the Premier, you have a gentleman farmer and you have Mr. Speaker. Now what time do those

MS65

MR. F. WHITE: gentlemen have, Mr. Speaker? What time do those gentlemen have? The House of Assembly at the moment is part-time for them, is part-time for them, so what time do they have to give any logical study to the implementation of a bill for the St. John's urban region? It was just a matter of getting together and putting together something and trying to force it through as quickly as possible. And even, Mr. Speaker, after they self-admittedly say that this bill was drafted outside of Cabinet, that it was drafted by the Government members on the other side from the St. John's area, to a man they have all stood up and said, "We are going to support Bill 50 but we disagree with a lot of parts of it and we want amendments to it". Now that is what they have said. So I cannot understand the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing bringing in a bill that he wants to force through the Legislature when the majority of the members on his own side of the House who are concerned about the St. John's region, or should be, have themselves said already that as the bill deals with the areas affected they are not sure that what is in the bill is right and proper and it might need amendments when it gets to Committee stage. Now that is basically the situation we find ourselves in where not only the Opposition are determined to hold out for the rest of the summer if necessary against Bill 50 but even the Government members on the other side who have spoken in this debate so far have said they have reservations about the bill, they want amendments to the bill and they are not satisfied with the bill themselves.

So this is the sorry state of affairs we find ourselves in, Mr. Speaker, as we deal with regional government, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House this year. And when does it come in? It comes in at the tail end of the session, at the tail end of the session. I do not know if the Government were of the opinion that we were going to be beat out to the point that we were going to give in and put on a show for a couple of days and try to get this bill, let this bill go through and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, they have a thing or two coming to them

11562

MR. F. WHITE: with respect to this bill because even thought it was brought in at the end of the session, even though the Government never had the courtesy to bring in this bill earlier on, two or three months ago in March or April. What have they been doing for the past year since Bill 101 was withdrawn? Why did it have to be in June month before this bill was brought into this House, or the end of May and we find ourselves now having to take this bill, having to talk to people, having to try to come up with some definite proposals and counterbalances concerning the various clauses in this bill and it was brought in at this late stage? That is reason enough, Mr. Speaker, the fact that it was brought in at such a late stage in the game is reason in itself if nothing else in this bill, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else in this bill provided a reason to be opposed to the bill the fact that it was brought in as it was at the tail end of the session in the midst of controversy with the minister roaring and raving about how the bill was going to be forced through over his dead body then that is reason enough to be opposed to it and I can think of a good many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we on this side and why members on the other side as well should be opposed to this bill.

And we understand, Mr. Speaker, that earlier a year or so ago there was a concern about the regional water supply and the need to get a regional government in place to deal with the regional water supply but that has all been taken care of from what I understand there has been seventeen or eighteen people transferred from the minister's department to Metro Board already to look after the regional water supply. The regional water supply is in place. It is going to take its course. They cannot use the excuse that oh! we have to get this regional government in or some communities might run out of water. That is a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, a lot of nonsense and it is a very poor argument. The regional water supply is onstream thanks to the federal government. The people are working to keep the regional water supply going and the government knows this and yet

MR. F. WHITE: they use that lame excuse to say that water is a major problem and so on to bring this bill in at this particular stage.

MR. S. NEARY: Correct. That is absolutely right!

MR. F. WHITE: So, Mr. Speaker, here we are towards the end of June dealing with one of the most important and perhaps the most important piece of legislation to come before this government or come before this House in the last two or three years and the government expects us to put it through without any further debate, without any further study, without giving time, Mr. Speaker, for the ramifications of what the government is doing in Bill 50 to seep out to the populace because the people are out there and if do not realize what is happening to them with respect to this bill. They just do not realize partly because of the time of the year they are going off on weekends the people are working to get home to do their gardens and everything else and while that is going on while all those people are out there in the Northeast Avalon doing that here we are in this House with the government trying to force things on them that they are not aware of. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, before this debate is over they will know their taxes are going to go up and then they will

11564

MR. F. WHITE: start to scream when they find that out because taxes have to go up and there is no way that they can avoid taxes going up and in some places where there are no taxes at the moment, taxes will have to be imposed and the people in those areas are totally unaware of this. They think they are living in their little communities there, that what is going on in the House at the moment is not going to affect them but it will affect them, Mr. Speaker, as I will demonstrate in a little moment when I come to it. The government know, Mr. Speaker, the government know that eventually taxes have to go up in those areas around St. John's where they are paying at the moment in sixteen or seventeen communities, they are paying not a cent, Mr. Speaker, not a cent in fifteen or sixteen communities they are not paying a cent for taxes of any kind, of any shape or form and how long is that going to last after this bill goes through the House? About one week maybe and up the taxes go or new taxes being imposed. You have other areas and I will go down through the whole list before I finish my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, on what taxes are being paid and what taxes one can expect to be paid before this regional government really takes effect or when the regional government really takes effect. The kind of thing the minister should have done when he stood in this House and gone down through the various communities and outlined what is going to happen in those communities. And all they see is this one big blob on the map with an arch going across it showing the St. John's urban region, the Northeast Avalon area and there you have it. All they see is that is going to become one big area and by setting up the regional government they abrogate all responsibility for tax increases or any other thing that might be forced on the people of the Northeast Avalon area that they will not have to take responsibility for, Mr. Speaker. They are throwing it over on the regional government, absolutely and completely.

11863

MR. F. WHITE: You heard the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) today talking about the state around the countryside, and I agree with him. It is an absolute mess and I would be ashamed to sit with any government that permits it to go on. It is absolutely terrible. I almost want to close my eyes when I drive around and yet you have a government that is totally unconcerned with respect to that and making no attempt. You need a whole new change, Mr. Speaker, a change in the attitude of people. They cannot see cans along the highway if they are flying over it all the time. So this is what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am sick and tired of it too, the mess that is around but it is not going to be cured by regional government, it is going to be cured by a concern on the part of the government in power and a government that is not afraid to take responsibility for what they were elected to take responsibility for, and that is what you have now.

This government is throwing all responsibility for one of the most tiresome in terms of dealing with the problem, one of the most complicated, one of the most controversial areas of the Province, perhaps the most confused and complicated municipal areas of Newfoundland. The government has said, We want nothing else to do with it. We will throw it over on this regional board, if taxes go up in St. John's, as they will, they will blame the regional council. If taxes go up in Shoe Cove or Bauline or some of the other unincorporated areas, blame the regional government, Mr. Speaker. Well I can give this government notice, that from now on taxes that go up after regional government comes in, if it does come in, it is going to be blamed on this government because that is where the blame should go and we will make that point, that every time there is a tax increase in St. John's you will hear the mayor coming out saying, "We have to put up the taxes because of regional government," and lay it right back at the feet of the provincial government, Mr. Speaker. They are making a rod for their own backs,

MR. F. WHITE: a rod that they cannot envisage at the moment will come down to haunt them in years and years to come. In the strongest conservative area of the Province they are really cutting their own throats and you can see that happening, Mr. Speaker, and I can see it happening all the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are sitting here and we are standing here in this House and we are expected to vote for a bill, Bill 50, to give untold power to a new regional council to be set up with five appointments on it. The government can pick and choose and the reference earlier to the hon. gentleman from St. John's South when he said that Mr. O'Dea may be the new Chairman. Mr. O'Dea has accepted and agreed to be the new Chairman of the Regional Council. The Minister of Municipal Affairs announced in the House, and I have his direct quote here with respect to Mr. O'Dea's position, Mr. Dinn in the House, "I am pleased to announce that Mr. John R. O'Dea, the present Chairman of Metro Board, has agreed to accept the position as Chairman of Regional Government," said the minister. There you are, Mr. Speaker, it is already gone. The bill is not even passed in the House and he has gone to Mr. O'Dea and said, "Mr. O'Dea, do you want a new cushy job that we are going to create as soon as we force it through over the dead bodies of the Opposition, force it through the House of Assembly?" You know, it is automatically going to go through the House of Assembly. That must have been the assumption on the government's part. There is no way in the middle of June or towards the end of June that the Opposition can stall off on this bill. No way. So he goes to Mr. O'Dea and he says, "Mr. O'Dea, will you agree?" "Of course.

11867

Mr. White:

I will agree to take it." Why not agree to take over?

AN HON. MEMBER: How many more has he got?

MR. WHITE: More power. The Empire builder. More power for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is full-time Chairman of Metro now.

MR. WHITE: I know he is full-time Chairman of Metro. I know all about that. But the presumption on the part of the minister when he went and asked Mr. O'Dea, Look, we got all of the government members now to agree to this Bill 50, we are going to fling it in, the last minute fling it in at the last minute well just before the House closes, get all of the government members from St. John's to support it, and then, you know, you will be the new Chairman of Metro, and you have got a year and a half before any elections have got to come up, and the whole thing. And we can go through this bill piece by piece and almost every clause, which we will demonstrate in third reading if it ever gets to it, needs to be amended, every clause needs to be amended, one hundred-and-forty-odd clauses that need to be amended and they will be, Mr. Speaker. Because the government has deliberately set out to confuse the people to not abrogate their own duties in terms of turning over the responsibility for the Northeast Avalon Region over to the Council, a buffer, Mr. Speaker, between the people and the government. That is exactly what they are creating.

Henley in his study, and I went through that a few moments ago with respect to the recommendations that they did not even touch, Henley in his study clearly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that before any regional government should be brought to the Northeast Avalon Region that a plan be drawn up with respect to the Northeast Avalon Region, that a plan be put into effect, that a plan be looked at. The plan! The plan, we do not even know what the borders are going to be! How can you have a plan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, they do not even have a plan. They do not know what the borders are going to be of this regional government. Government members on the other side are speaking against the bill, they are not going to vote against the bill, but they are speaking against the bill. And the minister wants to force this through the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: He can think again.

MR. WHITE: I mean the minister wants to force this through the House. There has got to be something wrong with him, Mr. Speaker, to want to do this after all the opposition to it, after all of the opposition to it. And I have all the press clippings here I can go through, Mr. Speaker. I can go through all of the press clippings here. It is probably one of the major subjects that has been covered by the press in the St. John's area. And we can go through the press clippings. The minister says the only opposition is from St. John's, and he is totally wrong, and he knows it is wrong, and there is no need for me to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and demonstrate why the minister is wrong. They are creating a monument or not a monument, they are creating a monster, Mr. Speaker, that they do not know they are creating a monster with untold powers and coupled with the powers that are been vested in the minister through this bill, it is going to be a totally uncontrollable situation with the poorer people, and the people who are not aware of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the unincorporated areas, the unorganized areas, not realizing what they are getting themselves into, not for one single minute, Mr. Speaker, and we can demonstrate that.

Let us look at a few places, and what the taxes are today and think about what the taxes are going to be. Let us look at Wedgewood Park that obviously does not want to come into the City of St. John's, apparently does not. It should have been in the City of St. John's when it was first set up out there. Wedgewood Park should have been in the City of St. John's then, in my opinion. It should have been in the City of St. John's at that time. They got a property tax of 7.5 mils, which works out on an average house and a business tax of 23 as well, but on the basis of the property tax that would work

Mr. White: out in Wedgewood Park on an average I would say of about \$200 a year, for the average house, a \$30,000 house. And all I am talking about now, Mr. Speaker, are average figures, and that is the only way you can deal with it. Wedgewood Park a property tax of 7.25 mils, about \$200 a year they are paying, Wedgewood Park.

AN HON. MEMBER: And it is going to go up.

MR. WHITE: And it is going to go up. Of course, it is going to go up. As soon as regional government comes in Wedgewood Park people - and they might as well realize it now, and we might as well tell every one of them, we might as well go on the radio and tell all the people in Wedgewood Park that as soon as regional government comes in their taxes are going to go up.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. WHITE: Their taxes are going to soar, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

MR. WHITE: Now we got to go around, and we got to tell all of the people in Wedgewood Park that their taxes are going up. So Wedgewood Park people realize now that your taxes are going to go up as soon as regional government comes in, and you might as well realize it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go down to the next one, Torbay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. WHITE: Torbay, a council that came out against this regional government, came out against it. Now they have a service fee, Mr. Speaker, a service fee down in Torbay, not very far from St. John's, not very far at all, a nice community, a fair number of people, and they are paying total taxes, Mr. Speaker, total taxes of \$40 a year. Now that is what they are paying, a service fee -

MR. NEARY: Up she goes.

MR. WHITE: - a service fee of \$40 a year that will be tripled -

MR. NEARY: Up she goes.

MR. WHITE: - in one year, Mr. Speaker, after regional

MR. WHITE:

government comes in. Immediately a property tax will go on, the kind of property tax that Metro Board has already put on. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the property tax Metro Board has put on. For example, in Kilbride and Newtown where they are paying 6 mils already and in those areas where they are governed by Metro Board they are already paying \$200 and \$300 a year.

MR. NEARY:

Right.

MR. WHITE:

Now let us face it; under Metro Board they are paying a couple of hundred dollars a year already, they are paying 6 mils. Mr. Speaker, under Metro Board and under regional council all the other communities that are not under Metro Board will have to pay the same thing and that is the way the regional - it is only logic, Mr. Speaker. So instead of forty dollars service fee, Mr. Speaker, in Torbay a year from now it is going to be \$200.

MR. SIMMONS:

Right.

MR. WHITE:

So people should realize that. Or more! Two hundred dollars or more in Torbay within a year after the Northeast Avalon region goes into effect. We might as well realize that because it is a fact of life and the minister might as well realize it. Now this is going to be drummed into all the heads of the people in Torbay and Wedgewood Park and everywhere else before we stop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right.

MR. DOODY:

How many will (Inaudible) next year when they find out it is not true?

MR. WHITE:

Next one, Mr. Speaker, Flatrock: Service fee of twenty or twenty-five dollars, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-five dollars a year in Flatrock at the moment. What do you think that is going to be, Mr.

115 21

MR. WHITE: Speaker? Two times would be fifty dollars, three times would be seventy-five dollars, four times would be one hundred dollars so it is going to be two hundred dollars minimum because we have to go on the basis of what Metro Board has already done. So in Flatrock, eight times, Mr. Speaker, eight times, the taxes have to go up eight times before they come in line with that the Metro Board is already charging, before they only come up to the present standard of Metro Board.

MR. DINN: What is Metro Board charging in Airport Heights right now?

MR. WHITE: I do not know what Metro Board is charging in Airport Heights. When I get down to my sheet I will know, I have it all here. At least the minister did not do this exercise and he should have done this exercise.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. He is only telling half the story.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, Flatrock, twenty-five dollars a year. Not twenty-five dollars a month, Mr. Speaker, not twenty-five dollars a month, not twenty-five dollars every six months, but twenty-five dollars a year in service fee in Flatrock at the moment. So we can expect that to be eight times as much.

MR. SIMMONS: Eight times?

MR. WHITE: As soon as Mr. O'Dea and his people get involved in it, eight times.

MR. SIMMONS: The Dinwit formula.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at Pouch Cove. Pouch Cove is another area that we can talk about. Pouch Cove, Mr. Speaker, thirty dollars a year. A service fee of thirty dollars a year in Pouch Cove. Again we can expect, and this is giving all kinds of - I am giving the government all kinds of reasons where they do

11572

MR. WHITE: not have to let the tax go up any higher than two hundred, and I have just taken the median tax, Mr. Speaker, as imposed by the Metro Board in New Town and Kilbride and other places, that is all I am taking, but Metro Board has already established six mils about an average of two hundred dollars in Kilbride and New Town and here we have in Pouch Cove at the moment thirty dollars a year. So Pouch Cove people, beware! Your taxes are going to go to two hundred dollars a year before you get a chance to blink an eye. So that is Pouch Cove, Mr. Speaker.

Now we come on down to the next three communities on my list which are St. Phillips, St. Thomas and Portugal Cove. Now these are the three new communities that have recently been incorporated and they have no taxes set at the moment, I guess they are waiting for regional government, so St. Phillips, St. Thomas and Portugal Cove might as well realize that right off the bat they are going to have to pay two hundred dollars a year. Not twenty dollars a year, not thirty dollars a year but as Metro Board continues with what it has already established in trying to get uniform taxation throughout the area. Because you are not going to have a council over an area, a big regional council when some guys are paying twenty dollars a year and others are paying two and three hundred dollars, they are just not going to stand for that so St. Phillips, St. Thomas and Portugal Cove might as well realize that up she goes, and they are going to be paying quite a bit of taxes, at least two hundred dollars a year before this is all over.

Conception Bay South, Mr.

Speaker: Now, Conception Bay South said no to regional government, they wanted nothing to do with it. Conception Bay South said no and for a good reason Conception Bay South

MS73

MR. WHITE: said no. Because do you know what they are paying now, Mr. Speaker, in service fees in Conception Bay South, the third largest municipality in Newfoundland? They are paying forty dollars a year for a service fee. Forty dollars a year in service fees in Conception Bay South, Mr. Speaker, so you know what is going to happen there. Conception Bay South are getting their water in now and the whole thing is coming together so you can expect them to pay more than Flatrock and Torbay and those other areas up to \$250 and \$300 a year where they are paying forty dollars right now, Mr. Speaker. And that is the message, that is the message to Conception Bay South and the gentleman who just walked in, the Minister of Transportation and Communications kept Bell Island out, kept Holyrood out contrary to

MR. WHITE: the Henley recommendations, contrary to the Henley recommendations, Mr. Speaker, he kept them out because he knew exactly what I am saying now was going to come to pass in a year or so, that taxes are going to soar, Mr. Speaker. Taxes are going to soar in this area, so for his own political good the Minister of Transportation and Communications says, no way do I want to do anything with that considering the fact that he at least looks to the future and hopefully has a good one in politics, which I cannot understand some other members with respect to that. So Conception Bay South, Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with Conception Bay South; \$40 a year in service fee at the moment and up she goes, sling she goes after regional government! So Conception Bay South residents, you might as well realize that when it comes to regional government this is the law and up your taxes are going to go because that is the way it is going to be in Conception Bay South.

Now Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, Mount Pearl. Now God only knows we cannot impose any more taxes on the people of Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: But they will.

MR. WHITE: Of course they will, as soon as regional government gets in effect and the people of Mount Pearl cannot afford it. If I were the member for Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, I would be opposed to regional government for that one reason and that one reason only, because Mount Pearl has no tax base, Mr. Speaker, it cannot afford to maintain the services it has now, and the member knows that, and they are already paying over \$300 a year in taxes, Mr. Speaker. In Mount Pearl now, where they have no tax base, they are paying \$300 or \$400 a year. No wonder New Town did not want anything to do with them! You know New Town did not want anything to do with Mount Pearl because New Town got relatively cheap taxes compared to Mount Pearl. In Mount Pearl the taxes are \$300 and \$400. In New Town they are a couple of hundred dollars, \$240 or \$250. Because the mill rate is -

11528

June 28, 1978

Tape No. 4862

NM - 2

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WHITE: - of course. The mil' rate is seven something in Mount Pearl. Of course.

So there you are with regional government, with regional government, Mr. Speaker, they have already got a limit set with Mount Pearl \$350 so I guess they will drive everybody else -

MR. NEARY: Everybody else.

MR. WHITE: - drive everybody else up to the level of Mount Pearl, which is three hundred-and-some-odd dollars a year and sooner or later something has got to be done about the Mount Pearl situation, sooner or later the member for Mount Pearl has got to address himself to it because they are going head long into something that they have no control over. The town of Lewisporte, Mr. Speaker, with about one quarter the people that Mount Pearl has, has a tax rate that is twice as large. Lewisporte with one quarter the people has a tax rate twice as big as Mount Pearl so I do not know what the solution is to Mount, but I am sure that Mount Pearl residents do not want their taxes to go up any further and God forbid that they should and I hope that nobody has the nerve to put up taxes in Mount Pearl any further because they are getting higher and higher all the time and that is the reason that other areas around - Now if they are successful in annexing the Donovan's Industrial Park area and getting that into Mount Pearl there will be some taxes there for the Mount Pearl people. But Mr. Speaker with the way things are going in Mount Pearl at the moment, if they have to pay their share, if they have to pay their share of regional government, look out, Mr. Speaker, look out because there will be hell to pay in Mount Pearl.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go on - I am swiftly running out of time, - as I indicated when I stood, Mr. Speaker,

11576

June 28, 1978

Tape No. 4862

NM - 3

MR. WHITE: that we are totally opposed to this Bill 50. We are not going to let it go through the House. We are going to use every parliamentary tactic open to us, Mr. Speaker, to stop this bill from going through the House. We are determined to do it, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to demonstrate why the people do not want regional government. For the first time today, Mr. Speaker, for the first time since this bill came before the House we are dealing with individual communities and we are dealing with individual tax bases and we are dealing with the taxes that the individual communities are going to pay. And we want to know, Mr. Speaker, how high Flatrock and Torbay and those people are going to - how high their taxes are going to be. The government just sloughs it off. Let regional government take responsibility. I can hear the minister. The first press release he will make, "It is regional government's responsibility, not mine. I have nothing to do with driving taxes from \$25 a year to \$200 a year in Flatrock, eight times as high. I have nothing to do with that."

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the word "now" be deleted and adding the words, "Upon this day six months hence," Mr. Speaker. It is a six month hoist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. WHITE: No, Mr. Speaker has to rule the motion in order or out.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I have to hear a point of order before I do anything.

MR. SIMMONS: We want to know where the part time member stands.

MR. MARSHALL: Never mind the part time member.

MR. SIMMONS: Sure you are a part time member.

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

11579

11579

June 27²⁷, 1978

Tape No. 4862

NM - 4

MR. MARSHALL: We have seen exhibitions of what full time members do and I think we can do without a lot of them.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker as I understand it the motion is that all words after

11580

11578

MR. MARSHALL: 'now' be deleted and it says then that the bill be not read now but in six months time. I refer to Beauchesne, page 170, paragraph 202 (10) which reads: "An amendment cannot be made, by the addition of words, to the question for reading a bill a second time. The same rule applies to the question for the Speaker's leaving the Chair or going into Committee of Supply." I think the hon. gentleman needs to be doubly full-time. He has talked about full-time and part-time members, but the fact of the matter is this six months' hoist, I believe, is only available with respect to the third reading. But this statement here in Beauchesne I think is explicit, which says that an amendment cannot be made by the addition of words to the question for reading a bill a second time.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. WHITE: If the gentleman who thinks he is such a great expert on parliamentary procedure would only turn to page 498 of May, it reads: "A traditional way of proposing the second reading of a bill is to move an amendment to the question by leaving out the word 'now'" - and it says specifically second reading - "by leaving out the word 'now' and adding the words 'upon this day six months'," Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Poor old 'Part-time Marshall'!

MR. F. WHITE: You could be six months, Mr. Speaker, but it is a normal way, a traditional way and once before in this House, Mr. Speaker, this matter came up and was dealt with quite adequately at that time. So, Mr. Speaker, the motion is in order and I have checked all kinds of authority with respect to it.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Sometimes Marshall'.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, the citation read by the hon. gentleman from Lewisporte is certainly a relevant one. I would point out as well, Beauchesne, page 170,

11581

11578

MR. SPEAKER: subsection 11 and the part in parenthesis "(in other words, the six months' hoist only applies to 'readings' or other proceedings which take place on an appointed date. It has no application to motions for direct adoption.)" Obviously, the point being made here is that with respect to motions, but implicitly it also states that the amendment is applicable to readings of a bill. Also, Beauchesne, page 169, paragraph 202, subsection 7: "An established form of amendment, such as the 'six months' formula used to obtain the rejection of a bill is not capable of amendment." Actually, the six months formula is in order on second reading and that is all I am asked to rule on. It is in order on second reading. There is no need for me to say in what other instances it is or is not in order. It is in order on second reading.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before the hon. gentleman speaks to it I should now actually read it. "Moved by the hon. gentleman from Lewisporte (Mr. White), seconded by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that the word 'now' be deleted and that the following substituted therefore 'upon this day six months hence'.

The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: So we have now, Mr. Speaker, moved an amendment to this motion, the main - well, not the main motion, I suppose, but just for second reading purposes, and it gives the government a good opportunity to give six months leeway with respect to this. All they have to do is say, 'We support it,' and I will sit down and forget about it. So it is six months. That is all we are asking, Mr. Speaker. We could have put three months in but that does not give time for the House to be recalled. But we

MR. F. WHITE: decided, Mr. Speaker, that we would go for six months and that is what we have done. I have asked for a six months hoist on this particular matter and we will continue with our various parliamentary ways and means of continuing to debate this bill and to keep the matter going.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I was dealing with the various towns and communities that will be affected by regional government, something that has not been done in this debate but something that will be done day after day after day, week after week as long as this debate continues.

MR. SIMMONS: Hear, hear! Right to Labour Day.

MR. F. WHITE: We will demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, why we are opposed to this bill, because it is going to be a burden and a hardship on the people who surround the St. John's area and people within St. John's as well. Their taxes are going to soar and they have to be made abundantly aware of this before they get themselves into the soup. So I was coming down, Mr. Speaker, and I did refer to Mount Pearl and the kind of taxes Mount Pearl is paying now. And I hope that the people in St. Phillips and St. Thomas and Portugal Cove, Torbay and Flatrock, Pouch Cove and all those areas realize what kind of tax base they have now, \$30 or \$40 a year, and all of a sudden, you know, they see Mount Pearl out there with no more of an economic base than they have themselves and taxes in Mount Pearl are

MR. WHITE: \$300 and \$400 a year so I am sure the people in those small areas outside St. John's where they are already paying minimal taxes do not want their taxes to soar and go sky-high, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure they would not want that to happen and I am sure members on this side anyway would not want that to happen.

So let us come down now, Mr. Speaker, to Paradise, a service fee of thirty-five dollars. So Paradise residents -

MR. NEARY: No longer a paradise.

MR. WHITE: That is right, no longer a paradise because Paradise residents can realize now that where Metro Board is, and that is our example, Mr. Speaker, we are not being unfair, we are only taking the medium base as outlined already by six mills as put in place already by Metro Board in places like Kilbride and New Town and so on, they have already established the precedent, Metro Board has said, "This is it."

Now, when Mr. O'Dea becomes Chairman of the regional council he has all this big area that he can whack the six mills on the property tax, whack it on and look at the money they have pouring in right over night. And that is exactly what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, and that is the method behind the madness and we might as well realize it.

MR. SIMMONS: And that is Paradise.

MR. WHITE: Paradise, service fee thirty-five dollars a year, Mr. Speaker, so we can expect Paradise residents to be paying at least, minimum now, minimum is \$200 in about a year according to precedent already set by Metro Board and outlined.

MR. SIMMONS: And that is Paradise.

MR. WHITE: And that is Paradise.

The Goulds: The Goulds is

11580

MR. WHITE: not as well off now as Paradise is in terms of the service fee they are paying. Paradise is thirty-five dollars a year and the Goulds forty dollars a year. So the Goulds people are going to have to cough up one hundred and sixty dollars more a year service fee. All kinds of it, all kinds of it, water, sewer, you name it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Water and sewer (inaudible).

MR. WHITE: Yes, of course! Forty dollars a year, of course, you know they are. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the Goulds. Now forty dollars a year they are paying in the Goulds so they can expect to pay two or three hundred dollars as soon as regional government gets their hands on them, gets their greedy hands on them look out, up she goes!

Now look at the people who will really suffer, Mr. Speaker. I have not even mentioned the people who will really suffer yet. I have demonstrated the towns and communities that are going to suffer a hardship because of the increased taxation going to be brought on by regional government but let us look at the towns that are really going to suffer. Let us look at Seal Cove, Mr. Speaker, Bauline, the Topsail Road area, Middle Cove, Outer Cove, Shoe Cove, Foxtrap, Shea Heights - they pay a water rate up there now - Witless Bay, Bay Bulls, Logy Bay, Airports, Penetanguishene, and some other areas on the fringe of the city unorganized areas, Mr. Speaker, unorganized areas. Most of the people have some services in, most of the people in those areas are better off by and large than the people in rural communities along the Northeast coast of this Province, most of those people are better off already than most of the people along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and they are paying nothing.

Now, any other community out-

MR. WHITE: side the Northeast Avalon region, they would have to call a public meeting, they would have to get the town to go along with it and in any event, the minister is not likely to go along with a municipal council anyway. In those areas, Mr. Speaker, fifteen or sixteen towns and communities in the Avalon area carte blanche, forced, bango, they have organized council and not even a word to say about it, not a word. They just have to sit down and take it because the bill clearly points out, Mr. Speaker, and I can go through the section, clearly points out the regional government will have responsibility for all the unorganized areas. They are paying no taxes there now, how long are they going to get away with paying not a cent in taxes, Mr. Speaker? After regional government comes in the minimum they will have to pay is two hundred dollars a year, the minimum. They are paying not a cent now, not a dime, not a copper and as soon as regional government comes in they will be forced, with a municipal tax structure that they never even dreamed would come down on them, that they would not even dream of it, Mr. Speaker, they have no concept of this regional government thing and what it is going to do to them in those various areas. And this is the point that we are going to try to make, that people should be made aware of this.

The member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) talked about the opposition to this bill. There has already been mounting opposition to this bill, Mr. Speaker, mounting opposition, and those who are not totally opposed to the bill, like the members on the other side from St. John's, already have reservations with respect to the bill and want to see amendments brought in. And when the people in the areas outside that are affected most by this bill find out what is going to happen to them they are going to scream

MR. WHITE:

blue murder and I do not
blame them.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can
tell the people in Seal Cove and tell the people in
Bauline and tell the people in the Topsail Road area
and tell the people in Middle Cove and Outer Cove and
Shoe Cove and Foztrap and Shea Heights and Witless Bay
and Bay Bulls and Logy Bay and

Mr. White: Airport Heights, Penetanguishene, and all those unorganized communities, Mr. Speaker, unorganized, some of them have wanted to be organized, some of them wanted to call meetings and said let us form councils. But now by passing a piece of legislation here in this House, a piece of legislation that flies in the face of everything the democratic system ever stood for, all of a sudden those unorganized areas have been planked in on a regional government and they have total responsibility with respect to them. You can go through the whole sections, thirty-five, Section 35, in that whole section, Mr. Speaker, you can talk about the power that the regional government will have with respect to the unorganized areas. They have got total responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for those areas. And I am just trying to find the exact words now. The regional council has all the powers of a council, of a municipality under The Local Government Act 1972 in those areas of the region that are not under the jurisdiction of a municipality and that Act applies to those areas. Now that is what it says. The Act says if you want to put a property tax in, you can put a property tax in, whatever you want to do in those unorganized areas-form a council, do whatever you want, it is included in The Municipal Government Act 1972, and the bill, very specific here, very specific, take over the unorganized areas and sock it to them, Mr. Speaker, sock it to them!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is spelled out in 36 and 37.

MR. WHITE: That is right. And spelled out in 36 and 37.

So there you are, Mr. Speaker, there you are: the unorganized areas, any other unorganized area in Newfoundland at the moment, any other unorganized area, if they came in to the minister and said, "Please give us a council, Mr. Minister, give us a council. We want a council so badly!" Then, let us get a meeting going, get 50 per cent of the community to attend the meeting, get 50 per cent of the people at the meeting to vote in favour of a council, and then maybe we will give you a council. For two years they had a freeze on councils. They were not going to let another council go in Newfoundland. They have eased up on that a little bit now, but all of a sudden with one piece of legislation before this House they are incorporating about fifteen or sixteen communities, and we do not even know if they want to

Mr. White: be incorporated or not. They have no say.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WHITE: They cannot hold a meeting and say we want to be exempted from regional government, no. They cannot do that. No such thing. They cannot hold a meeting. One hundred per cent of the community comes to the meeting and say, we do not want any municipality yet we are still going to be faced with a municipality, -

MR. NEARY: We fixed them over on Bell Island.

MR. WHITE: - and a municipal government.

MR. RIDEOUT: Like the minister said now -

MR. WHITE: Congratulations to the Minister of T and C, how smart he was, Mr. Speaker, because he knew what was coming up.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did -

MR. WHITE: Get Bell Island out, and get Holyrood out, and you guy take your lumps in the rest of it, because that is what they are going to have to take.

So there we are, Mr. Speaker; Newtown already are paying 6 mils, they are under Metro Board directly. Metro Board has forced a tax on them of 6 mils, so they are already paying about \$250 a year average, \$250 a year to Metro Board from the Newtown area. They said no to Mount Pearl. We do not want to go in Mount Pearl. And again, Mr. Speaker, why did they say no to Mount Pearl, I wonder, why? I guess for the same reason that every single community that is suppose to come under Metro Board or under the regional government plan would say no to regional government, for the same reason that the people of Newtown said no to Mount Pearl, because we do not want our taxes to go up \$100 or \$200 a year. Now it comes right down to facts and figures and money in the pocket, and taxes you are going to have to pay out of that money that you have in the pocket. That is why Newtown said no to Mount Pearl, and that is why the other communities, even the communities that now have municipal councils, will say no to regional government if they were given the chance in a plebiscite. If they were given a chance, Mr. Speaker, in a referendum, they would say no to regional government. All those places now that cannot get councils,

Mr. White: could not get councils in the past and here they are now not getting a cent in taxes, not a dime, not a nickel in taxes, and all of a sudden regional government comes in and the minimum they will have to pay is \$200 a year, the minimum \$200 a year, minimum. And the minister knows that, I know it, and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WHITE: No, I will not permit a question, of course not.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people in this House know it, some people related directly to the bill know it, but I will say the people in the areas do not know it, And when they find out, when they find out, Mr. Speaker, when they find out this government is going to have hell to pay; when they find out the kind of imposition that has been placed on them by a majority of the members in the House of Assembly who sit in the government, Mr. Speaker, and support the government of this Province. They should all be told, there should be a circular

MR. WHITE: sent out to every single one of those communities, no sweat to do it at all, send out a circular informing them of what regional government is going to bring. What is it going to bring to Shea Heights, or Witless Bay or Bay Bulls or Logy Bay? What is it going to bring? Number one, it is going to bring this, number two, this, number three, this, number four, this, and here is what they are going to have to pay. Now that is what the people want. It is as simple as that. Black and white.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they are not going to get it from this government.

MR. WHITE: So far, although we got the bill before the House we do not even know what the area is going to be. I assume that sooner or later the minister is going to say, "Here are the boundaries. Here are the communities going to be included." Presumably before the bill goes through. Because we have no intention at the moment, Mr. Speaker, of voting for or permitting, Mr. Speaker, or permitting a bill to go through this House that has such power to enforce such restrictions and taxes on the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the people who were opposed to Confederation in '48 and '49 almost won, almost won, because of the word "taxes". Almost won because people were scared of their lives of what the taxes were going to be, scared of their lives.

I would say there are twenty-five or thirty people in the St. John's urban region at the moment that they should be scared of their lives and we will see to it, Mr. Speaker, that the message is broadcast loud and clear, loud and clear, and to make matters even worse, you would not mind now if they were going to have a regional council and everybody was going to be elected on the regional council and a guy whose taxes go up gets on the phone and he calls the guy on the regional council and says, "What is happening with my taxes?" You would not mind that so much. You know, if they were all elected and they had to all go back and face the electorate the next time around. But no, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. You have five appointees to the new regional council, five appointees.

MR. WHITE: They will be able to control the quorum, if necessary, five plus three is a quorum on the new regional council, So they are not elected, they are appointed by the government, you know. They are getting paid for what they are doing. So why could they care? They do not have to face re-election. Sock it to them. Drive up the taxes. I would suggest before the election even comes in a year and a half that Metro Board will have its greedy fingers on the taxes in some of those unorganized areas.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Regional government, you mean.

MR. WHITE: No, the Metro Board. Before the election takes place to form the regional council -

AN HON. MEMBER: Metro Board will not be there then.

MR. WHITE: That is right. The existing Metro Board will have its greedy fingers on the taxes of people in St. John's and outside the St. John's area. And when I went down through all the communities where the taxes are going to go up, Mr. Speaker, I said on behalf of those people, and from looking at this situation, from seeing what Metro Board has already done in the areas that it has control over now, we can see that. We know that. We know what they have done. So obviously they are going to follow the pattern. For St. John's what can we say for St. John's, Mr. Speaker? What can we say about taxes in St. John's? The largest single area affected.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not want it.

MR. WHITE: The mayor and councillors have already said that, that taxes have to go up. They say that taxes have to go up in St. John's, so I assume that the City Council in St. John's know whether or not taxes have to go up or not. So right now they are saying that because of this government, it is going to be this government's fault that taxes have to go up and taxes are going to go up. The mayor has said it. The deputy mayor has said it. People from the other areas have not said it about their own communities but we can say it for them and we will continue, Mr. Speaker, to say it

MR. WHITE: for them, that taxes are going to go up in those particular areas.

Now Mr. O'Dea, I have to laugh, Mr. O'Dea defending the government. "Metro Chairman Defends Government." Why does he say? "The regional government will not be able to impose taxes in other municipal areas." Now what a lot of nonsense. What a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not even read the bill.

MR. WHITE: What a lot of nonsense. The regional government, Mr. Speaker, can force things on those municipalities that the municipalities will have no choice but to raise taxes within their own areas. Mr. O'Dea is technically right when he says, "We cannot force taxes up in municipal areas, of course we cannot." But he is totally wrong because he knows and I know, and the government know, and people who have spoken in this debate know, that when the regional government makes a decision to charge a municipal area for certain services, that municipal area is going to have to put taxes up to its people to pay for the costs. It is as simple as that. Mr. O'Dea should know that and yet in just about every clipping where Mr. O'Dea has appeared, in just about every clipping where the minister has appeared, regional government has no authority, no responsibility for forcing up taxes. And we all know that it will, Mr. Speaker, and we know what it is going to do. The unorganized areas of the

MR. F. WHITE:

St. John's urban region are going to be the most seriously affected. We should really feel sympathy for them, Mr. Speaker, because in any other part of this Province where people have a degree of freedom, where they have low taxation or no taxation at all, and all of a sudden while they sleep at night - that is how this bill might go through, while they sleep at night - Mr. Speaker, they are going to be imposed with taxation that they are totally unaware of and did not have a clue about. The minister has to change his view on this particular bill, he has to make a lot of changes to it. We are going to make amendments to it as we go through, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to let this thing go through in any other way. And it is as simple as that, Mr. Speaker. We are going to deal with the bill because we have to deal with the bill and the powers that the bill confers on people.

DR. J. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. F. WHITE: Yes, go ahead.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the hon. member's remarks and this is the point I was getting at in my remarks. At last, I think, we are getting down to something substantial in this debate. Up to now it has been really a lot of nonsense, picking at little bits and pieces here, but at least now we are getting down to the question of a concept of regional government. And a question - two questions really. One, in view of the hon. member's remarks I understand - is this a correct understanding? - you are against the concept of regional government on the basis that there might be a tax change involved?

MR. F. WHITE: No.

DR. J. COLLINS: That is one question. The second question is, In view of your remarks regarding the various

DR. J. COLLINS: councils, how would you tie that in with Section (5) of the bill?

MR. F. WHITE: Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, right from the start that our concept of regional government is somewhat similar to that envisioned by Mr. Alec Henley in his study - to a point, of course. To a point, Mr. Speaker, our concept of regional government is similar to that.

If you look at the city of St. John's and you increase the city of St. John's to a point, if you find out whether or not all the unorganized areas around St. John's can finally get organized and then you set up some kind of liason between the city of St. John's and all the councils around the area and they form some kind of regional group, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Henley suggested, but not quite to the same extent as he suggested, you can have a very sensible working regional council that does not have to be elected because all the people on it will have been elected in their own communities. Now that is Mr. Henley's concept. The concept of this government is to take part of that and part of something else and throw it all together in a mish-mash. So what we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, is a change completely from that recommended by Mr. Henley in his study.

I have a broad concept of what regional government could do and I am in favour of that broad concept of regional government as I see it myself. I am not only in favour of it from a St. John's point of view or an Avalon Peninsula point of view, but I am also in favour of it for my own area, the Lewisporte area. There are a lot of communities around Lewisporte and some form of regional government in that area, Mr. Speaker, would do wonders I am sure, but not the kind of powerful government - the government here today are setting up another body that is second only in power to themselves. That is exactly what we are setting

MR. F. WHITE: up. It is controlled by themselves, second only in power to themselves, has more power than the city of St. John's, more power than the city of Corner Brook will have, Mr. Speaker, and they are expecting this to go through the House in a breeze because all those guys over there simply sat around the table and said, 'Now we have to put this piece of legislation through this year because we are getting sick and tired of having to incorporate some of those other areas and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can talk over here about our broad view of regional government. And during the next three or four days as various members speak to the amendment that I have moved and then we get back on the main motion again and then in clause by clause study we will demonstrate the changes we want made and we will see the overall picture evolving hopefully then, Mr. Speaker, if all the amendments that we make are adopted by the crowd opposite.

MR. SIMMONS: No, not necessarily.

MR. F. WHITE: So all I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not want - this is far too important - I would sooner have stayed in Lewisporte yesterday where the weather was nice and gorgeous and I could have gone out in boat or done anything, but I had to drive back into St. John's again and I am quite prepared to stay here just as long as everybody else. And hon. members might be interested to note that this morning at the caucus there was only one of our members missing and that was the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac), and she will be in later on in the week.

So, Mr. Speaker, our determination

MR. WHITE: is to try and get this six month hoist to the bill that is before the House. The government would be well advised to say, Look, there is so much controversy with respect to this bill we do not know how many of those areas that I talked about where taxes are going to go up in, we do not know what they are going to go up, we do not know if Conception Bay South are going to have to pay two or three hundred dollars from now on, those things have to be dealt with, they have to be figured out on paper, they have to be presented to people in the area who have to know. But when you are faced with a situation where Metro has already established a precedent of six mils, a property tax, two or three hundred dollars a year for the people in them, then you are facing other communities that are not even incorporated, Mr. Speaker, paying no money at all. Those are the issues that we have to deal with here because there are people in those communities. It is not just a philosophical view of members opposite of what regional government should be and looking on the map and pinpointing it.

Down in Bauline and Middle Cove and Outer Cove, have they no say? Have they no rights left in this Province or are they just going to be taken and flung into a bag with St. John's and Mount Pearl and everybody else and treated with the same kind of taxation as everybody else are treated with? So this is the problem, Mr. Speaker, that is why we are against the bill, we do not know enough about it. I was out of the House, as I say, when the minister made his speech and I came in fully expecting, Mr. Speaker, to see exactly what kind of a tax base would be set up. The recommendations of the Henley Commission, for example, recommendations number 23 to 53, which are all based on taxation, we do not know how many of those, how many

MR. WHITE: formulae are going to be employed. So this is the point we are making. I am sure hon. members opposite must see the significance of looking at a community that has no council now and looking at another one close by that - not a council but a town that comes under Metro Board, seeing what Metro Board has already done in those areas, knowing that much of the same kind of philosophy and thinking that has gone into Metro Board is going to go into regional government, knowing that regional government are not going to have a completely elected group on them, that five of the people are going to be appointed, that the chairman, the most important person, is going to be appointed and can take all the flack he wants on the phone. He can say what he like to the people because he does not have to go out to re-election. So we know all those things and knowing all those things, Mr. Speaker, one would hope that the government would see fit to adjourn this bill or let this bill be amended to the extent I moved and let it go on to the Fall session if there is going to be a Fall session as has been suggested by the government. And during the interim, Mr. Speaker, the next six months all kinds of points could be made to Middle Cove, Outer Cove, Shoe Cove, and all those places.

I am sure the minister can go visit those places and call a public meeting and tell them, say, Look, here we are you have no community council at the moment, you have no regional district council at the moment, you have no town council at the moment, and you are not paying a cent of taxes, not a cent. Now a year from now, after regional government comes in you are going to have to pay \$200 a year, each of you out here. Each of you are going to have to pay \$200 a year. I think that point should be made, Mr. Speaker, to the people in those areas. The point should be made that their taxes are going

MR. WHITE: to soar. Because if you only look at the administration alone of this fifteen man board, with all the things that this bill talks about, the staff they are going to hire - they already have seventeen or eighteen right off the bat dealing with the St. John's urban region.

The water system: They have about seventeen or eighteen that have been transferred over to Metro Board already from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. So somebody is going to have to pay those salaries, somebody is going to have to pay Mr. O'Dea's salary. Do you tell me that you are going to pay it by getting forty dollars a year from the people in Conception Bay South? Or twenty-five dollars a year from the people in Flatrock? Or fifteen or sixteen communities where they are not paying a cent right now? No, Mr. Speaker, taxes are going to go up, the government should explain this to the people concerned that their taxes are going to soar sky high and then we would find out what kind of flack there would be against this bill. Because you are not hearing a ranting roaring public opposed to the bill at the moment because it is just a piece of legislation. It is the powers that are going to come with that and six or eight or nine months from now when they start shouting out about this bill it will be a bit too late. So that is why now, during this debate, the next couple of weeks people in all those areas that we have talked about have to be made abundantly clear on what they are getting themselves into and what the government are forcing the people in those areas into, Mr. Speaker.

That is why we are opposed to it. We are going to stay opposed to it. We are going to speak on this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that they do see some common sense on the other side

MR. WHITE: and say, Look, we are going to hoist this bill for six months, let it die, bring it back in the Fall. In the meantime, everybody can put their heads together and try to change some of the damaging clauses in this particular thing and we will see how things will work out with respect to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the cost, the money, the money aspects of it, and the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) dealt with this when he spoke,

MR. WHITE: the cost, the money aspects have not been debated, have not been discussed.

The Deputy Mayor of St. John's, the other day, when he was talking about this talked about forty parts of the bill, forty parts. One-third of this bill deals directly with money and we are not told how much money is going to be involved and we are not told where the money is going to come from, we are not told what the taxation base is going to be in all those areas. We want to know and we have to know.

Mr. Speaker, it is just about six o'clock so I will adjourn the debate until eight o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Shall we call it six o'clock? Do we have leave of the House?

MR. WHITE: I was going to adjourn the debate until eight o'clock, Mr. Speaker, because there is only one minute left on the clock.

MR. HICKMAN: You should sit down.

MR. WHITE: I did sit down.

MR. F.B. ROWE: But he adjourned the debate.

MR. RIDEOUT: He said he adjourned.

MR. WHITE: Well, I said I was going to adjourn the debate. Not the House, the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know about calling it six o'clock, my understanding was that the hon. gentleman just sat down and that the Chair had recognized the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): The Chair understood the hon. gentleman adjourned the debate and called it six o'clock.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, I see.

MR. SPEAKER(Young): I now leave the Chair until eight o'clock.

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 P.M. - 11:00 P.M.

TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for
Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Here we go!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: How is that, eh?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying
before I was so rudely interrupted, our position on
regional government is very clear. We are for and in
favour and totally - we totally go along, Mr. Speaker,
with the idea of regional government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: We totally go along with that
one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: We are absolutely - we are totally -

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on now, 'Luke'.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member would allow
me to interrupt him for a moment, I would like to welcome
on behalf of hon. members Mayor William Tucker of St.
Phillips who is in the gallery.

The hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see
Mayor Tucker in the gallery. I do not have his comments
in front of me but I did see them, I think, in The Morning
News. I think he, along with everybody else that have
spoken in this debate so far, and I refer to Government
members opposite and Opposition members on this side, would
like to see some amendments to bill 50, some changes to
bill 50. It is all agreed, Mr. Speaker. It is all agreed.

MR. WHITE: It is agreed by us over here, it is agreed by members of the Opposition from St. John's, they have stated quite clearly in this debate, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly, that they want some changes, they want some amendments and they do not want this bill to go through like it is.

The member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), Mr. Speaker, showed that this afternoon quite clearly and demonstrated quite well his colleagues' opinions that there should be some changes during the third reading of this bill and for that reason we say, Mr. Speaker - and for other reasons as well - that this bill should get a six-month hoist, as we have moved, that the bill should be deferred for six months until the Fall when it can be dealt with properly and give everybody a chance to have a look at it once again.

MR. NEARY: You do not think there is going to be a Fall session, surely -

MR. WHITE: Oh, I think there is going to be a Fall session and this bill will come up in the Fall, really!

MR. NEARY: Unless we are going to keep the House open until Fall.

MR. SIMMONS: That is how we are going to do it.

MR. WHITE: Sure! Sure I take the Premier at his word, sure! Of course.

MR. SIMMONS: Somebody should, nobody else has yet. Somebody might as well take him at his word.

MR. WHITE: So, Mr. Speaker, clearly during the rest of this debate, if the government are determined to push this through between now and September, if they are determined to push this through we want to know how much taxes are going to go up in all the areas; we want to know, Mr. Speaker, how the individuals are going to be troubled by this; how the families are going to be troubled by this, Mr. Speaker; how the groups and the councils, how everybody

MR. WHITE: is going to be affected by bill 50. It is a very serious piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

In one way this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I likened this to back in 1948-49 when we were deciding to join Canada or not and it all depended on, at that stage, how much we were going to get out of it and how much we were going to put into it in terms of taxes. It is the same with regional government, it is the second most powerful government in this Province that we are establishing, Mr. Speaker, the second most powerful group and we should give this very, very serious consideration. It is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, that can be pushed through in a week or so, a bill, a major bill brought in, a bill with 149 clauses, Mr. Speaker, brought in at the last minute before the House closed, the very last minute. We were all ready, Mr. Speaker, to run back to our districts for the Summer and at the last minute, in she comes.

MR. MURPHY: Four weeks ago.

MR. WHITE: In she comes, Mr. Speaker, fifty-six pages. Up goes the taxes as soon as this goes through, demonstrated this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, eight times as much. Eight times as much and in some communities the taxes can be expected to go up - and that is only in line, Mr. Speaker, that is only in line, that is only on a par, that is only on an average of what the Metro Board and its Chairman, Mr. O'Dea, have already established. They have already established the six mils property tax, and they have established that, Mr. Speaker, in New Town, they have established that in Kilbride so the people of St. Phillips, Mr. Speaker - and I do not know, I will check and see. St. Phillips has no tax base established, they are a new council - they can be expected to pay a minimum of \$200 a year, as established by the Metro

MR. WHITE: Board, before this regional government is one year old. That would be my estimation, my prediction, Mr. Speaker. At least \$200 a year for every taxable income individual in St. Phillips during that period of time. I do not know what the tax - I suppose \$600 a year, if they are making that much, they will have to pay. Or, if it is based totally on property tax I am sure there are some beautiful homes, Mr. Speaker, in St. Phillips, Portugal Cove and those other communities, beautiful homes that would at least be estimated to be \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year, and on an average of a \$30,000 or \$35,000 home, based on the property tax across the board, as we assume Metro Board will do to maintain the consistency of all communities within its region, then they can be ~~expected to be paying \$200 and \$300 a year in a very short period of time.~~

MR. F. WHITE: expected to be paying \$200 and \$300 a year in a very short period of time. So, Mr. Speaker, those are the main points that we want to make on this regional government legislation, this bill, the Northeast Avalon urban region. We think the government will have second thoughts. The Government of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, had second thoughts about regional government. In at least two individuals places they withdrew the bills after considerable opposition from the NDP and the Liberal Party in Ontario. They withdrew the bills. And, Mr. Speaker, this year Toronto regional is celebrating twenty-five years as a regional council. And the first Chairman of that council, Mr. Speaker, Fred Gardner, after twenty-five years and I will quote what he said after that period of time. "Ironically, having convinced almost all his opponents Gardner today has switched sides. 'It was great a thing for its time,' he says, 'but now the whole clutter have amalgamated into one city under one council, the whole area is Toronto. Everyone looks at it that way and it is just silly to leave it divided into six different municipalities.'" Now he is talking about, after twenty-five years, having second thoughts about it and the whole thing going through there.

St. John's should not, the largest city in this Province should not be allowed to stagnate and all of a sudden come to a complete stop, because that is what is happening. It should not be allowed to happen and no government should let it happen. The major capital city, the oldest city in North America coming to a complete stop, bango! with one bill before the legislature of this House and that is exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly what is taking place. We will take on this bill. We will fight the bill and we will see that this bill is not passed during the present session of the House and I would urge members to support the amendment which I have made which gives a six month breathing spell to the government, Mr. Speaker, and a chance to bring in a decent bill to the House.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, what we have on display today is another sign of dictatorship. What is being put forth as an argument, by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) specifically, is that all the people surrounding St. John's even though they have indicated by petition, their councils have indicated, they have indicated by letter, they have indicated in every way, shape and form that they do not want to become part of St. John's, the hon. member for Lewisporte says, "Forget about that. Throw them in there anyway because that is what they should have."

MR. MORGAN: That is exactly what he said today.

MR. DINN: That is what we want. We want to go back to twenty-five more years of dictatorship. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to wilt to that kind of thinking. That kind of thinking is gone, the people voted it out and they will never accept it again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: They will never accept it again, Mr. Speaker. Now let us have a look at this tax scare, this tax scare that the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and several other hon. members opposite, the tax scare that they are trying, they are attempting to shove down the people's throat. I have here, Mr. Speaker, - let me explain me what we are going to have when we have regional government. What we are going to have is we are going to have Metro Board expanded to a point where two-thirds of that appointed council is going to be elected. Now are we against that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Yes, we are against that on the Opposition side. They stand up and they say we are against that, we do not want elected people, we want the Metro Board, we want to stay as we are, we do not want this shoved down people's throat.

MR. FLIGHT: Who said that?

MR. MORGAN: The Opposition said it.

MR. DINN: That is exactly what the Opposition has said. They do not want regional government, they want Metro Board that is what they want to stay with for another six months or another year and a half or another two years. "We want that appointed body." Well we know where that thinking started. The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is not here right now but we got regional government in 1971, Mr. Speaker, in this Province in Conception Bay South.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want your rattle now?

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) should observe the rules of the House and listen for a change instead of interrupting and breaking the rules of the House, the rules that are continually broken in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir should be quiet while I am speaking or he should be given the place.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want your rattle?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Every hon. member has the right to speak without interruption. The hon. gentleman has required its observance and hon. members should comply therewith.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks, hon. members opposite whether they realize it or not I covered just about every section of the bill that is not contained in a Local Government Act, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 21. I will go through, Mr. Speaker, what is contained in the Local Government Act, what every council in Newfoundland is operating under today and what Metro Board is operating under, The Local Government Act. local improvement district operates as a town council under the Local Government Act. Section 16 exactly the

MR. DINN: same as Section 13 in the Local Government Act. There is absolutely no difference. Hon. members opposite may want to cross reference. They may want to check my notes after and cross reference. I will go through the different sections, because I have covered in my opening remarks on the bill, I will cover on this amendment what sections of the Regional Government Bill are contained within the Local Government Act. Sections 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, Section 17, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53. It may be getting a little boring, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is that 90 per cent of Bill No. 50 is already contained within the Local Government Act, is already the Act under which the totally appointed board called Metro Board is operating now. Sections 55 and 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 98 to 109 inclusive, 113, 114, 115, 120, 122, 123, 124, all the Act under which Metro Board operates now. What is the difference going to be? The difference is we are going to elect two-thirds. This terrible government is going to elect two-thirds of a regional council that will have the powers of Metro Board and that will have the power to operate a regional system so that we do not have the bickering between St. John's and Mount Pearl, so that we do not have the bickering between St. John's and Conception Bay South. That is what we are trying to prevent. We are trying to get these communities to come together and work together so that we will have a region where we can work together and provide the services for our people that we should be providing.

I was a little bit disappointed in the hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) because he got up in the House of Assembly and misled the

MR. DINN: people of this area. I do not know if it was deliberate. I would say it was not, because I think the hon. man is a gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not say deliberate.

MR. DINN: I did not say 'deliberately misled', Mr. Speaker. I do not think it was deliberate. I think because the people on the opposite side are opposing Bill No. 50, the hon. member got up, had to oppose and pick on taxation. The fact of the matter is, continuing on, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 145, 146, 144, 141 and 142, all of these, Mr. Speaker, are those items that are in the Local Government Act. The differences between Bill No. 50, the regional council and the Local Government, and what we have now, Metro Board under the Local Government Act, there are several: Number one, we could have as a government, and we have, signed an agreement to pass the regional water system over to Metro Board. We do not need Bill No. 50 to do that. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council has the power to do that and did it. It is done. We do not need Bill No. 50 for that. The Metro Board will have the power to operate, manage and maintain that regional water system. We do not need Bill No. 50 for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: the Metro Board right now is appointed. We need Bill 50 to change that. We need Bill 50 so that we can have two-thirds elected, so that we can have a representative group of people, six from the outside of the city of St. John's, and four from within. It would have been six and four the other way around but it is six outside and four within because we have not expanded the city, because we, Mr. Speaker, do not believe in dictatorship. We believe that the people should decide and the people have decided and the people have spoken loudly and clearly that they do not want to become part of the city of St. John's. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people should become - the expanded city should come. But I do not believe that you can force that upon the people of this region. That is not what government is all about. Government's responsibility is to provide service and Mr. Speaker, this government from 1972 and onwards, from the start of the regional plan, from the start of the Proctor and Redfern study, from when Mr. Henley went about finding out how we were to provide service, this government took its responsibility and took it not by words but with action.

First of all they said, "We cannot wait for Mr. Henley to finish. The city of St. John's will run short of water unless we take action." And, Mr. Speaker, it is a lucky thing that we did. We were short in '76 and short in '77, and in September of '77 this government could say to the people of St. John's, "You will not be short of water for another fifty years."

MR. NEARY: Thanks to Ottawa.

MR. DINN: I am not one not to give credit where credit is due.

MR. NEARY: You did not mention it.

MR. DINN: I mentioned it when I opened my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I mentioned it many times when I was

MR. DINN: on TV or radio or when I spoke in public. I spoke to the Rotary Club a week ago, at that meeting I explained regional government to that group and explained exactly what had happened since 1972.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yes, we got some assistance through DREE.

MR. NEARY: How much?

PREMIER MOORES: We got in on request.

MR. DINN: On request.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. DINN: And we would never have gotten it if we had not made the request, or if we had not made the pitch for St. John's. We made the request, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DINN: - and, Mr. Speaker, that request was based on - it was not based on a whim. We did not go to Ottawa and say, "We need some more money for water for St. John's or for sewer." We went up and we had it well documented. We had a Proctor and Redfern report which said, "In five years time you will be out of water in the City of St. John's, in our capital city." And that was documented, the evidence was presented and Ottawa, yes, Ottawa came through with some \$25 million.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: As they should.

MR. DINN: As they should. As they darn well should, as the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundrigan) pointed out. If we got our just desserts under the terms of union, Term 29, we would have \$35 million this year and every year, Mr. Speaker. So Ottawa recognized their responsibility, as we recognized our responsibility. And this government was not hesitant when the time came for \$8.3 million for the regional water system and we came here to this House of Assembly, and the House of Assembly approved it. And the hon. member was in the House of Assembly when the House of Assembly approved it.

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4873

NM - 3

MR. DINN:

He may not have discussed it, because

Mr. Speaker, they have not discussed, the hon. members opposite

have not discussed - I went through some

Mr. Dinn: \$60 million this year in Municipal Affairs and Housing, in municipal affairs alone \$51 million, and the hon. members opposite never went through one item, and that is what the problem is in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: They did not get up and say, 'Let us go through item by item.' They got up and made their big political speeches and that is what they are doing now. They are, Mr. Speaker, attempting, whether knowingly or unknowingly - and if it is unknowingly they should be ashamed of themselves - knowingly or unknowingly are attempting to frighten the people of this region because this government took it upon themselves to do something for the people of the City of St. John's. And that will be noted, Mr. Speaker. There is a time and place when that will come back to haunt hon. members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this going to cost the people in the region? Well, first of all it is not going to cost the people of Airport Heights anything, I can guarantee that, that the people of Airport Heights will not get water and sewer until they decide that they want it. The people of Conception Bay South from this day forth will not have a backhoe go into Conception Bay South until I see an indication that 80 per cent of the people want it. We have the money because we think they need it, but they will not get \$2 million this year for water and sewer until they answer my request. And I had the Council in my office some five or six months ago, Mr. Speaker, and I said to them, "You find out what the people want, and if they want water and sewer I will do everything in my power to get it for them." And, Mr. Speaker, I live up to that commitment. I will still. That is no threat. That is the way it should happen. That is the way it happened in Bay de Verde. Bay de Verde were asked, "Circulate a petition to your people and find out do they want water and sewer. Send that petition in. Let us know if you will hook up."

MR. CANNING: How about Lewin's Cove?

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Lewin's Cove, and Lewin's Cove did not get back, Mr. Speaker. Rushoon did get back, Mr. Speaker. And the hon. member who is now -

MR. CANNING: Are you going off track?

MR. DINN: - the hon. member who is now interrupting apparently does not know what is going on in his district. Because I know, and I know what I have received and have not received, and if the hon. member wants to interrupt, I do not mind if he interrupts, Mr. Speaker, if that hon. member wants to interrupt I am quite capable of handling any hon. member on the opposite side if they want to interrupt. But I would suggest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they wait a little while and they will hear a little bit about Bill 50. That is what we are attempting to discuss here in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have heard nothing so far.

MR. DINN: Metro Board, Mr. Speaker. What will happen? Metro Board.

MR. F. ROWE: It is gone out.

MR. DINN: If the regional council never sees the light of day, Metro Board will operate in this region. If the regional council does not see the light of day, if it does not, this side of the House will get fifteen seats, if it does see the light of day it will still get fifteen seats because they were against regional government. They were against Bill 50. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite -

MR. NEARY: We will get the whole Province.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, let us go through the Metro Board because I do not like to speak about what will happen. I know what happened last year. I got all of the figures here about what happened last year. I got the audited statements for Metro Board. They have a proposed budget in, the budget was approved, it looks like a good budget to me, Mr. Speaker. Last year the budget was approved and I have the financial statements. And I have here, Mr. Speaker, the scare

MR. DINN: tactics that were thrown across this House of Assembly are something less than - we have here, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. F. ROWE: Are you going to table the report?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is not your style now.

MR. DINN: - liabilities and balance of fund with respect to assets and liabilities, with respect to Metro Board, the 31st. of December, 1977. The people in the region are going to have to pay all of the debts of Metro Board, all of the debts, all of the accumulated debts of Metro Board, and what happened last year? Accumulated surplus, \$248,000. They started out, Mr. Speaker, with a balanced budget. They started out with a balanced budget. The people in Newtown, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who is not in his place and who is interrupting from the wings -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have got the dope on him.

MR. DINN: - and had his - and we have the dope on the hon. member, do we?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Right. You need not have to worry about that.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who was interrupting from the wings talks about Newtown, who voted to stay with Metro Board.

MR. F. WHITE: How did Mount Pearl?

MR. DINN: They voted to stay with Metro Board.

MR. WHITE: What was their option?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the accumulated surplus is \$248,395 and I do not have the cents there but we will not quibble about the few cents. It is not here in cents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White), if we get regional government he predicts right now, he said this afternoon that we were going to have all these taxes. But next year we were going to have double the accumulated surplus. Well, I would make a prediction like that, because we have, Mr. Speaker, probably one of the greatest local improvement districts in Newfoundland, and as a town council it cannot be mastered. They are one of the biggest and best town councils, local improvement districts on this Island today.

MR. F. WHITE: You should have spent the money for services, not have a surplus.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You would have been better off if you had kept quiet.

MR. DINN: Now the hon. member opposite who has not read Bill No. 50 - if he has, he does not understand it; and if he has and does understand it has misled the people because, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Unwittingly.

MR. DINN: Unwittingly.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Half unwittingly.

MR. DINN: I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. It was some other member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Half unwittingly.

MR. DINN: If there was a wit over there he would be half of it, I agree.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through some of the comments made by hon. members opposite

MR. DINN: with respect to Bill No. 50. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) stood up in this House of Assembly and spoke for forty-five minutes, parroted one or two items by the Leader of the Opposition and then spent forty-five minutes being totally irrelevant to the debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not my words, these are the words of the press. The Daily News had it reported on the House of Assembly the next morning, and they said the hon. the member for Bay de Verde spoke for forty-five minutes and he was totally irrelevant to the debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make excuses for the hon. member. If he was irrelevant that is fine but I did sit in this House of Assembly and I concur 100 per cent with that article in The Daily News. I do not often agree - I do have some disagreements with The Daily News - but I sat here while the hon. member was speaking in the debate and I concur 100 per cent with what The Daily News reported the next morning.

MR. DINN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition took great pains in going through many items in the bill, many items. 'The powers in this bill would scare you to death!' he said. Well, Mr. Speaker, he covered several sections. I wrote down one or two of them. 'Expropriation,' he said, 'they can walk into a person's house unannounced. Whenever they want to they can take a person's house.'

MR. FLIGHT: 'Dinn' can not find his house (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that was taking everything in that bill with respect to expropriation of private individuals' property, every item - and I challenge hon. members opposite to name one section of that bill where it involves expropriation of private property that

MR. DINN: is not contained today in the Local Government Act. There are 310 municipalities in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, from Rose Blanche to St. Anthony to Main to St. John's to Corner Brook. Every council in Newfoundland today has all the expropriation provisions in the Local Government Act as they do have here in this Bill No. 50. So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to take their houses and we can sell them to anybody else after.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there may be some changes required in Bill 50 but that is not one of the changes. If you want to run a water and sewer system in your community and there is one house preventing you from serving your whole community, you have to have expropriation provision. That is in the local government act and should be there and it is in the City of St. John's Act, the City of Corner Brook Act and all the rest of them, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to change them and we are right now looking at -

MR. CALLAN: Are you going to provide water and sewer?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is the hon. member from Come By Chance interrupting again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Does the hon. member want to ask a question? If he does not, Mr. Speaker, I request that there be a little silence while I finish my few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On both sides of the House hon. members I am sure will give the hon. minister his due and remain silent while he speaks.

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we will go through a couple of other questions by hon. gentlemen opposite. The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) stood in the House and he said that he did not know anything about this bill 'but I have to speak anyway.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: That is what the hon. member said, Mr. Speaker. After speaking for thirty minutes in this House he said that he did not know anything about this bill 'but I have to speak anyway.' The hon. member for Windsor Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. W. CARTER: Spreading Newfie jokes.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that none of the parliamentarians who were here last week overheard or heard that kind of a thing.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I do mind the hon. minister quoting me but I am sure that I have a right in this House to be quoted properly, Sir. I did not say that I know nothing about the bill. I did say that regional government is not very important to me, it is not very important to my constituency and that is about it. I did not say that I know nothing about the bill and the minister should withdraw that because he is misleading the House. And if he does not I will request that we get Hansard. He is deliberately misquoting me and he is not allowed to do that, Sir, under the rules as I understand them and if he insists I will insist that we bring Hansard in the House and determine that he is indeed deliberately misleading the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not think the Chair can rule on this point. It is a question of what was said and what was not said. When the documentary evidence comes to hand, if a point of order needs to be raised it could be raised at that time.

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the documentary evidence does come into this House the hon. member will probably have to eat it.

MR. FLIGHT: Before this is all over you will be eating worse!

MR. NEARY: You will all be eating the same thing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You did not say that, did you, 'Graham?'

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition made a great point out of the fact that the Chairman would be all powerful. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know where he gets his idea from there. He was in a Cabinet where the chairman was all powerful but that is not the case with Regional Government, Mr. Speaker. With Regional Government the chairman under normal circumstances brings in the topics we are going to cover today and then we vote on them, and we have to have a majority vote for anything to carry. That was not the way the hon. the Leader of the Opposition saw it. But, Mr. Speaker, we can understand why he did not see it because, as I have already stated, he was in a Cabinet where that did not

MR. DINN:

is about twenty-five cents per thousand gallons of water that this disgraceful regional council will bring. Well, Mr. Speaker, whether regional council comes or Metro Board stays that will still be the charge. Somebody will pay for the operation and maintenance. We do not believe that the people of Conception Bay South should have to pay for that system from Bay Bulls Big Pond to Conception Bay South. We do not believe that is fair.

DR. KITCHEN:

St. John's will pay for it.

MR. DINN:

We do not believe that St. John's should pay for that water system from Bay Bulls to Mundy Pond reservoir. We do not believe that is fair. We believe that there is a fair way of doing it. How much water do you need out of this system? You can take it or you can leave it. But if you need water you have to pay for the operation and maintenance of that regional system. And right now, after about nine months of data, that is twenty-five cents per thousand gallons. It is not the same as the city of St. John's is charging Wedgewood Park.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

How much is that?

MR. DINN:

That is sixty cents per thousand gallons. It is not the same as the city of St. John's is charging East Meadows right now.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

How much is that?

MR. DINN:

That is sixty cents per thousand gallons. We think, Mr. Speaker, that if we worked together in this region, if we worked together in this region we can do it cheaper than that. That will be documented whether regional government comes or not. We think that we can do it for twenty-five cents per thousand gallons and we can do that because we have a \$35 million system that we have that this government put there, that the previous administration did not recognize, that they should have planned for and did not, we have a \$35 million water system and whether regional

MR. DINN: government comes or not the people of St. John's will water their lawns, drink water and do their wash and we will have either Metro Board, which is not elected, or we will have regional government, where we will have two-thirds elected, and that is what the hon. members opposite are against.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DINN: The first regional government, Mr. Speaker, set up in this Province, the first regional one was Conception Bay South because it gathered together some eight communities and joined all these communities together and they called it a local improvement district, and they appointed a chairman and seven councillors, and they ruled the roost and that was done by a former Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. SIMMONS: I know all about him.

MR. DINN: Now the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) should not talk about the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Smallwood. That is who brought in the Local Improvement District in Conception Bay South. That was done in 1971. Well in 1972 -

MR. WHITE: Things were different in those days.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have the dope on you fellows.

MR. DINN: - and we talked about changing -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You had better cool her out.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have the dope on you guys.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You fellows had better cool her out a little bit.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There you go! Trying to dig up something!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You had better cool her out a little bit.

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

Interjections from both sides are tending to interfere with the procedure.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971, as I say, the first regional government was set up in the St. John's urban region and that was Conception Bay South. It involved eight or nine communities. It was set up by a former Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the former premier of this Province, Mr. Smallwood. And the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) should not make disparaging remarks with respect that we know all about that.

There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. That was what was required at the time, I believe. But in 1972 we thought there should be a change and in Conception Bay South, Conception Bay South was set up on a ward basis and we elected all of the councils of Conception Bay South.

Now that is what the hon. members opposite are really against. I have gone through Bill 50, I have covered all the points where the regional council is different from the Local Government Act. There was not a member opposite that got up and said anything really against any of those provisions. Even the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. member for St. John's West attempted to scare the people on taxation.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to try to in four or five minutes just outline to the

MR. DINN: hon. member for St. John's West, because he is obviously not aware, he could have come down to my office and asked for the information. He could have spoke to me since he got elected. But he did not come down and he did not discuss the regional government concept, even though Bill 101 was in this House last year. But the fact of the matter is that what we are going to have with respect to taxation, that will not be near \$200, will not touch \$200. And I will cover the communities, Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted.

Pouch Cove will not pay a cent towards the regional government because they will never get regional water, They have their own water system.

MR. WHITE: Are you going to write that in the bill?

MR. DINN: There is no need to write it in the bill, because Metro Board has control over only the unincorporated areas and we know, we know, we have facts to prove that the water system in Pouch Cove is their own water system. It is in their own watershed and they get water from that, never get it from the regional council and therefore will not have to pay regional water.

MR. WHITE: You are not guaranteeing to serve the people and not charge them taxes?

MR. DINN: I am absolutely guaranteeing that 100 per cent.

MR. WHITE: What about the service fee?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about Flatrock.

MR. WHITE: The service fee will stay the same.

MR. DINN: The service fee in Pouch Cove will not be affected by the regional government. It will not be affected by the regional government at all.

MR. SIMMONS: Could we have that in writing?

MR. DINN: I would not touch the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) with a ten foot pole, let alone give him something in writing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: A barge pole.

MR. DINN: A barge pole. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, Flatrock. Flatrock will not get the regional water system. They will never be connected to the regional water system. If the hon. members knew anything about the plans that were made by Proctor and Redfern, that were done by Canadian and British consultants, that were done by Newfoundland Design Associates for this region they would know, and those plans are available in my office and any hon. member who is interested could have come down to my office and asked for them, Flatrock will never be connected to the regional system.

MR. NEARY: Who elected Proctor and Redfern?

MR. DINN: Proctor and Redfern were not elected. They were appointed to have a look at, to study this region. It was studied in 1957. These problems were identified in 1957 and nothing happened from '57 up until 1972.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. Ignore it.

PREMIER MOORES: They were originally appointed when the hon. member was President of the PC Party.

MR. DINN: Yes, that is right. They were originally appointed when the hon. member was President of the PC Party. He got the royal order of the boot. It is the only one in history, I believe. He is the only person in history.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to deal with Bill 50 here. The people of Flatrock will not be connected to the regional system so therefore they will not pay regional water rates. They will not pay a regional user fee. They will not have to pay the twenty-five cents per thousand. And, by the

MR. DINN: way, it is anticipated that as the water usage goes up, and the staff is not increased, that the user rate will go down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is in a bad mood tonight.

MR. DINN: The Leader of the Opposition was totally against number 58 in Bill 50, they call it Bill C50, but it is Bill 50. He was against 58, which dealt with plebescites. He did not think that we should have plebescites apparently. But we will have plebescites, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have a plebescite in a lot of areas because we want to find out what the wishes of the people are and then we will -

MR. MORGAN: They are against that.

MR. DINN: That is right. The Opposition is against this. They agree that we should set up a local improvement district, shove it down their throat and then when they are gagged and they have no choice then we will see if we will do something about it. We are going to have some plebescites in the region, Mr. Speaker, and we do not apologize for having plebescites and we hope that the people will opt for getting the service that we have available to them if they want it.

MR. SIMMONS: All free, no problem.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a great dissertation from the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) on regional government. He obviously is an expert on the Northeast Avalon urban region. He threw across the House of Assembly the fact that Metro Board owed all this money and the people in the region would have to raise taxes to pay it off. I even tried to interject. I said, "Does the hon. member want to know the truth?" He said, "No. The hon. member," he said, "will have time to explain" - after they put out the poison, after the poison

Mr. Dinn: was put out there and he got reported in the press, I get an opportunity two or three days later to rebuff it; it may be too late to get this across. I do not know if the press will print the fact that Metro Board has a surplus last year on account of \$248,000, I do not know if the press will print that.

MR. SIMMONS: Is that so special?

MR. DINN: Yes, we are talking about a surplus of \$248,000.

MR. SIMMONS: But it has liabilities.

MR. DINN: Certainly it does. Oh, yes, it has liabilities. It will continue to have liabilities.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, but the assets (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Yes, if the hon. member - you know, maybe I will give it in baby talk, I should not have to, I normally deal with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in baby talk, but I will give it to the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS: You are talking about a surplus on current account.

MR. DINN: Surplus. Assets versus liabilities.

MR. DOODY: He has been reading the textbooks: he got a loan of some of the books!

MR. DINN: Assets versus liabilities, and we have a surplus of \$248,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should not have said that. You should not have said that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White), of course, he addressed himself to the enlarged city, We are not going to force that upon the people, we are going to wait until the people decide. His remarks, Mr. Speaker, after forty-five minutes and then an amendment, amounted to the fact that we should shove down the peoples throat an enlarged city. We are not going to do that. We are going to continue on. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) in speaking into the debate also talked about Price and ASARCO, and we know he is against them,

MR. DINN: that has got nothing to do with Bill 50 either. The hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) 'sloppily drafted' a direct quote from the Mayor from the City of St. John's, 'sloppily drafted', she had a 'sloppily drafted' draft. It was 'sloppily drafted'. But we got some good, dedicated legislative draftsmen, I suppose, we have got one of the best, if not the best - the hon. the Minister of Finance would know more about it than I would - but I suppose we got one of the best, if not the best, legislative draftsmen in Canada today.

MR. SIMMONS: Draftpersons.

MR. DINN: Draftpersons, that is right, draftpersons.

So the hon. member for St. John's West says, "It is sloppily drafted."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: He again spewed the venom of increased property tax, \$200 in the first year. He took a quote from that gentleman who is not in the House, who has made a lot of comment on Bill 50, and who is a lawyer, and I do not want to bring his name into the debate, but who is a lawyer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that?

MR. DINN: Fahey.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not want to say his name.

MR. DINN: But we would not name the hon. gentleman, I do not want to bring his name into the debate, but who is spewing the same kind of poison on the people of this region, and when we get regional government, and whether we get it or not we can have Metro Board for another year, but whether we get regional government or not the people of St. John's and the people of the region will know that there is no increase of \$200 or anything like it on the people, especially in the unserved areas.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am shocked.

MR. DINN: We have in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the provision for designated service areas, and we also have in there the provision in the Bill for varying the taxation structure.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not believe it very well.

MR. DINN: The hon. member does not believe it. The hon. member did not read the Bill. The hon. member did not read the Bill, but the fact is that if they get nothing, they pay for nothing.

MR. S. NEARY: Nothing for nothing.

MR. DINN: The hon. member does not know that, for example, Airport Heights today does not pay property tax, does not pay a service fee because they have not got service. And the hon. member keeps interrupting, because he knows, he really knows, Mr. Speaker, whereof I speak, he knows I am speaking the truth, and the truth will out, and the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for St. John's West cannot win on this one way or the other, because if we have Metro Board, which will be exactly the same, if we have Metro Board, which will be exactly the same, if we had the seven appointed people, which is exactly the same, has the same powers, the hon. member will know that the people of St. John's will know that they will get their services, and their tax bill will not go up no \$200.

MR. NOLAN: How much will it go up?

MR. DINN: It will go up. I understand the City of St. John's is using, Mr. Speaker, approximately a million gallons of water a day over and above what they are able to generate. So the hon. member who knows a little bit about mathematics can divide twenty-five cents per thousand, a little bit of mathematics for him, twenty-five cents per thousand and they are using about a million a day, that is what they will have to pay. They will pay that whether we have regional government or not, because that is what is required, Mr. Speaker, to pay off the thirteen technicians and engineers who will service this system.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pay for what you get.

MR. DINN: That is right. Or we will take the technicians away and let it fall to ruin. But, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: It is going to fall apart?

MR. DINN: No, we are not going to do that. We have a good system now. We have and we will, by the way, Mr. Speaker, before the end of 1979 we will have the best water system in North America, bar none. And it will

MR. DINN: be very cheap to operate. We have gone through and checked, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT: What are we talking about?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, whether regional government comes or not, that is the way it is going to be. We have had the scare tactics. There are some people in this region that are scared because of the poison that has been spread by hon. members opposite. But I am telling the people of this region the people in Airport Heights will not have to pay if they do not get service, and they will not get service if they do not ask for service. And the people in Conception Bay South will not get water and sewer if they say they do not want it, and they will be asked. They were asked six months ago and I have not got the answer. The money is there, but if they do not want it they will not get it and they will not have to pay. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the way she is going to go. That is the way I operate with Bay de Verde. That is the way I operate with Old Perlican. That is the way I operate with Bonavista. That is the way I operate with the Northeast Avalon region. And, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. S. NEARY: How about Burnt Island?

MR. DINN: How about Burnt Island?

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, how about it?

MR. DINN: How about Burnt Island?

MR. S. NEARY: Are they going to be asked if they want water & sewer?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is there is no increase in taxes. The fact of the matter is if the city of St. John's do not want their million gallons they do not have to buy their million gallons, that there is a little tap that turns off and turns on. And the fact of the matter is we know, we realized in 1972 and 1973 that the people of St. John's wanted this and they still want it and they are going to get it. Metro Board will operate it if the regional council does not come. But the fact of the matter is the hon. member opposite he will know that in this situation he has no winners. He is absolutely out on this one, made a wrong calculation. We know that Metro Board can operate it. We know that we would like to see a two-third elected council. If we do not get it we know who to blame it on. And, Mr. Speaker, the time

MR. DINN: will come when that will come home to roost.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if there is any germ of common sense in this entire debate, Mr. Speaker, is that we need some regional government. The people in Humber Valley have recognized that for years and they have evolved a regional government out there. They have evolved a regional government out there without a great big act, I may say. The people on the Burin Peninsula have realized the need for regional government and they are slowly but surely moving towards a proper regional government on the Burin Peninsula. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the way regional government must come in this Province, the way that elected government, that parliamentary government came to this Province in the first place. It was not just suddenly imposed and then legislated. It came as a result of an evolving need and that is the way we have to have regional government on the Burin Peninsula, on the West Coast; in Central Newfoundland and here on the Avalon and wherever else it might apply.

Now my colleague for Windsor - Buchans

(Mr. Flight) was scorned because he did not know everything about regional government. I, Mr. Speaker, take off my hat to a man who does not come from the Avalon who will stand here and say he knows less than everything about the bill. I know less than everything about this particular bill but what is happening with this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, will have far reaching ramifications for all of this Province whether we represent the Coast of Labrador or the Southwest extremity of the Island or parts of the South Coast, as I do, or other parts of this Island in this Province. The advent of regional government even in this rather warped fashion is going to have implications for all parts of this Province and that is the point that seems to escape the minister - not the only point, mind you: most points escape the minister - most of them.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all let it be understood that we here in the Opposition, and I personally, believe strongly that regional government is needed; regional government must come, regional government has begun to come to the West Coast without all the trappings of this omnibus bill that we have here. It is needed. It must come. Indeed it is coming but, Mr. Speaker, this bill, this has nothing to do with regional government.

MR. SIMONS:

Its only relationship to Regional Government is that it seeks - I do not know whether it seeks, that assigns motives; I will stop saying that. The only association of this bill to Regional Government is that it has the effect of perverting, of prostituting the concept, like this government has also prostituted the Public Tender Act, like it has also perverted and prostituted appointments to government agencies and commissions and committees. They are the experts at perverting and prostituting on matters like this, the absolute experts on it, and is it any wonder that they are so good at it right here - How many sections? One hundred plus - one hundred and forty-nine sections and the only one that gets me excited is the one that provides for doing away with the act itself. This, Mr. Speaker, is a perversion of Regional Government. Now let us let everybody in the Avalon area and everybody throughout this Province know what it is we are for and what we are against. We are for Regional Government. No matter what the minister says and the way he tries to warp as only he can warp, Mr. Speaker, we are for Regional Government. We on this side were talking about Regional Government long before the minister even understood it, if indeed he does understand it now. If you judge by what he says in this House he does not understand it, Mr. Speaker, he was even over there tonight when he was replying to the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) reading off his spewed out venom as though somebody had written it for him. Who taught him how to pronounce 'spewed' I do not know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with Regional Government. I know that is the way it is brought in and that is the title on it and that kind of thing, but it has nothing to do with Regional Government in terms of why it was brought in here. This, Mr. Speaker, this entire document, has two purposes and two purposes only so far as the government is concerned and Regional Government is neither one of these purposes. That is the guise and that is the way they sold it; that is the way they have sucked some people and hoodwinked some people in the councils into supporting it. There are people in the gallery tonight who say they support Regional Government and their words are paraded in this House as meaning they support this bill and some of

June 27, 1973

Tape No. 4881

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS:

they build a school in So-and-So place.

Now I will tell you what the stock answer will be, that is not our responsibility, you had better talk to the school board, you had better talk to the DEC. That is the answer. Right? But that is not what you see when you pick up the brochure of the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) in the last Provincial election

MR. SIMMONS: when they brag about all the schools they have built -double talk! Double talk on this particular bill too, Mr. Speaker. They are putting a buffer, just like the education buffer, they are now putting a buffer in terms of municipal government between the government and the population of the Avalon Peninsula, more than half of the population of the entire Province. That is what this is all about. One, looking after your buddy. This government has its priorities. There is no doubt in this government's mind about priorities. Do not ever let anybody say that this government does not have priorities. It does, Mr. Speaker, and it acts on these priorities without exception, and their priority number one is look after your buddies, whether it is in office space rental or in farming out contracts for work on public projects, or now in appointing people to commissions or setting up regional government. Their number one is always the same, Look after your buddies! You might hurt some people along the way, you might suck some innocent people in who want to do a good job in municipal government, you might convince them that by supporting it they are doing the right thing, you might do a little double talk in the process, you might conveniently hear the fellow down in St. Phillips or St. Thomas, or somewhere else who says, "I am for regional government." You might loosely interpret that to mean "I am for all the nonsense in this bill." You might loosely interpret him to say, "I am for the fifty-five sections of this bill which give authority to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and to the minister."

Mr. Speaker, do we realize what is happening if this bill were to go through? And it will go through, and it will go through, Mr. Speaker, only if this government uses closure, or if, after the last drop is drained out of us, Mr. Speaker, they use their government majority to vote it, to ram it through at some wee hour of some morning, a month or two months down the

MR. SIMMONS: road. That is the only way that bill will go through, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is the only way it will go through.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is an insult, an absolute insult to anybody who would serve on a municipal council. God knows we have had enough trouble getting people in some councils because the minister has been making it so difficult for them to serve, and threatening them and intimidating them every time he opens his mouth.

But now, Mr. Speaker, where will the municipal government be for the Avalon Peninsula? Will it be down in City Hall? Will it be in St. Phillips or St. Thomas or some of these other communities? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker! It will be on the eighth floor. That is where the decisions will be made. If you are to believe no less than fifty-five sections of this act, it gives authority to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, Cabinet, and/or to the minister, fifty-five separate sections of the act say it can be done if you ask the minister first, it can be done if you ask Cabinet first. So let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this council, Mr. Speaker - I will read the sections for the minister, Mr. Speaker. He is trying to put me on and all that but I am prepared for him, I am prepared for him.

Section 3,6,7,9(a),9(c),12(1),12(4), 14(1), 15(1), 15(3), 17(1), 17(2), 18(2a), 22, 22(a), 22(b), 30, 31(3), 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39(1), 40 (1), 42(2), 45, 55, 56(1), 57, 58, 59, 62, 65, 66, 115(2), 119(1), 121, 125(1), 125(2), 126, 127(1), 127(2), 128, 129, 130 (1), 130 (2), 130(3), 130(4a), 132, 133, 138(1), 138(2), 147, 149. These are the sections, if the minister wants to know.

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4882

NM - 3

MR. WHITE:

You had better read them again.

He did not take them down.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now if he were so forthcoming,

Mr. Speaker, if he were

MR. SIMMONS: only so forthcoming with information as we are, if he would only give us a bit of information!

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) it will not come to that.

MR. SIMMONS: Says the minister, Mr. Speaker. I have long since, Mr. Speaker, learned not to believe a word he says. You see, the fact is we have all been in the situation, Mr. Speaker. You get yourself into a real jam and you have to stonewall it. We saw it here today in Question Period, a beautiful example of stonewalling, an absolutely beautiful example. You have a case where two ministers should at the very least vacate their posts, not because they are guilty or innocent but because they cannot operate anymore. It happened in British Columbia with Mr. Davis and all over the place. But what do they do here, Mr. Speaker? Spiro Agnew in the United States had to resign because he misappropriated \$8,000 in funds, or was suspected of it at the time, had to resign as Vice-President of the United States. What do you have to do to get this crowd out, Mr. Speaker? Is there no such thing as an understanding of impropriety over there anymore?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Two ministers who should be sitting with the private citizenry tonight -

MR. WHITE: Very private too.

MR. SIMMONS: - very private. If I were them, as private as possible. And what do they do? They brazen it out and they get the Premier to make a great speech about whatever he said.

MR. RIDEOUT: Gets the blood pressure up.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, they are into another stonewalling. As a matter of fact, this government spends more time stonewalling, bluffing her through, whether it is about contracts or ministers, and now about regional government bills, or so they call it. So realizing their mistake too late, Mr. Speaker, because they are a stubborn crowd - one attribute they have, Mr. Speaker, is stubbornness in full measure - and led by the stubborn, arrogant minister - I have never before, Mr. Speaker, seen somebody - I mean, it is such a pleasure to be here and see somebody who knows everything.

MR. DINN: I know that.

MR. SIMMONS: The story is told, Mr. Speaker, that first when the Premier interviewed the minister for Cabinet he said, 'Now, 'Jerry', I do not know too much about you. Why do you not start at the beginning?' So he did. He said, 'In the beginning I created heaven and ...'

MR. DOODY: You had better go over that again.

MR. WHITE: Did you miss it? Did you miss it 'Bill'?

Oh, I see, okay.

MR. SIMMONS: He told me. He writes my stuff.

MR. WHITE: Good stuff!

MR. SIMMONS: So I will take the credit if it is good and you blame him otherwise.

Realizing their mistake, Mr. Speaker, after it was too late because they are such a stubborn crowd - you see, if you do not have skill it does not mean you cannot be stubborn. You are allowed to be stubborn, and they have taken advantage of that little licence. And being stubborn, but yet realizing their mistake, because somebody over there had a spark of light, just a little insight over there, realizing their mistake they all went scurrying around the city, around the environs of St. John's, around the region, all the P.C. MHAs and the ministers scurrying around holding little secret conclaves, little secret meetings with councils, telling them half the truth, Mr. Speaker. Some of the stuff that has come back from these meetings about what the minister has told, he should resign, Mr. Speaker, the stuff he has told them, the nonsense he has told them - nonsense, absolute nonsense - telling them half the story, Mr. Speaker. I do not see them make any effort - I do not see the MHA for St. John's East, the minister and the others make any effort, Mr. Speaker, to get a meeting with the city of St. John's, not trying there very much, but they are rushing all down around the other places trying the old game, Mr. Speaker, of playing the small places against St. John's and St. John's against the other places - a very convenient trick, but a very dicey trick for a bunch of city MHAs, I would think.

MR. WHITE: Something is going to get caught in the middle, I would suspect.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) were here tonight, but if I have to wait until he comes to speak

MR. SIMMONS:

I might never speak.

MR. WHITE:

Come back Christmas.

MR. SIMMONS:

So perhaps one of his buddies will tell him what I am about to say. Mr. Speaker, the MHA for Kilbride, like the other ones who were ordered out there, ran out and had their little secret conclaves with various members, various councils and sucked some of them into supporting it - and 'sucked' is the word, Mr. Speaker, and there is no reflection on the councils involved; they were given information by members and ministers and they took it in good faith, and some of them are realizing after the fact now that all this promise of amendment, of course, is a lot of hogwash the same as it was under the Redistribution Bill three years ago. The bill that was promised for the Fall of 1975 is not here yet, two and one half

MR. SIMMONS: years later, although the Premier made a public commitment to the member for Labrador South. So do not hold your breath, I would say to councillors in the area, do not hold your breath for the amendments to this particular bill. Do not hold your breath.

Now the latest to go out all around the city and spread the half-truths about this bill, Mr. Speaker, because they have to sell it somehow, Mr. Speaker. The minister got up and made such a buffoon of himself when he first spoke on this. I really thought, Mr. Speaker, the fellow had a problem. I really - you know I know him and I wondered if we should call a doctor, to tell you the truth. I really wondered if we should call a doctor.

MR. HICKMAN: Is there a doctor in the House?

MR. RIDEOUT: He blew his mind.

MR. SIMMONS: And having talked himself into a corner and the whole crowd over there with him, then they had the stonewall it. Because I know from talking to some people over there they were prepared to leave this until the Fall.

MR. WHITE: They still are.

MR. SIMMONS: But 'Jerry' blew it for them.

The minister, old GG went and blew it for them. Little old GG blew it.

MR. WHITE: GD.

MR. SIMMONS: Blew it. He was supposed to get up and test the waters. Instead of that he got up and flopped all over the place and did a backstroke and everything. And he blew it. Old GG went and blew it for them. And they had to dig in. They all want to go home over there, Mr. Speaker, what is left, but old GG went and blew it for them. Poor little old GG.

MR. RIDEOUT: He blew his mind.

MR. SIMMONS: So who is out defending them?

Sir, imagine having the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) out

MR. SIMMONS: defending the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is there anything more ludicrous? He is down in Kilbride, only last night, I am told, Mr. Speaker, the member for Kilbride was down, rushed out and met with the citizens committee down there last night. Did he tell them all the truth? Not on your life, not on your life, Mr. Speaker. He just told them convenient little bits about, "You will have an amendment tomorrow morning. When you wake up the first thing there will be an amendment on your table, the first thing. We will consult you on everything." I suppose he even consulted him on the membership. Or did he tell them, did that member tell them that his good buddy down there, one Mr. Burke, has already been approached to go on the regional council.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear! Right on!

MR. SIMMONS: Did he tell the people in St. Phillips or St. Thomas that?

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Did he tell them that his good Tory hack down in Kilbride, who is the chairman of this committee, is going to be appointed to the regional board, tell him that it is all signed and sealed? Did he tell that to the committee last night? Not on your life, because that is a private little deal between the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and Mr. Burke, with, I suppose, the minister. I suppose they told him what was going on. I know they do not tell him much over there but I guess they told him that. Did they tell the committee that last night? Not on your life.

MR. DOODY: Can that be verified?

MR. SIMMONS: I verified it before coming here tonight, I say to the Minister of T and C. Mr. Burke has already agreed to become a member of the regional council. Now I have other announcements than that, I say to the minister, I am going to announce just about

MR. SIMMONS: the full board before the night is out.

MR. FLIGHT: That is the kind of thing.

MR. SIMMONS: The chairman of the board is the man after whom we have named the plan, the O'Dea vacation plan, this is the other name for this bill. And, as is known, Mr. O'Dea is going to be the chairman, I am pleased to announce.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Are you serious? You talked to him already.

MR. SIMMONS: I have got sources.

MR. WHITE: You talked to him, did you?

MR. SIMMONS: Some better than others. And Mr. Burke has agreed to go on it.

Now the only question, and I could not quite confirm this, I could not get ahold of the person concerned, but I am told that a former President of the PC Party, now put your mind at rest, not the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), who has since seen the light as you will notice.

MR. DOODY: He did, rather forcefully.

MR. SIMMONS: Rather forcefully, that is right.

Unlike the minister, my colleague did the Damascus Road trip in the forward direction, rather than backwards. And he has seen the light. But, Mr. Speaker, another former President of the PC Party, indeed I think the immediate past president, one Mr. Bill Dalton, has been approached to go on the regional council.

MR. WHITE: Oh, I see. Very good.

MR. SIMMONS: Now you see the cards stacking, Mr. Speaker, see all this impartiality coming together, Mr. Speaker. Old Mr. Bill Dalton, the former President of the PC Party, he has been approached and I am told he has agreed.

MR. DOODY: Has he accepted?

MR. SIMMONS: Well I am told he has. I have not talked to him on it but I am told he has accepted. So we have Mr. O'Dea -

MR. DOODY: Send him a telegram and congratulate him.

MR. SIMMONS: - Mr. O'Dea, Mr. Burke, a good friend of the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells). I can see why he would be so anxious to go to meetings for a change, that he cannot normally find them but suddenly he became very visible, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), because he had something to sell. If this bill did not go through, if the public had an outcry against this bill his buddy would not get a job. That is a good reason. That is a good reason to come out of your locked office door.

MR. RIDEOUT: Bring your buddy week, is it?

MR. SIMMONS: Bring your buddy week, yes.
Mr. Burke, Mr. Dalton and now Mr. O'Dea. So you see it all shaping up, Mr. Speaker. That is three out of five and I shall leave some of the excitement until later.

MR. DOODY: Aw, come on now.

MR. SIMMONS: Now Mr. Speaker -

MR. DOODY: Drop all the suspense.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder last night if the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), I know he did not tell them about Mr. Burke, but I wonder did he, Mr. Speaker, tell them it was going to cost them some extra taxes? Did he tell them that? Did he tell them, I wonder? Did he tell the people in St. Phillips it was going to cost them extra taxes? Now, I was glad for straight political reasons, I say to the House, I was glad that the minister got into the record tonight - it is a stunned thing for him to do but he does a number of stunned things - He got into the record tonight. 'Not a one cent increase' you heard him say. All right? That is like the cheap beer, the poor man's champagne, from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) no increases and the trawler fleet from the Premier, and now Ma Bell's dingaling, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. minister now joins the crowd of people who make expressions I wish I could forget.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The 'Dinnwit' formula.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The 'Dinnwit' formula for tax increases - multiply by six, seven or eight - choose your number, not less than five.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: That is how the 'Dinnwit' formula works.

MR. R. SIMMONS: That is how the 'Dinnwit' formula works. Exactly! That is how it will work for the people of the areas concerned, but the member for Kilbride did not bother to tell that meeting last night. He did not tell that the big, fat salary Mr. Burke is going to get on that regional council, or Mr. O'Dea, or the former president of the Tory party, Mr. Dalton. None of these. None of that has been mentioned in the House.

MR. DINN: Who tells you this stuff anyway?

MR. R. SIMMONS: You should be interested because perhaps the Premier will tell you one of those days. This illustrates how much the minister knows about what is going on.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) remarks word for word.

MR. R. SIMMONS: You should check with me more often. I tend to have more of the facts than he. Mr. Burke out in Kilbride and Mr. Dalton, of course. All right?

MR. DOODY:

Who are the others?

MR. R. SIMMONS:

We have a couple of others but we are keeping them for later. I believe in punch lines, you know, I will get to them eventually.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the issue here ought to be the issue of regional government, and that issue should not have got cluttered up with this scandalous, perverted, prostituted document. The issue is regional government, and yet the minister himself, in opening debate on the bill last week, badly misrepresented an issue, badly misrepresented. It was absolutely shocking and I think when I am finished he will probably want to apologize to the House because I hope he did not do it intentionally. Last week, Mr. Speaker, he lost complete control of himself and went wailing on like a child. - not complete uncharacteristic, mind you. - wailing on like a child that this bill would be providing water and sewerage for the Battery. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever an untruth! I checked the Hansard, I checked the Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and he tied water and sewer for the Battery directly to this bill. If there was ever an untruth in this House, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever another word that could apply - a little three letter word that I am not allowed to say here. - an untruth, to get up here, Mr. Speaker, and say that water and sewer was tied to this particular bill. Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, as most people now already know, that water and sewer in the Battery has nothing to do whatsoever with this bill, nothing whatsoever!

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, - in time I will permit a question, Mr. Speaker, But it has nothing to do with this bill. Whether this bill dies on the vine, as I sincerely pray and hope it will for the good of the people on the Avalon and the Province as a whole, or whether it goes through will have nothing to do with water and sewer in the Battery. It might delay it because of the new bureaucracy, but one councillor, Mr. Speaker, in the region, who has no vested interest in the Battery at all, but one councillor in the region whom I talked to today said to me, "Well, at last give Dinn credit for one thing: he finally mentioned the Battery in the House." Albeit in a somewhat perverted and untruthful way.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, he leaves the impression last week that if regional government did not go through Battery would not have water and sewer. What a hoax, Mr. Speaker! What an absolute fraud! What a political fake for the minister! What a absolutely cruel political trick to play on Battery residents! Even he should know better than that. The minister knows. He should know. The minister knows that this bill will have no bearing on the Battery water and sewer supply. None whatsoever. He knows already, Mr. Speaker. He knows already. We know, and I hope he knows, the people of the Battery know and that is the important thing - that the provision of water and sewer has already been taken care of thanks to the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme.

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4886

AH-1

MR. SIMMONS: which has been approved -

MR. DINN: Who has to approve that?

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister saying that if the bill does not go through he will not approve NIP?

MR. WHITE: Yes, that is what he said.

MR. SIMMONS: Scandalous.

MR. WHITE: No NIP for the Battery.

MR. SIMMONS: After what he said last night about Airport Heights he must be a child.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

No new NIP for the Battery!

MR. SIMMONS: The government I hope in time will approve it but you are not telling me you need a Regional Government to approve that stuff.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SIMMONS: That is what I am saying. But the minister last night or last week -

MR. DINN: Will you permit just one question?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no questions. I do not mind hearing questions from adults, but children! Mr. Speaker, I am harassed by a little child. Is there no way to keep him quite, Mr. Speaker, I wonder? I had some candy. Perhaps if the Page would come down he could help me because there has to be some way to shut him up. Would the Page come down? I have something to give to the minister if I could. Just give him that to keep him quite will you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Did you send him over a candy with it?

MR. SIMMONS: No, I do not want the candy to get stuck in his throat, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have got the minister kept quite perhaps he will listen to some of the things we are saying about the Battery. The Battery water and sewer programme had nothing to do with this bill whatsoever. It came thanks largely through the Federal government and the NIP project but here is something else, Mr. Speaker, something else that the minister skated over rather callously. Who is the Chairman of the committee

MR. SIMMONS: down there? The minister's uncle.
AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.
MR. SIMMONS: The minister's uncle, another Mr. Dinn.
MR. DINN: Twenty-five years with no service from a previous government!

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, a good man, Mr. Jack Dinn. Now look cannot the - that rabbit - show him how to use it, 'Bill'.

MR. DINN: Get the hon. member to demonstrate it.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course I could. I passed through my childhood. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has even rejected a rattle, even rejected a rattle. Well, we will save it for him and as soon as he is old enough we will show him how to use it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That was brilliant fellows. Could we have a little cheer? One, two, three. I had more control over my band than this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of NIP for the Battery area is none other than Mr. Jack Dinn, an uncle of the minister. A good man, Mr. Speaker, a man who has worked hard, particularly during the last year and an half since he has been chairman, to get this water and sewer project. And who tries to upstage him? His own nephew! His own nephew comes in this House and says, "All that nonsense you hear about NIP, that is nonsense. We are going to do it all through this bill and if you do not pass this bill you do not get any water and sewer in the Battery." How shameful, how callous, when you pull the rug under your own relatives, Mr. Speaker. How callous can you get? How completely callous. Is that not shocking?

MR. FLIGHT: Unbelievable.

MR. SIMMONS: He does not deserve a rattle, does he? Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is the minister of the water and sewer for the Battery badly misled the House. I had one or two calls from the Battery myself.

MR. DINN: That is surprising.

MR. SIMMONS:

A lot of things surprises the minister. A lot of the things about reality surprises the minister, as a matter of fact. I had a couple of calls myself from the Battery from people who were sure this thing was salted away. They are getting confused with Mr. Dinns you see. They are getting confused with one Mr. Dinn and the other Mr. Dinn. But I set them straight, Mr. Speaker, I told them to listen only to the sensible Mr. Dinn, just the mature Mr. Dinn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the minister did very badly and callously misled the House and the people of the Battery. I think he should apologize. He should apologize to the House and certainly to the people of the Battery. I invite anybody to check with the other Mr. Dinn, Mr. Jack Dinn, the mature, the adult Mr. Dinn, the man who has fought so hard for this project the last year and a half, and you will find from that Mr. Jack Dinn, the minister's uncle, the man with the rug just pulled out from under him by an upstart nephew who forgets the base degrees by which he did ascend; that other Mr. Dinn, Mr. Jack Dinn, sensible, mature, adult, he will tell you Mr. Speaker, how hard he has worked for this project that his nephew has come in here and tried to undermine in the name of trying to get this bill through. I do not mind a fellow using argument and rationale to get the bill through, but his kind of nonsense, this kind of perverted nonsense, Mr. Speaker, from the minister. Why does someone not give him a little talking to, sit him down and tell him the facts of life or something, for goodness sake?

MR. SIMMONS: And then the threats tonight, Mr. Speaker. Airport Heights, Conception Bay South, you know, you hear them raving on. It sounds like Idi Amin with a frontal lobotomy. I will do this and I will do this and shoot this one and this and this. God help us, Mr. Speaker -

DR. KITCHEN: I will guarantee (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - the only saving grace. "I will guarantee they do not get this" and "There is a tap," he says, "There is a tap you can turn on and off." I wish we could turn the minister on and off for the sake of the people of Conception Bay South. We are going to turn them off after the next election. That is the only saving grace with this bill, Mr. Speaker; after the next election there will be a sane, sensible bunch of Liberals around to administer it, revoke it, take it back and write some sensible stuff to allow regional government to go forward in this Province. Let us hope too much damage has not been done. Let us hope too many Tory buddies have not been tucked away so safely in ten year contracts, like Bob Cole. And where is that contract, I say to my buddy from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), where is that contract, which was going to be tabled every day?

MR. FLIGHT: Get all thirty of them together and we will have a look at them.

MR. SIMMONS: No, the Premier had other things on his mind today. He had other things. He had two ministers and he was not sure if they were in or out.

MR. F. ROWE: He is waiting for the Question Period.

MR. SIMMONS: He is in a touchy mood this afternoon. I would be too. I would be in a touchy mood too if I had fellows down to that enquiry saying things about my ministers like that. I would be in a touchy mood as well. One thing about the Premier, he has got sensitivity.

MR. RIDEOUT: He has his hands full.

MR. SIMMONS: It is too bad for him he has these days because he has to exercise it so often, with ministers like the Minister of Manpower and the Minister of Industrial Development and now the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It must be a real worry. Cabinet must be like a sand box with only one rattle. What a disaster!

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what the Battery is going to get out of this, because they were misled last week.

DR. KITCHEN: A full shot of taxes.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. They are going to get a full dose of taxes, like the people of Conception Bay South and Flatrock and Middle Cove and Outer Cove, Torbay, St. Phillips, and St. Thomas. All these places are going to get a full shot of taxes, that is what they are going to get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, some time somebody should explain to the minister that there is no such thing as a free lunch, you have to pay for everything. And, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot understand how the minister can say with a straight face and expect us to believe it that he is going to impose another bureaucracy at no extra cost. How can you do it? How can you pay big fat salaries and rent big plush offices and all kinds of equipment, how can you do all that and hire engineers and you name it, how can you mount that extra bureaucracy at no cost? Because that is what the minister is saying. Or he is saying one other thing? Is he saying that the money now that we are collecting is not being used somewhere? Is that what he is saying? Is he saying that the money now is not being well spent? Is he pointing his finger to the Mayor of St. Phillips, or the Mayor of St. Thomas and saying, "You are wasting the money now, and we are going to spend it so efficiently in regional government that we will be able to pay Mr. O'Dea

MR. SIMMONS: \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$70,000?

We are going to pay Mr. Dalton several thousand, Mr. Burke several thousand and the others several thousand, and a number of secretaries and a number of engineers and a number of cost accountants and all that at no extra cost." Is there anybody here, Mr. Speaker, who believes that for a second? How can you believe it?

DR. KITCHEN: Water grows on trees.

MR. SIMMONS: There is no such thing, I say to the minister, there is no such thing as a free lunch. There is no such thing as a free lunch. Why does he not, Mr. Speaker, start levelling with the people down in Pleasantville if he wants to get re-elected again? I do not think he has a hope now but at least he should go through the motions. He should go through the motions. Why does he not level with the people down in Pleasantville? Some of the people are calling me: One who called me last night; two who called me from the Battery in the last couple of days. Why does he not level with those people? And the big question on everybody's mind, Mr. Speaker, is what is it going to cost? What is it going to cost? Why can he not listen to the people around the city, Mr. Speaker? Why are they ramming this through, Mr. Speaker? Why are they ramming it through?

I gave the reasons early in the game, Mr. Speaker, earlier tonight and I gave it

Mr. Simmons: the day the minister opened the debate when I referred to it as the O'Dea vacation plan. Now I am not criticizing Mr. O'Dea. If I had a thing this good, Mr. Speaker, I would grab it, believe me I would grab it, because I could get my \$60,000 and have time to go fishing besides.

Look at the set up Bob Cole got, \$47,500 for a part-time job and the Premier goes and called him a volunteer, by the way, down at Rotary. He told they were volunteers. Boy, I would be a volunteer too for \$47,500. Down at Rotary the Premier told the Rotary people-it is in the paper, I will find it for the Premier the once.

MR. F. ROWE: Dedicated public servants.

MR. SIMMONS: He talked about the volunteers. Fantastic! What volunteers? Who would like to be a volunteer tonight? Anybody want to volunteer for the regional council?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: What is the Premier talking -

PREMIER MOORES: I am talking about people who devote -

MR. SIMMONS: No, no the Special Action Group. I have got a copy of what he said down there. I got a tape of it. I will play it back for him.

MR. NEARY: He said somebody got a grant in Newfoundland now to go around and see why people are volunteering their services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: I was going to give it back at the end of the year.

MR. FLIGHT: \$47,500.

MR. SIMMONS: For a part-time job.

So, you know, I am not blaming Mr. O'Dea, Mr. Speaker. If I had a set up like that I would take it too. But I blame the government that concocts that vilest game.

MR. FLIGHT: Perhaps Danny Gullivan can come down here too.

MR. SIMMONS: He would be better paid down here. We pay our hockey announcers down here better than they do in Toronto, I am told.

MR. FLIGHT: Danny Gullivan.

MR. SIMMONS: He will be down as soon as the Premier finds something for him to do.

AN. HON. MEMBER: The Premier is going to announce hockey.

PREMIER MOORES: What do you do to keep the hon. member in place.

MR. SIMMONS: Boy, you know, that is not a bad idea, I could even listen to him then. I could actually listen to the Premier then.

MR. NEARY: The Premier would make a good substitute for Dick Nolan.

MR. SIMMONS: If the Premier were broadcasting hockey he would have to do it from the penalty box.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this entire bill makes a complete shambles of what could have been good regional government along the lines that it has been evolving on the West Coast in the Humber Valley. You know, they have not got it on the dotted line, as it were. They have not got legislation, but they have working regional government, at least in the embryonic stage or a little beyond that. It has been going for a number of years in terms of co-ordination and co-operation. Now they are at the point out there where it is ready for some legislation. And I say to the minister and to the government that is where they should have tried it first, in an area where it had been checked out, where it had been tried for a number of years, the weaknesses have been found out, and they had rejected certain ideas for others, and now they have got a workable mechanism on the West Coast in the Humber Valley. I am talking about the greater Humber Valley joint councils, a good working mechanism. And they have ironed out some of the bugs, and now would be the time for legislation there, and I believe that is where it should have been applied. But where did they apply it? In here! And why, Mr. Speaker? Because, as I say, not regional government is the concern, Mr. Speaker, but salting away your buddies, Mr. Speaker, and putting a buffer between you and at least half the population of the Province. These are the motivations, Mr. Speaker, they are the motivations, so you can use the regional government as a scapegoat in the very same way that you now

Mr. Simmons: use education school boards as a scapegoat. You get all of the credits for the water and sewer systems but you take none of the blame for the taxes, none of the blame for the taxes.

MR. FLIGHT: He must be tired.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. FLIGHT: He looks like he is falling down.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, I do not want to wake him tonight. he looks so comfortable, so very comfortable.

Now the gentleman who pulled the smartest trick of all, of course, and this is not surprising, is my good friend the Minister of Transportation and Communications. If there is one member over there who uses his brains, who is keeping himself out of trouble it is the Minister of Transportation and Communications. And he was what was coming, Mr. Speaker, and while this thing is going to reach down to Cape St. Francis and all down around Pouch Cove and all of that, it is not going to touch Holyrood, not going to touch Holyrood.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Bell Island.

MR. SIMMONS: - because the minister knows what it takes to get elected. A smart minister.

MR. F. ROWE: They elected a council there last year.

MR. SIMMONS: We have always said he is a smart minister. This proves he is a smart minister. Why should he be concerned about the bill? He got all of the naive M.H.A.s in the city all around him falling all over it, and saying, "great bill", and all that kind of stuff you know. "Great bill", that is what is called.

MR. NEARY: I got Bell Island pulled out from under me.

MR. SIMMONS: - singing on your way to the guillotine. "Great bill.", he says, the member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor) down the other night in one of the communities, down in St. Phillips, I think, with the minister

MR. SIMMONS: singing the praises of this bill.

I wish he could tell us what the praises are to be sung about this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is an absolute shambles. The Minister of Transportation is the only one over there who showed any deft judgement at all, deft, d-e-f-t, deft, deft judgement. He has shown some judgement on this, Mr. Speaker, and he has managed to hoodwink his buddies over there into supporting this thing without his active support. He can support it passively now, Mr. Speaker, because he is not involved, because Bell Island is not involved, because Holyrood is not involved. And if you want to know, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know what one member of the government thinks of the bill, look at how the Minister of T and C arranged, Mr. Speaker, to have his own area taken out of the area of jurisdiction. Now he will support it, Mr. Speaker, because he has nothing at stake any more, and I would suggest it is too bad that all the members, the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor), the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), it is too bad they all do not have the same clout over there. It is too bad the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation does not have the same clout as the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOODY: Because he has a regional (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No. I would not suggest that.

Mr. Speaker, if this is only a regional water supply bill let us call it that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just have a minute or two and I want to clue up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I thank the minister. I thank the minister. I have got one supporter on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and that worries me. That worries me. It really worries me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, quickly, and these are two points touched by my colleagues already so I will just touch on them very quickly. One of the real reasons we are against this bill is that it represents such a blatant dictatorship. It is an absolute dictatorship. There was a simple way of doing this in a very democratic way. The way you are doing it can only mean you have no faith in the present elected councils around this area. You have no faith in them. You have used them. The government has used them and told them they were a nice bunch of fellows in those private meetings to get their support, but you do not believe they are competent enough to sit on one of these. You have to go out and hand pick your own buddies, your Mr. Daltons and your Mr. Burkes and your Mr. O'Deas. You have to hand pick them, your own political hacks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) have to run.

MR. SIMMONS: Running? When are they going to get the chance to run? The initial, crucial decision making will be made before they ever get a chance to run. This act empowers these people, these initial people, to go ahead and make decisions. It empowers Cabinet to make all the decisions anyway. So what difference if they even run with the miserable set up you have got here now where fifty-five sections give authority to Cabinet, give authority to the minister, particularly this minister, Mr. Speaker. And the other objection we have to this bill, Mr. Speaker, apart from the dictatorship of it, is the unknowns in this. What is this going to cost? What is it going to cost?

MR. RIDEOUT: Too much!

MR. SIMMONS: The minister told me and I do not believe him. I say in all sincerity, and without trying to be brash

MR. SIMMONS: at all, on behalf of the people of the Avalon I have talked to, I do not believe him when he says it is not going to cost anything. I just cannot believe him, Mr. Speaker, because common sense tells me not to believe him. Common sense tells me you cannot hire Mr. Burke and Mr. Dalton and Mr. O'Dea and a dozen secretaries and engineers and accountants at no cost. How can you do it? You cannot do it.

So I say to the minister without being unkind, I do not believe him. I just cannot believe him. Common sense prevents me from believing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is it, the unknowns in this bill. What will it cost the people affected? And I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, My constituency is not on the Avalon and I think a very cheap shot was taken by the minister at the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), because he really suggested that the only people who should be talking about this are the people on the Avalon. What utter nonsense. We are sent here, Mr. Speaker, to see that the taxpayers' money is being well spent, to see that the legislation that is brought through this House is good legislation and I will never apologize for standing in this House if it is a bill to correct a comma in the city of Corner Brook Act, if that is what I have to do to ensure that good legislation goes through this House. So this nonsense that somehow he is the member for Windsor - Buchans and he should only talk about systems in Windsor and Buchans and the future of Buchans is shameful coming from a minister of the Crown. And I see the implications in this bill for other parts of the Province, including Bay d'Espoir in my own district, Central Newfoundland, the Burin Peninsula and if we set up this monster, Mr. Speaker, this dictatorial monster with all the unknowns, what can the people of Humber Valley and Central Newfoundland and the Burin Peninsula expect after this?

MR. FLIGHT: They will never accept that.

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4889

MM - 4

MR. SIMMONS:

I was talking to my buddies in
Corner Brook the other day, Hear this, will you? The Premier
was out to a function about a month or so ago and he was
going around in his own district saying, "Oh hello,
I am Frank Moores." Five years after and he is still
introducing himself to his own constituents. Well I can
understand they would not know him out there. I can understand
they would not know him

Mr. Simmons:

because he has not spent that much time out there, I am told. But they know who he is, Mr. Speaker. They know who he is, Mr. Speaker. They say, "Oh, that is the fellow who had two different signatures, a fine irrevocable one and the tentative one." Remember that one? That is another story, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER MOORES:

Then run out there with Jeff Sterling as your campaign manager.

MR. SIMMONS: No. Well I may do that. Now that is not a bad idea, not a bad idea. I told the Premier already I am coming out, and I am not sure who is going to be my manager yet. But if the Premier is going to be out there I will be out in the next election.

PREMIER MOORES: Sure, Humber West area.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I have decided I am going to run in Humber West if the Premier stays there. That is a deal that I will be out in Humber West.

PREMIER MOORES: Under those conditions I will stay.

MR. SIMMONS: You will stay?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we just made a deal, Mr. Speaker. Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that deal is better than the one he gave Craig Dobbin.

MR. FLIGHT: No, it could not be.

MR. SIMMONS: I hope it is more signed and sealed than the one he gave Mike Martin about redistribution.

PREMIER MOORES: There is no building.

MR. SIMMONS: But if the Premier would like to come over and shake on it I would certainly shake on that one, Mr. Speaker. Imagine how sweet would it be, Mr. Speaker, how sweet would it be at once to get yourself elected to the House and at the same time know that you had a special role in retiring the Premier to private life, where he belongs, so comfortably.

PREMIER MOORES: The NTA would welcome you.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, the Premier has bigger things on his mind than NTA, Mr. Speaker, much bigger things. Not NTA, Mr. Speaker, but a couple of ministers, The DPW, I would say, is more on his mind than NTA these days, and, I would say, for a very good reason.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has unknowns, too many unknowns. It is sloppy, I do not care what the wording is. The wording is very nice, the draftsmen are competent, nobody said the draftsmen are not competent. The draftsmen only drafts what they are told to draft, Mr. Speaker. They did not initiate the legislation. They are the implementers, they are the administrators, they are the writers, if you like, in this particular case.

MR. NEARY: We do not care who typed it.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not care who typed it. Sloppily drafted in terms of concept. Of course it is. You could not even, Mr. Speaker, salt away your buddies efficiently. He even clumsified that. Salting away your buddies, putting a buffer between yourself and the people, you even managed to clumsify that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Clumsify?

MR. SIMMONS: Clumsify is a new word. That comes in the next grade, you will get it after a while.

Mr. Speaker, too many unknowns and too blatant a dictatorship, and too blatant an effort, Mr. Speaker, too blatant an effort at salting away your buddies in the name of regional government. I believe very, very firmly, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I support the amendment that we give this the six month hoist so everybody has a chance to think about it, and so that the government has a chance really, because really the motion, the amendment would kill the bill in effect and bring in a new bill in the Fall, and we will be willing to support a bill that gives regional government in a democratic fashion at reasonable cost to the people. But until we know what the cost is, and until we can see for sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to be democratic- not autocratic, dictatorial, Ida Amin fashion- until we can be assured of that, then, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of supporting this bill,

Mr. Simmons: And what is more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is not a passive thing where we just withdraw. We feel strongly enough about this, Mr. Speaker, strongly enough that we intend fully to do everything in our power to see that this bill does not go through. We will use -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - every Parliamentary mechanism, Mr. Speaker, not to filibuster as such; but to expose this bill for what it is. And if it takes two weeks to get into the consciences of the people of Pouch Cove and St. Phillips and St. Thomas and Flatrock and all these other places, then we will take two weeks in this House to do it. If it takes all night sittings to do it, Mr. Speaker, we will take all night sittings to do it. Not to filibuster as such, but to use the opportunity to get across what an infamous scheme this is, Mr. Speaker, what an infamous scheme it is, and how unrelated it is to regional government.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: I could not get over the shock, Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues across the way were applauding me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Do you want to speak, Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Carry on, 'Tom'. Carry on. No.

MR. HICKEY: I will gladly yield for the Premier if he wanted to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I started out with the intention of speaking to Bill 50, but I find myself now speaking to an amendment to give a six month hoist. And what troubles me, Your Honour, is that listening to the hon. gentlemen opposite one would almost be convinced that they believe that they are going to achieve a six month hoist. Now if

Mr. Hickey: they believe that of course their actions might be just looked upon with justification, but of course knowing the way that the House is made up in terms of numbers I do not think they are so naive as to believe that they are going to succeed in giving this bill a six month hoist, and that the amendment will be defeated. And therefore one can only conclude that the six month hoist

MR. HICKEY: procedure is purely a stalling practice, is purely a stalling system or what we commonly refer to as filibustering.

Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunately.

Certainly it is unfortunate from where I sit because I have a bill, for example Bill 74, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games," not of the greatest importance in terms of, maybe, this legislation. It may not have all the ramifications of Bill 50 but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is a great number of people waiting to use those facilities and those facilities cannot be used until that legislation goes through the House.

MR. STRACHAN: You can call it now if you want to.

MR. HICKEY: And, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that dawned on me as I was listening to the debate since it began on Bill 50 is that there has been references to Pouch Cove and Flatrock and Torbay and Logy Bay and my own birth place, Outer Cove, all of those places, And I wonder, I ask myself the question, since when did hon. gentlemen opposite start speaking for that area? Since when did they have such a handle on what or how the people in that area think? Gentlemen who came before them tried to read the way those people think down there and they were sadly mistaken. Indeed they did not read them right at all. I suggest, Your Honour, they are not reading them right today. Because I have to take exception to some of the statements being made, such as councils being had, being sucked in by a Minister of the Crown. That is a very serious statement. That has some very serious implications, Mr. Speaker. Are hon. gentlemen opposite suggesting that there are councils in my area that are being sucked in? That is a poor way to get votes, gentlemen. by ridiculing people who give freely of their time on a voluntary basis to serve their communities and towns to say that they can

MR. HICKEY: be sucked in by one minister.

Let me tell hon. gentlemen that the people that I represent are not so easily sucked in. Let me tell them as well that nothing has been kept from them in the years that I represented them and nothing has been kept from them now with regards to Bill 50. They are against it. Who is against it?

MR. SIMMONS: The cost is being kept from them.

MR. HICKEY: Well tell us. My hon. friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), let us face it, who is in really close proximity to Pouch Cove, tells me they are against it. Now, you know who is against it?

MR. FLIGHT: They call me all the time.

MR. HICKEY: They call you all the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do they call you?

MR. HICKEY: I see.

MR. FLIGHT: They call me finer things than they call the Minister of R and R.

MR. HICKEY: That is very interesting, Mr. Speaker. That is an interesting observation. That is an interesting observation because, Your Honour, I have just recently met with the councils in the area and it is rather strange to say the least that I do not find too much opposition to Bill 50. Does that startle hon. gentlemen opposite?

MR. FLIGHT: No.

MR. HICKEY: That is a fact.

Would my hon. friends opposite really believe that I would sit here and now stand here and support a piece of legislation, at least get up in my place and go into detail as to why I support it if it meant taxation, double taxation for the people I represent? Are they so naive as to think that, Mr. Speaker? Do they think I have lost my mind?

MR. SIMMONS:

The hon. minister thinks he can
get away with it.

MR. HICKEY:

Are they suggesting, Mr. Speaker,
that I would be so crazy as to stand in my place and support
a piece of legislation which is so vile as we have heard,
which is going to perpetrate taxation on those innocent
people, double taxation?

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not
hear too much from hon. gentlemen

MR. T. HICKEY: about the taxation that is being levied against people now without representation by the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board. I do not hear anything about the rights of people to be taxed. And who is or what is the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, let me ask my hon. friends opposite? Who conceived the idea of the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board? This government? No! What government? The former Liberal Government? Yes! And those are the people who have levied taxes in my area on the people that I represent and they have no voice, Mr. Speaker. They have no recourse. Pay it. There it is. But I find the same hon. gentlemen now standing in their place and what do they suggest now?

MR. SIMMONS: Say seven years.

MR. T. HICKEY: Seven years what?

MR. SIMMONS: Democracy.

MR. T. HICKEY: Seven years of what? Seven years of taxes. Seven years we have been running Metro Board? God, Mr. Speaker, you know, we are told now that we are rushing in where fools dare to tread and rushing through Bill 50. Imagine if we had brought it in in 1973 with just one year in office. What would you say then? And now you say to us seven years. At least it took us seven years. At least we went and did the planning.

Well let me raise another question with my hon. friends opposite. What plan was it that Canadian British brought in in 1959, if my memory serve me correctly - Was it 1959 or 1957? 1959, I believe.

MR. A. MURPHY: No, it was before that, before I came in.

AN HON. MEMBER: 1957.

MR. T. HICKEY: 1957. And that consulting firm, Mr. Speaker, were engaged by the former government, the former Liberal Government, to do a study on this whole question of services to the people of St. John's and the outlying areas. Mr. Speaker, what was the result of the study? I do not hear my hon. friends opposite talk too much about that. The results, Your Honour, of that study was to do precisely what this bill is doing now. How many years ago was that? That is twenty years ago. The Liberal

MR. T. HICKEY:

Government did not act and as a result St. John's had a water shortage. No planning. There would be sewer running all over the place but for the fact that this government has done something about it in the last five or six years, done its planning and put in the infrastructure and brought on Bay Bulls Big Pond and the trunks, the major trunks sewer systems and all of that. The harbour of St. John's will be cleaned up. Quidi Vidi Lake will be cleaned up as a result of this. Robin Hood Bay will be cleaned up, which I have been beating my brains out for twelve years to clean up. But, Mr. Speaker, it is bad legislation, they tell us.

Your Honour, I know the motives of my hon. friends opposite. Obviously they want to latch on to any issue, even in the warm, hot Summer, that they think, either in their wisdom or otherwise, that they can make a few political points on. But, Your Honour, what a bad one they have picked because being against Bill 50 and the principle of it is almost like being against motherhood, it really is, because what it says, for example, if you are against regional government it means you are against cleaning up a place like Robin Hood Bay. If a regional council is not put in place to clean it up, who will? The City of St. John's will not. It is a regional dump. The City of St. John's is but one of the areas now that use Robin Hood Bay. I have heard, as I say, Pouch Cove and Flatrock and Torbay and Middle Cove and Outer Cove and Logy Bay mentioned as though, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKEY: as though they were storming the Confederation Building opposing bill 50.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the reading I get. There are, obviously, some people who will oppose bill 50 because they are led to believe things, and the Opposition should be ashamed of themselves because they are aiding and abetting those people who are picking pieces of this legislation and zeroing in on it. How can anyone, Mr. Speaker, with any credibility at all stand in a public place outside this House and say there is going to be double taxation when, in fact, there is not going to be? How can anyone, Mr. Speaker, say that the municipalities, for example, in my area, in my constituency, the people within those municipalities are going to be taxed by the regional council when, in fact, the bill states clearly the regional council will not pass within a municipality?

MR. FLIGHT: Where will they get the money to operate?

MR. HICKEY: Where will they get the money to operate? How much money? My hon. friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), I have heard him speak on this subject, My hon. friend has looked into it deeply, he is well versed on all of its implications, how much will they want to operate?

MR. FLIGHT: You tell me. You are the minister.

MR. HICKEY: I am not the minister, I am just one minister. Here is the minister, right here. But my hon. friend has taken the position against it because it is going to tax the people so he must know how much it is going to cost.

MR. FLIGHT: What source of revenue will a regional council have that they have not already?

MR. DINN: None.

MR. HICKEY: What source of what?

MR. FLIGHT: What source of funding will a regional government have to carry on these services.

MR. DINN: No, Metro Board.

MR. HICKEY: Metro Board.

MR. DINN: The same as Metro Board has.

MR. HICKEY: Metro Board has a surplus this year of \$248,000?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: \$248,000, that is a fine chunk of bread. You would pay a few salaries on that, would you not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Well, you know, if they have a surplus of \$248,000 this year, one would assume that the revenue was not going to disappear. I mean, no one is going to wave a magic wand and disappear this revenue next year. Would my hon. friend agree?

Mr. Speaker, what it means, really, is much ado about nothing. It is the cheapest form of politicking that I have ever seen since I have been in this House, Your Honour, because rightly or wrongly I would not be true to the people that I represent if I did not acknowledge in this House tonight that whilst they are not scoring many points, Your Honour, they are scoring with the odd person. They are convincing the odd person and they are deceiving those people by spreading innuendo, by spreading things which are not really so, not really going to happen, getting some people upset because they are going to be taxed.

What does my hon. friend have to say, for example, about the town of Pouch Cove that will have its own water and sewer system? Presently underway, its own water supply. What additional taxes are they going to pay under the regional government?

MR. FLIGHT: As soon as (inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Never mind now, tell me.

MR. FLIGHT: You are fleecing the public.

MR. HICKEY: Let him tell me, Mr. Speaker, what taxes the people of Pouch Cove are going to pay for water. Let us deal with the water one first. They have their own supply and that supply comes from a pond within the boundaries of their municipality, but my hon. friend and his colleagues are shouting from the rooftops that you are going to pay water taxes, where? In Pouch Cove? In Torbay? In Shoe Cove? Where?

MR. FLIGHT: Botwood has its own water supply, and the mill (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Going to pay taxes for water, Mr. Speaker, in the City of St. John's -

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - in the Town of Wedgewood Park -

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

I must remind hon. members that they are only allowed to speak from their own seats.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honour. I do not mind, it keeps one sharp to be taken on now and again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of St. John's will pay water tax. Of course they will! The people who use the regional system coming from Bay Bulls Big Pond will pay a water tax. They are paying it now, Your Honour. My colleague has said that the City of St. John's will pay twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons.

MR. DINN: Yes, as everybody else will.

MR. HICKEY: The City of St. John's charges the Board of Trustees of Wedgewood Park sixty cents per thousand gallons now, so there is a profit. Are my hon. friends opposite suggesting that the people of Wedgewood Park are going to pay more taxes for water after this goes through, Mr. Speaker? How crazy! I mean, you know, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to misunderstand a piece of legislation, it is another thing to perpetrate on the people something which you yourselves do not believe, which you know is not right, and yet you mouth it off in this Assembly, aided and abetted by a couple of people on the outside, who have their own axes to grind, Mr. Speaker, I submit, and I will be charitable to the gentleman in question, I will be charitable and I will say, as I have said earlier, I know the motives and I know what motivates hon. gentlemen on the other side. The system of politics is opposition and government. One crowd are in and another crowd want to get in and anything goes. So they are politically motivated. But what motivates two gentlemen on the outside of this Assembly who are going around the countryside spreading this information on this bill, which is far from the truth?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said I will be charitable and I will indeed be. I will not suggest, because I do not know, and I make no assumption that any citizen in this Province is dishonest unless I have absolute proof and I have none. But I simply asked a question, what motivates those people, what axes have they got to grind? What is behind it? They are traipsing around the countryside into areas which are really of no concern to them as private citizens, What motivates those gentlemen? Time, Mr. Speaker, will tell us. Time.

Why am I in favour of regional government? Mr. Speaker, I am at liberty, and I am not breaking any secrets, or any confidentiality when I say that I had my doubts of regional government three years ago when the public

MR. HICKEY: meetings were going on, when presentations were being made to the Henley Enquiry into regional government and all that that meant, the Urban Region Study which was done by Proctor and Redfern and the enquiry into the whole question of that report. I had my doubts. For like a good many more, Mr. Speaker, I looked and thought I saw down the road extra taxation. I looked and I thought I saw down the road an additional financial burden. And I looked and I thought I saw down the road an encroachment on the rights of municipalities who have been striving through local government to improve their own area and who were doing a good job at it, such as the areas in my own constituency, such as Torbay, which is a model town, Mr. Speaker, for anyone to go to. It has become a model town, I might say, under this administration, since 1972. It was not much of a model town before that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pork barrelled.

MR. DINN: We will pork barrel Windsor.

MR. HICKEY: One had to almost get on their knees, when I sat on that side of the House, to get a bit of road paved. And then you were told if you were nice you would get it done. In other words if, you were quiet and kept your mouth shut you might get something done. That is the treatment we got. Here are those people now, Mr. Speaker, who have obviously, who have as their aim to be the government some day, not levelling with the people and they accuse us of not levelling with the people. Is there anyone on the opposite side who wants to say to me that I go to my constituency, any single part of it, any single constituent of mine, and not level with him on what this is going to mean to him? If they are, Mr. Speaker, let them make the charge and I will make them eat their words because I have not got re-elected since 1966 by not levelling with the people that I represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

June 27, 1973

Tape No. 4894

NM - 3

MR. HICKEY:

Somebody over there said a minute ago how much clout I have. I do not know how much clout I have. I never looked to find out really. I go about my business and do

Mr. Hickey: my job. I also acknowledge the old saying that many are called but few are chosen. It really does not make much difference to me how much clout. I got a fair amount of clout as a minister. I have had a fair amount of clout which has enabled me to do a great many things for my constituency and the people I represent. And this is going to be another one of them, to clean up a mess down in Logy Bay that I had been preaching about over there for five years and got nowhere, and preaching about it on this side and do not have the vehicle to do anything about it, but this is going to do it. So would hon. gentlemen expect me to just sort of get up and do handstands with my colleague because he is bringing in a piece of legislation which is going to sort out an age old problem that I have been stuck with? Oh, yes.

No, Mr. Speaker, thank the Lord when I was born I received a full deck, I am not dealing with half a deck. I want to be to oppose this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY:

The sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, is that hon. gentlemen opposite will during June month, in the dying days of June when there are so many things to be done and other pieces of legislation facing this House, bring in a measure which is nothing more nothing better than a vehicle to filibuster—a six month hoist. How silly! What a waste of time! So that everybody over there can get up and talk again, and after talking for forty-five minutes for the second time still say nothing. That is the unfortunate, that is even the most sad commentary of all, for if they were doing something, if they were saying something constructive affecting the people, who by the way, none of them represent, Mr. Speaker, as constituents other than the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), and it is too bad the member for Conception Bay South is not here tonight —

MR. DINN:

He is ashamed to be here.

MR. HICKEY:

— because I take it he is against this bill too, is he not?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, vehemently.

MR. HICKEY: That is amusing. Very interesting, but amusing because he represents a constituency that does not have water services, -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

PREMIER MOORES: They are the first regional government.

MR. HICKEY: - but are in the process of getting water service and sewer service. And where is the water going to come from, Mr. Speaker, out of the sky? No. Out of the river? No. They are polluted. Out of the sea? That is salty. Bay Bulls Big Pond!

MR. DINN: That is where it is coming from.

MR. HICKEY: Oh my, is that not something now. Bay Bulls Big Pond, what you fellows are against.

MR. FLIGHT: At no extra cost.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, no extra cost! Yes, of course there will be extra cost. Since when did you get services that you demand, which the people of Conception Bay South have been demanding for years, and demanding of the other administration and they did nothing about it; the cesspools that are in that municipality that the former administration did nothing about, and no water to drink, and they are demanding it. And does my hon. friend say or think I am going to stand here and say that they get that water for free? No. They will not get it for free.

MR. DINN: Twenty-five cents per one thousand gallons.

MR. HICKEY: No. They will get it twenty-five cents per one thousand gallons.

MR. DINN: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Indeed they will not.

MR. HICKEY: Indeed they will, yes. But, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Any money to put on that one?

MR. HICKEY: - hold on a second now. Let us get to the rest of the scenario, the twenty-five cents per one thousand gallons. It does not all stop there, because in order to put in that system we have spent how many million? \$50 million?

MR. DINN: For Conception Bay South it is \$1.6 million to get the water down to them, \$2 million so far, \$2 million committed this year.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, yes, but that is only in Conception Bay South.

MR. DINN: Oh, yes.

MR. HICKEY: But, you know, -

MR. DINN: \$35 million for the regional system.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, but my hon. colleague is being most generous. For example, I would like him to tell me what the infrastructure cost for Bay Bulls Big Pond.

MR. DINN: \$35 million.

MR. HICKEY: Because you cannot bring it down if there is no water, and there is no other water but Bay Bulls Big Pond to give Conception Bay South with the growing population and the potential population explosion that is going to go on up there. How much will that cost?

MR. DINN: \$35 million. It is going to be about \$18 million to do Conception Bay South.

MR. HICKEY: Does that bother your mind, \$35 million? Why does not the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) go up and say, "We are against Bill 50. We are not going to go along with that. We are going to do it ourselves. And we are going to find \$35 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. HICKEY: - to get a water supply" and see how long he will sit in the House after the next election. Mr. Speaker, they will not know the going of him because for sure they will say he is dealing with half a deck.

MR. DINN: That is what he is dealing with.

MR. T. HICKEY: Have I converted the hon. gentleman yet?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. T. HICKEY: He is breaking.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is misleading about that? Thirty-five is paid for.

MR. HICKEY: There are some people, Mr. Speaker, who are unconvertable

AN HON. MEMBER: Pastor Davis.

MR. HICKEY: I am not going to try to convert Pastor Davis or anyone who stands for and who believes in what Pastor Davis believes in. Anytime hon. gentlemen want to get going on that one I suggest that I am ready, for their lies a real tale of woe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. HICKEY: And it will not be John the Baptist at all. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, let us not confuse the issues, let us not get on to something, Mr. Speaker, which is very serious because that issue is not laughing matter. I do not want for one second to entertain even the slightest joke with regards to that issue because it is a very serious one.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is willfully wrong for the Opposition to mislead, to cause to be misled the people in this region that this bill directly affects by simply - again I will be charitable, I will not say they deliberately are doing, that they are going to deliberately deceive the people that this applies to. I will simply say that in their debate they glide over the real positive aspects of the bill. For example, I have not heard anyone over there, Mr. Speaker, say that the power to be entrusted to the regional council is no more, or the power that is to be given to the minister is no more than he has today or that a municipality has today, which

MR. T. HICKEY:

will go unchanged, unchallenged, Mr. Speaker with one qualification.

What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hiring the town manager.

MR. T. HICKEY:

No. One difference. One exception.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is where a municipality such as Conception Bay South who now have their own domain, they are a municipality with all the powers under the Local Government Act today, but they demand water and sewer and under the regional council there will be some responsibility and some power exercised by that council to pipe in water and at the point of entry charge twenty five cents per one thousand gallons. Now as a result of that there will be a charge for services. But, Mr. Speaker, the underlying point to be made is that if there was no regional council, if they had a pond up back in the woods that they tapped into and water flowed eventually through the pipes and there were sewers to take away the sewerage, that municipality would have to make a charge against those people for the maintenance of that system. Because what my hon. friend said a moment ago, \$35 million of an asset will be used for Conception Bay South at no charge, Mr. Speaker, not one single solitary cent. Is that not correct?

MR. DINN:

Absolutely 100 per cent.

MR. T. HICKEY:

The only charges made against any municipality in this Province is for the operation and maintenance. So what are my hon. friends talking about? What are they talking about? Is it the heat of the day that has gotten to them, because they are intelligent gentlemen and the lady that sits opposite, all intelligent people. I do not question or quarrel with, Mr. Speaker, that they are here to serve the people they represent. But, good God, I mean can they honestly say within their own conscience that they are doing the right thing by holding up this piece of legislation, by:

MR. HICKEY: painting this piece of legislation something it is not? Surely goodness that is wrong, creating unrest, creating problems for people, worrying people unnecessarily by talking taxation to them when there is not going to be taxation, by talking takeover when there is not going to be takeover.

MR. RIDEOUT: Then what is the bill for?

MR. HICKEY: What is the bill for?

MR. FLIGHT: Then why is it included in the bill?

MR. HICKEY: Why is what included in the bill?

MR FLIGHT: The ability and the right to expropriate, why is that there?

MR. HICKEY: The ability and the right to expropriate? Well, I mean, how would - Mr. Speaker, let me answer the hon. gentleman. I am delighted he raised that one. How does he propose I would clean up Robin Hood Bay? Of course, I cannot clean it up. I cannot cause it to be cleaned up; my good friend and colleague will. Under regional government how does he propose he, the minister, could take over or cause to be taken over a dirty - I am not going to break the rules, Your Honour, I am talking about the dump - a dirty, rotten, smelly dump that has been polluting people for the last ten or twelve years? How does he think my colleague could cause to have taken over that area to be cleaned up, to put incinerators down there, to make a half decent looking spot, to do away with the pollution and the dirt and the filth and everything else, including the rodents that are rampant down there, if there was not a system to do it? If he could not, through the regional council, finally, if there is no agreement, go and expropriate that land how, would he do it?

MR. FLIGHT: Newfoundland needs a new Premier.

MR. HICKEY: Okay, so he can do it for any reason as long as that reason is for the public good and it is justifiable. And, Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of one other pertinent fact that I want to address myself to insofar as bill 50 is concerned, and against a charge that has been made consistently by the Opposition, and against my colleague whom they say wants to railroad this thing through. Railroad it through, eh? Now what a joke that is. There was a bill 101. You do not see it today, it is bill 50. I wonder what happened to it? What happened to it, Mr. Speaker, is that my colleague took into his confidence the people who were directly affected. Mr. Speaker, nobody should challenge, nor surely do they challenge, that the people who sit in this House have a responsibility to represent their constituents. And we are here to govern on this side so should we always go out and ask the people who make up the municipalities, 'Would you please sort out regional government for us because we are having trouble and we are too busy? Now, we do not want to get involved in it. Of course, we have a bunch of M.H.A's and they are too busy, they do not want to be really stuck with it either because there are a few touchy areas there to sort out. But would you please, although you are not being paid a single cent for working, you have jobs to go to, you meet in the night, you give freely of your time, but you take something else up, a small issue like regional government and would you come back four months from now and tell us how we will do it?' Now would we not be a fantastic government? We should all be given plaques for running away from an issue, Mr. Speaker, and abdicating our responsibilities as a government and as elected members of this House.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: That is what we would be doing. And that is what the minister is accused of though, not

MR. HICKEY: consulting. What do they mean by not consulting? He consulted his colleagues.

All throughout the Winter more than twelve or fifteen meetings, Mr. Speaker. Bill 101 could not be recognized when you compare bill 50 to it. There is not the slightest - well, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison between bill 101 and bill 50. We went through it section by section and, Mr. Speaker, the underlying question that I am getting to is, who should do that work? Is it the people who are sent here such as myself, representing a constituency, my colleagues from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), from Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor)

MR. HICKEY: and all the other MHAs, St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins), and Kilbride (Mr. Wells), are those not the people, Mr. Speaker, who should do the work? Are those not the people who should sit and meet? They are paid to do it. Or should we go to Torbay and say to the Torbay Council, should I go down and get them all together, all the mayors, and the chairman of committees in the unincorporated areas and say, "Fellows, I do not know what to do with this Bill 50," or better not the Bill 50, Bill 101, "I do not know what to do with this and I do not really have any time. So you fellows are not busy. Here, tell us what you think of it so that we can ram it through the House next year." Oh yes, we would be great people. That is tantamount to what hon. gentlemen opposite are saying, Mr. Speaker, and my friends outside who are leading the attack on this legislation and my colleague, I want to add that, because there has been an attack on him. It has not been confined to Bill 50. It has gotten a bit personal on times and that is unfortunate because he does not deserve that. He has worked pretty darn hard on this legislation. There has been more consultation, Mr. Speaker, on this piece of legislation, I would suggest, than ever in the history of this Province of any piece of legislation. I would like my hon. friend to name one bill that has gone through this House which has been vetted more, there has been more consultation on, I would like to know what it is. Name it. You will not find it.

MR. NEARY: That is not enough.

MR. FLIGHT: Not enough.

MR. HICKEY: No. No. That is right, not enough! Typical, typical, Mr. Speaker, although they taste power from time to time they have not changed. We are dealing, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the Premier should be delighted to hear this if he is being just purely political he should be. He should be so delighted to see that there has been no change over there from the sixties.

MR. HICKEY: Because what do they believe in? Not action, not planning, have a chat about it, it is a problem, we will not deal with it today, it is too warm outside, it might go away. That is what happened to the Canadian British study report, Mr. Speaker, it was too big for them. There was a bit of politics that they thought they might lose out on. It was an issue. Did they meet it head on? No. No. "Throw it in the garbage. It has cost us a good many bucks to get it but just let the dust pile up on it there and those problems will go away. With the help of God there will not be a shortage of water in St. John's. And who gives a damn if the harbour stinks and if Quidi Vidi Lake runs dry with sewer. After all, that is down in Tory territory. And St. John's is Tory anyway, and really, Mr. Speaker, what are we worrying about because the Liberal support is outside the Avalon?"

MR. MORGAN: They think it is.

MR. HICKEY: Oh yes, but I should point out to my colleague that that is the way it was there. When I sat over there, Mr. Speaker, there were three of us. From the Grace Hospital west was Liberal.

MR. FLIGHT: I know a bill we can work on today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven years?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the administration of that day, having engaged Canadian British, they brought in a report which pinpointed the problem and which said in no uncertain terms what would happen if that report was not implemented. And, Mr. Speaker, in the face of nothing short of disaster, water shortage, pollution, they gambled, Mr. Speaker, even with the health of people and sat on the report and did absolutely nothing. And now they chastize the government, who came in, took the bull by the horns and said, "We cannot have this. There must be planning. There must be a system. We must guarantee the health of our people. We must guarantee clean drinking water." My God, this day there

MR. HICKEY: is nothing more essential or basic than clean drinking water and sanitary conditions, this day and age. And what are you chastizing us for, because we did something about that? And of course, Mr. Speaker, because we are not going out in the boondocks and we are not going out, and I am not going out to my constituency and telling the people, "Ah, ha! You are going to get everything you want but it is not going to cost you a nickel." Ah, Mr. Speaker, how they underestimate our people, how they underestimate our people. Because, Mr. Speaker, I have come to know the people who I represent in this House,

Mr. Hickey: that they may not like what you tell them if you tell them that there are going to be a few taxes if you get water, there are going to be a few taxes if you get garbage collection, they may not like the news, Mr. Speaker, but they sure appreciate straight talk and the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And that is what my people have got, and that is what they have got since 1966, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell this House tonight that as late as yesterday that is what they got on Bill 50, and they stand foursquare with me. The Council of Pouch Cove favours regional government, the Council of Flatrock favours regional government, Outer Cove, Logy Bay, Middle Cove, Torbay, basically regional government. Where are the people who do not favour regional government in my constituency? I say to my friends, where are they?

DR. KITCHEN: In Torbay

MR. HICKEY: Stop kidding me. I met with the Town Council of Torbay yesterday. They are not against regional government. They have some concerns about this bill. And I have Airport Heights. Who do I talk to up at Airport Heights, apart from the citizens?

MR. FLIGHT: Are not the citizens concerned about the bill?

MR. HICKEY: No, no, no. I mean who is the spokesman?

DR. KITCHEN: Are they for or against you?

MR. HICKEY: No, no. Who?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fahey.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Fahey. Mr. Fahey in all his meetings and all his attempts has not asked me, requested me, or given me the courtesy of an invitation to one of his meetings.

DR. KITCHEN: What about Torbay?

MR. HICKEY: I do not consider Mr. Fahey a spokesman for Airport Heights, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: You are the spokesman for Airport Heights.

DR. KITCHEN: What about Torbay?

- MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, Torbay. I met with the Council yesterday.
- DR. KITCHEN: Are they for it?
- MR. HICKEY: And I can tell my hon. friend that whilst the Council in Torbay have some concerns about Bill 50 I think it is fair to say that I have allayed their fears.
- DR. KITCHEN: No taxes.
- MR. HICKEY: There will be no taxes in Torbay as a result of this. If there is garbage collection to be disposed at a regional dump there might be a small charge against the municipality.
- MR. DINN: They are paying now.
- MR. HICKEY: But they are already - that is right, that is right, they are already paying it.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
- MR. HICKEY: Let me give my hon. friends maybe the classic one, the classic one is in my own birthplace, Outer Cove, Middle Cove, Logy Bay where there is not a council yet, but where there is a committee for incorporation and they stand foursquare in favour of this. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because I have gone through this bill and they have seen the bill and I have explained it to them, and I have told them, my friend is absolutely right. And, Mr. Speaker, they have not known me to lie to them or to deceive them or to tell them anything but the truth. I will gladly go to my constituency and take whatever is coming on Bill 50 with the knowledge that I had not let them down, I have told them nothing but the facts.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. HICKEY: And they accept that.
- MR. MURPHY: You are telling them now, 'Tom', boy.
- MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of a six month hoist is to say the least I cannot find words to adequately describe it other than disgraceful. It is an absolute and total attempt to filibuster at a time, Mr. Speaker, when there is other work to be done and at a time when this government has got lots of things to do, when really this House indeed should be closed, and the work should be finished

Mr. Hickey: but, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that tactic used from the day this House opened, God forbid it has not ended yet.

Let me say to my hon. friends one little bit of advice and let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that there are no politics to be gained by opposing Bill 50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And that might sound like a joke to my hon. friends because I believe some of my hon. friends, I believe my hon. friend for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) for example I honestly believe that he is sincere in his opposition to this bill or the concerns that he expresses. And I do not quarrel and I do not question him on that. If he believe that more power to him because that is what he is here for. I do not challenge that at all, but by gosh, Mr. Speaker, I sure do challenge some of the other hon. gentlemen who indeed are not so sincere. And all I say to him is that give Bill 50 a chance, give it three or four months or indeed a year and see where the taxes will be levied. There will not be any, Mr. Speaker, unless services are demanded in unincorporated areas. There will be no change unless the municipality wants

MR. HICKEY: to go with it and impose a tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I sat here today,
Your Honour, and listened to the hon. member for St. John's South
(Dr. J. Collins) saying that to the point that he himself had
spoken up to that particular point, in his opinion no other
member in this House had said anything worth listening to about
Bill 50, "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region."
With the exception of the very excellent remarks made by my
colleague from Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) this evening, a few
other remarks from this side, and having listened to the Minister
of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the member for St. John's South
must go home tonight again disappointed, Mr. Speaker. Because
the diatribe of verbal diarrhea that came across the House from
the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation was some
of the -

MR. HICKEY: Watch your language.

MR. RIDEOUT: If the minister wants to come back
in his seat and raise a point of order he is entitled to do so
under the rules, Mr. Speaker. If not, he should not be shouting
from the door.

The attempted record that I heard
from that hon. gentleman - tonight.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did
not intend to raise a point of order but seeing the hon. gentleman
wants me to I will accommodate him and I will simply say that I
am not hurt by his remarks, I have grown accustomed to them in
twelve years.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Of course,
the hon. gentleman was under no obligation to have attempted to
make one even upon invitation.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it shows of course that the hon. gentlemen on the other side insist in breaking the rules every chance they get, by raising those specious and foolish points of order.

Now as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, what came from that hon. gentleman tonight was a litany of the past. It had nothing to do in the main, ninety or ninety-five per cent of what the hon. gentleman had to say had no bearing whatsoever in any context, in any way you can twist, it had no bearing whatsoever on the principle of Bill 50 or the amendment. It was a litany, Mr. Speaker, of the past, a litany of a man who still wishes to live in the past, a man who wants to blame all the troubles of the St. John's urban region on the previous administration. If that hon. gentleman could not utter the words previous administration and the Liberals of the past and all that type of thing, Mr. Speaker, take all of that out of his speech and all the sentences related thereto and you would have had about a two or three minute speech on the St. John's Urban Regional Bill.

So the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) must go home again tonight disappointed, I would say, in his colleague this time, because I had thought that the hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation would have said something to us about Bill 50. But he certainly did not and, you know, the minister said to us, "With the exception of the St. John's MAs," he says, "I do not see what other members are speaking in this debate for. It is no concern of theirs." That is the exact words. I made a note, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman was speaking. "It is no concern of theirs."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be so bold as to stand in my place tonight, representing a district on the

MR. RIDEOUT: Baie Verte Peninsula on the Northern Coast of this Province, and say to that minister that regional government is a concern of mine. I have every intention of saying how I feel about it and whether that hon. minister thinks that it is a waste of time for me to do so or not I say too bad. I will exercise my right as a member of this House. It may not be of any concern to me about regional government in St. John's, if that is what the hon. member is trying to say. But that is not what he said. He said it was no concern of ours, no concern of the members outside of St. John's. Well I say to him it is, Mr. Speaker. Because regional government as a concept is a concept that I have no hesitancy in supporting. I can support fully and wholeheartedly the concept of regional government. I have no qualms about that whatsoever. Neither, Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues on this side of the House. And we have said that time and time again. We have said it until we are blue in the face and we will continue saying it, that we have nothing against the principle and the concept of regional government, but we do have a lot, Mr. Speaker, against this infamous Bill 50 that is before us tonight. And that has been before us this last couple of days.

So for the minister to say that it is no concern of mine, Mr. Speaker, flies in the face of what responsible government and what democracy and what this House is all about. So that is another bit of claptrap and the verbal diarrhea that I

MR. RIDEOUT: referred to a few minutes ago when I began my remarks. The minister asked rhetorical questions, Mr. Speaker. "Name us one other bill" he said "that has had so much consultation and that has been on the go as long as this bill 50?" Well, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to scratch your brain or tear the hair out of your head trying to remember at least one other bill in this session that had as much consultation, had more consultation, Mr. Speaker, more appropriate consultation than did bill 50 and, of course, I refer to bill 26, "An Act Respecting Occupational Health And Safety In The Province." That bill was under discussion for two full years when there were people all across this Province clamouring for its imposition, when there were people all across this Province crying to the government to bring that bill before the House, but the minister responsible for it was saying to the House and saying to to us in Question Period, "No, no, we cannot do it. We cannot do it. We have an Interim Advisory Council that is made up of representatives of the workers, and made up of representatives of the companies and until they tell us what they want in the bill, until they decide amongst themselves without any rocking of the boat, or without one group coming out in public and going against the other group, until they do that there is no way you are going to see that bill before the House."

But did you see that same principle followed in this bill, Mr. Speaker? Not on your life you did not. That same principle was not followed with bill 50. The minister knows that, the Minister of Municipal Affairs who rants and raves, Mr. Speaker, in the introduction of a bill, almost enough to frighten you to death. You would almost think he was gone snarky, gone off his head, a half maniac or something like that, introducing the bill. He did not have that kind of consultation, no way did he.

MR. RIDEOUT: So the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, Mr. Speaker, should do a little bit of research before he gets up in the House and asks those foolish rhetorical question about what bill had more consultation than this one. He must have a very short memory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speakers on the other side make a great deal - the minister himself today got up and he ran down through - I believe he said 55 sections - of this particular bill that can be found in the Local Government Act, the Community Councils Act, or any of those acts all under the umbrella, I suppose of the Local Government Act. The minister made a great harangue about that, that there is nothing in this bill that is not now in place in Municipalities in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is a deliberate attempt on the part of the minister, I cannot say that under the rules, Sir, and I will not, but the minister is certainly misleading this House and misleading the people of this Province and the people whom this bill affects when he says, no strings attached, that there is nothing in this bill that is not included in the Local Government Act. Mr. Speaker, the minister could not have read his own section 5. Section 5 of the bill destroys that argument completely. There is, Mr. Speaker, there is something in this bill that is not included in the Local Government Act. There are powers assigned to this regional council in this bill that have not been assigned to councils under the Local Government Act. The minister should read section 5. It says very explicitly; 'Except as is necessary for the regional council to exercise the powers granted to it under or pursuant to this Act, nothing in this act will abridge the Local Government Act' and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that say? It says, 'Except as

MR. RIDEOUT: where necessary for the regional council to carry out its duties, it will live by the powers of the Local Government Act.' Except as where necessary, but where they cannot do it, where they cannot do it under the powers of that act, then by section 5 they have the authority to forget about it, they have the authority to do it their way, they have the authority to do it as they see fit, they have the authority to do it the way that they think it should be done. Then, Mr. Speaker, led off by the minister who introduced this bill speaker after speaker has the nerve and the gumption to get to his feet on the other side and say that every power in this act is included in the Local Government Act. That is a falsehood, Sir. It is not true. Every power in this act may be included in the Local Government Act but there is no clause 5 in the Local Government Act which says that except as stated, and except as where necessary for the regional council to do what it has

MR. T. RIDEOUT: to do then it can circumvent the powers of the Local Government Act. The minister should be more careful, Mr. Speaker, and so should speakers from the other side be more careful when they say things of that nature. This bill certainly goes far away and beyond the powers granted to municipalities under the Local Government Act. And if nothing else does it, Mr. Speaker, then section 5 does that, Section 5 does it absolutely and clearly because it states 'except as otherwise' and 'except as otherwise' to me can only mean that if they cannot do it under the power that is given to a municipality under the Local Government Act then this particular section and this particular bill is supreme. It is superimposed on top of that and they have the authority by Section 5 to do it as they see fit.

Now that is the way it comes across to me, Mr. Speaker, as a layman. I am not a lawyer I have no legal training.

MR. DINN: Will you permit a question?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: No I will not permit a question yet until I am finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the right interpretation.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: That is my interpretation and I cannot see how any learned gentleman could interpret it any differently because it states in black and white 'except as is necessary for the regional council to exercise those powers.' They will live under the Local Government Act but if they cannot do it under that, that is where the 'except as is necessary' comes in then they have the authority to go beyond that they have the priority to circumvent the authority granted under the Local Government Act.

MR. DINN: You might want an explanation.
on that.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would interested in an explanation, yes. Obviously I would. But the minister has only spoken for only - what?

MR. W. ROWE: Two or three hours.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Two or three hours already in this debate, and except for the political ravings, Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. ROWE: He still has not referred to the Bill yet.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: - except for a few political ravings the minister said nothing about the bill. He came in with a big harangue this evening on this amendment, he came in with this big harangue this evening and listed out fifty-five clauses where it said that all this fantastic power that the minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is going to have, fifty-five clauses, well, it is there now, it is in the Local Government Act. He almost pleaded with us to buy it but he forgot, Mr. Speaker, section 5, he forgot that section 5 overrides all of that.

MR. DINN: You may want an explanation on that.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: As I said, Mr. Speaker, the minister had ample opportunity for explanation and he can -

MR. NEARY: We want an explanation for the people, not to my colleagues. Explain it to the people.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: And the minister will have another opportunity to speak.

MR. WHITE: He will tell them how much taxes are going to go up.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I am not closing the debate, Mr. Speaker, the minister will have another opportunity to speak, so if there is an explanation, a reasonable explanation, logical explanation then why have the minister not told us already?

MR. WHITE: Because there is none.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I would say because there is none. I mean, what is section 5 there for.

MR. DINN: I already did.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: You already told us, did you?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this minister -

MR. W. ROWE: No wonder the government is on the rocks.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Well, the government is on the rocks anyway. But this minister has just put the last stroke or the last straw that is going to break the camel's back.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: So, Mr. Speaker, all this foolishness that the minister has been getting on with tonight about those fifty-five sections that are exactly the same as in the Local Government Act, they have no more authority now than they would have under the Local Government Act, not an ounce not an ounce of authority more, have not got a bit, have not got a bit of authority more than they would have under the Local Government Act, Mr. Speaker, that is completely false. The minister was not leveling with this House and I would suggest that he has not been leveling with the public because section 5 changes the whole complexion. Now there may be an explanation. I am not saying there is not an explanation, but the fact is that it is there and, Mr. Speaker, it is not very difficult language to understand. Not very difficult to understand at all, Sir, There are no words in there the length of your arm that you would have to be a Rhodes Scholar or have fifteen degrees to understand. It is not that. It says very plainly except as necessary for the regional council to exercise the powers. Now 'except' to me means very simply that it is excepted, that the authority under this one will be above and beyond -

MR. S. NEARY: What are they going to do?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The authority under that clause will be above and beyond anything given to any council in this Province under the Local Government Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Act, that monster that the minister and the members from the other side talk so much about, this bill, Mr. Speaker, is going to affect, is going to affect - what? A half a dozen? Eight or ten communities in the Northeast Avalon urban region that are not even now under the Local Government Act, communities that are unincorporated,

MR. RIDEOUT: communities that do not even know the least little bit of how the Local Government Act operates, do not even know what - they may know what it could do for them but they have no idea at all, Your Honour of the workings of local government. They have not indicated any interest in becoming incorporated in many cases. But this bill is not going to give them any choice, Mr. Speaker. This bill is not going to give them any choice because under this act they are coming in anyway, like it or lump it. It is going to be, like the minister told us in his opening remarks a week or so ago, that like it or lump it we know what is best. No such thing as representative government anymore, Mr. Speaker. This hon. crowd knows what is best, so like it or lump it it is going to be done anyway. That is what the minister told us in his opening remarks on this bill and that is what is happening in many cases, especially in the cases in the non-incorporated communities.

What about the consultations that the minister said he had, Mr. Speaker? How many of those councils changed last Fall in the November elections?

AN HON. MEMBER: A lot of councillors.

MR. RIDEOUT: A lot of councillors changed. The vast majority of the councils changed, the make up of the members, the vast majority of them: many were defeated, some chose not to run again. The whole complexion of the elected municipal representatives changed, Mr. Speaker. Did the fine consultation that the minister talked about, the hard core consultation that the minister tried to leave the impression in this House that he had, has that gone on with those new people, Mr. Speaker, who were elected seven or eight months ago?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, it has not. Many of those people never even saw the bill until it was sent to them by members from this side of the House.

MR. NEARY:

We had to xerox it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There was the consultation,

Mr. Speaker. There may have been some consultation with the -

MR. NEARY:

Even, by the way, the President of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities retired.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is right. The president - yes. And the minister was boasting that he had some degree of support from those people. But there is a different -

MR. NEARY:

He told me last week he was against appointments to the council, the former President of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. Against appointments. He was against appointments.

MR. MURPHY:

Is the gentleman in his seat?

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is an interesting point that my hon. colleague is making.

MR. DINN:

They presented a brief.

MR. NEARY:

They were against appointments to the regional council.

MR. DINN:

They presented a brief. Would you like to see a copy?

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Speaker, what it all boils down to, Your Honour, is that there are many thousands of people on the Avalon region who are going to come under this urban regional bill whether they want to or not. The minister does not care about that.

MR. W. ROWE:

No choice.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No choice whatsoever. This is the great democratic government that we have, the great democratic philosophy of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Whether they want to or not they are coming in. We will take them in because the minister thinks it is better for them. The minister is convinced it is better for the region, it is better for the people. So no matter what the people think we will drag them in

MR. RIDEOUT: anyway. If we drag them in we drag them in kicking and screeching but we will drag them in.

Now I notice the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is tut-tutting, he does not like it, but I am going to have my say and that is it. He had his say and I did not like a lot of the things he said but of course, Mr. Speaker, he has one advantage over me, he helped to draw up the bill in some of those overtime settings that they had secretly in basements around the capital city during the past number of months. Because these were apparently the only people who saw the bill.

MR. F. WHITE: Inspiring.

MR. RIDEOUT: You know they must have been the only people who saw the bill, Mr. Speaker, because those new people who were elected to council in November they did not see it. They had no idea of what was in the bill until we sent them - not I but some members on this side sent them xeroxed copies. When they came to us in frustration, in desperation, they knew that the bill was coming and they had not seen it and they came to us looking to find out what was in it. That was the consultation, Mr. Speaker. That was the consultation that went on.

MR. RIDEOUT: Some consultation.

MR. RIDEOUT: Some consultation, for a bill that is going to effect over 100,000 people, is it not? About a third of the population of the Province. A bill that is going to affect that many people. That is the type of consultation.

New communities, Mr. Speaker, new communities that were only incorporated in the last four or five months, less than that, in the last four or five or six weeks, what consultation went on with those people? I would suggest there was none, Mr. Speaker, practically none.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you finished?

MR. RIDEOUT: It is the voice breaking the glass.

MR. WHITE: The handwriting on the wall.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is the handwriting on the wall for the government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing goes into the long harangue that they will pay for what they get. "They will pay twenty-five cents a gallon" he says, "for water from the regional water system.

MR. DINN: How much?

MR. RIDEOUT: Twenty-five cents for 1,000 gallons. Everybody knows that that is a slip of the tongue. Twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons for water that you will get from the regional water system. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister would like us to be naive enough, and like the people this council is going to affect, the minister would like them to be naive enough to believe that that is all they are going to pay. It is twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons for whatever water they take from the regional water supply, the Bay Bulls Big Pond water supply. Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, that is a pile of foolishness. This bill goes a lot deeper, Mr. Speaker, than that. It talks about a regional fire department, it talks about regional police control, it talks about regional superintendent of works, and regional this, and regional that and regional something else. What is going to pay for that, Mr. Speaker? The minister has not addressed himself to that. I have not heard one hon. gentleman from the other side say one word about who is going to pay for those services.

MR. WHITE: You cannot get it from bingo.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not going to come from bingo. There was one hon. gentleman flicked out of the Cabinet for suggesting bingo games to raise money. I would assume that the Premier has warned the rest of the ministers not to suggest bingo. It is not going to come from bingo, that is out.

MR. DOODY: Bingo is out.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right. That is out.

MR. DOODY: Bingo is out.

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, the twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons will pay, the minister says, for the maintenance and upkeep of the regional water supply. Well, what is going to pay for the rest of it, the regional collector of this, and the regional superintendent of works, and the regional fire department, the regional police services? Then the minister says, "I can guarantee people there will not be any increases in taxes, above what they have now."

AN HON. MEMBER: The first week. The first week, I would say.

MR. RIDEOUT: The regional engineer, the regional inspector of buildings, is that going to come out of the twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons levied on the water, Mr. Speaker? I mean, that is, I would assume, going to pay for the maintenance and upkeep of the regional water system.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$250 a year will accomplish that?

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister said, Mr. Speaker, that \$35 million grew on trees to build in the water system because the people are not going to have to pay it back. They are not going to have to pay back the \$35 million that built in the regional water system. Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not one community in my district that has been fortunate enough to get a water system and does not have to pay it back. They are paying

MR. RIDEOUT: it back. They did not get any gift. They got no gift in Fleur de Lys or Baie Verte or Roddickton or any of those places, they are paying back the interest and the principal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Paying through the nose.

MR. RIDEOUT: Paying through the nose, that is right, twelve dollars a month, I believe. The minister forces them now.

MR. WHITE: One hundred and forty-four dollars a year.

MR. RIDEOUT: One hundred and forty-four dollars a year, and the minister has the nerve, Mr. Speaker, and all the hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken on this bill so far, to tell us, and through this House tell the people, that there is not going to be any increase in taxation, that they will only pay for what they use. Sure, they will pay for the water that they use. I can buy that. They will pay for the water that they use but who is going to pay for the rest of the regional services?

MR. DINN: That is it.

MR. RIDEOUT: What do you mean, that is it? What is section 111 doing here is that is it?

MR. DINN: 111?

MR. RIDEOUT: 111. It says, "They may establish the offices of regional collector and regional engineer and a superintendent of works and an inspector of buildings and chief of the regional fire brigade, a regional treasurer, a regional solicitor." Is he going to do this free gratis, this regional solicitor? He is going to work for nothing, is he?

MR. DINN: Metro has a solicitor, that is okay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, what is going to pay for it? That is the whole point that my colleague from Lewisporte

MR. RIDEOUT: (Mr. White) was making this evening, Metro has their property tax at six mills, I believe - is it? - and that is going to be the basis, that will be the minimum and that will be \$200 or \$250 per year per household in the St. John's region.

AN HON. MEMBER: No! No!

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, it is going to be in all of them because all the region is coming under it.

MR. NOLAN: Sure it is.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is weasling. It is weasle words on the part of the minister, weasling on behalf of the administration to tell people that what they use they will pay for. It is wrong! They will pay twenty-five cents per 1,000 gallons for the water that they use but then, because they are part of this regional government, the boundaries of the regional government will have to pay for those services. Who else is going to pay for them?

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4905

NM - 1

MR. RIDEOUT: if the community of Flatrock is within the Urban Regional Council then are they not going to have to pay their share of the Superintendents of Works, or the solicitor.

MR. F. WHITE: Of course. Of course.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, he says. Well go out and justify that to Newtown.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Go justify it to St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, what a concept. Now we are getting there, Mr. Speaker. Now we are really getting there. This is what they are up to. This has been the hoodwink behind it. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, this six month hoist is the most sensible thing, according to what the minister just admitted, this is the best thing that ever happened for my colleague to make that six month hoist amendment. Because now we are getting to the bones of what the minister has in mind. He is saying to those people, "If you do not take any water we will not charge you." That is fine. I can buy that. "If you do not take any water we do not charge you. But you are in this region now, if you are in Flatrock, or if you are in Middle Cove or some other, you are in the boundaries of this council, we are going to provide a regional solicitor but we are not going to charge you for him. You are not going to pay your share. We are going to have to have a Chief of the Regional Fire Brigade and if there is a fire in Flatrock we will get somebody down there. But we are not going to charge you for it."

DR. KITCHEN: Until there is a fire down there.

MR. RIDEOUT: "We are not going to charge you for it."

Mr. Speaker, what a concept. Now we can really see what the minister has in mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going to keep time sheets, regional time sheets.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now this is the other part of the user concept, Mr. Speaker. There will be regional community time sheets. If the director of the regional fire brigade spends one hour carrying out inspections to private homes in Flatrock then they will pay for it.

MR. F. WHITE: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the concept. They will pay for it. Or if the regional -

MR. F. WHITE: 500 people will keep it going.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right. If the regional solicitor spends one minute arguing on behalf of somebody from Flatrock or Foxtrap or Bauline, then they will pay for that one minute.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the concept. That is the user pay concept.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Dinn fairy tales.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. Mr. Speaker, it was aptly named by my colleague, the Dinnuit formula. Well there is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, that must be what it is, the Dinnwit formula, because if that is going to apply like that then, Mr. Speaker, this is the shambles. Is that the way it is going to apply? This is what the minister tells us.

DR. KITCHEN: Regional time sheets.

MR. RIDEOUT: Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the minister must be gone right off his head.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I do not want to let the cat out of the bag but Mr. Fahey is going to be the regional solicitor.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising

June 27, 1978

Tape No. 4905

NM - 3

MR. HICKMAN: do adjourn until tomorrow,
Wednesday, at three of the clock and that this House do now
adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this
House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 P.M., those in favour
"Aye," contrary "Nay", carried.

This House stands adjourned
until tomorrow at 3:00 P.M.