

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Sinms)

Order, please!

I have a letter here from the Consul General of the United States of America. He has asked me to express to the members of the House his thanks for the honour extended to him when he was permitted to sit in the gallery last Monday at the House of Assembly in the Province of Newfoundland when Ambassador and Mrs. Curtis visited the House. He says he enjoyed the Question Period and found the first-hand exposure to the parliamentary system in operation a very useful experience. "Please extend my thanks to the members of the House and inform them that if I may be of assistance in any way, they should not hesitate to communicate with me." Signed: Thomas P. Wilson, Consul General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sure all hon. members would like to welcome to the gallery today the member-elect for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Hal Andrews.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, may I ask a question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment? I regret that I did not have the opportunity to give the hon. minister notice, but I think it is something on which she would be well informed. Perhaps she could help us.

The question arises out of reports which were carried, I believe, on the C.B.C. radio this morning. They may have been on other stations as well, but we will give C.B.C. the credit for this one. With respect to the ERCO plant at Long Harbour, I ask the minister whether she could tell the House, Mr. Speaker, whether there have been any

MR. ROBERTS: arrangements made between the government, in respect of which she would speak as the minister responsible, and the operators of the plant at Long Harbour, the ERCO company, with respect to - I suppose we would call them the tolerable or the tolerated levels of emissions in respect of fluorides from that plant?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had, I think, two or three meetings with ERCO this year so far and I think there is another one coming up before the end of the year. We have been doing monitoring out there and the fluoride conditions out there are just about normal, that is, the water is almost to acceptable levels of drinking water that has been, you know, fluoridated, which many towns now have. Other emissions are under control and we are quite pleased actually with the conditions and the improvements that have been made at Long Harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister. The news is good news and that is welcome. I wonder if she could perhaps be a little more precise and tell us exactly what arrangements have been made? Because as far as I am aware, the news story was the first public notification that the minister and her officials had entered into what amounted to a treaty with the plant at Long Harbour.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Could she perhaps tell us what arrangements have been made, exactly what are the tolerated or tolerable, or if we wish we could use the term TLV, the threshold limit values, in respect of fluoride emissions that have been accepted by the government in respect to the plant at Long Harbour?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. M. NEWBROOK: I really cannot give you that exact figure except that I know we have standards and that ERCO has been required to meet the standards, but I really cannot give you exactly what that figure is right now.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPLAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think I can appreciate the minister's position, perhaps she can undertake to consult with the relevant officials and get us the detailed information, I appreciate she would not have that at hand. I wonder if she could tell us by virtue of what authority she has entered into these arrangements with ERCO, please?

MRS. M. NEWBROOK: I did not quite get that question, please.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Oh, I am sorry. I wonder if the minister could tell us by virtue of what authority, legislative or otherwise, she has entered into these arrangements with ERCO?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. M. NEWBROOK: Well, the authority, Mr. Speaker, would be under our Environmental Act and ERCO is required to meet the standards of that act the same as any other company and these are the standards they are trying to meet and, like I just said before, they have done a very good job and they are increasing their standards every year and we are doing probably by this time next

MRS. M. NEWBROOK: year that the conditions in Long Harbour will be comparable to what they were before the plant started its operation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Final supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in summation, I wonder if the minister would be kind enough to undertake to let the House or hon. members - she may not wish to make a full statement in the house - that hon. members have a full statement on the situation at Long Harbour setting forth exactly what has gone on and what is going on and what exactly the government has agreed to accept because, I say to the minister, that there has been little public disclosure of these facts until the matter was raised first on the news media overnight and then latterly here in the House of Assembly? I do not think anybody was aware the government had made some arrangements with ERCO, Mr. Speaker, to accept the given state of affairs and then where we go from there.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. M. NEWBROOK: The only arrangements we have with ERCO is that they are to increase their monitoring and their conditions so that we will get back to a pure state of environment at Long Harbour and

MRS. NEWHOOK: I would be very, very glad to disclose the reports we have on all the different types of monitoring that we are doing at Long Harbour. And I can give you the figures; there is no problem at all on that.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. In view of the controversies and the complaints that are surfacing as a result of awarding of Canada Works projects by the Government of Canada, would the hon. gentleman indicate if his government or any ministers in his government had any input into awarding of any of these Canada Works projects in Newfoundland? And if so, to what extent did the Provincial Government participate in the selection of these projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is all news to me. There is a Canada works programme in operation, I know that as a member of the house for my own district and so on, and applications I have supported when they have come my way. But I am not aware of anything out of the normal than has been the practice in the past, ongoing input between the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of Labour and Manpower, provincially when they start a programme, and the normal selection procedures that are followed each year. So I am not aware of, I have not been getting in my office, complaints about the selection procedure used and so that therefore I am at a loss to respond to the hon. member in a more definitive and substantial way.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: I will try to be a little more specific with the hon. gentleman and ask the hon. gentleman if he - well, he says he has not had any reports, but there are reports reaching our desks that there has been political interference at the provincial level, that ministers and private members and district PC associations are calling the shots on these Canada Works projects. And I would like

MR. S. NEARY: to ask the hon. gentleman if he will undertake to investigate these complaints of political patronage and pork barrelling involving Canada Works projects in Newfoundland because just for the information of the hon. gentleman, the situation is not the same as before because there are no committees now and I understand the staff of the Job Creation Branch of Canada Manpower are completely demoralized because of all the political interference. So would the hon. gentleman inform the House if he will undertake to investigate this whole matter to see if there has been undue political pressure and interference from provincial ministers and supporters of the Tory Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I shall immediately and personally investigate. I know that the hon. member for Harbour Grace, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), would only do what was in the best interest of his constituents. I know that the hon. member for Gander, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs Newhook), likewise. And all through the front and backbenches here I am sure that we have all supported applications to the federal department. I would not like to second guess the hon. members around me because they are all honourable people and would only do what was honourable. Whether or not there are a number of people out in the various districts who classify themselves as P.C.'s or Liberals or

PREMIER PECKFORD: NDP's or whatever, who are also putting pressure on, I do not know. But I will personally investigate to ensure that these things are done properly insofar as I have any control over their awarding a job to one community over another community. Sure, no problem there.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Grand Bank, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Premier also investigate a statement that is being made in most cases that previously were awarded Canada Works projects that they could not qualify for a Canada Works project because of financial mismanagement, I consider that to be an insult to committees and the people who have these projects in various district, in various ridings. Would the hon. gentleman check this out to see if it is correct? The statement has been made, I know. I have seen it and I have heard it. But I think that is an insult to Newfoundlanders, and it paints a bad picture of Newfoundlanders in Mainland Canada when we hear so many cases of where projects are rejected on the grounds that there was financial mismanagement in previous projects. Would the hon. gentleman undertake to check this out too with his counterpart up in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, no problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. THOMS: In the absence of the Minister of Justice, I would like to ask the President of the Council a question. In this sitting of the House we will be voting on an act to change the name of the Newfoundland Constabulary to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, a piece of legislation, of course, that we on this side of the House would be only too happy to endorse and support.

MR. THOMS: In the last session of the House, the Minister of Justice indicated that he would be considering the possibility of turning over the policing of parking meters in the city of St. John's to the City Council of the City of St. John's. I was wondering if the President of the Council would indicate to this House when this menial task that is now given to our Royal Newfoundland Constabulary will be turned over to the City Council?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to acknowledge what the hon. member stated with respect to the designation and I think it is a great honour of the Newfoundland Constabulary and a deserved honour to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. I would point out that we have tried valiantly from time to time, day after day, week after week, month after month, to get this designation changed and finally we are able to get the change realized after a happening of another great event that happened in Ottawa in the Spring.

But in answer to the hon. member's question, I think the hon. Minister of Justice has already indicated that he is looking into this aspect. It is not considered to be - many people consider it not to be a function really of the police to be handing out parking tickets of the nature that the Constabulary has had to give out these parking tickets. It is being looked at, it is being looked at actively and I know we are not in a position at the present time to say that it is going to come to pass immediately, but certainly it is a matter that the government is concerned about, and the government intends

Mr. Marshall: to act upon, you know, within the parameters of financial constraints and other considerations.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Could the President of the Council indicate to me whether or not the department has been in touch with City Hall, whether or not any discussions have actually taken place or whether it is still the same situation it was the last Session of the House when I asked the question?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I am not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to make that statement at the present time. But I do know that obviously discussions will have to take place with the Municipal Council, if any change or alteration is to take place. I know that if such conversations have not taken place they will within the foreseeable future when the staff of the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) himself is able to turn, you know, his full attention to his attentions with respect to the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Could the President of the Council tell me whether or not there has been any representation from the City Council to the department in connection with this matter, because I understood that after the announcement was made in the House by the Minister of Justice that City Council were going to get in touch with the department rather than wait for the department to get in touch with the City Council? Has there been any representations from them?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any such representation, but I would assume that, you know, within the normal arrangements being effected between, you know, with respect to the change that there would be such consultation. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question specifically, but, you know, I can say I would expect that the Municipal Council having an interest in it would also

Mr. Marshall: be in touch with the Department of Justice. But in any event, it will be part of the overall proceedings of the Department of Justice, that if the Municipal Council in effect does not initiate the discussions the Department of Justice certainly will when it is in a position so to do.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). In view of the fact that recent studies, scientific studies, have shown that limestone can be used successfully in the treating of non-productive soil which has been adversely affected by acid rain, has the minister been approached by any interested companies? Or has he himself given consideration to the large developments of limestone on the West Coast, which I understand the Table Head Group, the Pine Tree Group, and the Port au Port group I think they are geologically known as, are the largest and most pure block of limestone in the Eastern Seaboard of Canada, and perhaps part of the United States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of initiatives underway at the present time. I might say that the use of limestone to counteract the effects of acid rain is not the only reason that limestone would be used or in fact

MR. BARRY: has been used in the Province. There is a considerable amount of the material utilized in the farming industry at the present time. There have been, and in fact there is right now, a project co-ordinated by the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the Department of Mines and Energy to utilize the tailings at Daniel's Harbour and there will be further announcements made on this in the near future. The tailings at Daniel's Harbour, basically is limestone.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some trace elements.

MR. BARRY: There are trace elements, heavy metals, that have been analysed but apparently that is of such a small proportion that it can be utilized safely in farming operations. But there are also, as the member opposite knows, large reserves of limestone on the Port au Port Peninsula and there has been interest expressed from time to time by various groups and we are actively pursuing the development of these deposits and I hope again to have something in the very near future that I can report to this House or to the Province in this regard.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: My question of course was directed at that largest, most pure block of limestone which is known as the Table Head Group, but I would ask the minister, since I understand that world markets have improved dramatically with limestone in that our natural market is the Eastern Seaboard of the United States and that we have an interest by LeHigh Cement and later by Ontario Portland Cement, has Brinex, who I believe were looking for a partner to develop that particular area, have they taken any initiatives as of the last, say, six months?

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

MR. BARRY: As the hon. member has just stated, Brinex has been actively soliciting partners and I have nothing further to say on that matter other than what I have already said, that we are

MR. BARRY: actively pursuing the possibility of seeing an early development to the limestone potential of the Port au Port Peninsula as we are a number of other mineral occurrences around the Province and we may be in a position to say something further before too long on it, but at the present time I can say nothing more than what I have already stated.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment. I would ask the minister a supplementary arising from my first question, whether her department has been doing any studies into the acid rain and the effect that it is having on the environment in Newfoundland and whether her department has come up with any conclusions as to the use of limestone in the treatment of the soil, the acidic soil from acid rain?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been doing monitoring of waters this year to determine the increase of acidity in the water, and our officials just came back from a conference in Halifax on this particular subject of acid rain. In our programme of next year we are hoping to monitor lakes and ponds and soils and vegetation and forests. We are now co-ordinating a new programme with the federal and provincial Departments of Fisheries, of Forests and Agriculture and we will be including extra monies in our budget for this monitoring for next year. Memorial University will be doing the analysis, and I am not quite sure whether they have a monitoring programme of their own or not, but if they do, well, then this will be included in our co-ordinating process.

With regard to applications of limestone, I think we would have to determine first the condition of the soils through the testing before we would determine whether or not it is necessary to make applications of lime.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) with regard to the ferry on the Northern Straits at St. Barbe and Blanc Sablon. The question was asked earlier last week whether we would get an extension of that ferry from St. Barbe to Blanc Sablon and the minister said that he would be contacting the federal Minister of Transportation, Mr. Mazankowski. Could the minister report to the House now these findings, in particular with regard to Mr. Jim McGrath, Minister of Fisheries, who has announced that the freezer trawlers will now be operating on the Northern cod stocks? Surely, if they can operate on the Northern cod stocks among the free ice, by the time the Arctic ice comes down, surely we can have the ferry operating at least until the end of February. Thank you.

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not had a reply from Mr. Mazankowski.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

for Eagle River.

A supplementary, the hon. the member

MR. HISCOCK:

Seeing that the deadline is cut off at December 11th, I think it is about time we get a reply from him, since there is no CN boat in that area. Also with regard to a letter coming from The Daily News today advocating provincial status coming from Wabush, I think it is about time you get on the go.

MR. WEARY:

Hear, hear! Yes, boy, get the lead out and do something.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook).

I think on Thursday of last week, my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) asked the minister a question concerning whether, or not the potential contract between BRINEX and Commonwealth Edison in Chicago has anything to do with the timing of the public hearings in Labrador that started today. I understand that Mr. Jim O'Rourke wrote to the minister on October 17th. He said in this letter that he

MR. WARREN: would like to have an answer, or government approval, by the end of this year. Is the minister trying to meet that deadline? What I am trying to say is, does he expect the board to report back with their finding before December 31?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I do not know of any deadline with regard to responding to Mr. O'Rourke. We have answered him to the effect that there will be no approval given until after the public hearings are held. We do not know just how long this will take, how long these reports will be coming in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Mines and Energy, also concerning BRINEX uranium mines. In this impact study that BRINEX submitted to government on October 17, they did say that limestone from the Island will be used in the operation of the uranium mines of Kitt's - Michelin. Does the minister foresee enough limestone coming from the Island to support this project?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, limestone is of great interest today for some reason. There are a number of possible markets for limestone in this Province. Part of the market is the farming industry of Newfoundland where we have an acidic soil. The Minister of Agriculture can tell more about this, but the soil is basically acidic so the farmers have to use lime. At the present time, unfortunately, it is coming in in bulk shipments and we are actively examining the development of an internal supply

MR. BARRY: of lime within the Province, a small industry within the Province to meet the farming needs of the Province first and foremost, but there would be icing on the cake in terms of additional markets that might become available that would make the limestone industry all that more viable and we are actively pursuing whether its utilization in the Kitts - Michelin project, or any other possible market. Even farming markets in other provinces might be a possible thing to aim at as a market for Newfoundland limestone.

So we are, the Department of Industrial Development with Mines and Energy and the Department of Agriculture, actively pursuing every potential market for limestone that can be foreseen. I might say that there is no limestone industry that will be dependent upon the Kitts - Michelin project going ahead. Any project that is being looked at is looked at in terms of meeting the farming needs of the

MR. L. BARRY: Province first and foremost, but if
Kitts-Michelin needed limestone then obviously that would make the
project even more viable.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for
LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask
the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, if BRINEX now have
their people in Newfoundland, their engineers and so forth in
Newfoundland to get the project in place, to get it off the ground
and if the matter of employment on that project has been discussed
with the minister? I am told that BRINEX, the company that is going
to develop the property, have told the government that they would
only employ 50 per cent Labradorians. Is there any foundation to
this? Could the hon. gentleman tell us whether or not this matter
has arisen? Where will the equipment and materials be purchased?
Will they be purchased in Newfoundland? But I am more concerned
right now about the employment situation where an official of the
company made a statement recently that only 50 per cent natives,
Indians and Eskimos, would be employed on that project if and when
it gets off the ground.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there has been no such
statement made to me and none to government that I am aware of, and
I would frankly be very surprised that any company or individual
would make any such statement. Now, whether the statement has
been twisted by the hon. member, unintentionally I am sure, to the
effect that it may not be possible to obtain from any particular
area of the Province sufficient individuals with the skills necessary
for a mining operation, I do not know, but ultimately we want to
see as many persons employed from Labrador on this project as is
possible.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: And the more that will be employed.

MR. L. BARRY: there, the more economically viable it will be in terms of a project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: I mean, why would a mining operation bring people in from elsewhere if they have people locally who can be employed there?

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) take the houses in Goose Bay (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Also, Mr. -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) tend to hire (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Also, this is nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

What is this setting of 50 per cent? The hon. member, maybe this is what he wants to have -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) the company has said (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: They have not said it to me -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) native people. Well, I heard them say it (inaudible).

MR. L. BARRY: - they have not said it to me and if they do say it to me I will tell them to go back -

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

The hon. member has asked a question and I think that the hon. minister should be given the opportunity to reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. BARRY: They have not said it to me and if they do say it to me I will tell them, 'Do not be so foolish, boy. Go back and look at it again. How do you know you can only get 50 per cent of your workers in Labrador?' You know, we want to have a fuller explanation of what they are saying than that. I am giving the hon.

MR. L. BARRY: member the benefit of the doubt that somebody connected with the company has said it, which I would find surprising: they have not said it to me. And on the second point, yes, Mr. Speaker, the company, as I understand it, has been, as is necessary in any project, examining

MR. BARRY: employment aspects, examining the question of what equipment is going to be necessary and so on. It is this government's policy that to the maximum extent possible employment be from within the Province, the purchase of supplies and material be from within the Province, and any company that does not comply with these guidelines will not be considered a good corporate citizen as far as this government is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have an answer here, Mr. Speaker, to question number six, July 18th., asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and I table the answer.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, question number fifty-four on the Order Paper, asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and I table the answer.

000

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before we move on to Orders of the Day, and I do not wish to embarrass Your Honour in any way, shape or form, but I believe, Sir, that it would be appropriate to draw to the attention of hon. members on both sides of the House that Your Honour has just been made a life member of the Kinsmen Organization, and I believe we would be remiss in our responsibilities in this House if we did not offer Your Honour our sincere congratulations, especially from this side of the House, and I am sure that other members on the opposite side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - I do not know if it is in order to move that Your Honour draft Your Honour a letter of congratulations but I am sure somebody could take it upon themselves to make it official and send - probably the Government House Leader - might wish to communicate on behalf of all members of the House our congratulations to Your Honour.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that there is complete unanimity on this side of the House, particularly with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but certainly in this matter there is complete unanimity and we join whole-heartedly in congratulating Your Honour and also wishing Your Honour many, many years in your present position as well as in your life membership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other members who would like to make a comment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, Bill No. 58

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order 2 - Committee of the Whole on a bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise and Consolidate the Law Relating To The Establishment And Administration Of Municipal Government In The Province."

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the said bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. BAIRD): Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: As Your Honour is aware we are debating Sections 10 -

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Your Honour recognized me?

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, we know - well, unless the House changed since we adjourned at 1:00 o'clock on Friday we know what we are debating.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Unless the hon. gentleman was in a coma of some kind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
We are now discussing Bill No. 38,
Amendments 109 and 110.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: And after me heaping such great praise on the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) the other day, and telling the House what an intellect the hon. gentleman was, now he does not know what is going on in the House. The hon. gentleman is going to let me down.

MR. RIDEOUT: You were wrong again 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: I was wrong again.

Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at 1:00 o'clock on Friday the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), the

Mr. Neary: Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations who does not seem to be aware of what is going on around him, who thinks he is an expert on municipal affairs, who is now advising the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor), little Mussolini, the little dictator that I call him, when he was in the Department of Municipal Affairs he had everybody frightened to death, he had every municipality in Newfoundland frightened to death. But he got up the other day and told me that I did not read the Act, I did not know what I was talking about, the hon. gentleman, and then proceeded, by the way, to get a little personal and a little nasty.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier should stay in the House because when the hon. gentleman's back is turned, despite the fact that he has laid the law down about getting personal and making snide remarks and lowering the decorum of the House, he should have been here the other day to hear his Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

But anyway I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that I have read Sections 109 and 110 of the bill. I have it here in front of me. And then the hon. gentleman went on to say, "There is going to be chaos in Gander. What is going to happen?", he said. He was so concerned about communities, municipalities like Gander, "What is going to happen in Gander?" he said. And what is going to happen in Corner Brook? Oh, if they cannot collect the property tax, they cannot impose a property tax, what is going to happen?

Well, you talk about twisting and distorting something that was said in this hon. House. My main complaint about Sections 109 and 110 is that they are undemocratic. And I hate to be repeating myself, but what other word can you pick than undemocratic to describe a situation that is not carried out in a constitutional manner? Section 110 is my main complaint, if the government wants to allow Gander and Corner Brook and all the other communities that are

Mr. Neary: presently collecting a property tax, if they want to allow them to continue to do that, all they have to do is to put a very simple section in the Act saying that councils may impose a real property tax, if they so desire, after prior consultation with the department and a referendum is conducted in the municipality in which they want to impose the real property tax. That is all they have to do. I am not saying , and I have not said, and we are not debating the pros and cons of the property tax, we are not debating that. We are not debating whether municipalities need

MR. NEARY: the money or they do not need the money. We are not debating that.

MR. MARSHALL: That is what your amendment says.

MR. NEARY: No, my amendment does not say that.

Mr. Chairman, I would welcome a very simple wording from the Government House Leader to say to the effect that town councils all over this Province can impose a real property tax after a referendum is held in the municipality. Now what is wrong with that? My amendment says that Sections 109 and 110 should be deleted but then if the hon. gentleman wants to bring in another section to replace Sections 109 and 110, then I would be very happy to react to it.

What we are objecting to, Sir, and the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations (Mr. Dinn) knew this but he tried to twist and turn and squirm and tried to come to the rescue of his colleague who is digging his grave deeper every day he is discussing this bill. Municipalities are now starting to get the message from this House of Assembly that all is not right with this bill. I have another telegram today in front of me, another telegram, and there are other members who have telegrams. I am sure government members, private members and ministers have telegrams. Here is one from Pert aux Basques about another aspect of this bill. It says, "Following message sent to Len Stirling today. If by giving authority to Cabinet to take away assets without compensation means eventual loss of water supply system installed and paid for by residents of this town, council strongly objects to any such authority being given and would appreciate any assistance you can give at this time. Signed Rodrick Keeping, Mayor of Channel Port aux Basques." I would like to table this telegram. That is the third one. How many does the hon. gentleman want? Well, how many does the hon. gentleman want? If the hon. gentleman had twenty-two would he then withdraw this clause that makes it compulsory for town councils to impose a real property tax?

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible)

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) member.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. NEARY: We are very familiar with the hon. gentleman's mathematics after last year. What was it the hon. gentleman said? You go from two per cent to three per cent - And what did he call it?

MR. F. ROWE: A one per cent increase.

MR. NEARY: A one per cent increase. From two per cent to three per cent, a one per cent increase. We used to have a fellow over on Pell Island in business and he said you buy for one dollar and you sell for two. One per cent.

DR. COLLINS: That was Fred Rose.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not Fred Rose. He was not in that kind of business. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what else can be said about Clause 110. Just about everything, I suppose, has been said that can be said about it. It is wrong. I would think it is unconstitutional and I would think if it was tested in the courts it would be rendered to be unconstitutional. What the government is doing, Sir, what they are doing and it is just as well to face it man fashion, they are doing what they were too cowardly to do directly, they are using the legislature, they are using the legislative process to whack in the property tax, to put the property tax in, to sock it to the people who live in communities where you have water and/or sewerage servicing fifty per cent or more of the community. That is what they are doing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier we are not arguing whether or not the council needs the money, whether or not the government is sneaking in through the backdoor what they could not do through the front door.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not what I wanted to say at all, Sir. That is not what I wanted to say. We are not

MR. NEARY: debating at this particular time whether or not the council needs the money. We are not debating that, we are debating the principle of forcing the property tax on Newfoundlanders and Labradorians through using and abusing a privilege in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is what is happening, Sir. Thank God, the word is starting to filter through up over my shoulder. Once in a while now you will get a story being pumped out telling the people that in this bill there is going to be a compulsory property tax and telling the people that in this bill the Cabinet has the right to set up regional government. It is starting to get through.

But these are only two bad features about this bill. If we can hold the government on this bill long enough, Mr. Chairman, if we can keep the government here until Christmas Eve on this one bill, and we are only about - What? How far down are we now?

MR. WARREN: One-tenth.

AN HON. MEMBER: One-sixth.

MR. NEARY: One-sixth, are we? About one-sixth of the bill done - by the time we move several amendments on Clause 110 and several other amendments on other clauses that should bring us up to Christmas Eve and by that time we should have had reaction from all the municipalities and a cross-section of the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: What will you be doing on Boxing Day?

MR. NEARY: What will I be doing on Boxing Day?

That is about the extent of the intelligence of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman sits over there, supports a government that is bringing in undemocratic measures, is bringing measures into this House that impose and intrude on people's lives, that affect people's daily lives, and the hon. gentleman comes up with the worst drivel that you could ever hear from a member in this House. Honest to God, Mr. Chairman, it would make you wonder about the democratic process. It would make you wonder, Sir, about whether or not democracy is going to survive when you see people go out and elect the likes of that to this House of Assembly. I would say democracy must be in pretty bad shape, Mr. Chairman. And the government

MR. NEARY: that he is supporting has brought in in the last couple of years all kinds of measures that govern people's daily lives, regiment people's lives, dictate to people what they can do and what they cannot do. Only, I believe, two Summers ago, the government told the people of this Province, 'You have to get a permit to pick blueberries.' And there was such a fuss kicked up about it they eventually backed away from it and they said, 'Oh, the permit is free - you do not have to pay for it. All we are doing is getting a record of those people who pick blueberries.' But then, if they had gotten away with it, the next year you would have to pay for that permit. But they did not get away with it. They will soon, Sir, be regulating the number of times that you are allowed to go to the bathroom every day. And this Section 110 is just another example, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: We just had an interjection. We just heard from the minister responsible for starving cattle in Bonavista!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Another gem! Another pearl of wisdom, Sir! The hon. gentleman would be far better off if he went out and counted the number of larvae on the branches of the balsam fir trees in this Province and took a

MR. S. NEARY: look at the spruce budworm. The hon. gentleman seems to be responsible for all kinds of disaster in this Province, the spruce budworm and the starving cattle down in Bonavista.

Let me read the Clause, Sir, that government backbenchers and ministers are supporting. Mandatory real property tax, section 110 (1) - now hon. gentleman should pay attention to this because I am sure that some of them have not even taken the time to read it because if they had - nothing sets the devil in me more, I am sure, and members on all sides of this House and newfoundlanders, than to be dictated to by an arrogant government and this government, Sir, is becoming arrogant, has become arrogant, is more arrogant than the government they used to refer to that was here for twenty-three years. You talk about arrogance; we saw an example of it the other day, the showmanship and the arrogance, and we saw the minister take to the airwaves on television and display his arrogance. It is a bad example set by the Premier. And here is what section 110 says, Mr. Chairman, "Every council that has a water system, sewerage system or a water and sewerage system serving more than fifty per cent of the residents of the town shall impose the real property tax pursuant to section 109", and that is why I had to include section 109. If the hon. gentleman wants to replace it with new wording I would certainly welcome it, but there is reference to section 109 so I had to make in my amendment in order to get at the root of the problem to move that section 109 and 110 be deleted, "pursuant to section 109 to take effect when assessments are completed under The Assessment Act." It is called mandatory real property tax, the council has no choice, the people have no choice and I would submit, Mr. Chairman, you are going to have mass resignations. You will not get people to run for councils when they discover that they are going to be up in the firing line, that they are the ones who are going to have to bear the brunt of this Clause. They have no choice! They cannot

MR. S. NEARY: put it to the people. They cannot ask the people if they want a property tax, they have to force it on them. They have to say, 'Look, we have no choice because section 110 of the Act says that where you are supplying a community with fifty per cent water and sewerage, well, the tax is mandatory'. No referendum! No plebiscite! No petition! Nothing! Force it on them!

MR. F. ROWE: They said no increase in taxes (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Little Napoleon over there says, 'Force it on them'. Why the Ayatollah Khomeini over there is only a baby compared to this crowd, what they do here in the name of democracy, in the name of the legislative process, the things they try to sneak through this House. Let them do it man fashion, At least the Ayatollah does it man fashion, he does not beat around the bush. We have so many Khomeini's over there that it is pathetic. The people should be the ones to decide whether or not they are going to pay a poll tax - first of all, whether they want a town council, whether they are going to pay a poll tax or whether they are going to pay a property tax, a real property tax, the people should decide. Before there were no negotiations between the town councils and the Department of Municipal Affairs and that is the way it should be. Do it through negotiation and work through the town council and the people and do not force it on them

Mr. Chairman, this is going to do nothing to help regional disparity in this Province. The government are moving pretty swiftly to try to raise taxes in this Province. The whole purpose, Sir, of not making the property tax mandatory before was to give the smaller communities an opportunity to catch up to the larger communities in this Province. The smaller communities that have no services,

MR. NEARY: give them an opportunity to get these services. First of all, Newfoundland had to catch up with Canada. That is why she was a little bit wide open in the last twenty-five or thirty years.

A lot of communities that were helped and assisted and given subsidies and grants would never have had the water and sewerage, they would never have been able to flush a toilet, they would still be using the outdoor privies but for the generosity of the public treasury that this crowd seem to be so strongly opposed to, that they are against. The smaller communities that have not been fortunate enough to get on the bandwagon and get the water and sewerage, where people are still using the outdoor privy and carrying their water in buckets, and there are a few communities in my own district in that category, will now be discouraged from getting the modern every day services, they will be discouraged by the government that represents the big towns and the urban centres, which always said they were all for rural Newfoundland. They are for rural Newfoundland alright!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Like Conne River (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Like Conne River and the town of Francois and all those other great towns.

MR. NEARY: What is the Premier saying? I do not understand the message but I will gladly yield to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to make a statement if he wants to or to ask a question. What is it the hon. gentleman is trying to get across? Is he going to build a bridge down in Conne River? He is so proud of himself. He went down and played a little bit of politics with the poor people of Conne River -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - with a candidate that was not even a resident of the Province.

What is the problem?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like you to stick to

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): the amendment please.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier said something about Conne River. I do not know if Conne River has water and sewerage or not, Mr. Chairman, but if they do not have it, if they were not fortunate enough or lucky enough to get it they certainly will not get it now when they know they are going to be faced with the property tax.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right. A very good point.

MR. NEARY: Because they need, Mr. Chairman, anywhere from five to ten years after they put in the services to get their feet on the ground and so this is going to, instead of wiping out regional disparity, Sir, this is going to help foster regional disparity. We can see it in the field of education, we see it in just about every field of public service, regional disparity and all this is going to do is foster it. There will be people living in communities in Newfoundland - the hon. gentleman says, Well, we do not believe in resettlement. Well, what is this? This is a very subtle way to say to the smaller towns and municipalities, You will never get water and sewerage, you will never get it. This is what this particular clause of this bill means, Sir.

I am surprised there have not been editorials written in every newspaper in Newfoundland, that the open lines have not been blocked solid with people up in arms saying, Look, if we are going to pay a property tax, we will decide whether we will pay it or not. I am surprised that the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: That is right, they disguise it, they say, Oh, what a major reform this is. What a major reform! The hon. gentleman is going to make his mark as Minister of Municipal Affairs, he is going to go down in history, this is going to be the Magna Carta for running municipalities in Newfoundland. It is, Sir, the Property Tax Bill and the Regional Government Bill.

Last year they were defeated

MR. NEARY: on that bill in the House, that Regional Government Bill and they have been sulking and kicking themselves ever since, and brooding, and now they are going to do it another way and they think the people are too stunned to see what they are up to. Well, everybody knows what they are up to and if we have to stay here until Christmas Eve to get the message through to Newfoundlanders what the government is up to, then we are prepared to do it.

As I say, Sir, I am not arguing for or against the property tax.

Mr. Neary: I am not arguing for or against municipalities imposing a property tax if they want to, that is their decision. It is up to the council and it is up to the people, and if they need the money, then they will take the initiative. But they should not use this House as a big stick to come down on the backs of the ordinary people of this Province and force a property tax on them. What a Christmas gift! What a Christmas gift, Mr. Chairman. Two or three weeks before Christmas the government that campaigned and said, "We are not going to increase taxes in Newfoundland," On June 18, prior to the election, "We are not going to increase taxes," they said, "in Newfoundland," and now they are going to make the property tax mandatory. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that people have become cynical, disillusioned, and discouraged about politics and politicians? Is it any wonder when you get that kind of political hypocrisy? And is it any wonder that the government will not allow the proceedings of the House of Assembly to hit the airwaves, to be televised and broadcast? Is it any wonder they want to hide this kind of legislation? They want to hide - I am relevant do not worry - they want to hide Clause 109 and Clause 110, and all the other clauses in this Act from the people of this Province, and that is why they will not allow the sessions of the House to be televised.

The Premier will take to the airwaves, himself, tomorrow or the next day and he will say, What a wonderful, what a lovely legislative programme we have, a legislative programme of reform. And then everybody in Newfoundland will bow like they bow to Ayatollah Khomeini and say, that is right. That is right Premier Brian Khomeini Peckford, you are right, Sir, a major legislative programme. But they will not allow the sessions of the House to be televised so that people can see what their legislative programme consists of, what it is comprised of, what we are debating in this House, things that intrude on people's lives without people having any input, any say in these major decisions that are made. That is why we do not see the microphones and the television cameras on the floor of this House.

Mr. Marshall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): A point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman (inaudible) refrain so he can get a rest. But the hon. gentleman is completely out of order, he is talking about the televising of debates and the broadcasting of debates. The amendment that he has brought before the Committee is amendments to Sections 109 and 110 to have them stricken out, and it has absolutely no relevancy whatsoever to those particular sections.

MR. THOMS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): No point of order can be raised on a point of order.

MR. THOMS: No, no, I said, to the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 231 (a) Beauchesne.

MR. THOMS: I said, to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: To the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is completely relevant when he speaks of bringing the matter of the television set into this, because it seems to me that what he is saying here is that, of course, it is something that should have been widely broadcast prior to this. And his reference to television is completely in order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order as to whether or not he was relevant, I think, we are possibly straying a little from it. I just like to remind the member to be relevant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was straying a little, so I presume I was a little bit right too. Because what I was saying, Sir, up over my shoulder are supposed to be the eyes and the ears of this House. I do not know if, and I do not want to be critical, but I do not know, Sir, if that is true today. I do not know if the reporting

Mr. Neary: is that good, that the

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - not all, some, not all. The hon. gentleman is over there smiling. I do not know if the reporting is that good that the message is getting across of what it is we are doing in this House, what we are debating. We are debating a bill, a major piece of legislation six hundred and some odd - how many clauses in this bill?

MR. THOMS: Over 600.

MR. NEARY: Over 600 clauses in a bill which is a major

MR. NEARY: piece of legislation, and my remark concerning television broadcasting the proceedings of the House - I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the eyes and ears of this House, which is the media up over my shoulder, is getting the message across or not, or would it be better, in order for people to see what the government is doing, to bring in the television cameras and the microphones on the floor of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few comments on the amendment to Clauses 109 and 110. When I spoke a few days ago, most certainly my opinions were expressed. Probably I may not be able to say any further what has not already been said about Clauses 109 and 110, but there are a few telegrams and letters beginning to come in. I had two this morning from the district I represent, and if you could bear with me, I would like to read them and have them tabled for your future reference. This one comes from the St. Barbe Central Development Association and it is signed by Mrs. Wentzell, who is the Chairman. It is addressed to myself and I understand she sent a copy of this to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor). "If what we understand is correct, your department is preparing to introduce a bill which would enforce property tax in rural Newfoundland. We, the members of Central Development Association and residents of the above communities in the electoral district of St. Barbe, wish to register our objections to your government in enforcing property tax on residents when they are not fully aware or have the opportunity to understand all implications of Bill No. 58, especially the section which demands that property tax be implemented in rural areas." Signed: Effie Wentzell, President, Central Development Association.

I have another from the Mayor of Port Saunders, Mrs. Carmel Lavalle. It is addressed to myself and it says, "Dear Mr. Bennett: As Mayor of the town of Port Saunders, I would like to make a comment on the government's levying a property tax on all municipalities in this Province. I feel that this is immature thinking and that even the idea lacks planning expertise," -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

"and more importantly, common sense.

One day we hear of the millions of dollars that will be generated in the Province because of the offshore oil, and almost in the same breath, they tell us, 'All municipalities will be taxed.' We have nothing to warrant taxing our people. We have not even the worth of the recycling of our provincial tax dollars. Most of the small communities are 'have not' communities, but especially the Northern Peninsula. If we want to get a legal document filled out, have an eye examination, see a medical specialist, a lawyer, plus many others, we have to drive 180 miles to Corner Brook; we have to spend money for lodgings - a 360 mile return trip. We have no golf courses, no curling or skating or ice surfaces, no Arts and Culture\$, no facilities, no theatres, no government depots, no tie-up facilities for our fishermen, and more people unemployed than employed. We pay astronomical prices for food, for clothing, for gas, for liquor - you name it and we pay more. For instance, we have no sewer system, and I can tell you, it will take some years of paying a property tax to enable the government to put a sewer system here. Because of the lay of the town, it would cost millions. We have no protection, like Consumer and Corporate Affairs, no information centres - we have nothing, except a water system, paid mostly

MR. BENNETT: by LIP grants, and garbage collection and street lights. And to add insult to injury, McGrath has turned down something that took years to build up by allowing large destroyers to fish in the Gulf. There is a possibility that next year our boats will be on the Banks. When the PC's began to campaign in Newfoundland, and Mr. Peckford was a member of that team, we were told, "If we are elected we will have a government of the people." You will have to forgive me, I can hardly read some of this, Mr. Chairman. It was written in haste it seems. "Not for the people, you the people, and the government, and we are your elected representatives to do what you, the people, want us to do. You, the government, under different leadership, but part of the prior one, is bringing in legislation to make people pay property tax without any input from the councils or the people. We are on the threshold of dictatorship, or communism, in a modified form, we are not being asked, we are being told. Where do our tax dollars go? - to build golf courses in Clarenville, or a new tourist chalet in Corner Brook, etc., etc. We are not ready for property assessment. In no way are we ready. It is only this past year most of the homes were -", I cannot read this very well, but in essence what is being said is that in the last year or two we have had a RRAP programme, a federal programme, introduced to the district of St. Barbe, and the housing has been upgraded considerably, which, in effect, will give the council an opportunity to levy a higher tax, simply because of the upgrading of these homes by this RRAP programme.

"This past year most of the homes were made presentable through the RRAP programme. Now our government is going to take the homes that are done up, or renovated by federal grants, make sense to you? And there is a big question mark behind this. That is the view of the mayor and, I guess, all of the mayors in the have not areas.

"I would like to suggest that most of the water systems and sewerage systems that have been already introduced in rural areas have been done either with LIP projects or DREE money, which

MR. BENNETT: apparently did not come from our provincial government authority." In a lot of little communities, in tiny communities, a lot of these water systems were installed by local labour, with very, very meagre government support financially.

Most of the rural areas of Newfoundland, and I might be bold enough to say all of the rural areas of Newfoundland, have been hundreds of years, Mr. Chairman, hundreds of years, without the services of water, except for a well. Now, all of a sudden we are expected to pay through the nose if we have a pipeline piped to our homes.

We are already overtaxed, very much so. Our people are already overtaxed in these small areas. As the lady stresses here, everything that they need in those rural areas they have to go 100 miles away to get the services. They are overtaxed on gasoline. They are overtaxed on income tax. She is asking the question in this letter, 'What happens to our

Mr. BENNETT: tax dollars? And I think most people in the Province would like to ask what happens to our tax dollars. Tax dollars have been coming into the government for hundreds of years with very, very few dollars going back out into the communities to provide any of the services that all of a sudden people are demanding. Surely goodness our forefathers have paid something, our fathers and our forefathers. Down through the last fifty years, one hundred years, two hundred years, we have been pouring fish, lumber - the resources of the Province have been poured into the capital of Newfoundland, into St. John's, and very, very little has ever gone back out into the communities by way of services until the last very recent years. Just in the last few years have there been any dollars returned to the communities, except in the form, maybe, of highroads. But when it comes to the amenities of life, very few dollars have been returned. We are still penalized with one television station, television channel, CBC. We are victims in that respect. None of the services are provided and still as soon as we want a water system or a sewerage system, where it can be installed, the government wants to be paid for it, wants to be paid twice for it. We would certainly like to know where the tax dollars go. I think these people here are very, very right in their desire to have an opportunity to read the implications of this Bill No. 58, and most certainly the tax section, when it comes to the taxing of properties in little communities. Most of you are aware, you hon. gentlemen are aware without a doubt, that when you build a home in rural areas it does not appreciate in value like it does in the bigger centers. One can make a business of building homes in the towns of St. John's or Corner Brook and with the appreciation of property values you can get to be quite a wealthy person. But if you build a home in rural areas you have to own, maintain that home indefinitely. There is no way you can sell it and have an appreciated value, you have to take a loss. So on top of all of this loss on properties in communities, now we are going to have a tax loss added to the value of these properties.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to serve on a community council in rural areas. If I served on a council in St. John's or the bigger areas, I think you all realize how little we know our neighbour. We never get to know our neighbour in the cities, consequently we have not got the same feeling of compassion as we have in small communities. And when you get into communities of 100 families or less and you serve on a council and you have to inflict tax on your neighbour and you know every person in those communities, you know every man, woman and child in these little communities, and when you have to inflict tax on an already overburdened breadwinner, you are not a very popular fellow. Now, the infliction of the tax is one thing but then when you have to call the sheriff to come and collect that tax - if you hon. gentlemen were familiar with tiny communities around the Province, I think you would realize that people find it difficult paying the existing poll tax or tax for collecting garbage. Garbage collection seems to be just about the only service provided in quite a number of small communities around the Province. Government has seen fit to freeze.

MR. T. BENNETT: they have seen fit to put a freeze on so many things. They have stopped spending but all of a sudden they expect people in rural areas to increase spending, all of a sudden we have to pay more but its ironic that we should become so thoroughly unemployed and we are thoroughly unemployed.

The district of St. Barbe that I represent at this time, Mr. Chairman, certain areas of that district are 75 per cent unemployed. We have only two lucrative areas in the total district, one has a fish plant, Port au Choix where people seem to be reasonably well employed, and the other is Daniel's Harbour where we have a mine where people seem to be reasonably employed but for the rest of the area it is just seasonal occupation that we find ourselves the victim of. We have to catch as catch can, as the old saying goes, make a dollar where we can. And most of our people have to go out to the mainland to seek employment and it is not very fair, in my opinion, to inflict taxes on people in small rural areas when they have to go out to Toronto or Alberta to make the dollars to pay the taxes in this Province, especially the taxes on the people who already have the services and services that they have themselves installed in many cases.

In the last few years a lot of people have given up their wells and they have hooked on to their local three-quarter inch plastic pipe and they find it very convenient but the cost was very nominal and if the government of this Province cannot see fit to do that, to give that wee bit of service to these people, then I do not know what we have a government for and neither do the people in the districts.

Regulation in the Province denies our people the right to go lobster fishing, denies our people - it takes years to acquire a piece of land to become a farmer to go farming. You have got red tape, all kinds of red tape to cut through to get timber grants. Most of the country is taken up by some of the bigger companies like Sowards and Price, so our local men find it very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to make a living in the first instance,

MR. T. BENNETT: and now, all of a sudden, they are going to be nailed, they are going to have this property tax inflicted on their properties and in my district, property tax is going to be inflicted on homes that have just been upgraded by federal dollars and undoubtedly these homes will have a higher value for the provincial authority to reap taxes from. We have not got the property values in the rural areas, we have not got the services in the rural areas, we have not got the employment in the rural areas, tell me, I wish somebody could tell me where the justification lies that you can ram through that 109 and 110 - Section 109 and 110 - and inflict a tax on these people who are already overburdened, who are unemployed, and who lack the services that government volunteers to do when they go seeking support to become government. To me it is not very fair and this is explained in these letters and telegrams from people in the district. These people are pleading, Mr. Chairman, with the government to hold back. As I understand it, they are only asking that you should hold back and let them know what is going on. They want to be able to keep their end up and pay their way.

MR. BENNETT: A lot of people are suggesting that community councils will be the greatest land owners, through sherriffs having to go in and put liens on people's property when they cannot meet their obligations. So I would most certainly like to plead with the government to delete 109 and 110 and most certainly I feel very certain that we are going to have more letters of this sort coming in from all around the Province.

I would very much like, if the hon. gentlemen across have the welfare of this Province at heart, and the people of this Province at heart, if they have telegrams and letters from their constituents, I plead with them to bring them forward and table these letters and these telegrams and speak up for your districts. The people elected you to speak up for them. They did not elect you to come in and inflict more injury on them. I would venture to bet that if you would go back to the people, if this government went back to the people on this issue, they would get a rough ride.

MR. NEARY: You can say that again.

MR. BENNETT: If you went back to the people on this particular issue, this tax, 109 and 110, you would get a rough ride to form the government.

I have had telephone calls from my district and I have asked people to send me letters so I can pass the information along to this House and it is the view of the people out there, it is the view of the taxpayers, it is the view of the electorate, it is the view of the people who put you hon. gentlemen in office, like myself, it is their view, they went to the poll and cast their ballot to give you people a government -

MR. WARREN: And they are kicking themselves ever since.

MR. BENNETT: - and I think out of all fairness it is your responsibility to go back to the people before you let that 109 and 110 go through and make it law.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments on this bill. I have listened with interest to the submissions by my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), and my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and if there is ever a clause in any bill, or any bill that has ever been presented to this House that should be called the Judas Iscariot clause, well, this is it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: This clause and this bill, is a complete betrayal by this government and its Premier of the people of Newfoundland, a betrayal of the trust that the people of this Province placed in them when they were promised that there would be no taxation increase, promised publicly on television, publicly in the newspapers and on the radios, no taxation by this government if we are elected, and no taxation does not mean some taxation. It does not mean partial taxation, it means none, no taxation at all. And the first thing that this government is doing through the backdoor, cowardly, irresponsibly, surreptitiously, deceitfully, through the backdoor, they are mandatorily imposing property tax on the innocent people of this Province in the municipalities that are governed by local government, a betrayal of the trust of government but, more importantly, a betrayal of the democratic rights of the people upon whom this clause is to be imposed. Any law, regulation, clause, bill,

MR. MCCRES: any statute whatever that is mandatorily imposed upon any group of people is, in its essence, a deprivation of rights of the people upon whom it is to be mandatorily imposed. My colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in somewhat flamboyant and harsh terms says that these are Khomeini like tactics, something that you would see in a dictatorial government or worse still, anarchy. This type of action submitted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs but in every sense directed by the Premier of this Province, and I say that not without forethought because it was this Premier when he was the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who mandatorily imposed what we in Carbonear called the gutter tax. He mandatorily imposed and specifically on the people of Carbonear because Carbonear was a pilot community, he came out and he said to the people of Carbonear, 'You will pay \$144 a year for your water and sewerage or you will not be given any authority by my government, by my department to undertake capital borrowings for anything else'. Now, if that is not Khomeini like and if that is not evidence by me that this Premier, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is only his puppet that it is his attitude, that it is his personality behind this Bill then I do not know what evidence you require.

Now it is real property tax and whatever real property tax has to do with water and sewer is beyond me. If the government said, 'we are going to bring in a water and sewerage tax on water and sewerage', I would say that is at least partially acceptable. But what does a property tax have to do with water and sewerage and why am I making this distinction between property tax and water and sewerage? Well, I will point out to you very briefly; as the regulation now stands, a community that is serviced by water or sewerage or water and sewerage more than fifty per cent is liable for property tax. Now, in my district I have one large community that is about fifty per cent serviced by an underground type of water and sewerage, that is to say the infrastructure type of water and sewerage, and I have another community that is serviced by artesian well which is not in the technical, in the infrastructure sense

MR. R. MOORES: underground. Although it is literally, it is not for terms of definition. Now, the community that has the underground type of water and sewerage, all of the citizens in that community will pay property tax not the fifty per cent that is or is about to be serviced but all of them. Now if the government of this Province via the puppet minister can say to me that the fifty per cent who are not serviced by water and sewerage will be within two or three years, then I will accept it. Then I will say, 'Fine, your property tax is well taken and well intended'. But there is no way that I am going to stand up in this House and support this type of flagrant, cowardly abuse of the democratic rights of my constituents when ten years from now they still will not have water and sewerage because they happened to vote Liberal at an election. No way, Mr. Chairman, this Bill will never pass in this House with my support. This Clause and the amendment to it will be

MR. R. MOORES: supported fully by me because of this simple compassionate, human response to my constituents. Now, I have another community - they have a few artesian wells down there and they, through my help and the help of the federal MP, happened to extend the artesian wells by Canada Works grants and now this mealy-mouthed Premier and his government are going to say, regardless of who gave them to you, if you are 50 per cent serviced, you will pay the real property tax.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. R. MOORES: Now, there are two clear, concise, understandable examples. If there is anybody in the media listening today, if they have any kind of intellectual, journalistic ability to see what this government is doing, then they will report to the citizenry of this Province that this is the most disgusting, irresponsible piece of legislation, the Judas Iscariot clause, Clause 110 of Bill No. 58. And any member in this House on the Opposition side or the government side who would so shamefully and shamelessly get up and support it - whether he is the hon. the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) or Trinity North (Mr. Brett) or anywhere else - get up and support this hollow, simpleton type of backdoor mythology of imposing, arbitrarily, real property tax in this Province, they just have no understanding, no sense of responsibility towards the people who elected them. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the responsibility for educating the people as to what is going on in this House - my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says that they should put the television cameras in here. Why should we do that when the media that we now have here covering this House have so poorly publicized what is going on with this piece of legislation? I have town councils and every member of this Opposition has town councils who are phoning and saying, 'Boys, keep it up, because it is only now that we are starting to see the light.' And they would not be seeing it except that we on this side of the House are responsibly,, perhaps somewhat deliberately, stalling the debate on this bill so that the people in this Province can become aware of it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

Not the media, not the newspapers, not the bleeding hearts up in the gallery, but some people here on the Opposition side who are holding it up because we want the people of this Province to know what is going on. And I want to be able to say when I go to Carbonear or Victoria or Salmon Cove, that I stood up in this House and I told the government and I told the media, gave them two concise examples of how you are going to be rogued out of your taxation money and deprived of your rights as citizens, and nobody bothered to report it. My conscience is clear. I have done my duty as an elected member.

MR. WARREN:

And you will get re-elected!

MR. R. MOORES:

I will get re-elected. There has not been a man born in this Province yet who could - And my friend, my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), so-called by the government members, 'the voice crying in the wilderness' - well, if he is crying in the wilderness, the wilderness is pretty populated these last few weeks, because just isolated examples in my own experiences, a large number, more than a dozen, which is a large number of people to come to you on any one issue over a period of one or two visits to your district - a large number of them have come to me and said that what the member for LaPoile is saying is true, that we are being bandied about; we were betrayed; we were promised no taxes and we are getting them.

Mr. Moores: and the town councils; I had one town council elected in my district just three or four months ago, and they are now at this present moment trying to arrange a meeting with the Minister's officials to have it explained to them, the complexities of this bill and the ramifications of it. Now, the official who was called said, "Boy, look, you know, it is going to be five years before certain sections of this Act are going to be implemented. And there are 309 councils and we just do not have the time to deal with you." He said, "I do not have the time to drive to Salmon Cove and meet with the Town Council and explain the ramifications of this bill".

So they called their M.H.A. and they said, "If we cannot go to the officials of the minister's department then who can we go to? We called a man and tried to arrange a meeting and he just brushed us off". He said, "You take care of it the best way you can".

Now, to clear myself in this I did not call that official, I wrote him, and he should be in receipt of the letter through the internal distribution that we have in this building here. He should be in receipt of that letter. And the letter very simply states that on behalf of my Town Council I would like him to go and meet with them, and explain to them, because it was a reasonable request they made, but more importantly it is the clear responsibility of the government, represented by the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs, to do whatever is necessary to see that these town councils are educated.

Now the minister got up here, well what rubbish, and what trash we have to listen to in this House. It is a wonder, you know, that we come here at all. The minister got up and he said, "There has been overwhelming consultation with the town councils in this Province".

MR. HOLLETT: (Inaudible) I have not found it yet.

Mr. Moores: We have had submissions and briefs and meetings and more meetings with town councils, with mayors and municipalities, federations and so on". You know, the only thing that I can conclude from what the minister is saying is that perhaps without his knowing it, he misled this House. Perhaps he did not really have a grasp on what he was saying, the legitimacy of what he was saying. Perhaps he innocently misled this House, when he said, "There was overwhelming consultation", because there clearly is not, and there clearly has not been anything near reasonable consultation with the local governments that will be affected by this Act.

And that, Mr. Chairman, in itself perhaps, is the greatest shame of this piece of legislation. I have been saying in my initial comments on the principle of the bill, second reading, and I have to repeat it now, that if there is no other reason at all why this opposition or why any member of this House should stand against the bill, if there is no other reason at all, then the reason should be that they are trying to do something through the backdoor that they can not, will not, or should not do through the front door. They will not come into this House and say, here is a bill on regional government, they will not come into this House and say, here is a bill, an Act to incorporate property taxes in municipalities in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: - and the fact that they will not do that in itself reflects that something is wrong.

MR. R. MOORES: If a government or a department or its minister believes that what he is doing is right, right for himself, his government and the people of the Province, then why should he go under to table? Why should he go through the backdoor? Why not bring it in head on where a few fellows like myself and a voice crying in the wilderness can get a go at you. But we are having a good time of it now, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken my twenty-five minutes and I have cried in the wilderness and there have been a number of others on the Opposition side who have cried in the wilderness and if we are crying in the wilderness, if all we are doing is recording this in Hansard, then the responsibility lies clearly with two other aspects of society, the government and the media.

The government traditionally and the media traditionally are held responsible under these rights that they so often wish to protect of educating, informing, promulgating whatever goes on in this House and making sure that the ordinary Newfoundlander not only hears of what is going on but understands and digests it.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Baird)

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague from Carbonear who just made a most eloquent speech, Sir, one of the -

MR. HON. MEMBER:

Excellent.

MR. S. NEARY:

- excellent, One of the best speeches I have heard in this House for a long time, very colourful, his phraseology was really good, he has pious hopes, Mr. Chairman, that the government will either vote for this amendment, will amend the legislation or just ram it through in its entirety, and he has pious hopes that the eyes and ears of the people of this Province, up over his shoulder, will report accurately the effects of this Bill as outlined by the various speakers on this side of the House. They are too busy, Mr. Chairman, too busy worrying about when they are going to get out of here, what time this thing is going to end up, they are tormented with the tedious debate; I wish Neary would sit down, he is repeating

MR. S. NEARY: himself. What is 'Moores' saying down there? What is that fellow Thoms up to now? What time are we going to get out of here? That, now, is in between toddies of rum they are saying all of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Ah, Mr. - not all of them, not all of them. In between toddies, yes, in between toddies. As far as I am concerned there should be no rum in the press gallery on this floor. If we are going to have it, open her up, open the bar up and let us have a bar on the ninth floor or on the tenth floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Baird) Order, please! Under Section 299, "Relevancy, while it is not easy to define, the member is usually given the benefit of the doubt". I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to 109 and 110.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, Sir, we are talking about the reporting of both of these sections. The impact, and the hon. gentleman looks at me, I say, there should be no rum unless it is legal. Unless we put a licence in, put a bar in as they have in the Province of Quebec in the Legislature, there should be no booze on the ninth or tenth floor of this building and anybody who does not like that, they can lump it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me read on. Section 110, let me show the House the impact of Section 110.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is repetition.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it is not repetition, I have not read this part of Section 110 yet. I only read one part, I only read part 1 of Section 110 but have the media, in between their little toddies, have they read part 2 of Section 110? Just listen to this, Mr. Chairman. "Where a council applies for provincial assistance towards the construction of a water system, sewerage system or water and sewerage system, it shall agree to impose the real property tax pursuant to Section 109 to take effect when assessments are completed". Now, Mr. Chairman, is that not what I said earlier when I was on my feet, that the little towns and communities who do not now have

MR. NEARY: water and sewerage who were not able to avail of the bonanza of the last thirty years when government was giving grants and assisting towns and settlements, especially in the rural parts of this Province, to get rid of the outdoor privies, now when they come in to government, Little Harbour East, Harbour Main, Conception Harbour, when they come in to the government now, when my hon. friend leads a delegation from Harbour Main, from Conception Harbour, from Avondale, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. N. Windsor) and he says, 'We want Avondale and we want Harbour Main and we want Little Harbour East and we want all the other small communities in our district to get the same treatment as any other community in Newfoundland has gotten for the last thirty years; we want water and sewerage, we want the modern facilities, what does the hon. gentleman from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) think the answer will be from the minister? What will the answer be? Here is what the answer will be: They are not going to get their community brought up to standard the same as every other community in Newfoundland that has received the benefit' so far, as a result of Confederation, they are not going to get the same treatment. Here is what they are going to get from a Scrooge government when a council applies for provincial assistance towards the construction of a water and sewerage system, it shall agree to impose the real property tax - that is the answer they will get from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The minister did not have the courage to tell the mayors and councillors eyeball to eyeball in his office, face to face - did not have the courage to say, 'Look, this government has adopted a policy, we have adopted a policy in this department that if you want water and sewerage you have to go and charge the people the property tax, did not have the courage to do that, thought he would sneak a bill through the Legislature to do it. If the hon. gentleman wanted to use the big stick, to hold this over the heads of the municipalities, he should have gone ahead and done it down in his office. But he did not have the courage to do that, he is trying to suck in every member of the Legislature. And the real property tax, it goes on to say, has to be uniform throughout the town.

MR. NEARY: What about my friend from Labrador City - Wabush where the government played no part in putting in water and sewerage? If these people down there ever get democratic government - and they should have it by now - if they ever get it, my hon. friend had better be prepared to face the people down there and say, 'As soon as you get an elected town council, you are going to get the property tax.'

AN HON. MEMBER: They already have it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, they have it already. They have had an assessment done and they have the property tax. How much property tax do they pay?

AN HON. MEMBER: At the present time, I do not have the information, but I will get it for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman had better be prepared to face the people in Wabush and Labrador City and say that you are going to have to pay for a water and sewer system that was put there by IOC and by the Wabush Mining Company. The same way in Buchans, if my hon. friend from Buchans was here. What about Saie Verte? Who put in that system down there?

AN HON. MEMBER: A substantial input from the company.

MR. NEARY: A substantial input from the company. Where, in Makkovik?

MR. WARREN: (inaudible) the Federal

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Federal boys. The Federal Government put in the water systems in Makkovik, \$3,000,000. So now that the

MR. S. NEARY: community is serviced, paid for out of Canadian taxpayers money under an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Provincial Government whereby the Government of Canada pays ninety per cent of the cost in communities that are native, where you have a native population. When you have ninety per cent Indian and ninety per cent Eskimo, the Government of Canada pays ninety per cent of the cost. And so now after this Bill is passed the people of Makkovik -

MR. WARREN: Indians ninety per cent

MR. S. NEARY: Ninety per cent, sixty-six and two-thirds where you have an Eskimo population.

MR. WARREN: Ninety (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, Sir, my memory is not too bad. I signed the last agreement I believe with the Government of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: The last one?

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, the last one I think I signed it. I am not sure now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Has it got to be signed?

MR. S. NEARY: Has it got to be signed? No, Sir. I doubt if there has been a change made in it.

MR. THOMS: Bob Cole's did not have to be signed every year.

MR. S. NEARY: No, that is right.

So, Mr. Chairman, you can see the discrimination that will creep into this where you have communities that are serviced more than fifty per cent with water and sewerage that this government did not have one thing to do with, nothing! Nothing to do with it at all! Wabush and Labrador City are good examples of that. I believe, if my Hon. friend was here from Gander - although they have the property tax in Gander but this government had nothing to do with putting water and sewerage in Gander, as a matter of fact, Gander was built by the Government of Canada, the Department of Transport.

MR. S. WARREN: And Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. S. NEARY:

And Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. G. WARREN:

And half of it is coming from the (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY:

That is right. And Stephenville, and Pleasantville.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bell Island?

MR. S. NEARY:

No. So, Mr. Chairman, this Act cannot be made uniform. The whole matter should have been left up to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. All this house should do is pass enabling legislation to enable the minister to do certain things and not use the house. It is an abuse of power by an arrogant government to bring in this kind of legislation. It is an insult to the intelligence of members of this house. We said to the government last year, 'You cannot bring in regional government in that form that you have in that Act. That has already been voted on in this House - when was that in May of this year?

AN HON. MEMBER:

In June.

MR. S. NEARY:

In June. And six months later they bring in the same bill in another form.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It was May.

MR. S. NEARY:

May. Oh, that is right in June we were on the hustings.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ayatollah

MR. S. NEARY:

That is right.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that the only way that I can see that we can convey the message of the impact of Clause 109 and 110 to the people of this Province is to allow the television cameras and the microphones to be brought in on the floor of this House. The only way, Sir! The hon. gentlemen are afraid to do that, they are afraid of their shameful attendance records and they are ashamed of their lack of participation in debates in this debate. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), I am sure his constituents and according to the telegrams that I have seen there, his constituents are very concerned.

MR. STEWART:

I have not had any (inaudible)

MR. WARREN:

They do not even know you.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has not got any yet, well just imagine! The hon. gentleman has not spoken in this house yet to my knowledge.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will send an address 'Don'.

MR. S. NEARY: I could read one for the hon. gentleman from his district but I will not I will leave that for somebody else.

AN HON. MEMBER: You asked the people to send telegrams.

MR. S. NEARY: I see, we asked the people to send telegrams. Well, that is more than the hon. gentleman did, the hon. gentleman has not asked his constituents their opinion on having the property tax forced on them.

MR. NEARY: No wonder, Mr. Chairman, no wonder the hon. gentleman will not - his House Leader, the hon. gentleman's House Leader, told the media a week ago, "No committee, no television cameras, no microphones on the floor of the House, we are against it". No wonder they are against it, no wonder the hon. gentleman is against it. The hon. gentleman will not get up and speak in protest of this piece of dictatorial legislation that the government is supporting, is ramming through this House a couple of weeks before Christmas. No wonder the hon. gentleman will not kick up a fuss and say let us have the television cameras. No wonder the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) will not get up and say, "Yes, bring in the television cameras and let the people see me, what I have to say about Section 109 and 110 of this bill". A shameful piece of legislation! The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), I do not think, has any - oh, he might, there might be a few - St. John's North, does that still include a part of the rural parts of St. John's? That is all City Council now?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) boundaries.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) boundaries.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not. Since the government gerrymandered the Election Act, I do not remember the boundaries, but I do not think the hon. gentleman has any of the rural parts of -

Mr. Chairman, what about the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) who seems to be in very great difficulty in his district these days, very great difficulty? What are the hon. gentleman's constituents -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - yes, what are the hon. gentleman's constituents going to say when the hon. gentleman sat there in complete silence and ignorance as the bill was being debated to impose the property tax on communities in the district of St. George's that do not have water and sewerage? The hon. gentleman is sitting down there in the Premier's office, so his constituents tell me, completely oblivious to what is going on in the world, in a trance, does not

MR. NEARY: pay any attention to his district, could not care less if the government he is supporting - as long as he gets his extra income, an extra little bit of income, gets his appointment, could not care less about this dictatorial bill, could not care less what his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor), does to the people in his district. As long as the thirty pieces of silver keep pouring in, the hon. gentleman will sit there like a mute in silence and say nothing. No wonder St. George's voted Liberal in the Federal election, is it any wonder? They have not seen or heard tell of the hon. gentleman since he got elected, and they are waiting now to hear, waiting with bated breath, to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say about Section 109 and 110 of this bill. Will the hon. gentleman let his constituents down?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Is that the only community in the hon. gentleman's district, Stephenville Crossing? "Oh, do not go talking", says the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett).

MR. CARTER: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would you enforce rule 51(b) of our Standing Orders?

AN HON. MEMBER: Cite it.

MR. CARTER: I will cite it, I will read it.

"Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or needless repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech. If the member continues to speak, Mr. Speaker may name him or, if in Committee, the Chairman shall report him to the House."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Thank you. With regard to the point of order, I would still like to go back to 299 on relevancy. While it is not easy to define, I would again remind the member for Lapointe (Mr. Neary) to keep on 109 and 110, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go out and play with his little flag and go out and learn the rules of the House, that might be a good idea.

Every council or where a council applies for provincial assistance towards the construction of water and sewerage - now, what does that mean, Mr. Chairman, what does it mean? It means that every community in Newfoundland,

MR. S. NEARY: big or small, every community down in Fortune Bay, every community out in the district of Kilbride, is there any there that do not have - and I believe there are some - every community down in Ferryland district that do not have water and sewage and every community out in the district of St. Georges, where they think the member is after vanishing into thin air, will have to pay the Property Tax. Every community down in Placentia Bay, if they do not already have the Property Tax and I so not think they do,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. S. NEARY: No. They are going to, that is right. If the hon. member comes in to see the minister, the minister says to his delegation, 'Yes, if you want your water and sewerage, if you want the same treatment that every other town and community in Newfoundland got in the last thirty years then you are going to have to pay the Property Tax. And in Bay of Islands you will have the same thing. The champion of democracy, the great reformer who gets up and talks about everything in this honourable House, where is he now when his people need him? Where is he when they need him to talk about and come to their rescue and protect them against this dictatorial government? Where is he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: Where is the member for Bay of Islands? Let us hear from him now on sections 109 and 110 of this bill. Why has the hon. gentleman suddenly gone on retreat? Is he like Khomeini?

MR. WOODROW: No, retreat is coming on December 24.

MR. S. NEARY: The retreat is coming on December 24th,

MR. RIDEOUT: That is when the bill goes through.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, that is when the bill will go through.

It is a wonder Sir, it is a wonder, that the hon. gentleman who espouses just about every cause in this House has not gone on a hunger strike -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: - because -

MR. NEARY: because the scrooge government which he supports is ramming through a piece of legislation that is going to force the Property Tax on his constituents.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is a wonder he has not taken hostages down in Municipal Affairs.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is true Sir. You would think the hon. gentleman has such strong views on democratic matters, democratic issues in this House, that it is a wonder he has not taken all the opposition as hostage in protest of this bill, it is a wonder he has not done it. But not a word from the hon. gentleman about sections 109 and 110 of this bill and he will be up tomorrow or the next day when he finds out how the people feel about it, he will be up mealy-mouthed -

MR. WOODROW: They have it all ready, they have heard.

MR. NEARY: Oh, they have it all ready.

MR. WOODROW: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: They have it all ready. He will be coming in with a petition just the same Sir, just the same as the hon. gentleman gets up and says " I have a petition here against electricity rates and I am all for it, I am against increases in electricity rates" and then supports the government that does it. How hypocritical can you get to support a government that does it?

MR. WOODROW: I was convinced (inaudible)

wait until Wednesday (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: What is that song? Almost Persuaded. That should be the hon. gentlemen's theme song, Almost Persuaded. When his constituents get on the war path now he will come in with a petition or he will get up and he will give the minister a little flick on the knuckles, or the colleagues a little flick on the knuckles but where is he now, Mr. Chairman, where is he now when we are debating clause 109 and clause 110?

AN HON. MEMBER: Come out and run against me in the next election - I will show you up.

MR. NEARY: Now, there is some challenge, Sir, there is some challenge. That would be like taking candy from a baby.

December 3, 1979

Tape No. 1566

RA - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY:

If I take on somebody in the next election on that side of the House, it will be a big gun, it will not be the small fry, I do not go looking for rabbits' tracks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. S. NEARY:

You sent the biggest one you had, you sent the biggest gun you had against me the last time and you did not get very far .

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, section 109 and 110. Why does the hon. gentleman not get up and say a few words on section 110? Why has the hon. gentleman suddenly become mute, caved in?

MR. NEARY: I believe, Sir, the hon. gentleman has a contribution to make to this debate on behalf of his constituents. Tell me, what does the hon. gentleman - how does he feel about this? Where a council applies for provincial assistance towards the construction of a water system, sewerage system, or water and sewerage system, it shall agree to impose the real property tax. Does the hon. gentleman feel that that is a form of blackmail?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, it is not. It is perfectly all right.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Five minutes left. What a shame, what a shame!

I am looking forward, Mr. Chairman, looking forward to some of the supporters of the government having the courage, the intestinal fortitude -

MR. THOMS: You will never see that happen.

MR. NEARY: No, I will never see that happen because - No that is true, you will never see it happen - to get up - I would like to see the hon. member for Bay of Islands, Fortune Bay, Kilbride, St. Georges, where they think the hon. gentleman has done the disappearing act, the invisible member, the member for Ferryland - I would like to see them all get up and have a few words on this bill, especially Sections 109 and 110. Or have they been directed and ordered by the government to keep quiet and say nothing, we want to get this bill through as fast as we can Christmas is coming. They are getting worse than some of the people up in the press gallery. When will it end? When will all this debate and this nonsense, this foolish nonsense that is taking place down there, when will it all stop so we can get out of here and go home? It is interfering with our other extra-curricular activities. This foolish House of Assembly and that crowd down there on the floor, bunch of jackasses and fools and clowns, that is all they are. We are the kings of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are talking about yourself now.

MR. NEARY: We have the pen in our hand and we can screw them anytime we want to. We can give them favourable publicity or unfavourable blah, blah, blah and who cares, as long as we do our job?

MR. WARREN: As long as they get paid for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) last week

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants to make a contribution to this debate, Sir, I will gladly take my seat and yield to the hon. gentleman, and let him have a few words on Sections 109 and 110 of this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. member for Grand Bank

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I must say I had no intentions of speaking to this particular amendment. I figured everything that could be said about it would have been said. I do not feel too optimistic that the amendment is going to carry. I do not think that is going to happen because even the simplest amendment, even amendments that are proper and in order, even simpler amendments will not carry.

MR. NEARY: Right on, right on.

MR. THOMS: But a comment from my friend from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), actually made me get on my feet, when he said that the people in his district, the towns in his district, the people in English Harbour East, Terrenceville, St. Bernard's, Bay D'Argent, English Harbour West, Boxey, Pool's Cove - Pool's Cove still in the district? - all these people, they all support this particular piece of legislation, they are all voting themselves - if they had the opportunity - they would all vote for a mandatory property tax, that is the impression I get from his comment. If you people want a challenge, I will give you a challenge. I do not have a community of any size, shape or form in my district at the present time with a property tax. If the minister wants to find out how popular this is I will accept it. I will resign from this House today and in a by-election I will take on

MR. THOMS: the Minister of Municipal Affairs

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. THOMS: You want to prove that you went out
and you consulted every town council in connection with this matter.

MR. CARTER: Every one.

MR. THOMS: I am talking to the Minister of
Public Works. I would not run in St. John's North, they can have you.
They are welcome to you.

MR. CARTER: The member knows (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, he is the one person
reciting the orders, I have a right to be heard in silence, would you
silence him?

MR. THOMS: There is not one town or community in
my district that has a property tax.

MR. THOMS:

Now under this particular dictatorial piece of legislation they have no choice. They did not have a vote. As a matter of fact, they never heard of the act, they never realized it, that they were getting compulsory property tax. It is no good for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to stand on his feet in this House and say they were consulted. They were not consulted. None of the town councils were consulted, none of them. And for the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) to make a comment in this House that his constituents support this bill is a lot of tommyrot.

MR. NEARY: What a joke!

MR. THOMS: Garbage!

MR. NEARY: What a joke!

MR. THOMS: You know and I know that they have not been given an opportunity to disagree or agree with this act brought in, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says and my friend from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) under the disguise of An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Relating To The Establishment And Administration Of Municipal Government In The Province. It should be called an act to force the people of this Province to pay property taxes.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: That is what it should be called. Have the gumption - so why does the minister not have the gumption to bring in an act imposing property taxes instead of trying to hide it in this particular bill, bill 58. If he thinks it is such a popular thing to do, if any of you think it is a popular thing to do, come down to Grand Bank, call a by-election there. We will fight the by-election on this one issue, this issue only -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - and nothing else, and we will see who wins. That will tell the tale, how popular this particular act is.

MR. CARTER: You would not be allowed to run.

MR. THOMS: Why would I not be allowed to run?

I would certainly have more right to run in this Province than the member

MR. THOMS:

you got elected a few days ago.

MR. BARRY:

Why?

MR. NEARY:

Because he has been living in Halifax for four or five years.

MR. THOMS:

I do not know if it is too late to challenge the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy or not. I doubt if he was ordinarily resident in this Province six months before his last election.

MR. NEARY:

Right! Right on!

MR. BARRY:

Do not be so foolish.

MR. THOMS:

Maybe we missed -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD):

Order, please!

MR. THOMS:

- our opportunity there. Maybe we missed our opportunity there.

MR. BARRY:

Do a little legal research for a change for God's Sake. Read the cases there have been. Read the Devine case.

MR. NEARY:

No, the Devine case is completely different. I happen to be very familiar with that one. That one is completely different.

MR. THOMS:

If the government will pay me eighty dollars an hour I would be only too happy to do a little research.

MR. NEARY:

No, sixty and save money, save the government twenty.

MR. THOMS:

Sixty and save twenty.

MR. NEARY:

That is the new math. They do not need me but I will give them my services for sixty dollars instead of eighty and they save twenty dollars.

MR. BARRY:

They are saving a lot more now.

MR. NEARY:

That is right, they do not need the hon. gentleman.

MR. BARRY:

We are saving about five dollars an hour now.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. BAIRD): The hon. member for Grand Bank has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, sections 109 and 110 are like a lot of other sections in this particular act. There are sections that are very important to the people of this Province, they affect the people of this Province. And if it means that we get up here and repeat ourselves and offend rule 51, that my friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) quoted, then (inaudible) it, let us get up and let us repeat ourselves. If that is the only way we can get across to the people of Newfoundland what this act is doing, what it is going to do to them, if that is the only way we can do it, then by God let us do it.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: But there are other sections just as onerous. I have spoken on a number of them. I think the conditions under which the councillors have to act in this Province, the one that I have already spoken on, is unfair. It may not be quite as unfair as this, trying to sneak property taxes in the backdoor. Now, the minister has said that he has advised all the councillors and so on. That too is a lot of tommyrot. He has not advised them. There may have been a few attending in Gander who heard the minister's speech when the minister talked about property taxes. What he said about them I do not know, I was not there but I doubt very much -

MR. HOLLETT: He did not leave the impression with anybody that they were going to be forced through.

MR. THOMS: He did not leave

MR. L. THOMS: the impression with anybody, my hon. friend says, that they were going to be forced to do it, but the impression was that it would have been voluntary. But nothing, nothing this government is doing seems to leave any voluntarism in it at all, it is everything being rammed down their throats. and this Section 110 is a prime example of that.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly going to support this amendment. I am only too happy to support the amendment and there may be other amendments to this particular act before we get it through. It does not bother me, I am quite happy to stay here until Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve, for that matter, to debate a piece of legislation like this, especially since I can sit here secure in the knowledge of knowing that half the crowd on the other side do not support it either but are forced to support it, are forced to sit in their seats mute -

MR. S. NEARY: And toe the party line.

MR. L. THOMS: - and toe the party line, of course -
or it does not bother me if I am here until Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve, I enjoy the House of Assembly, particularly when I can get up on my feet and argue against a piece of legislation such as this with some of the clauses that are in this, and the sneaky way in which you are trying to get it through.

I certainly repeat my challenge, too.
The hon. minister is familiar with the district, he paid at least one visit to the district since June 15th when we opened the Fortune Arena, so -

MR. S. NEARY: I heard he went down to buy an Air Canada ticket to get -

MR. L. THOMS: - he will not be completely unknown in the district of Grand Bank and he could have a lot of fun the next three or four weeks, a by-election down there, and then he can show the people in Newfoundland just how popular this piece of legislation is.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. J. THOMS: That is, if he has got the gumption to take a challenge such as that.

MR. NEARY: A good challenge, a good challenge.

MR. L. THOMS: I doubt if he does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Baird) The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, one sometimes hesitates to respond to this sort of diatribe we have been subjected to this afternoon so I think it is imperative that we clarify a couple of statements. The hon. gentleman does not even want to hear it, he can not bear the truth, Mr. Chairman, he can not stand it, he will deal in innuendoes and that sort of thing, he will not facts of life, he will not read the bill and interpret it properly. He will interpret it so that it is argumentative and that sort of thing, he will not face the facts, he will not live up to it, he will not admit to the facts.

The hon. member from St. Barbe (Mr. T. Bennett), let me respond briefly to a couple of points that he made and he read a couple of telegrams that came down from people up there. The first one stated that government is to impose property tax in all rural communities. I mean, what utter nonsense, Mr. Chairman! The hon. gentleman did not even have the intelligence to clarify that statement when he knows that the person who sent the telegram in, obviously sent it in in error. The hon. gentleman hopefully knows the difference, knows that we are not imposing property tax. First of all, government is not imposing property tax, the municipalities will have the right to impose that. Admittedly, it is mandatory that they do impose it if they want services but not in all rural communities, in developed communities and there is a big difference there, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman should be a little more accurate in his statements. He talked about the

MR. H. WINDSOR: town of Port Saunders. What happens to our tax dollars, the mayor asked. Well, if the mayor does not know what happens to the tax in her community we are in bad trouble, Mr. Chairman. The town council decides where the tax dollars will go.

MR. S. NEARY: The income tax dollars -

MR. H. WINDSOR: The town council decides where they will be spent, what level of service will be provided -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) the income tax dollars.

MR. H. WINDSOR: Well, the town of Port Saunders, Mr. Chairman, knows very well where the income tax dollars go too.

MR. S. NEARY: No, they do not.

MR. H. WINDSOR: Do they not?

MR. S. NEARY: He cannot even find out.

MR. H. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman said they get absolutely nothing. He went on at length, Mr. Chairman, talking about a great number of irrelevancies of services that are not provided which absolutely have nothing to do with local government or with municipal taxation or with property tax, certainly nothing to do with section 109 or 110. Absolutely, even totally irrelevant and he says that the town of Port Saunders has never gotten anything, Mr. Chairman, from government. Well, I have a list here of some things that the town of Port Saunders got and I could read them out but I would not want to embarrass the hon. gentleman and I would not embarrass the town council. But I can assure -

AN ON. MEMBER: Read them out anyway.

MR. H. WINDSOR: Well, maybe I will just read a few,

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, \$440,000 for water and sewer in 1973; special grant for operation of water supplies, \$6,000 in 1973; \$3,000 to improve the water supply system in 1973; \$5,000 to improve water supply system in 1973; \$7,500 in 1973 for water and sewer; \$50,000 water and sewer in 1974; \$3,000 to extend water lines in 1974; \$4,500 to hook up 35 homes in 1976; \$15,000 for water and sewer in 1976; \$61,000 for paving in 1977; \$80,000 and \$10,000 in 1977 for financing subdivisions; and \$2,200 in 1978, a special grant on the water and sewer system. Mr. Chairman, these are some of the things that the Town of Port Saunders have never gotten, some of the money that was never put back into the community, and I can list them, Mr. Chairman, for every municipality in the Province. The book in front of me lists the grants and loans and everything else that have been given to every municipality, every one in the Province since 1972. The question is: How much was given to that particular community before 1972, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) no list there for that one.

MR. WINDSOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman talks about municipalities that have water and sewer systems that have been put in by financing from other means, Canada Works grants, by local labour, this sort of thing. We talked about - hon. gentlemen have talked about certain systems that are well systems, a rather rudimentary type of system. The question is, Mr. Chairman, are these systems adequate for a community? Is the level of service being provided, is it adequate, or do we need cadillac systems? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying, that in order to pay property tax we should have a deluxe system that is five times or ten times or twenty times as expensive as we need to have? And he says, "Well, if these systems are already paid for by the people, why should we tax them?" The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that hon. gentlemen opposite intend and, obviously, want to forget about - they do not want to talk about the fact that the council will set the property tax. And if the system is already paid for, if there is no debt on it, then obviously there are no taxes that will be needed to be raised to pay for

MR. WINDSOR: that particular system. The municipalities set the tax rate, Mr. Chairman, and if the town can get along on a one mil tax or two mil tax rate, as one municipality in this Province now does, they have property tax and they have had it for a number of years and the tax rate is two mil. Do you know what a two mil tax rate is on a \$20,000 house - \$40 a year, Mr. Chairman? Now, is that not disgraceful? \$40 a year at a two mil tax rate, and if that is sufficient, Mr. Chairman, to operate the municipality, and do not forget that this act also gives the municipality the authority to set their own budget without reference to the minister again, so they will decide what the level of expenditure will be in the municipality. They will decide what services will be provided because the people in the community will tell them what services they need provided, and, therefore, they will decide how much money they need to raise; therefore, what the tax rate will be. We are not talking about how much money the municipality will need to raise locally, Mr. Chairman. Hon. gentlemen are deliberately confusing that. You know, what we are talking about is a method of collecting taxes. Shall it be a service fee, which is totally inequitable, which does not treat people equally, or shall it be a property tax system which is far more equitable, far much more fair and puts the burden on those that are receiving not only the maximum benefit but those who can afford to pay? Or is the hon. gentleman saying that everybody should pay equally whether they can afford to or not? Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I think it is very important that we get in proper context what this property tax is all about. It is not something that will greatly burden a municipality, it is only another way of raising the amount of revenue that is required. Not only that, it opens up avenues to municipalities that will ease the burden somewhat on the average residential taxpayer, because it makes it far more easy to get taxes from business and industry, from Federal government properties, for instance, and so forth, so a greater share of the burden of the municipal tax can be borne by business and industry and by Federal government who will not, by the way, pay grants in lieu of taxes in municipalities that do not have the property tax in place. So, what are we talking about, the amount of taxes raised or the method

MR. WINDSOR: of raising it? Obviously, Mr. Chairman, it is the method of raising it that we are talking about here, because the level of service that is required in a municipality is not going to change because the system of taxation changes. You are still going to need the same services, people are going to want the same services, and they are going to cost the same amount of dollars so that the same amount of money will have to be raised locally, whether it is by a property tax system or by a service fee system or by an income tax system. Some hon. gentlemen raised that proposal several times. Now,

MR. N. WINDSOR: let us look at the income tax system, Mr. Chairman, everybody agrees that income tax is probably the fairest tax as it relates to income and the ability to pay but it does not relate to the property that one owns in a municipality. And how would you propose, Mr. Chairman, if a gentleman is a travelling salesman? He earns his revenue all over the Province, which municipality should he pay it in the one that he lives in or the one that he works in? How about the business, Mr. Chairman, the business chain that is all around the Province in various municipalities, where shall they pay taxes? Where their head office is, is that what you are suggesting or in the municipality where they actually have and operate their business and raise their funding? And how would you do it, Mr. Chairman? Are you saying that 309 municipalities in this Province should have the same tax rate, is that what you are saying? Equal tax rate right across the Province so that we can say that your income tax shall be increased by one per cent or two per cent which shall represent your municipal tax, is that what you are saying? Mr. Chairman, the needs of municipalities across this Province vary greatly; some municipalities can survive on a two mil tax rate and some need a ten mil tax rate depending on the level of service and the cost of servicing in that municipality. So it would be totally impossible to implement an income tax system. So what we are talking about here is the type of tax, of municipal tax that is used far and wide in Canada and North America based on the real property value which is as fairly as we can come to a tax which puts the burden on those, first of all, who can afford to pay and it is based upon the property in the municipality. In other words, those who have property should bear the proportion of the tax base as their property bears to the total value in the municipality.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all we are talking about. It is only another way of raising the same amount of money. The hon. gentlemen opposite would like to represent it as a means of raising all kinds of new money, that taxes are going to triple and quadruple and multiply by ten, well, that is utter nonsense, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case and point. The fact is that the

MR. W. WINDSOR: municipality levies the tax rate, they will decide what the tax rate will be because they know how much money they need to raise locally to provide the services that are required and demanded by the people in that community and that is all it means, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (JAIRD) The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment as a member from a district that gets very little from this government in the form of municipal services, I have to support this amendment.

MR. THOMS: Ask him (Inaudible)

MR. G. WARREN: I have several questions. In fact, that is the first one that I have on my list. As the minister was so good, as to read out the list for my colleague for St. Barbe, would he be kind enough to read out the list of the municipal services that this government has provided for communities in my district. I believe, the list would be much, much smaller and without the federal/provincial agreement and the good graces of the former Liberal administration in Ottawa, my district, in particular, would not have very much.

Mr. Chairman, the minister did say a few moments ago that it is not the government it is the municipality that imposes the tax. Mr. Chairman, section 112 says that, "Where there is no poll tax, a minimum of \$20 must be paid". Mr. Chairman, that is not the municipalities doing that, that is the government in this Act saying that regardless you have to pay a minimum of \$20. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the municipality has any choice whatsoever in the matter.

I want to go through a couple of the communities in my district and ask the minister - I believe, that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has a community in his district also - what will happen to the town of Makkovik that just saw a \$3 million water and sewerage project completed where we have ten to fifteen homes that are owned by the people there, and where we have the rest of the homes owned by the government of this Province?

December 3, 1979

Tape No. 1571

DW - 3

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who is living in them?

MR. G. WARREN:

Who is living in them? People from Makkovik.

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) down there.

MR. G. WARREN:

People from Makkovik, also people working with the government up there as managers and store clerks and so on. These are the people who are living in those homes that are owned by the government.

MR. WARREN:

Now, what I am asking the minister is - I believe I did hear the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) say the other day, 'granted in lieu or taxes', does that mean this provincial government will be financially supporting the community council of Makkovik to keep their water and sewerage system operating in the black or does it mean, on the other hand, that the eight or ten or twelve who own their own homes, who, by the sweat from their own brow got the dollars that went into their homes - they own these homes - does that mean that they will have to pay the taxes for all? Mr. Chairman, in this act it does say that the provincial government is not required to pay taxes, the federal government is not required to pay taxes, the churches are exempt, the hospitals are exempt. I am just looking at Makkovik in general, Mr. Chairman. If we take the hospital and the provincial government and the churches out of the town of Makkovik we have very little tax base there to support a \$3 million water and sewerage project.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on further and mention about Davis Inlet that is presently in the process of having a water and sewerage project, probably in the halfway stages. Now, here we have the complete extreme. There is not one home there that belongs to a private individual. There is not one building there that belongs to a private individual. Every building, every home belongs to the provincial government. The business there is belonging to the provincial government. The churches have several buildings but they are exempt. And the only building there that probably could come under this tax base would be Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Does that mean that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will pay a tax sufficient to maintain the water and sewerage in Davis Inlet?

Mr. Chairman, I can go through each one of the communities because as you know the communities in my district are designated under the federal provincial agreement wherein the Inuit communities are sixty-six and two-thirds per cent and the Indian communities are ninety per cent paid by the federal government. Am I left to believe that, as my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said

MR. WARREN:

earlier and my colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) said earlier, if we get water and sewerage into the communities regardless of by what means we get them, this government is going to bring in a section in the act saying that the council may impose an annual tax and further on say, regardless of no poll tax, you have to collect a minimum of twenty dollars? Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit leery about this real property tax. I believe it was expressed by colleagues of mine, and I believe members on the opposite side of the House are genuinely concerned about this particular section, because they know that a new community such as Bay L'Argent cannot feasibly - there are some homes down there probably that are worth \$30,000 and \$40,000 and \$50,000 and even at a 2 mil rate you are talking about seventy and eighty and ninety dollars property tax. This is unreal, Mr. Chairman, for our minister who, up until June 18th, along with thirty-three others, and probably we should say fifty-two others, said there will be no taxes. Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with my colleagues that regardless which way you look at it it is a tax. It is a backdoor tax and a tax that is going to be imposed on the residents in many municipalities throughout this Province.

MR. WARREN: I have to agree with a telegram that came out from the town council of Makkovik and it says -

MR. NEARY: Another telegram?

MR. WARREN: - that 'We are quite in favour of your concerns'. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the community council down in Bonavista, where the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) is from -

MR. MORGAN: The people in Bonavista (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: - is just as concerned also. Probably the reason they are not replying, Mr. Chairman, is -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) and they told me so (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I would say there are many, many more telegrams that are going to come in and probably also from Bonavista South showing -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: - that people are concerned about this amendment and about this tax. Mr. Chairman, what will happen in Bonavista South, if the Minister of Lands and Forests acted with the people as he has been acting with the cattle? Mr. Chairman, this telegram from Makkovik which is signed by the chairman of the Makkovik Council, says - "We are in favour of your concern." Mr. Chairman, if we are concerned we try to express it in the best democratic way possible, and that is through this honourable House. Now, the last two or three days we have been trying to express that concern. We are expressing that concern because we are afraid that the government is pushing through this act, and a section under this act that they are pushing through and ramming down through the throats of Newfoundlanders and they are not aware of it.

MR. MORGAN:
(inaudible) Nain.

Twenty-six replies you have so far

MR. NEARY:
in Bonavista.

Go down boy and feed the cattle down

MR. WARREN:
that twenty-six community councils in this Province care, and that is more than the Minister does.

Mr. Chairman, twenty-six replies means

MR. MORGAN:
the telephone.

Out of twenty-six eight were calls on

MR. WARREN:
town councils in this Province replied, as I said earlier, that means that there are twenty-six town councils in this Province that are concerned about what this government is doing to those councils. If they have interest enough to reply to a telegram that was sent outlining parts of this act that we think are not fair to them, why should they not express concerns? And Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if we keep this bill going for another day or two we will have more telegrams, because people are beginning to get more aware of it. This is where our news media needs to get more involved. There are places in this Province, Mr. Chairman, that do not have radio, do not have television, do not receive the news papers.

Mr. Chairman, if there were twenty-six

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:
find out? The minister has not sent these copies out to anybody. These copies have not gone to all municipalities, so how are they going to find out if the members in this House do not speak up for them? Mr. Chairman, no one, not one council in my district has received a copy of this act

How are these town councils going to

MR. MORGAN:

It was given to the members

MR. WARREN:

I agree. I have asked the minister.

He has none. I have asked the minister. He does not have any. If the Minister of Lands and Forests has extra ones I will have them.

MR. MORGAN:

Use a photostat machine.

MR. WARREN:

If you have extra ones I will have them.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard nonsense before but the Minister of Lands and Forests is so crazy that he needs a hat on with a hole in it where it will come down around his ears.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, just in Labrador the weekend, I heard the President of the Municipalities Federation -

MR. WINDSOR: Tell us what he said now.

MR. WARREN: Yes Sir, I am going to tell you exactly what he said. He said, I will not officially quote him, but he said that we are in support, in principle, of this bill, right. He said we are in support, in principle of this bill, however, there are parts of this bill we do not like and we will talk to the minister about it. Now, that is what he said. And that is exactly what I am saying now.

MR. NEARY: Vice-president of the federation.

MR. WARREN: No, the president. The president.

MR. WINDSOR: The president?

MR. WARREN: Yes, the president of the federation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us what he said now.

MR. WARREN: He said that there are parts of this bill that we have talked to the minister about. There are parts of this bill that we are concerned about.

MR. BARRY: The greatest Minister of Municipal Affairs we have had, ever.

AN HON. MEMBER: You notice Jerry Dinn is not saying anything.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, we are not against this bill completely, we are for this bill

MR. WARREN: bill in principle, but there are parts of this bill that we are against, and this is what we have picked out so far as part of this bill. I believe that it is high time for us to have a new municipal act in this Province, because the other one was outdated and had used up its usefulness, but we need something that is going to be satisfying to the 309 that are registered in this Province. Mr. Chairman, the greatest concern I see is that in the smaller communities, if this act goes in as it is now stated, what is going to happen is we are going to have problems. The Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing is going to have problems when the next municipal election rolls around, to have enough people in those communities offering themselves for election. Mr. Chairman, it might be okay in the big places like St. John's, Mount Pearl, Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and so on, but how about the smaller places with 400 and 500 people? Mr. Chairman, when the municipal election is called, the first thing they are going to say - in a small place, probably like McCallum on the Southwest coast - you know, a man runs for election on the council - "What am I going to do? I am on the council, a member of the council. I am imposing taxes on the poor guys who are just now making ends meet - imposing taxes on them." Mr. Chairman, you know, it is okay for the bigger communities, but I have a funny feeling that in the smaller communities the people are going to think the second time before they offer themselves for municipal election, because, naturally, in the smaller communities everybody are much, much greater friends than they are down on Prescott Street in St. John's.

MR. YOUNG: You do not have friends here, do you (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: I have friends everywhere, Sir, more than the Minister of Public Works can say.

MR. NEARY: You do not have many friends left in Island Cove.

MR. WARREN: You burned them all. Yes, I figured that, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, Sections 109 and 110 are imposing a burden on the public lives of people in the smaller communities. You are not giving them as much leeway as you had, probably, to get involved in public life, because first thing we are bound by is our neighbours and our friends - automatically they are saying, "There you are on council and you are bringing in the Municipal Tax Act". The reason we are bringing it in is because the minister has made it so obvious by putting in the act and saying, "You may impose it".

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say again that I am definitely in support of the amendment to this act. I would like to see it deleted from the act altogether and leave it up the councils how to raise their taxes. If the councils have been given a mandate, the councillors have been given a mandate by the people of a particular community, if the council has the backing of the people by being elected as councillors, surely goodness the minister should see fit to say, "Well, boys, you have the backing from the people, you have the backing from us, so you fellows come up with your own tax scheme and we will support it in any satisfactory manner". I think that Sections 109 and 110 definitely should be deleted and leave it up to the discretion of the councils and the councillors in the communities on what taxes and how are they going to raise the revenue for their community councils.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to stop now. I am sure there are other people from this side of the House, maybe, who will be talking at great length on part of this act, but I think we have said what we need to say on Section 109 and 110, and we would like to see it deleted from the act.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. BAIRD): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I can only say to my hon. colleague who just took his seat, Sir, well spoken. The hon. gentleman made some very interesting and valid points in connection with the native communities in Northern Labrador. Mr. Chairman, the remarks made by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) were certainly more intelligent than the rebuttal given by the Minister of Municipal Affairs who was very weak in his stand, in his position on this bill, on these two sections of the bill. The hon. gentleman, Sir, seemed to take great pride, and he has a big book in front of him with a hard cover on it with a list of all the grants and all the subsidies that were given to various municipalities in the last seven years, as if that was justification for ramming this dictatorial piece of legislation through the House. The hon. gentleman gets up, flings at my hon. friend from St. Barbe South a whole list of grants that were given to Port Saunders. Well, I would say, so what? That is precisely the point that we were making. What the hon. gentleman is admitting now is that because of all these grants, because the government for the last thirty years, since Confederation, has been putting in water and sewerage and services and trying to bring the people up to modern, everyday living, get rid of the outdoor toilets, the hon. gentleman is saying, because we did that that gives us the right to come into the House and ram through a bill that makes it mandatory to impose a property tax. If the hon. minister feels that there should be a property tax then the government, the party that he represents, should have adopted it as their philosophy, as their ideology and should have had the courage to say to the municipalities when they came into the minister's office, look this particular party, the Tory Party, the party of big business, the party of the rich, this party of the wealthy, this party of the rich people, this party that speaks for the big oil companies and the multi-national fish companies - that is all they know about - this party, what we stand for, if you want your water and sewerage -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman should have the courage and the intestinal fortitude to say it to the mayors -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR: I went up to gander (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, but Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what I am saying, that the hon. gentleman said it but now the hon. gentleman is using the Legislature and trying to suck in members on both sides of the House to prop him up. Having said it, the hon. gentleman should have gone down in his office and waited for the town councils to come in and then the hon. gentleman should have said, look, as a part of the Tory philosophy, as a part of the Tory ideology, as a representative of the party that represents big business and the big oil companies and the big multi-national fish companies, that we have to say to you that you will not get your water and sewerage unless you are prepared to go back and recommend a property tax to your people. Now, that would have been the manly thing to do.

MR. MORGAN: What about the Liberal policy?

MR. NEARY: The Liberal policy, Sir, was to wipe out regional disparity in this Province, to write it out, wipe it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Pork barrelling (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman knows all about pork barrelling after this round of Canada Works Projects that I raised during the Oral Question Period today. And the member for Bonavista (Mr. Morgan) knows all about pork barrelling when it comes to Canada Works. The hon. gentleman was one of the biggest culprits. So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman would have been well within his rights if he had followed through by making these speeches in Gander that he is talking about and then saying, okay, I am prepared to go in my office now and suffer the consequences. But no, the hon. gentleman did not have the courage to back up what he said. He is trying to use this Legislature to do it, to make a law. If the hon. gentleman - we do not subscribe to this law as a Party, as a Liberal Party, we

MR. NEARY: do not subscribe to this law. That is not saying that we do not agree with town councils getting more revenue, with town councils getting more revenue, with town councils imposing a property tax or a poll tax. That does not necessarily mean that we are opposed to that. If they want to do it, God bless them, more power to them.

MR. THOMS: Go get your skidoo, boy, and we will pick the (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, why does the hon. gentleman not go out, Sir, and count - why does the hon. gentleman not go out -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) the language first.

MR. NEARY: - why does the hon. gentleman not go out and count the spruce budworms in this Province? Why does the hon. gentleman not go out, Mr. Chairman, and count the spruce budworms? He has starving cattle in Bonavista -

AN HON. MEMBER: Repetition, repetition.

MR. THOMS: Repetition (inaudible) tell you did not repeat yourself.

MR. R. MOORES: That is the first rule of education.

MR. NEARY: Right, Sir, my hon. friend who is an educator and an academic says that this the first rule of education, repetition, and that is the only way we are going to educate the crowd up over our shoulder, and I do not hold her up. Everything is gone to bed, as they say in the business, we have put the press to bed at five o'clock. So, I am not worried, Mr. Chairman. I am doing my job in this House, and I am not worried if they put their little stories to bed at five o'clock and they all rush down after the Oral Question period and go over and beckon the ministers and send in their little notes to ministers and take them upstairs and give them little interviews, and that is the coverage of the House for the day, 25, 30 seconds. The Liberal philosophy is, Sir, the Liberal philosophy -

MR. THOMS: You do not force it down their throats.

MR. NEARY: That is right, that is right.

The Liberal philosophy, Sir, Mr. Chairman, was to try to -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) do your (inaudible) course and get your French down there and go and evict your Quebecers and shut-up. You are in Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There is no harm to say, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier is not in his seat, when the cat is away the mouse will play, the hon. gentleman who is a source of embarrassment, a source of embarrassment to the Premier. There are two people on that side of the House, two ministers, that the Premier would like to get rid of, two hangovers from the Moores' administration. The hon. gentleman is one, and the hon. Premier is hoping that the Public Accounts Committee will get rid of the hon. gentleman. You should have heard - it is unparliamentary - I could not repeat in the House what the Premier's reaction when somebody said to him, "I see your Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is in trouble with the Public Accounts Committee", and the Premier is alleged to have said -

MR. MORGAN: Alleged to have said.

MR. NEARY: - alleged to have said a four-letter word that I cannot quote in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try.

MR. NEARY: Him, him - something him. I will leave it to the hon. gentleman's imagination. If he is in trouble, he is in trouble. Now, the hon. Minister of Manpower -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) six o'clock, we will be here tonight.

MR. NEARY: Well, I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three o'clock.

VOL. 1

NO. 42

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1979

QUESTION # 54

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Number of dentists prosecuted for making false and fraudulent claims under the Children's Dental Care Program for the years 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979 to date.
- (b) Total amount for which fraudulent or false claims were made for the years 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979 to date.
- (c) Amount recovered from dentists who submitted false returns to the Children's Dental Care Program for said years.
- (d) What legal action has been taken against dentists for false claims and/or overcharging under the Children's Dental Care Program?

ANSWERS:

- (a) From 1974 to date, two dentists have been prosecuted for making false and fraudulent claims under the Children's Dental Care Program.
- (b) Total amount involved was \$1,937.73
- (c) Amount recovered - \$1,670.00
- (d) In both cases the Department of Justice conducted investigations resulting in subsequent court action.

One dentist pleaded guilty; was given a conditional discharge; placed on probation for one year and ordered to make restitution in the amount of \$1,670.00

The second dentist was convicted as charged; fined \$500.00 and placed on probation for 6 months.

Question #6 (July 18, 1979)

MR. HEARY (LAPOILE) to ask the Honorable the Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What action, if any, did the Government take on the Annual Auditor's Report to the shareholders of Labrador Linerboard Limited in 1977 and 1978 that the financial statements audited by the chartered accounting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell Company did not present fairly the financial position of the company as at March 31st for these years.

Answer:

Generally, the financial statements of all companies are prepared and reported upon by auditors based upon historical costs for assets purchased and debts incurred and upon the assumption that the company is a "going concern", that is, it is in operation. If a company has ceased operations its financial statements should be prepared on a basis to show the fair market or liquidation value of its assets.

In the event that a company has ceased operations but continues to prepare its financial statements as if it was a "going concern" the auditors' are required by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants to qualify their audit report in that the financial statements "do not present fairly the financial position of the company".

In the case of Labrador Linerboard Limited (LLL), as a result of the discontinuation of the wood harvesting operations in the 1977 and 1978 financial years and the subsequent closure of the mill, LLL was no longer a "going concern". Accordingly LLL's assets in its financial statements should have been shown not at their historical costs but at their fair market or liquidation values. Instead, however, due to the practical problems involved in determining these liquidation values and due to the uncertainty as to the best method of disposal of these assets the financial statements were prepared on a historical cost basis as they had been in previous years while LLL was a "going concern".

Accordingly LLL's auditors, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell Company, were required to include in their audit report a "going concern qualification". Such a qualification did not require any action by Government.