

VOL. 1

NO. 31

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1979

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), I would like to ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) whether or not it has been determined yet whether or not the patient in the alleged incident in Waterford Hospital was a ward of the Justice Department or referred to the Waterford Hospital by the courts?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Justice gave the undertaking to the hon. member yesterday to get this information. I had meant to check with the Deputy Minister of Justice on my way in this morning but I was delayed in other matters. However, I shall, hopefully before Question Period ends, and I shall get the information to the hon. member.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Yesterday the Minister of Justice advised the House that this particular psychiatrist had not made any further treatments of inmates at the penitentiary. My question to the President of the Council is whether or not this psychiatrist has been suspended from practicing at the penitentiary?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Again, Mr. Speaker, I shall take notice of that and give the hon. member a response before the Question Period ends or as soon as I get an opportunity to talk with the deputy.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary or a new question which I would like to direct to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Yesterday in the House the minister stated that this incident would be investigated by the Newfoundland Medical Board and the Hospital Board. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Waterford Hospital is a public institution, and in view of the fact that an incident such as this causes great concern to everybody in the Province who may at some time or other have somebody in the hospital, does the minister agree that an outside independent inquiry should be held in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I discussed this last night, I might say unofficially, with the Administrator at the Hospital and the Hospital Board Chairman. I do not think at this particular point in time, and I discussed it with my officials also, that it warrants an outside group to look at it. And I want to more or less point out that if I think there was a reference yesterday that there was sort of a cover-up. I do not think that they would have gone with an investigation, or they would have suspended the person's privileges if they had not been going to give a good review of the situation.

MR. HOUSE: I think we should wait until we see the results, the outcome of the particular investigation that is going on now.

MR. THOMS: Would you like to table that?

MR. HOUSE: I will have to take that under advisement.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, so we are not going to see them.

MR. HOUSE: I want to also make reference to the fact that the hon. member asked yesterday if the patient was injured, He was not, according to the information I got yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Would the minister tell us what the current state of negotiations is between his department and prospective operators of the former Rayo sawmill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the negotiations, if you would call them negotiations, the discussions are taking place between the Department of Industrial Development, primarily involving the Industrial Development Corporation and people who have made submissions in connection with the re-opening of the Rayo mill. What we have done in the Department of Forestry is we have met with the people who have put forward these proposals to determine the adequate wood supplies if the mill is re-opened and also to get a clear picture of their proposals. We arranged this Monday past in fact, Monday afternoon, for one of the companies making a proposal to meet with the officials from the Industrial Development Department and from the corporation and including the officials from the Department of Forestry, that meeting occurred on Monday afternoon and I understand that proposal is being scrutinized and analyzed now by the officials of the Industrial Development Corporation and it is a possibility it may be accepted, but it is not our decision to make. It is the decision of the corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Would the minister indicate the state of the burnt wood, the wood that was burnt in last Summer's forest fire? Have they had a chance to assess that? How much is involved? And can it be salvaged?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a survey carried out since the fire and fortunately most of the wood that was destroyed or damaged by fire was the wood that was already damaged by the budworm. There is a substantial amount of good timber left in the same area, the same general burnt over area, which can be used for sawmilling purposes. So we will be assigning that wood supply that is not damaged to the mills in the area and of course that would include the Rayo sawmill.

MR. STIRLING: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Would the minister on behalf of the government give a commitment, because there is a great deal of

Mr. Stirling: concern and a recurring rumour about the imminent dismantling of that mill, would the minister give a commitment to relieve the anxieties in the area that there is now no intention of dismantling the mill and that there will be, for sure, no thought of dismantling the mill until all other avenues are looked at and, in fact, that there will be no thought of dismantling it at any point before 1982? Could the minister give that commitment?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forest.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I can give that commitment, but I know that shortly after hearing a public statement from the Chairman of the Development Corporation to the effect that they were planning to dismantle the mill, that it was then that I arranged a meeting between the Corporation and the people who had already made submissions, to make sure the submissions were fully understood by the Corporation.

And I will say, as a result of the meetings that took place this present week, that the dismantling of that mill will be the last resort.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: My question is for the Premier. He will recall, I am sure, that before the House adjourned in the Summer he undertook to bring us up to date with respect to the situation as it existed affecting the contract of the head of the then existing, now defunct, Action Group. We have heard nothing since; that was a number of months ago, of course. Could the Premier, perhaps, bring the House up to date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle's preamble is not totally correct. I think the people of Newfoundland have heard since the House closed about what government was doing on the matter. So I do not think it is totally correct to say that nobody has heard anything since the House closed as it related to this matter on the status of that, because on a number of occasions - the member for the Strait of Belle Isle might have been out of the Province -

MR. ROBERTS: That is possible.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - or on other business or something and he might not have heard some of the news reports which reported upon the status of it. So it might not be totally accurate to make that kind of a statement.

The negotiations are still ongoing on the matter with the head of the Action Group, and, hopefully, within the next few days or a week or so I will be able to give a full and definitive report on those negotiations.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there are obviously a number of supplementaries, a number which has increased by the very vagueness of the Premier's answer. First of all, let me thank him for correcting my inaccuracy; you know, I am suitably grateful to him. I wonder if the Premier could tell us, please, how much has been paid by the public to the head of the Action Group since the Action Group was disbanded?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have the exact figure, but whatever the monthly payments are that were due under the contract have been, of course, paid. But several meetings have been held with the head of the Action Group and his lawyers, and with government, and members of the Department of Justice, and those negotiations are ongoing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you his lawyer?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker - no I am not his lawyer.

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: A final supplementary, if I might, Your Honour, So the gentleman has been getting his previously existing rate of pay. Could the Premier tell us what duties, if any, the head of the Action Group has

MR. ROBERTS: been carrying out in return for receiving his salary at the existing rate of pay since the Action Group was disbanded, I gather it was about the time of the Budget, which was in July. That is the time it was announced. What has he been doing the last four or five months?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Once again, I must correct the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) because I do not think he is totally accurate. For the purposes of his question it makes it somewhat more dramatic, somewhat more blatant to indicate things which are not exactly accurate. What is that it took some time for the Action Group to wind down and in a number of activities that the Action Group were involved in it was phased out over a period of time and did not actually disband, bang! the day after the Budget. A number of the individuals were brought back to the original departments from whence they came, so it did not happen overnight as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) would have us believe. The head of the Action Group was involved in the phase-down operations of the Action Group because there were a number of matters outstanding which had to be transferred to the Department of Forestry, which had to be transferred to the Department of Rural Development and the Department of Fisheries. They were the three main departments involved. The whole question of applications to the Loan Board or the Rural Development Board or whatever, it took some time for that to be phased down.

We have been discussing with the head of the Action Group other activities that the gentleman could get involved in in the meantime, but nothing has been resolved on that so he has been just winding down, paying the final bills. I do not think the final bills were all in when we did up the Budget, for example, and we put a figure there. So the coming Budget might reflect additional funds that had to be paid for rent at the place, to people who were on staff and so on, whom we could not phase down over a couple of weeks. So there were some funds spent over and above

PREMIER PECKFORD: what was predicted to be spent in order for the phase-down to take place. Mr. Cole was involved in the phasing down of the Action Group in the last number of months.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Spruce budworm, Sir. We are told, Mr. Speaker, that the minister had advice not to proceed with last year's spraying programme, that it would be useless and futile to proceed with the programme because of the late delivery of the spraying materials. Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not the spray programme last year had any effect at all or was it just a waste of the taxpayers money?

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the Minister responsible for the budworm.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: last year's spray programme was carried out as an experiment in conjunction with the same type of experiment carried out in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and the State of Maine.

We carried it out in our Province as members of the Eastern Budworm Council, consisting of representation from the places I just mentioned.

Because of the lateness in arriving because of the truckers' strike in the States and because of bad weather conditions, it was the intention to have two spray applications. We only carried out one spray application, and upon the advice of the officials, the second spray application did not occur.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, I gather then from the hon. minister's answer that the information that we have is correct, that the spray programme was completely ineffective, did nothing except cost the taxpayers money. Was it a failure? That is what I am asking the hon. gentleman. That new spray programme, that experiment, was it a failure and how much did it cost the taxpayers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish that we did have control over certain conditions over which we do not have control and that is weather conditions. I mentioned the lateness of arrival because of the truckers' strike but after it arrived and after the first application was carried out, we had some very severe weather conditions, wet weather conditions, in that time, in the month of June. I think we all recall that - we were out campaigning, looking for votes, all of us in the House here. We had some very wet conditions. Because of the weather conditions, that was the main reason for the second application not being carried out, and we had no control over the weather conditions.

MR. MORGAN: In connection with the cost factor, the cost of spraying 15,000 acres was approximately \$100,000. I do not have the figure off the top of my head here, but that is one of the reasons, as minister, upon reviewing the assessment of the spray application, influenced my decision in saying that using Bt in spraying in the Province is not the answer to any large scale spray programme because of the high cost factor. It cost approximately \$8.50 per acre to spray. This meant, in this case, almost ten times as much as using a chemical spray, and therefore it is not feasible or economical to carry out any large scale spray programme using Bt. That is the reason why I said that the answer to any large scale spray programme is not using Bt, and I think my decision in that regard will be also ratified by the Eastern Budworm Council, consisting of the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and the State of Maine, because I am of the opinion their conclusion is basically the same.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answers given by the minister, there must be then a substantial amount of Bt chemical on hand. How much do we have? How much of the Bt spray material do we have on hand? What is the dollar value of it? How much Matacil do we have on hand at the present time? What is the dollar value of that? Where is it stored? And would the minister tell us, this is a three prong question, what programme he intends to carry out next year, in the coming year, to deal with the spruce budworm which is still a major problem in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member has asked, I believe, about six questions there in that one question. It might be the type of question more appropriately placed on the Order Paper. I think there were about six questions placed and this would not be the appropriate time to ask that number of questions, during Question Period. If you would like to ask one specific question?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how much spray material is now on hand, where it is stored and the dollar value of the Matacil and the Bt spray material that is on hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer the questions, all of them if possible, if not, any information I overlook I will inform the House on the next sitting.

We do have Matacil, which is a chemical. Bt is not a chemical. The hon. gentleman referred to it as the Bt chemical. Bt is not a chemical, matacil is. Matacil is being stored. What was not used this year and left over from the spray programme of 1978, is stored, adequately stored, and secured on a site in the Stephenville area. And I mentioned some time ago, I do not think it is in the best interest of the general public to make known where it is stored but it is adequately secured and stored in the Stephenville area.

MR. J. MORGAN:

In the meantime, we are attempting to sell that Matacil, and we have been doing that for the past number of months now, to potential buyers. Potential buyers, of course, are limited because there are only those provinces which are going to use the Matacil next year in a spray programme that would be potential buyers.

What we intend

to do in connection with the budworm situation in the Province today, on Monday coming the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet will be totally briefed by the researchers and scientists who did the work this summer. They are employees of the federal Department of Forestry, the Canadian Forestry Service. They will give a total briefing, a detailed briefing to the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet on the present situation that is in conjunction with the report already received from the same people, and then the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet will be briefing or submitting the details to Cabinet and then Cabinet will decide what action they will take in the future. But in connection with the matters

MR. MORGAN: on the first part of the question, how much Bt is on hand, if any, and the cost of that material, I cannot answer that question right now but I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. I do not know if the Premier has had a chance yet to be briefed on happenings last night in Roddickton because I know he was out of the city on other business, but for his information I understand that the Town Council of Roddickton has sent a very urgent request to the Premier requesting that a commission of enquiry be established in an effort to determine why, despite the fact that the area is very richly blessed with forestry resources, the employment situation is so desperate and so unstable in that town as it is. So I would like to ask the Premier if he could tell me whether or not he will look sympathetically on that request and whether the government intends to see to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will ask the Minister of Lands and Forests, who is familiar with the problem, to respond.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is he familiar with the telegram?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the situation in Roddickton is that-I am completely at a loss as the minister responsible for forestry to understand what is happening in regard to the complaints Based on the following facts.

AN HON. MEMBER: We know that and that is -

MR. MORGAN: At a meeting with the council in Roddickton no longer than a month ago, approximately a month ago, we outlined to them, when I say we, the Department of Forestry, steps being taken, and which have now been taken by the department, to overcome on a short-term basis the employment situation in the area and the action being taken is as follows: We

MR. MORGAN: have arranged for the export of 22,000 cords of pulp wood from the area, from that area of Main Brook - Roddickton, by means of 15,000 cords going to Henderson and Company of Montreal and 7,000 cords to Trans Trade of Montreal, through Canada Bay Lumber. The 15,000 cords to Henderson and Company are through means of cutting permits issued to Mr. Leander Pilgrim in Roddickton, Mr. Booth Reid, a Mr. Coates -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - and to Canada Bay.

These are permits issued, and when we issued these permits in the area to these people to cut this wood it would have meant, if the permits were now being utilized and used, the employment of more than 100 people, approximately 100 to 150 people in the area. And when the permits were applied for and were issued, we were not of the opinion then that there was any problem with regard to the permit holders having difficulty arranging finances to get the men in the woods. That is the short-term.

On the long-term, this government is now carrying out and will be carrying out- we have called tenders for a detailed feasibility study to be carried out on the Great Northern Peninsula on the possibility of establishing a thermo-mechanical pulp plant, a waifer board mill or some kind of a mill to utilize the wood, like maybe a tissue manufacturing plant,

MR. J. MORGAN: any kind of an industry that will utilize the existing wood supply. These tenders have been called, we received thirteen submissions on the tenders, tenders will be awarded in the next number of days and, hopefully, the result of that study will show sufficient evidence to warrant the attraction of industry to go to that area and to establish some long-term benefits for the area by means of employment. Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is simply this: in the short-term we have taken action and we are also taking action for the long-term for the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. member for Baie Verte -White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel whatsoever with a single word that the minister has said and I do not think I have ever given any indication that I did. I know that those things have been done but there is still, obviously, a problem and the town council assembled in public meeting last night does not know what the problems are and does not know how to find out the answers. All the things the minister has said are true; yes, the crisis, the economic situation is still prevalent in that community. So I still go back to the original question; the duly elected representatives of the town have requested assistance from the government to put in place a commission of inquiry of some sort to determine why the things that the minister referred to, and everything else that has been happening with the economy of Roddickton over the last couple of years, why it is not working out? Now I ask the minister again, since he is speaking for the government, will the government be sympathetic to that request and can we expect to hear news in that regard shortly?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess the government will be just as sympathetic to the request received in that regard as the Leader of the Opposition would be to the request to have the hon. gentleman removed from the area, which is a very similiar request that came in two days ago from the same people in the same area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: I sincerely hope that the Leader of the Opposition will not comply with that request. I think the hon. gentleman is doing a fine job for his district and I say it sincerely.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including the people of Roddickton, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: However, the request, I assume, has been received by the Premier's office, I am sure the Premier will be referring it on to the departments concerned and if our department is involved I will be more than pleased to meet with the council again for the second time in a period of a month-and-a-half and to meet with the committee. I understand that what is happening in Roddickton, and the hon. gentleman can correct me, is that there seems to be two factions; one faction is the council, and then there is a committee established by a public meeting and there seems to be a difference of opinion between the two groups. However, I will be only too pleased as the minister responsible for forestry, which is a big resource in that area, to meet with the council or any group who wants a meeting with me or the officials of the Department of Lands and Forests.

November 15, 1979

Tape No. 1127

PK1

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS)

A final -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would just like to respond to

the hon. member -

MR. NEARY:

What response?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

One of the problems that we have-

I have the telegram here now and I have just seen it a few minutes ago.

MR. NEARY:

Is this in order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. NEARY:

By leave? I am not prepared to

grant leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the hon. member for LaPoile

(Mr. Neary) wants' to interfere with information that I want to give to his colleague, well then he is at liberty so to do.

MR. NEARY:

No, I thought you were going to

procrastinate and talk about oil.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!. Order please!

I understood from the hon. member for Baie Verte-White bay that there was leave to hear the Premier's response.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have some difficulty, as the hon.

member realizes. Two days ago we did get a telegram, a copy of a telegram that was sent to the Leader of the Opposition concerning the hon. member. And now we have another telegram from the same area, I do not think it is from the same group.

MR. ROBERTS:

This one is from the Council.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This one is from the Council. Well,

I can read. And if the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) If he would just remain silent, I will respond in the way that I see fit, and I do not need any assistance from the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

There is no oil - (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And so therefore we have to be sure, because as the Minister of Lands and Forest says, and I think most of us here in this House believe, that the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is doing a good job. We do not therefore consider the validity of the copy of the telegram

that we got a couple of days ago to be all that strong. At the same time, we have another telegram from the people of Roddickton saying something else, and asking for an inquiry: so we have to investigate to ensure just who is speaking for whom in Roddickton. And to ensure that when we respond, we are responding responsibly, and legitimately, because there are different factions, as the minister just mentioned, and we want to be sure before we take any action or respond to them that we are dealing with the majority of the people in the Roddickton area. And as the minister has already said, we are trying our darrest to take action there to alleviate a very difficult situation.

But the municipal politics or whatever of the area is somewhat confusing at the present moment because of the differences in the interpretation one can put into the various telegrams that are coming to our attention.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

A final supplementary. We have time for only one final supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

By leave? By leave?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not a bit concerned about any telegrams requesting resignations or anything of that nature. I have twice now, and I will do again, put my head on the line in the ballot box, which is what we are all accustomed to in this House. However, I want to ask the Premier, in view of the answer that he just gave me, whether or not the Premier is actually saying to the House that the government has to go about weighing

MR. RIDEOUT: or investigating the authenticity of the duly elected council; contrary to that, the authenticity of a nonelected, concerned citizens committee. It seems to me that one is an legitimate community force that the government ought to have no problems responding to, and the other one, if the government wants to find out whether it is authentic or not, that is up to itself. But certainly this request from the duly elected, legitimate representatives of the community, there should be no need, I do not think, to have any reason to want an investigation to decide who you respond to. The Premier is not saying that to me, is he?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. member is free to interpret my remarks how he wishes. I will say what I have to say and what I say is what I mean, but if he wants to put some other interpretation on it he may. All I am saying is that there has been a number of different groups; members on the Opposition side from time to time have brought the concerns of citizens groups and action groups before this hon. House in a way as to legitimize the concerns that those so-called action groups and citizens groups have been articulating outside of this House and have therefore given a fair amount of validity and credibility to groups who were not elected under any legislative act of this House to have their existence but who still had a fair amount of power and credibility and were expressing some legitimate concerns of a large group of people in that particular area. So how one determines the criteria for when something is legitimate or illegitimate as it relates to elected or nonelected in a given area is a good question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Order, please! Time

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to the question asked earlier this morning by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms). First of all, I have learned that the patient concerned is in fact a ward of the Department of Justice. Secondly, with respect to the second part of the question - Has the doctor been suspended from the penitentiary? - the answer is that he has not been suspended but the doctor himself has voluntarily withdrawn from the penitentiary pending the completion of the investigation which is ongoing. His patients are being looked after and they have been referred to another psychiatrist by the doctor himself who done this, as I say, voluntarily after consultation with the Department of Justice itself. May I say also in answer to the question - I know the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) will concur and agree with me on this - I think that we have to be careful in connection with this particular matter, that there is an investigation ongoing and there are rights, two separate rights, two or three varying rights to be looked at in this regard. I think that we should be very careful not to prejudice the rights of any particular individual because I know the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) would not wish these to be prejudiced. Suffice it

MR. MARSHALL: to say though that I hope that he has the information he requires and I would suggest that perhaps with the investigation ongoing that future questions, unless they are really necessary, perhaps should wait pending the outcome of the investigation, the result of which, of course, will be made known publicly. But in the meantime I know the hon. member will appreciate it becomes a little bit dicey and a little bit difficult with respect to it because there are rights to be concerned about.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Motion no. 32, first reading of Bill no. 66.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For An Advisory Council On The Status Of Women," carried. (Bill No. 66).

On motion, Bill No. 66 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 32, Bill no. 58.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 32, continuing debate, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Relating To The Establishment And Administration Of Municipal Government In The Province." (Bill No. 58)

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much. Yesterday as we began the debate I indicated that the government could have shown a little more respect for the municipalities involved by agreeing to delay this debate until after the minister had met with the executive of the federation, which I think is scheduled for this afternoon. I heard a news report that indicated that they had no problems as reported by the minister. The minister said they knew all about it. Then I read another new report which gave a different story from the point of view of the federation and I think that actually illustrates the point I was trying to make, that is a question of courtesy to the

MR. STIRLING: councillors, the vast majority of whom serve without any pay, without any monetary gain whatsoever, out of courtesy to those people the minister should have at least waited until after his meeting with them to decide to introduce this bill for second reading.

I would like just to review, Mr. Speaker, the points that I made yesterday bringing me up to the stage where we can look at some of the specifics. First of all, I have asked the minister to tell the truth about the basic purpose behind this act and the consolidation. He says that it was following, basically, the royal commission report. The royal commission told the truth. The royal commission told the truth that in their view many smaller municipalities in Newfoundland were not paying their fair share of the cost of services. They told the truth that in their view we were moving in the direction of having more provincial involvement, more provincial help, and away from having to force municipalities to increase their own taxes. The royal commission told the truth in that. When the minister spoke to the Federation of Municipalities, I suggest to you that he created a false sense amongst the municipalities that now have a property tax, a false sense in that he is introducing an incentive programme that is going to look like a real bonanza for them, a real bonanza for them. For those who have a property tax system now, that there is going to be an incentive grant system of a real bonanza. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should have followed the royal commission report and told the truth about the real purpose behind this act and should people

MR. L. STIRLING:

sort of spell it out in terms

for people to clearly understand and that is, the fact of the matter is, the intention of this act is to force 90 per cent of the municipalities in Newfoundland that do not now have property tax, to force them to implement property tax and the carrot that is held out is the act which was passed a couple of years ago, and the Capital Grants Act.

It is important, during the debate on this very essential bill, this bill which will affect - by very definition, it will affect 85 per cent of the people and has the possibility of affecting the other 15 per cent. And when I say affect, let us call a spade a spade, Under this act the people who are municipal taxpayers will pay more money, municipal taxpayers will pay more money unless the government substantially increases the budget that the minister has to work with. And I think it is important, in summarizing the points I made yesterday, to have the minister introduce into this House before we finish the debate on this bill, his projection of what effect it will have on municipalities if there are no additional funds provided by the government. What would be the effect under the old system? What will be the effect under the new system and to the various alternatives? Because what is not spelled out in this bill, or what is not spelled out in the municipal grant system is that each individual municipality must be looked at by the Cabinet and they will decide, they will decide how much they are going to force the municipality to collect in the way of tax because they are going to decide how much of the subsidy they are going to pay for these large Capital Works projects, the water and sewerage projects and related type projects.

So the minister should table for this House his comparisons of the old system and the new system. Out of courtesy to these municipalities, he also should send that to each municipality to spell it out, to say, based on the government's present thinking, and we are talking in terms of five year programmes. The minister made a very good point yesterday and I would like to

MR. L. STERLING: compliment him on the action that he is taking in getting engineering work underway so that we are not into a hit and miss kind of proposition, we are not into a situation where, come the first of January, nobody knows what is happening. And he has started by forcing municipalities to make five year projections. But if we expect municipalities to make five year projections, surely at this stage the government can make a five year projection for that municipality and for this House as to the amount of money they are going to put into this act. Because if they are not, between these two acts combined, going to put in more money there is only one place for the money to come from and that is, if you are promising to give more incentive grants to the people with property tax, then you must force the 90 per cent of the smaller communities in this Province to increase their taxes and to increase them substantially. So I believe it is important for the minister to get an indication from his colleagues in the same sense as he is requiring municipalities to provide their five year projections, to let municipalities know, based on his conversation with the Cabinet, just where they are going to go over the next five years. Because, otherwise, we are right back to the beginning situation of having each municipality come to the minister and say, "Tell us how much we have got to charge, in your judgement?" Because the minister has made the point, he has made it before the Federation, he has made it here, again, that in many communities there is not any kind of business tax base and the property tax for those communities that now have a good income from property tax, in those communities, a good portion of that income comes from the business tax, from the property tax on business as opposed to business tax itself. So these communities should know where they stand under the old system and under the new system because many of the communities do not have the base. By natural growth, by natural initiative from these municipalities they have

MR. STIRLING: have introduced property tax where it was feasible and sensible and practical, and it is not by coincidence that 90 per cent of these municipalities do not have a property tax. So I believe to sum up the point I made yesterday, the minister should let these municipalities know how this whole thing is going to fit in the money situation.

Now, let us deal with some of the specific points. The minister mentioned yesterday that the only difference between a community council and the town council under this act is the method in which they are elected. Now, I have talked to some community councillors, Mr. Speaker - and I would like to know why the government feels that a community council still has to go through the public meeting stage. All of us here know about the problems of nominating meetings, the people who attend meetings, the people who do not attend meetings and the reluctance of many of the satisfied citizens to attend a public meeting. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should ask the minister, we should ask the government, to consult with the community councils to see if they would not prefer to be elected as we are elected -

Right.

MR. R. MOORES:

MR. STIRLING: - and be elected as the town councils are elected in setting up a proper system. You know, we are talking about community councils that are relatively small. One polling booth for the whole day is not going to either wreck this government or wreck the community council. If, as the minister says, the reason that the government is requiring community councils to be elected by calling a public meeting - the reason for it is that it is costly, then for the small cost involved, this Legislature should pick up the cost of it. Because if you look at what we are trying to do - we are trying to say in this bill that the community councillors in the small communities, or the town councillors, have to go before their own people and be treated in a responsible and respectable manner. Well, the minister has already seen - and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) introduced a petition; we are only six months after an election and there is a petition with 5,000 names on it of people

MR. STIRLING: who have a desire to throw out the council. Now, suppose they force that council to go to a public meeting to get elected. A community council, under this act, may be required to make some very tough decisions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. STIRLING: And as a result of making the tough decisions, they naturally will attract to the public meeting all those who are upset, and in the heat of the moment they may take actions that they will be sorry for afterwards.

So I would strongly urge that the minister consider consulting with the individual members of the community councils all over this Province to find out if they should not be elected in the normal manner, in the secrecy of a ballot box, and let the person go in - rather than have to attend a public meeting, to go in, as we get elected and as town councillors get elected. Let somebody use the ballot box at the convenience of the individual person - no requirement for a public meeting.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point in this act - I know the Federation has made it very strongly, and yet, it goes back in this act. I would like to use Humber West as an example again. Humber West has just had a petition presented to the House signed by a majority of the voters who voted in the municipal election, asking that the council be dismissed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That many Liberals, eh?

MR. NEARY: How many Liberals - 6,000 Liberals

MR. STIRLING: We have had many requests over the last number of years to look at this specific piece of legislation. Under the Municipal Act, as the minister knows, he has the authority to dismiss that council or to dismiss any member of the council.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. STIRLING: And there is no right of appeal. And that has happened in the past, that the government of the day has dismissed a councillor.

MR. STIRLING: There is no right of appeal in this Act and the Federation has requested that this be changed. In this Act there is not even the right of appeal to their own citizens, because if the minister dismisses a councillor or if a minister dismisses a whole Council and there is an election within two years, we have taken away from the individual the right to submit his case to the people who put him there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You mean they defranchise him?

MR. STIRLING: It will not allow the person under this Act to seek election again within two years, if the election comes up within two years, the government has decided under this Act that the individual cannot seek re-election. Now, it is of no interest, none of the business of this government, if we are saying, that we give back to the people from that community the right to set their own budget, to elect their own people.

Now, bear in mind what you have - let us take Humber West as an example. What you have in that situation, a group of people elected a councillor, a group -

AN HON. MEMBER: A dictatorship.

MR. NEARY: You would not know but we are living in Russia.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister when he introduced this, that all of those--and the Present Minister of Health (Mr. House) was on the Federation of Municipalities, as I was, when this debate started on this Urban Region Study. And what we said is let us forget the past, let us forget the old Act, let us forget all of the past and let us try to look at it from the point of view of what is good for the future. And the minister said this, a lot of new things in this bill. And, therefore, I would say, Just because it was in the old bill, just because

Mr. Stirling: we treated people - he mentioned, for example, in the new bill, that we are not going to imprison someone for his debts. Fine, this is in the same rights of an individual, the right of the individual to submit his case, there is no appeal under The Municipal Act. If the minister says tomorrow, let us say Wallace House, when he was a member in Deer Lake Council -

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot use his name.

MR. STIRLING: No, I am using it as an example, Wallace House as an example -

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. HOUSE: You cannot refer to a member by his name.

MR. STIRLING: I am not referring - okay I will accept that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Refer to him as Tom Jones.

MR. STIRLING: Let us say that Tom Jones was a member of the Deer Lake Council. And let us say the minister said to Tom Jones, "That you cannot - I am dismissing you - within two years you have no appeal to this, and you cannot go back to the people of Deer Lake and ask for them to judge whether or not you have been a good councillor." And, I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the government does not agree to change this, the Federation has requested that it be changed, if the government does not agree to change this one item, they are saying that all the rest of it really does not make any difference, because we want to retain for ourselves the right to dismiss and say, within two years you cannot even go back to your people. If you cannot at least make that change, then what is the purpose of the debate? That is obviously a change that should be made.

MR. NEAPY: The next thing they will be doing it with members of the House.

MR. STIRLING: That is right. That is right. It is just as important. I used to be a councillor and as far as I am concerned the rights of a councillor, a community councillor, the rights of any Newfoundlander to submit his case to the people who elected him should be an absolute right. Let the people decide. If he is a scoundrel, then

Mr. Stirling: they do not have to put him in. Let the people decide. Trust the people.

MP. HENRY: The people elect scoundrels as we can see now from the June 18th. election. Rogues and Scoundrels.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there is another section which will be welcomed by old age pensioners. There is a section in which old age pensioners will not have to pay municipal poll tax, the new poll tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, may I have order?

MR. SPEAKER (HAIRD): The member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the old age pensioner is not going to be forced to pay poll tax, depending on the income. If his only income - he is not going to be forced to pay poll tax. However, the government should consider in the same sense as they are now going to pay for social assistance, that in many of these communities in Newfoundland,

MR. STIRLING: many of the residents are old age pensioners who have no other source of income. So it is great for the government to take that responsibility off the hands of the old age pensioners. Great! But is it fair to council, is it fair to the council unless we get back to that point that I made earlier, is it fair to the council unless you give a grant, unless you pay as you are going to pay for the social assistance people? Any time that the government wants to be big about it and say, okay, we are not going to force any class of citizen to pay something he cannot afford to pay, that is great. But the government has an obligation to give that municipality the lost revenue. And I would suggest that the minister consider this when we look at it.

Regional Council. Mr. Speaker, that regional council, that whole section of the act dealing with regional council, in my view, should be removed in its present form because it takes all the responsibility, all the authority of this House of Assembly and passes it over to the Cabinet. Now, when the minister introduced it, when the minister introduced it he said, this is only enabling legislation. I am not against regional council. I am not against Regional Government but I think that the decision is such an important one it should be made by this House of Assembly. Let the government do all their homework. Let us get all the feasibility studies done. Let us do all the consulting but let us bring it back to this House of Assembly because it is an important act and it should be done in this House of Assembly. The minister when he introduced it said, 'Oh, it is just enabling legislation.' Well, do you know what is included in that enabling legislation? Do you know what is included in that enabling legislation that every municipality and the city of St. Johns and the city of Corner Brook should know? What is included in that enabling legislation is that Cabinet can give the authority to a regional council, they can set it up first, they can give the authority to a regional council to take over whatever assets a municipality has and not pay compensation.

MR. STIRLING: That is in this act. That is being slipped through. And, Mr. Speaker, that should not be done. That should not be allowed. This is too important a matter to be left to the Cabinet which appoint all the members to the regional council, do not have to consult -

AN HON. MEMBER: Upon election.

MR. STIRLING: No, appoint it says here. It says 'appoint' in the act. Appoint all the members to the regional council.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it 'Len.?'

MR. STIRLING: Yes. I am not going to use up five minutes of my time. That is the only thing. Will you give me time to look that up?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure. By leave.

MR. STIRLING: Okay.

MR. NEARY: Could I have a few words about LaPoile district, Sir, while I am waiting?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, 313, "Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, by order, designate and change the number or proportion of a regional council that is to be appointed or elected at large or to represent wards." Where there are to be appointed councillors the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such appointments, and such councillors are not required to be eligible to be nominated or elected as a councillor under part V

Now, we can get into a debate about clarifying the act and we can do it when we get to the clause by clause study.

MR. MOORES: And the minister did not even do it.

MR. STIRLING: When we get to the clause by clause study - Mr. Speaker, what I said was -

MR. NEARY: Dictatorship.

MR. STIRLING: - the Cabinet can decide to set up a regional council. The Cabinet can decide to appoint that council.

MR. WINDSOR: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

MR. STIRLING: The Cabinet can then decide -

MR. MOORES: He just read it to you.

MR. STIRLING: The Cabinet can then decide under this act, without coming back to this House of Assembly, to do some stupid things. Now, the Cabinet has done many stupid things in the past without reference to this House of Assembly and I suggest that the House of Assembly should not allow them to make those kinds of errors. And what we have is a situation in which the authority that this House has granted this House if we pass this, will grant the authority to that regional council in their first year, when they are an appointed regional council, to acquire any of the assets of a municipality without compensation.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: An absolutely unacceptable kind of approach.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other points that my colleagues will be bringing up as they get into the detail. I think - how much time do I have?

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. STIRLING: By leave. Oh, well.

In that case, Mr. Speaker, let me go back to this concept again of this act, the concept of the act that says we are now going to give autonomy to the councils. We are now going to let the councils make up their own mind. There is a section in the act which says the councillors can decide whether or not councillors or the mayor should be paid a salary, I think the next section says subject to amounts to be set by the Cabinet, and I think the minister has already said that no such salary range at the present time is available. Is that right?

MR. WINDSOR: Under the existing legislation there is provision for payment of such amounts approved by Cabinet, there were never any amounts approved. Under this act there will be regulations set depending on the very size and financial viability of the community, so that within certain ranges the councils may decide to pay themselves. So there will be guidelines established by regulations.

MR. STIRLING: But they are not established as yet.

MR. WINDSOR: No, but they will be by the time the act - you know very shortly.

MR. STIRLING: Okay, well I think the minister makes the point and I think the government, I think the minister in the first place and the government and obviously the civil service have to get used to the concept of this act which is that you are going to transfer the trust to the people who elect the councillors and you set your own budget. Mr. Speaker, in that context, then, I think that you should go back and make a change in this act, that does not require unanimous consent. In order for councillors to decide to pay themselves, or to pay the mayor, it requires everybody on council to agree. Now, that is completely against everything we know as a democracy. It is like this House of Assembly having

MR. STIRLING: to agree unanimously on anything. And there we are no different. So it has to be 100 per cent.

MR. WINDSOR: To defer the reading of minutes, by unanimous consent -

MR. STIRLING: Pardon.

MR. WINDSOR: It requires unanimous consent of the House.

MR. STIRLING: On salaries?

MR. WINDSOR: No, to defer the reading of minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Unanimous consent in this context that says that it requires it to be 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: By leave. He has leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: He was given leave by -

MR. STIRLING: Five minutes.

MR. NEARY: All right five minutes. Is the House Leader agreed?

MR. STIRLING: Five minutes is satisfactory. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the point.

The point is that we say

MR. STIRLING: to a particular municipality,
"You set your own budget. The minister does not have to say it, you answer to the people who elect you." Now, part of that budget should be to decide whether or not they wish to pay salaries to councillors or mayors, but it requires 100 per cent. So I would suggest that you review this and bring it down to two-thirds as you have everywhere else in it. Why should that salaries question be put up as something to be looked at and that has to have 100 per cent? Nothing else in the budget requires 100 per cent, and there will always be on council somebody wealthy enough that he can make political points by saying, 'Oh, I do not need the money.' Because -

MR. NEARY: He had passed his cheque back one time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: I am just making the point that no one person should be able to hold up any matter on the budget. If we say that we are expecting them to be responsible, do not forget that this council that we are talking about which is going to set up, the budget has to go back to the people who elected them, and if they are satisfied that they are prepared to put their political futures on the line, that should be left to that council. So the 100 per cent point, Mr. Speaker, should be changed.

I will conclude now, Mr. Speaker, with one final point that I do not think has been cleared up to the satisfaction of the municipalities and that is this whole question of taxing people like Newfoundland Light and Power, the million dollar a month boys. There is a request to the minister to sort that out so that people can get - there is provision in the act that business tax be based on gross revenue but it is not very straightforward. It does not indicate that it is based on the gross revenue collected in that area or in that location. And that is the last point that on behalf of the municipalities, I would like to bring to the attention of the government.

All of the points, Mr. Speaker, that I have brought up in the last two days, are points which have been made

MR. STIRLING: to the minister by various members of municipalities from time to time over the last number of years or have been included in resolutions, and in the consultation that I know the minister must now have, I hope that he will call for additional requests for comments from municipalities throughout Newfoundland, of all levels, and that when we get into the clause by clause, I hope that he will have the good news that he has been able to make these amendments to things that may, to this House of Assembly, be relatively minor, but they are very important to the taxpayers in these communities. And in these days, when we seem to be intent on taking a policy that we are going to force people to do things by increasing their costs, it is the same old thinking that said, 'If we drive the price of liquor high enough, people will not buy liquor - drive the price of tobacco high enough and they will not buy tobacco.' I heard the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) on television last night expound that same theory. He lamented the fact that we now no longer fuel our furnaces with coal. And he said it sort of happened and he did not even notice it was happening, that all the coal went out of existence, and that now the poor consumer - the whole problem that we have is caused by this consumer that allowed these things to happen.

This act is taking the same kind of approach to modern municipalities by saying, 'We are going to force you to put in property tax.' And at the same time, in these areas, the people are going to be paying higher and higher fuel costs, higher and higher electrical costs. I suggest that the minister should find out from the communities what their comments are on this bill before it finally passes into law.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. MARSHALL: This is, Mr. Speaker, the most forward piece of legislation affecting municipal government, as a matter of fact, one of the more forward and progressive pieces of legislation that has come before this House in quite some time and I would like to join, not just with the members on this side of the House but with the Mayors and Municipalities Federation of Newfoundland in congratulating the minister on the hard work that he has done and the real incisive understanding of municipal operations in this Province which he has so well evidenced by this act itself.

This act, Mr. Speaker, strengthens local government. It is an act which, to a great degree, brings into effect the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Municipal Government and it will go a long way in this Province in strengthening the arm of local governments in the Province of Newfoundland. and strengthened they need to be. A province or a country or an area cannot function and function effectively within the democratic context unless there are strong local governments.

The history of Newfoundland with respect to its local governments has shown that it has not progressed as quickly as local government in Newfoundland ought to have progressed when you consider the extent and the span of the history of this Province. This observation was made way, way back, many years ago in the Amulree Report in 1930. The Amulree Report has come in for quite a bit of discussion and reference from time to time during this first session of this Assembly. It was mentioned in the Throne Speech. I suppose that was the main reason why it comes up. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts), from time to time, has drawn issue with the work of that Report, with the objectivity of it and he has called it, I think, a white-wash or he has indicated that it is -

MR. E. ROBERTS: A hatchet job I think I called it.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I beg your pardon. A hatchet job.

I sort of draw issue with him on that. I think that, although we do not want to get into a discussion today on the Amulree Report, I only made reference to it because it also made reference to the fact that local governments were not very mature in their development at that particular period of time. I do think, myself, that many of the observations that were made in the Amulree Report were quite valid and quite true. I think that the hon. member, from time to time, may be repeating observations that were made to him by older people in the Province with respect to the Amulree Report but I did not live in those days neither did the hon. gentleman.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The hon. gentleman (inaudible) I expect is repeating observations which were made to him from time to time.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Yes, but I am judging it in relation to the report and after that report suspended our self-government in this Province. And I observe the way in which, when we took up the cudgel again of self-government, after 1949, there were negotiations that people used to say to me and I would agree that you could read that report, you could almost close your eyes and you could see history really repeating itself because there were many, many similarities, particularly in the 1950s, which leads me to believe that the observations contained in the Amulree Report were a bit truer and more correctly reflected the state of Newfoundland at that time than has been indicated by the hon. member. But be that as it may, I suppose we can debate that until the cows come home.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The Law Society should have us down to do a Punch and Judy show for them.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

On that particular - because I think it is a very interesting inquiry. Really, that particular report was a very important one

MR. W. MARSHALL: in our history and whether or not the condemnations that are contained in every page are justified or not I think merits some inquiry at the present time because, and also an inquiry if they are true as to whether or not they have not continued and -

MR. E. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman and I can agree that we should learn from our past whatever - we may differ to what the lessons are but we both agree we should learn from our past.

MR. W. MARSHALL: But be that as it may, Amulree report or no, I think that the history of municipal government in this Province indicates that it has not developed as strongly and as dramatically as one might expect with a country of a history of 400 and 500 years such as we have. I do believe, that this Bill goes quite a long way towards strengthening this. I think one of the major points of this Bill, one of the major benefits, is the fact that it gives a great deal of local ^{autonomy} to the municipal councils themselves. And this, of course, is very, very necessary. Before, budgets of the councils, all budgets had to be approved by the department. The minister, in his wisdom, has indicated in this particular Bill that the municipal councils will now be able to formulate and determine their own budgetary requirements, make provision for them with respect to their revenues and their expenditures. And it is only at such point in time as a council gets in trouble, that there is to be a report to the minister and then the minister takes a hand in that particular situation and so it should be. But I think that this is one of the strongest measures in the Act itself and one of the principle measures to strengthen municipal government in this Province. It is long overdue and it is one that I know ~~that~~ will be received and implemented and in its implementation there is going to be difficulty, there is going to be a great deal of difficulty because some councils just really are not geared to take the responsibilities that have been cast on them by this Act. But whether or not they are able to survive as an effective

MR. W. MARSHALL: body is going to depend upon how they can react to this Act and in their reaction you will get, as I say, a great deal of strengthening of local government in the Province.

The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) brought up in the debate an observation which I expected would be brought up, which one would expect would be brought up by the Opposition; and this is with respect to the taxing. He says that this Bill forces municipalities to increase their taxes. I know this is the way it will be billed by certain people who are in Opposition to the Government, but this is not the case. All this particular Bill does and it says, 'That if municipal services are provided to a municipality or a local government where 50 per cent of the residents enjoy these municipal services, then they should impose property taxes, taxes should be imposed to pay for these. Now, I do not see, really, what is wrong with this, it does not say the level, it does not say that if 50 per cent of the residents in an area have these services that they must pay exclusively for these services, by municipal taxes. There is provision, ample provision in the law and ample provision under the Grants Act for the government to compensate certain of these municipalities which are in a less advantageous position than others. But the principle of that particular provision, I would submit, is very sound. I remember not too long ago seeing on television a comment by, I believe it was the mayor or a member of a council on the Great Northern Peninsula, I think it was up in Port au Choix -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Down at Port au Choix.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Down at Port au Choix. No, up in Port au Choix.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, one goes down North.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I see, well when you are up North
you go down but I am down South so I am going up.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, the minister is either up
or down anyway.

MR. W. MARSHALL: In any event, this gentleman from
Port au Choix was on television -

MR. E. ROBERTS: You go out West in Stephenville.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - and he was heralding the fact
that if they were required to impose any taxes at all, that he
was going to resign. Now I cannot really -

MR. STAGG: He was probably a Liberal.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know what he was.
He probably was. He certainly was emoting Liberal -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is no Liberal today
though.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know what he was.
He was certainly emoting Liberal philosophy anyway. But even the
staunchest Tory from time to time has an aberation in his thoughts.
This is probably the situation. But in any event -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the member for
Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) (inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: If he is a Tory I am in
sympathy with him but I am not in sympathy with the hon. gentleman's
remark at this particular time.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister means the
gentleman's remark.

MR. MARSHALL: What did I say? The hon.
what?

MR. ROBERTS: He was referring to the
mayor of Port au Choix I believe.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: He is an hon. gentleman, I
am sure, but he is not an hon. gentleman in the House sense.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, as I say he is a very
honourable fellow.

MR. ROBERTS: In all ways honourable,
Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: As I say he is a very honourable
fellow if his political persuasion is as has been represented. But I
do not agree with the statement which he makes because if at least fifty
per cent of the services are being enjoyed, why should there not be
some contribution by the local area towards these services themselves?
And this is all this provision indicates. If you have two neighbouring

MR. MARSHALL: communities, as we have neighbouring communities all over Newfoundland, one paying its property tax and having services, water and sewerage and the other alongside it not paying tax but still enjoying water and sewerage, what it means is that it is really double taxation for those people in the community which, in fact, is paying water taxes. Why should the members in community A pay all of the cost of the water and sewerage in community B? Why should they, if maybe in community A they may not have water and sewerage themselves and they have to pay it to community B through income tax? They may have water and sewerage in community A and that means that they have to pay double taxation themselves. So it seems to me to be really manifestly unfair. I expect this act to be attacked, if it can be attacked, which I do not think it can be in a reasonable manner, but I expect it to be savagely attacked by members of the Opposition, publicly, by attempting to give the innuendo that the hon. member for Bonavista North (J. Carter) has given, to the effect that this is an attempt to force the municipalities to increase and impose taxes. It is not that, it is an act, as I say, to strengthen and manifestly strengthen, I would suggest, local government in this Province. That is what they will say and that is what the opening shot from the Opposition - the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) indicated at the time, that this is the line of attack that they are taking. But this provision in the act, I think, is a responsible one and the government has no hesitation whatsoever of standing completely behind this provision and the implementation of that provision itself.

There are other matters -

I am glad the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) came back because, I know, he will probably make a few comments.

MR. ROBERTS:

I think he can be persuaded

to.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am quite sure he can.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman inviting me to make a few comments?

MR. MARSHALL: In due course. Yes. In due course.

MR. NEARY: Inviting me?

MR. MARSHALL: I am into something now that the hon. gentleman, I know, will probably make a few comments on. One of the items in this act that the hon. member did not bring up is - and how this also goes to strengthen municipalities, is that this act extends the operation of the Public Tenders Act which was implemented by this government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - to the municipalities.

AN HON. MEMBER : Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, yes. Very, very closely followed. All things in birth, as they go from birth to maturity have a difficult road to follow as they go.

MR. ROBERTS: And they decay as does the government.

MR. MARSHALL: They are not decayed. Right now they are in the full force of their adulthood and they are very, very strong and very viable and very dependable Public tenders Act.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, how can you tolerate the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) in the Cabinet? He has admitted breaking it. He has admitted under oath, breaking it.

MR. MARSHALL: This particular bill itself, I would like to draw to the attention of the House extends the provisions of the Public Tenders Act to the municipalities of this Province and that in itself, I think, justifies the amendment to the act itself even if the other provisions did not. The Public Tenders Act is applied to the municipalities, they must award, they must call for

Mr. Marshall: public tenders. In the event that there is, for a legitimate reason, to be an award to other than the lowest tender or the highest bidder, whatever the case may be, this can be done but it can only be done after reference to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor).

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) Cabinet.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will act through the Cabinet, as all ministers in the government act through the Cabinet itself.

MR. NEARY: That is what 'Morgan' said.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what 'Morgan' says too.

MR. MARSHALL: But this, as I say, this greatly, I think, strengthens the operation of Municipal Government, itself, in that The Public Tenders Act is extended to it. It also extends the provisions of the conflict of interest provisions to the council itself, which, I think, is very good.

Another item that, I think, I should draw to the attention of the House is that for the first time in any kind of elections in this Province, I believe I am correct in saying it certainly is for the first time, proxy voting is going to be permitted. Proxy voting is -

MR. ROBERTS: The first time in any election under the control of the Province, certainly.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, yes - well that is what I mean. Proxy voting is being implemented here. It goes along with necessary alterations, along the same line as is provided under The Canada Elections Act. But here again it is a matter that, I think, the department is going to have to concern itself very much about, that when the elections are called in municipalities, that they are fully aware of the procedures that are to be implemented with respect to proxy voting because, number one, it is a new method of casting votes and, number two, you know, it does lie open the possibility of an abuse.

But the Act, as I say, the proxy provisions of the Act have been looked at very carefully, have been made as strong

MR. MARSHALL: as they possibly can be, and, as I say, with necessary alterations as are required in order to alter the application of it from the Federal Government to the Municipal Governments themselves, it follows along the same trend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a couple of other items mentioned by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) when he was, as the principal spokesman for the Opposition, addressing himself to the bill. I know the hon. minister will address himself to them when he closes the debate. But there were one or two other instances that I would like to note or one or two other observations that he made that I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and that was he seemed to get very exorcized over the fact that in the event that a regional government or a regional council was established, it did not provide for compensation for payment of assets taken over by the municipalities themselves. This is an argument which was used -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty-eight I think, is it?

MR. ROBERTS: It is a big thick one.

MR. MARSHALL: - at another time by the City of St. John's when it was contemplating putting regional government in the greater St. John's area.

I just would like to, in dealing with that observation, I know the minister will deal with it in much more detail, I would just like to ask the question, you know, where does the money come from? If you pay for the assets of a regional council - if you force a regional council to pay for the assets, where does the money come from? It comes from the people. It comes from the same people in the region. So the same people in the region or a greater portion of them would have to pay, in effect, for the services twice. Now, this is what the hon. gentleman really wants, when he says, they should pay for compensation. Just take the hypothetical case of the regional government in the City of St. John's, which is the place, as Your Honour knows, that I am most familiar with, that place, that good place East of the Overpass. In that particular instance, if you apply regional government there to the City of St. John's and the areas of the City of

Mr. Marshall: St. John's and you require compensation for services as was suggested by councillors when they were criticizing the intent of government with respect to it a few years ago, really you would have - surely you could get the regional government to pay the City of St. John's for the water and sewerage. Where does the money come from? It is going to come in taxation, really, from the citizens of the City of St. John's, the same citizens who have already paid for it before. So you pay it to the City of St. John's, it could be any other city, and what do they do with it? You know, do they apply it for the water and sewerage services that are in there? No, because they have been paid for before. So what do they use it for? What is the purpose? Why does the hon. member want to have double taxation because that is, in effect, what he is advocating when you say that you pay for compensation.

If there were any argument for compensation because one area had more services than another - before there was to be any payment made you would jolly well want to know what

MR. MARSHALL: was going to happen with the money when it was paid; was it to be used to pay off debts that had been incurred over a period of time? Is it to be expended for the purpose of erecting huge majestic buildings, that the people will be saddled with even greater debts as the time goes on? So that is what the hon. gentleman is asking for, Mr. Speaker, when he asks for compensation, it seems to me, to be paid to the regional council.

On the position of salaries, you know, the points when we got down towards the end, and I think the hon. gentleman was really striving to find things to criticize as is the bent of the Opposition, wanting things to criticize rather than being concerned with the subject of the act itself.

I did hear the hon. member compliment the hon. minister, for instance, for bringing in this particular act which, as I say, enhances and strengthens local government in this Province, as anybody who has any knowledge of local government at all knows, as a matter of fact anyone can read the act itself and compare it with the other provisions.

Now, on the position of salaries, I think it is quite reasonable to provide that salaries are to be paid to councillors only when 100 per cent of the membership agrees. Because the reason for it is that you can get your prima donnas in your group and it gives the one or two dissenters a political arm that I think is most unfair and I do not see anything wrong with it at all. It is noted that this is the first time that there has really been any effective measure in an act to provide for compensation or payment of salaries to councillors themselves.

Now, all in all, Mr. Speaker, I think as I say, that this is a very forward act that has been brought forth by the minister and brought forth by the government. It strengthens the councils. It leaves the formation of the councils, the way in which they are to be set up, on a much more democratic basis. It provides for feasibility studies and it provides for an assessment of whether or not an area should

MR. MARSHALL: be within another area. It allows for the more orderly structuring of government, the more orderly carrying on of government. As each local improvement district, or each local government, each municipal council gets stronger the whole body politic becomes stronger.

Before, under the piecemeal legislation that was available, and it was piecemeal legislation, it was long overdue to have a Municipalities Act here. The previous act was, number one, written in language which is very difficult for many of the councillors to understand. This act has been written in simplistic language, or as simple as it possibly can be and at the same time expresses the intent that is desired. Before, there had been so many amendments to the act itself that it was rather difficult to follow. So a consolidation of the act was long overdue. But this is not just merely a consolidation of an act, this is the most forward step in municipal government that has been taken by any government in this Province since the idea of local government was conceived.

The ideas of the operation of local governments has manifestly strengthened and the minister is to be complimented on it. All we can hear from the Opposition, and all we ever do hear from the Opposition is criticism. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if they want to put their observations to the test, that they might give a little bit more thought to their observations if they wish to be really treated seriously and show a little bit more substantive observations than were given by the member for Bonavista North.

This is a very forward bill. It is one that is going to strengthen municipal government and I think that the minister himself is to be highly complimented for not only the way in which he presented it but for the act itself and it is to be borne in mind that this act has been enthusiastically endorsed at the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in Gander, which to a large extent, has been the result, as I say, of a minister who has a great sensitivity to municipal government, knows what he is talking

MR. MARSHALL: about and has the ability to have
an appropriate dialogue with the various governments concerned.

So I wholeheartedly endorse and support the
principle of this bill and feel that it will go, as I say, a great
way, for the reasons I have already given, a long way towards the
strengthening and fostering of local government in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are all very surprised to hear that the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) endorses this bill. What a surprise! That must be a piece of news, Sir, that will go out loud and clear across this Province today, that the hon. gentleman endorses the bill brought in by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor), when in actual fact, Sir, after following very closely what the Government House Leader had to say, I doubt very much if the gentleman took the trouble to read the bill. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman like members on this side of the House, took the trouble to read that bill. Unless he were getting \$150 an hour from some client, I doubt very much, Sir, if the hon. gentleman would bother to browse through this bill to see what it was all about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

the bill?

Have you read the bill? Have you got

MR. NEARY:

I have the bill here in front of me.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

I am only at \$75.

MR. NEARY:

Well, then I would say that particular lawyer is probably good for \$150 an hour.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to set rates for the hon. gentleman. But what I do want to say about this bill, Mr. Speaker, is this, straightaway, that if the government wanted to force a property tax on people in this Province, they should have had the courage to say so and to go ahead and do it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

- and not try to do via the back door what they did not have the courage to do via the front door. Now, granted, this is a consolidation of all the acts - they are all listed in the back, various acts under the Department of Highways, Department of Health, Public Utilities and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, as necessary as that was

MR. NEARY: to be done, it could have been done without forcing the property tax on the people of this Province. It seems that everything that this government does, Mr. Speaker, everything they have done since 1972 is an intrusion in people's lives. They have gone further than any other government that I know of in regulating the lives of people. We saw an act the other day that was -

MR. THOMS: The worst example.

MR. NEARY: That is right, the worst example of an intrusion in people's lives.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible). supported it.

MR. NEARY: Supported what?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I said the other day - if the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House) was listening, what I said was that there was an injustice in our society, and if the government wanted to correct that injustice they did not have to punish everybody in Newfoundland. They did not have to bring in a law intruding in the lives of every person in this Province. They did not have to do that.

MS VERGE: We already have a law.

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen to Newfoundland's answer to Jacqueline Kennedy - 'We already have the law.' What law do we have? What law? I thought we were debating a matrimonial bill the other day.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the compulsory property tax bill and I hope that the people up over my shoulder -

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody up there.

MR. NEARY: No, but they are listening. I hope that 'Sticky-Wicky' and the others - and, you know, I have had a tendency once in a while to criticize the media - I think the reporting of this session of the House has been the worst that I have ever seen. It is the worst in my eighteen years in the House and I am starting my eighteenth year now. No fault of the news people because fifteen or twenty seconds is all they are allowed on a newscast. And they write the copy up in the gallery. I have seen the copy - they write it, but it never makes

November 16, 1979

Tape 1141

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

print.

But I hope that despite the fact

that we all have

MR. NEARY: had a tendency to criticize the press gallery once in a while, that they will not be deluded by the arguments put forward by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) and supported a few moments ago by a gentleman who had not read the bill. I hope they will not be duped into thinking that this is the Magna Carta of the municipalities of Newfoundland, when in actual fact what it is is a policy on the part of the government to bring in the property tax and I hope that the press will report it as such. That is what it is. Of course, it is a consolidation of the act. It is a consolidation of the act. No question about that. But that is not the important ramification. That is not the implication of this act. The implication of this act is that it makes it compulsory for municipalities that service a community with fifty per cent or more water and sewerage, to impose a property tax. And the other thing is that, as somebody indicated this morning, I believe it was my colleague, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who made a magnificent speech, absolutely magnificent. Compare what the hon. gentleman said, my colleague from Bonavista North, to what the Government House Leader said and see who did his homework. Which one did his homework? Compare last night if you want to talk about homework. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) on television, Mr. Speaker, being interviewed by Michael Harris -

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean the Shah of Mount Scio.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mohammed, the Shah of Mount Scio, and see who did his homework. All they need are the turbans over there as I said, Sir, all they can think about is oil. But my hon. friend made a magnificent -

MR. BARRY: I will tell you there are more oily people on that side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would say that if a little drop of oil leaked out of a bottom pan in a car in Roddickton the whole Cabinet would be down there tomorrow. And that is the only way they are going to

MR. NEARY: get any results down there, to send the word up that they spotted a little drop of oil on the ground.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I believe the hon. member is aware he is straying a little bit from the subject at hand.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. But I was baited, Your Honour, and if I could just be heard in silence, Sir, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I was referring to my hon. colleague here, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who obviously did his homework, who has the experience, who served on a council in the capital city of this Province, who has the experience, and who was able to point out to the government the weaknesses in this legislation.

Now I want to repeat again, Sir, I want to repeat just in case there is somebody who did not hear what I said, in case there is somebody who may misunderstand what I said, in case there is somebody who may want to report what I am saying, that this bill is the compulsory property tax bill, that is what it is. It removes the democracy from the dozens and dozens of communities in this Province that are organized. They can no longer have referendums. The councils can no longer lay down the procedure whereby they want to decide whether or not there is going to be a property tax in a community as has been the tradition and the custom in the past. The government have stepped in and are going to regulate the lives of Newfoundlanders, whether Newfoundlanders like it or not. Democracy out the window. The government in future, apparently from the kind of legislation that we have seen brought before this House, are going to intrude on the lives of every Newfoundlander. The next thing they will be bringing in a piece of legislation stating the number of times you can go to the bathroom in the run of a day. That will be the next thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: It might be in the bill.

MR. NEARY: A couple of years ago they brought in a -
I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: It might be in the bill.

November 15, 1979

Tape No. 1142

MM - 3

MR. NEARY: It might be in that bill. It might be hidden away somewhere in that bill. A couple of years ago they brought in a regulation you had to get a permit to pick blueberries, you have to get a licence to catch fish.

MR. S. NEARY: You cannot go out in the woods any more. You cannot do this, you cannot do that.

Mr. Speaker, government is stepping into the people's lives a little too much, regulating people's lives too much. There is too much intrusion in the people's lives and this is another example of the kind of intrusion that I am talking about that will cause people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, to rise up when they find the implications of this bill. The people themselves will decide whether they want a property tax, the people will decide it, more than 50 per cent, but under this act they do not have any choice, they have to take it. They have to like it or lump it.

I read the act and the hon. gentleman did not read it. And the other thing that the act does is give the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the authority to do something that was turned down on the floor of this House and that is to set up regional government. The bill was defeated in this House, it was not deferred, Mr. Speaker, the bill was defeated before the last election. And now the government again is going to do via the back door what they could not do via the front door. And the hon. gentleman said to my colleague, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling), "Read the next paragraph," he said, "Read the next paragraph." Well, what does the next paragraph say. I read it. I will summarize it for the hon. gentleman. What it says is, "That when the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Cabinet, appoints a regional government, then within one year they have to have an election." That is what it says, "Within one year." Now, how much damage can be done in that one year? The hon. gentleman, the government are going to be half democratic, we will put it in there first and then we will let you elect the members after. Well, that is not good enough. If the hon. gentleman is hanging his reputation and his hat on that clause that he drew

MR. S. NEARY: to the attention of my colleague, then he better get up again because that is not going to be satisfactory to people who live in areas where regional government is going to be established, and there is no need of it, there is no need of it. Our people have served their apprenticeship since Confederation and they are ready for full democracy in this Province. The hon. gentleman is only going half way, he is going to say, "Oh, yes, we will trust you after a year, after a year or so we will trust you." Well, that is what the hon. gentleman is saying. The hon. gentleman makes the appointments for one year -

MR. DINN: It might be one year, it might be one day.

MR. S. NEARY: It might be. But why one day or why one hour or why one second?

MR. L. STIRLING: Just to clarify that point now that I have had a chance to look at it, there is nothing that says anywhere in the act that you cannot have additional people appointed. You are only talking about the election of those who are to be elected but you can vary, change, add to, appoint and the election is only for those that have to be elected. So it is misleading for you to say that after one year it is all elected because the minister can use his discretion to appoint, vary, change and do anything and there is no guarantee anywhere in the act that says at any time they will all have to be elected. I read it through carefully again.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker, we are all for the consolidation of the various acts. We are all for that but, Mr. Speaker, why do the minister and the government not trust the people? They want to give the people responsibility and they do not want to. It is like the old saying, "You cannot be half pregnant." Yes, I said, Mr. Speaker, we agree that the act should have been consolidated. We agree with that -

MR. STIRLING: And letting them set their own budget.

MR. S. NEARY: - and letting them set their own budget.

MR. S. NEARY:

There are a few good things in the act but they are all overshadowed by the major ramifications and implications of this act. My hon. friend, the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), who always sits there, does not say very much but he is always plugged in to what is going on and what is being said in the House, how is the hon. gentleman going to explain to the municipalities in his district that they have to enforce a property tax whether they like it or not? Maybe the hon. gentleman does not intend to run anymore, I do not know, maybe he does not care but there are people in this Province, in this House who care. There are people who believe that the people who live in the municipalities should have the right to determine their own future, to lay down their own rules and regulations, to decide the kind of taxes they think they should have

MR. NEARY: in a municipality and not have it forced on them by the Eighth Floor of Confederation Building. Does the hon. gentleman realize that that is what is happening under this bill? Does the hon. gentleman realize that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) expression.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is looking at me over there. I am sure that he can see -

MR. R. MOORES: He will not answer it.

MR. NEARY: - that he can see the difficulties and the problems that this bill is going to create, the same as the one we debated the other day.

No member should be ashamed or afraid to get up and say what he feels about a piece of legislation going through this House. That is what we were elected for. I have not heard one member on that side of the House yet say that he objects to the compulsory implementation, to the forcing, shoving down the throats of Newfoundlanders the property tax, not one of them have said they object to that principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are all for it.

MR. NEARY: Apparently they must be all for it. We can only assume that this bill will be rammed through the House in the next few days against the wishes of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) just told us was all in favour of this bill, that the minister had gone out to Gander unlike his predecessor, sitting to his right, he had gone out to Gander and met with the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and everything was harmonious and sweetness and light. We pick up the morning paper and we discover that the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities are kind of browned off with the minister for sneaking this bill into the House unknownst to them. That is the harmonious relationship.

MR. WINDSOR: Go away!

MR. NEARY: Oh the minister says, "Go away!" Well, the hon. gentleman can read the same as I can. I suppose, he can.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman had a call from a mayor, there have been other calls to Confederation Building, saying, "How come? Hold it! How come you told us that there was going to be a chance for us to take a look at this bill, to have some breathing space, and you were not going to introduce it until 1980? And there you are in the November, a month before Christmas, 1979, trying to ram the bill through the House as fast as you can, as a divisionary tactic to get people's minds off unemployment, and the cost of living, and this sort of thing, the high cost of electricity, and the increase in armed robbery, and violence in this Province, to get people's minds off that, ram some legislation through the House, a divisionary tactic on the part of the government.

Now, that is the only reason we are here at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, to put through legislation regulating people's lives. I think it is shocking. I think, it is terrible, Mr. Speaker. I pay the property tax, I pay the water tax, my hon. friend pays it, my hon. friend for Carbonear (Mr. Moores), and my hon. friend behind me, Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) we all pay the property tax. But the decision is made not by the government, not down on the Eighth Floor of Confederation Building, the decision is made down on Duckworth Street in City Hall, and if we do not like it we can get our chance, our crack at the mayor and councillors.

AN HON. MEMBER: Assessment. Assessment.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Well, I just got one recently, an assessment. So that we can get a crack at them. But they make the decisions. And we know where the decisions are made. But in this case the mayor and the councillors and the people who live in dozens piled upon dozens of municipalities in this Province will have no choice, will have no choice but to accept the directive of a dictatorial government, of a Fascist regime, of a regime that would make Mussolini look like small potatoes, the way they are intruding into people's lives.

The hon. gentleman thinks their dictatorial policy is laughable, very funny. Indeed it is funny. Ah, it is very

November 16, 1979

Tape 1144

PK - 3

Mr. Neary: funny indeed. Mr. Speaker, their Mussolini-like
attitude is not appreciated

MR. S. NEARY: by the people of this Province. And what is heralded as a magnificent piece of legislation, the Magna Carta of municipal government in this Province, really turns out to be a compulsory Property Tax Act and an Act to ram regional government down the throats of our people without having a chance to exercise their democratic right of whether they want it or who they want to serve on it; And the hon. Gentleman shrugs his shoulders and brushes it off by saying, 'Well, it is only for a year or so, we are only going to appoint these people for a year or so'. And what an insult that is to Newfoundlanders.

MR. STIRLING: That is not true, they can continue forever.

MR. S. NEARY: Even that is not true, they could continue it forever. They could make appointments over and above the ones to be elected. What an insult that is to our Newfoundland people. I thought we had served our apprenticeship, Sir, that we were now ready for full democracy but apparently we are not.

MR. DINN: Who brought in the Metro Board?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier going around this Province telling us that we have to forget the past because he is 'born again', he is the leader of a 'born again government'. We make no reference to the past, we are not allowed to talk about Labrador Linerboard, we are not allowed to talk about corruption, we are not allowed to talk about A.B. Walsh, we are not allowed to talk about this, we are not allowed to talk about Charbonneau Associates, and then the hon. gentleman now asked me a question who brought in the Metro Board? Who?

MR. MOORES: Step forward with 'Peckford'.

MR. S. NEARY: Step forward with 'Peckford', am I allowed to answer that, Mr. Speaker, or can we refer to the past at all? Should we forget the past? Sweep all the

MR. S. NEARY: corruption and all the mismanagement and all the extravagance and waste, sweep it under the rug? Sweep it under the rug and step forward with 'Peckford'. And this is the way we are stepping forward with 'Peckford', intrude in people's lives. They think this is all very well and good! They think it is great to intrude in people's lives to regulate people's lives, to run their daily affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe the government feels the people cannot run their own lives, maybe the government feels that the municipalities are not responsible people elected by the people who live in these towns.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, - the hon. gentleman obviously has not read it either. This Bill gives autonomy on one hand and takes it away on the other. That is what it does, Mr. Speaker! The hon. gentleman should take the time to read it. Everything is: the minister approves this, the minister approves that, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council does this, the Lieutenant-Governor In Council does that. If you are going to give the municipalities autonomy, give it to them, no strings attached, and let them run their own affairs and let the people deal with them. Do not sneak in the property tax and sneak in regional government under the pretense we are going to consolidate all the Acts and then go out and try to sell it to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, and I will be very surprised, I used to be President of that body for two years, I would be very surprised! I would be very surprised, Sir, if they go along!

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) sad state of affairs.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, listen to the king of the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: We are not allowed to talk about public tendering, Mr. Speaker, or it might come back to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman got up and praised up, praised up the Bill because now they fall under the umbrella of public tendering. Well, we all know, Mr. Speaker, about the Public Tendering Act and what a farce that has turned out to be. Mr. Speaker, what happens if a municipality does not conform to the Public Tendering Act? What happens? Is there any penalty in the Act? It is absolutely toothless! We have had example after example in this Province where ministers have admitted breaking the Public Tendering Act - It is in there, Mr. Speaker, it is in there. The hon. gentleman referred to it. It is in there, Sir. -Where ministers have admitted breaking the Public Tendering Act.

MR. MORGAN: Who admitted that?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman admitted it the other day.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman said, yes, I did it.

MR. MORGAN: I am not saying, 'I', now. There were other guys in the House.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman said, I broke the Public Tendering Act but I am absolved by the Cabinet.

MR. MORGAN: I never said that.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Sir. And the former Premier will be hauled in or the former -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I believe, a little earlier requested to be heard in silence. Am I to assume now that he is inviting some comments?

MR. NEARY: No. I am not inviting comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, the hon. member has a right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: I am merely asking the hon. gentleman who praised this bill and endorsed this bill, because now it forces the Public Tendering Act on municipalities throughout the Province, what happens to a municipality or a mayor or councillor who violates the Public Tendering Act? What happens to him? Does he get a little rap on the knuckles? Does he blame it on the Premier? Does he blame it on the Cabinet? Say, 'I am absolved. I broke the Public Tendering Act and the Cabinet knew about it. They knew about it so, therefore, that makes it right.' What right does the Cabinet have to break the law that is made in this Legislature? That is what the hon. gentleman is saying. The Cabinet knew I was breaking the law when under the act, Mr. Speaker, it is the minister -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. Minister of Lands of Forests.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. member is looking at me and pointing at me. I assume he is referring to me as someone who says, 'Look, I have broken the Tendering Act and it is okay because

MR. MORGAN: the Cabinet approved it.' What I have been saying and I have said so in the Public Accounts Committee and I am saying now in the House of Assembly, that it is not true. The hon. gentleman is aware of it. What I said is that the Public Tendering Act was never contravened. Everything done with regard to awarding extensions of contracts was -

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. minister has a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I am making a point of order, MR. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from the Burin Peninsula or St. John's or wherever he is from will keep quite.

What I said, Mr. Speaker, I have said in this House, I have said to a Committee of this House, that the act was never broken but any action taken in connection with extensions to contracts was approved by Cabinet. So the hon. gentleman should be asked to retract from making statements which are incorrect, especially when making them about another member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) I would not consider that to be a point of order but merely the minister has taken the opportunity to explain his position as has been done many times in the past.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that I am all for the consolidation of the local government act. I am all for it. But I would like to see it done without the minister and the government sneaking in and forcing on the people of this Province the property tax and sneaking in a procedure whereby they can establish regional government in this Province without any reference to the people, without giving the people themselves a chance to exercise their democratic right.

MR. NEARY:

There are other good provisions in the act, Sir, that I do not have to mention now. It is a good thing to consolidate all these acts, I am all for it. But let the word go out, let not anybody be duped or fooled by the minister and by the government, the real reason for bringing in this bill is to further intrude in people's lives and to regulate and run people's lives and to force things on them that they may or may not want. We should have less of that in future, Mr. Speaker. The kind of legislation that I would like to see brought into this House is legislation dealing with unemployment, the cost of living, electricity rates, crime in this Province, we never hear about it, and various other matters that are concerning Newfoundlanders today and not this kind of legislation, as necessary as it is. We could consolidate the local government act any time we wanted to but certainly let not the government try to fool the people because this is an attempt on the part of the minister and the government to sneak in the property tax and regional government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

If the hon. minister

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Nobody stood up.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: I say -

MR. J. DINN: Does the hon. member have a point of order?

MR. R. MOORES: Yes, under normal circumstances, Mr. Speaker, if the minister yields his place then automatically it comes to a member of the Opposition. The minister was about to speak and yielded to me at the microphone.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: That might be the hon. member's perception of the situation but the way of operating and recognizing members is the first one to get Your Honour's eye. Usually you go from right to left but that is entirely up to Your Honour! It is whoever catches his eye first.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. I think -

MR. R. MOORES: On that point of order. I am known to be an unreasonable man so I will let the minister speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I, perhaps, should clarify that the point that the hon. the President of the Council has made is obviously a good point and the usual procedure is to recognize left to right or right to left and whatever. Also, I did not see anybody - the hon. member from Carbonear I do not believe was in his place at that particular time therefore I recognize the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower now.

MR. J. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will obviously get a chance to speak on this most important piece of legislation. Actually, I was planning to speak on Monday but the hon. member who, I understand, wanted to go before me is not in the House at this moment so I will make my few remarks today and the hon. member will obviously get an opportunity to speak Monday.

MR. J. DINN:

We have before us, Mr. Speaker, a very important piece of legislation in this Province. It is one that should be considered very carefully. It is one that, possibly, should have been done fifteen to twenty years ago in this Province. It is one that has been under study well before 1972 but in 1972 the government had a Royal Commission set up - the Whelan Royal Commission - to investigate into and report on local government in the Province and make recommendations and those recommendations were received in 1974. And since 1974; in 1975 a Steering Committee was set up. The Steering Committee was made up of the Executive Director of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, and the President of the Federation at the time was on the Steering Committee. Since that time we still have representation on the Steering Committee to make recommendations to government, as a result of the Whelan Royal Commission Report, and as a result of that process, from 1972, when the study was commissioned, through 1974 when the report was made to government, through to 1979 when all of the recommendations culminated in what I consider to be a very, very important piece of legislation with respect to local government in this Province. And for hon. members benefit this legislation relates very directly to instances in this Province where local improvement districts have been set up that will now be town councils, will now be elected representatives and where democracy will indeed be brought back to the people of the Province in those areas that do not have elected councils.

Looking at the positive sides of this legislation, I think anybody can take a piece of legislation of this size, with the complexity that it has, and find something in there to develop an argument around. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling) made some points none of them, in my opinion, have very much validity and, indeed, I question whether the hon. member read the act or is acquainted with the people of this Province who made their decision as to who the government of this Province should be.

MR. L. STIRLING: A point of privilege Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Baird) A point of privilege.

MR. L. STIRLING: A point of privilege. He is suggesting that I did not read the act and as the lead-off spokesman, obviously, I did and had the responsibility. And he is suggesting that I am not acquainted with people in the municipalities and I ask him to withdraw the remarks.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order there. The hon. member should know, he should read, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point of privilege that has been raised is just a difference of opinion between two members.

MR. J. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I understand. I would not even want to comment on it. What I did say and what I repeat

MR. DINN: is that I doubt whether the hon. member read it. Now whether the hon. member read it or not, only the hon. member knows, but I doubt whether the hon. member went through this piece of legislation and read it in detail. Because it is a very good piece of legislation, it has many, many positive aspects and the aspect to which the hon. member referred was with respect to the lack of respect for councils. The hon. member must know, I mean if he did not know he could ask someone before he came in here and made remarks like that, the remark was to the effect that the department had a lack of respect for councillors. This piece of legislation, and the aspects surrounding it, and the different recommendations that were made were made over the past eight to ten years in this Province by the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. They wanted more autonomy and they realized and understood that getting more autonomy in the Province automatically means that you have more responsibility, they were quite well aware of that.

I served as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for two years and for two years went to the federation's meetings, sat in on steering committees where the federation was represented by their elected president and listened to the arguments from all sides, listened to the recommendations and Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation has many, many of those recommendations. There are items in here that are carry-overs from the Local Government Act, the Local Authority Control Of Expenditures Act, etc., but many of the pieces of the recommendations made throughout the years were made by concerned councillors in this Province, duly elected by their people in their various locations and towns and cities and communities and that is what we have in this bill, a very, very important piece of legislation.

The hon. member should also realize, with respect to regional government, that last year an act with respect to regional government was brought into this House and if the people of the Northeast Avalon area had decided that the government was doing something with which they did not agree, they had an opportunity in June past to make their feelings known. And all I can say to that is, is that there is not a member

MR. DINN: in the Northeast Avalon area existing that is now a member of the opposite side of this House. We had two and they were routed. And, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view I brought that piece of legislation into this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - I brought the piece of legislation into this House and got the biggest majority of any member in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I interpret that rightfully or wrongfully as the people of my district, at least, supporting what I was trying to do for the control of development in the Northeast - Avalon urban region. Because right now what we have are eight or ten councils that will be fighting amongst themselves when, if we ever - if there is a discovery of oil off the coast, this area will be just like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, and other hon. members said, will be like Aberdeen, and worse, because there is absolutely no control here now over the regional plan, none over a plan that was put in place because of a forward looking government, of a government that had the guts to plan and had the guts to attempt to carry out the recommendations of a vast study done. As a matter of fact, there was a study done in the fifties about the Avalon region, about the urban region in the city of St. John's and there were recommendations made then. And we had another government in at that time and none of those recommendations were carried out, none of them, not one, because they wanted the control of who developed through forestry and through Crown lands. They wanted their fingers in the pie. They did not want the elected people out there in the local areas to have any control. This piece of legislation puts some control in the hands of locally represented people. And the hon. member had better watch standing up in this House and knocking a piece of legislation of this type. Because what happened in the election in June identifies to me that the people whose lives would have been affected by regional government

Mr. Dinn: in the Northeast, Avalon area, told the hon. members opposite exactly what they thought of them, exactly what they thought of an Opposition who did not care about the lives of the people or control of development or whether the oil companies will come in here and take over. They made it quite well known to hon. members opposite and the hon. member, the former member for St. John's West, who is now looking for a job, and the hon. member for Conception Bay South who is now down on the South Coast, where he is not known looking for another job, and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who was the member for Bell Island and ran off to LaPoile -

AN HON. MEMBER: A cowardly act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - because the people got to know him, and got to know what he stood for, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite should read this piece of legislation very, very carefully.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Because I want to have an Opposition in this House, I do not want to have the next election come along, Mr. Speaker, I do not want - the hon. member had an opportunity, unless he has a point of order I will ask him to take his seat?

AN HON. MEMBER: True love.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite I want to have a democratic -

MR. STIRLING: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): A point of privilege.

MR. STIRLING: The last Speaker, on a point of privilege, said that questions that I had brought up I had not talked to the people in the councils. The question I was going to ask, and in support of that point of privilege, a resolution from the Federation of Municipalities: Be It Resolved that the Minister of Municipal Affairs be requested to prepare and distribute a white paper outlining the general objectives and procedures presently proposed for incorporation into a new Municipal Act.

MR. DINN: That is not a point of privilege.

MR. STIRLING: So my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DINN: Abusing the privileges of the House itself.

MR. STIRLING: - the last speaker is casting, actually, doubts about whether or not I was asking questions, which I said I was asking on behalf of some municipalities. And that I submit is proof of the resolution -

MR. DINN: Sit down ! You are making a fool of yourself, boy.

MR. STIRLING: - and that I was asking questions on behalf of the municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. BAIRD): The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege at all. The hon. gentleman first rose and asked the hon. minister if he would yield. And the hon. minister, as was his prerogative, indicated that he did not intend to yield, he did not wish to yield. Then the hon. member gets up on a point of privilege, using the point of privilege for the purpose of making the same observations that, presumably, he asked him for in the first place. And that in itself, Mr. Speaker, is an abuse of the privileges of the House itself.

When a member of this House gets up and he makes a speech, and in the course of making his speech another member disagrees with what he says, that is his prerogative. But he is not allowed to get up under the guise of a point of privilege or a point of order merely for the purpose of interrupting or clarification or what have you; he has his opportunity in his debate, and in Question Period, and what have you on these things, and it is very much an intrusion on the rights of members when they are speaking for persons to get up in this vein on what amounts to spurious points of privilege because it disrupts the proceedings of this House, and more importantly, infringes on the individual rights of members when they are making their speeches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): A point of privilege.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, none of the members who have spoken to this point of privilege yet have given any citations from any authorities. And -

MR. J. CARTER: Sit down!

MR. F. ROWE: I have all of the time in the world, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the jabberings on of the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the minister who is presently speaking has suggested on a number of occasions that my colleague has not consulted with any municipalities or any members, and he doubts very much whether he has even read the Act. Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this, referring to Beauchesne, Section 155, can be classified as imputation of false or unavowed motives. Or, referring to Beauchesne, Section 155, Subsection (3), I would suggest that he is questioning the honour of another member of the House of Assembly, and therefore is completely out of order.

Obviously, Sir, my colleague has researched the bill in question. He has consulted with municipalities, and with councillors. And the minister time and time again has questioned the honour of this member on this side, and I would ask him to retract these particular remarks that he has made up to this point.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Further on that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I just may? The hon. gentleman wished authority so I will give him authority.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are the only one with authorities

now, are you?

MR. MARSHALL:

Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition, on privilege, and I think this is an important point, because it can cause disruption in the House itself, infringement on the rights of members. Privilege - "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament" - Now, when I say each House individually, this refers, of course, to the Senate and the House of Commons - "and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus, privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law. The distinctive mark of a privilege," Mr. Speaker, "is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are 'absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers'. They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without the unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity."

Then, again, on the same page -

page 11, number 17: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House." And this is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman, in raising a point of privilege, infringes on the rights of individual members in this House when a member is making a speech and gets up on a point of privilege under the guise of merely disagreeing with what the hon. member says. If the hon. member disagrees, or any hon. member, they have an adequate time and opportunity to present their views before this House in accordance with the proceedings. For an hon. member to get up on a point of privilege of that nature, as I say, is a base infringement

MR. MARSHALL: of the rules of all members because it interferes with the rights of the hon. the minister or any hon. member of this House to give a speech within his time limit unimpeded except if he brings up something that is serious enough for a point of privilege or order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. the House Leader on the government side (Mr. Marshall) is completely out of order. What he has, in fact, done is he has raised another point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think we can go on all day on the point of privilege, we have had discussion from three or four. I would now like to make a ruling on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Under Beauchesne, number 84, the Speaker has to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The matter must be very serious. In my opinion, it is strictly a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

I would ask the member to continue.

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

I would not have expected that my time would be so drastically intruded upon in this House of Assembly by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling). The hon. member had his ninety minutes. He may not have taken his ninety minutes, but he had ninety minutes in which he could present arguments on behalf of his case. It did not appear in the notes that I wrote down, the hon. member did not say anything to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: And the hon. member still persists in interrupting in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of thing - everybody gets an opportunity to speak in this hon. House and that is the kind of thing the hon. member is and has been doing since I got up to speak. He is just breaching the privileges of the House and should not be allowed. But I just want to go on and make the case that I feel is there with respect to one of the best pieces of legislation that has been brought into the House concerning local government in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was into with respect to regional government, many comments have been made by the two hon. members with respect to regional government in this Province and all I can say to hon. members is experience is the best teacher, but if you cannot learn from experience, I do not know if we have any hope.

The fact of the matter is, in June past, the people of the Northeast Avalon Urban Region, I think, made it quite clear to elected people in this House when the only two members that existed were routed out and I, the minister who brought in the regional government bill at the time got the biggest majority in Newfoundland.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Some of the opponents could not even get nominated for the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is how bad they are.

MR. DINN: And the hon. the minister says to me that some of the people who were sitting in this House prior some of the opponents of regional government could not even get a nomination.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right, for the Opposition.

MR. DINN: For the Opposition or any other party.

So, Mr. Speaker, that speaks volume for where the members of the Opposition sit with respect to local government in this Province, with respect to regional government in this Province, and I would recommend to them, because I want democracy to prevail in this Province, I want to recommend to them that they consider very seriously the different aspects of this piece of legislation, very seriously, because I want to have an Opposition in this House after the next election. I do not want fifty-two members on this side of the House and have the unsightly case where the Premier would have to appoint an opposition to sit over on the opposite side of the House. In this House I want to see democracy prevail. I want to hear good argument when legislation is brought in because this is not the be all and end all, this is not going to end here.

The piece of legislation that this replaces, the Local Government Act brought in in 1962, was amended every single year since it was brought in. There were several amendments per year in some cases for that piece of legislation. I am not saying that this is the be all and end all, but involved in this piece of legislation is eight to ten years of very serious investigation. A White paper the hon. member mentioned, a White paper! We had a royal commission go about this Province, listen to input from people. We have had since then meetings of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities where different aspects of this piece of legislation was discussed. We had a steering committee set up since late '74 or early '75 and that steering committee was made up of the President of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, duly elected at their annual meeting and who hopefully expressed the views of the different constituent members of that association, we had the executive director on that steering committee who hopefully brought continuity from year to

MR. DINN: year as to what the Federation's ideas were and they sat down almost on a weekly basis, sometimes day in and day out when they got into various aspects that needed to be investigated as a result of the Whelan Royal Commission Report and attempted to work out the best possible recommendations to be made to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and a result of that, not a one year thing that looked at existing acts and just revised those acts and put it into one piece of legislation, eight to ten years of exhaustive and extensive investigation into local government in the Province, into the needs of the various areas, into the responsibilities that elected councillors have, and what responsibilities they should have, what autonomy they should have, and the hon. the minister sat down with members of his department after all of this investigation had been carried out, and came up with Bill 58, which in my opinion is the best piece of local government legislation this Province has seen in Canada and bar none.

It addresses itself to small communities with respect to local service districts which should not have the responsibility of major towns like the town of Gander in comparison, for example, if you can compare the town of Gander with, say, Green's Pond, or the town of Gander with respect to a smaller municipality where they have all of the various services in Gander that the councils are responsible for and have to provide. In the smaller municipalities the only responsibilities that they want to take upon themselves, and it would be their choice of,

MR. DINN: say, garbage collection and a water system. Then they can be incorporated under the new system brought in by the minister, the local service district, and be responsible only for that kind of a system, administering the funds of that water committee or administering the funds of the waste disposal committee and collecting only enough taxes to pay for that one service. And, Mr. Speaker, this addresses not only the Ganders of this world who need autonomy, who need to have the responsibility that this act provides, but it also addresses the small communities. The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) questioned me in the House when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs asking when are we going to do this, when are we going to consolidate the water committee in a small community and the waste disposal committee so that we have one area, one group of people that we can go to. Well, this bill looks after that and takes care of that and brings that about so that we do not have fifteen water committees that the hon. member is -

MR. F. ROWE: That is not working quite as well as expected.

MR. DINN: That is right. What has happened now is not working quite as well as was anticipated. This will assist even further in that direction, in that the water committees should come together under one local service district and they will look after the responsibility for water and look after the responsibility for waste disposal. But we will have a consolidation of efforts in the smaller communities and handle responsibilities that the community wants to become involved in. They do not want to become a town council or, indeed, they do not want to become a community council; they want to be a local service district so that they will provide the smaller services that are required, that they want to get involved in in that local service district and charge taxation enough, or a fee, a service fee enough to pay for only that

MR. DINN: small service that they provide.

So this, Mr. Speaker, is an all encompassing act, this Municipalities Act. It covers the small local service district, the community council, the progression to town council and, in cases where it is required, where it is necessary and after an assessment is done, regional governments that I think we need to go towards.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is not here today, did not speak very loudly last year when the regional government was brought into this House with respect to being against regional government because he knew that in his area, in Grand Falls and Windsor and Bishops on the regional water system out there, he knew that these councils were getting together out of necessity to control the operation of that regional water system.

MR. N. WINDSOR: On their own.

MR. DINN: On their own. Not pushed down their throats by anyone. on their own, got together and formed a committee to look after the regional system. This piece of legislation provides for that capability. They also have problems with respect to development in the area of Grand Falls and Bishops and Windsor, with respect to the New Bay Road area where development is uncontrolled basically and people are building sporadically around that area. We will have a very serious case of pollution if we do not watch it. We have it now, I believe. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) indicates that we do.

So this is the kind of thing that this piece of legislation provides for. It looks after these kind of things, these things that need to be done in Newfoundland, long overdue, ten years behind the times and this piece of legislation is now here,

Now hon. members opposite can stand up and in various areas of this piece of legislation pick fault with it. There are areas in here that may be able to be improved. I

MR. DINN: do not know where they are.

I have gone through every section of this piece of legislation night after night. I do not agree with any of the points made by the hon. member with respect to being against this piece of legislation. I have gone through it in committees last year with respect to members of this side of the House. We went through all different aspects of the Whelan Royal Commission Report and -

MR. STIRLING: Would you permit me a question?

MR. DINN: I certainly would.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) By leave. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much. As a member, as he quite rightly said, with the strongest majority in the city of St. John's, do you agree with the point in this bill that with the authority of the Cabinet, once a regional council is

MR. L. STIRLING: appointed, that they can take over any assets that are required to be taken over without payment of compensation? Are you saying that to the people of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. minister.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I went through this through my election campaign in June. The member who ran against me in Pleasantville district brought that out quite clearly that I was for this and I was for that and I still got the biggest majority simply because I do not want the people of St. John's to pay for their regional water system twice. They paid for Windsor Lake, they paid for the piping in the ground, they paid for every thing that they have, and I do not want them to pay for it again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that water system, there are 16 million gallons per day coming from that water system and going directly into the City of St. John's. The City of St. John's needs 18 million gallons of water per day, so they need it from somewhere else. If I pay the City of St. John's, or the regional council pays for it, then they are going to have to distribute that back over my constituents. No the hon. member. The answer to his question is no, I am not for that. I am not for the people in my district of Pleasantville paying for that system again. They already paid for it. And, Mr. Speaker, there are other points in this bill that the hon. member brought up and I would like to have the time, but I just got notice that I have three minutes left, one minute left, time is ticking away.

Mr. Speaker, I only had thirty minutes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. J. DINN: - with which to put out some arguments and I can develop the argument with respect to assets. Windsor Lake, the hon. member in his argument is saying to me as the member for the district of Pleasantville that the people of Pleasantville should pay for their system, their water system, twice and the answer to the hon.

MR. J. DINN: member's question quite clearly is, no, I do not want them to pay for that system twice. They have already paid for it, the 16 million gallons per day that is all the capability we have there. We have 16 million gallons per day and that water is running into the city and they need more than that. But I say to the hon. member that out in Bay Bulls Big Pond, a \$38 million system, I believe it will go to \$41 million before it is completely finished, a \$41 million system that I say to my people in Pleasantville that we have a water system that out here in Bay Bulls Big Pond we are going to need next year 2 million gallons per day from Bay Bulls Big Pond. And I say that they should not pay any more than the Town of Mount Pearl should have to pay for that water or whoever else uses that water, the Town of Paradise, Conception Bay South. I say they should pay exactly the same, no more, not one penny more than the people out in Mount Pearl or the people in Conception Bay South who will avail of that water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the provincial and federal governments got together on that system and they paid \$41 million and what we were attempting to say to them last year, and we never got the point through, but in the election, the people during the election got their point through as to what they wanted. And I said at the time, and I repeat it again, that the people will love it if we could get it, regional government. And I will still be fighting for regional government for the Northeast Avalon urban region because I believe so strongly in it that the people of St. John's should not pay any more; if they use 18 million gallons per day it should be done on a gallonage basis and everybody who uses it should pay the same. And that is what I am fighting for - equality for the people of Pleasantville. And the people of Pleasantville understood that. When that was mentioned in my election campaign, Mr. Speaker, I did not even go back and challenge it in the paper. I did not waste any money on it. It would have been an insult to my constituents to go back and explain

MR. J. DINW: my position because they knew what my position was. It was the gentleman that was trying to get my job that made his position clear. My position was quite clear. And he was a good candidate. The hon. gentleman was a very good candidate, a man I respect, a man I know quite well, very well indeed, a good candidate and I think if he had not taken that position he might have gotten, instead of the votes he got in, he might have gotten another 1,000 votes or more.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) PSC in Ottawa, the great step forward (inaudible) regional government (inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: But it was a great step forward, too. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to get into - and I appreciate getting into this kind of thing back and forth in the House it does not pertain to the municipalities Act but if he wants to get into it I am willing to get into that. I had a conversation with Mr. Ron Atkey only a week ago, and two months before that I had a conversation with him again with respect to Newfoundland and with respect to what our aspirations were. We talked about at the time, two months ago, the slogan that we used in the campaign 'Step forward with Peckford for the way you want to grow'. And he came back to me two months later and he says, 'Do not step forward', he says 'Leap forward' and 'LEAP' was one of the programmes.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) Order, please!

The hon. minister has admitted that that perhaps is a little bit irrelevant.

MR. J. DINN: I apologize to Your Honour, I was just -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Provoked.

MR. J. DINN: I was just provoked by hon. members opposite and I like that kind of thing; the cut and thrust is the kind of thing we should get into more often here in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation has gone through an exhaustive amount of time. Most of the people in this Province know what is involved here. We have something like right now, with no pressure on anyone, thirty-four municipalities who have property tax.

MR. STIRLING: Out of how many?

MR. J. DINN: Just one moment now. Well, we have community councils, for example, that do not have property tax right now. But we thirty-four municipalities that do have property tax and that involves something like 65 per cent of the population of this Province that have property tax or a form of property tax. In St. John's we have that ungodly

MR. J. DINN: rental value system that should be replaced. If the hon. member wants to know what my position on that is, it should be replaced.

MR. THOMS: What do your constituents think of that?

MR. J. DINN: My constituents in Hillview Terrace Apartments, who pay 30 per cent of their rental value, which is about five times as much as I pay for a three bedroom bungalow, who live in Hillview Terrace Apartments, who live in the apartments on the base, who live all over that district.

MR. N. WINDSOR: People take an apartment because (iraudible)

MR. J. DINN: The people who cannot get an apartment because of the vacancy rate because nobody will build in the City of St. John's because it is too expensive, because the people who build they have to charge into their rents 30 per cent for an unfair tax, to the hon. member, I am against it! And my people are against it and if the hon. member wants to question that come down and have a chat with some of my people and he will find out. Weekly I meet with the people in my district and they tell me. All the hon. member has to do is walk into Hillview Terrace Apartments and ask them should they be paying 30 per cent of their rent to the City of St. John's when most hon. members in this House -

MR. L. STIRLING: Will the member permit another question?

MR. J. DINN: I certainly would.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North, by leave.

MR. L. STIRLING: If you are prepared to force all of the municipalities across Newfoundland other than the City of St. John's to have a real property tax, why do you not force the City of St. John's to have a capital property tax.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Hon. minister.

MR. J. DINN: The hon. member knows that the city of St. John's has their own Act, albeit that it needs to be changed. The city of St. John's Act needs to be changed. It is a deplorable piece of legislation. Anybody who has taken the time to go through the city of St. John's and sees what is in it obviously knows that the thing needs to be changed. What we attempt to do, Mr. Speaker, is wait for input from the city of St. John's to see what they want. It is an Act of participatory democracy. The city of St. John's sends in their recommendations and we act upon those recommendations if they are reasonable. And, Mr. Speaker, they have a property tax. The fact of the matter is they have an unfair rental value system and they should convert to that. I have talked to the city of St. John's about converting to that. And the hon. member should know that he represents Bonavista North and he should be concerned about what goes on in Bonavista North. I am concerned about what goes on in the city and I will look after the city of St. John's. They will not be adversely affected because I am elected to this House of Assembly, I can guarantee the hon. member.

MR. L. STIRLING: Why do you not do something in this House for them? The Act is an Act of the House of Assembly.

MR. J. DINN: Consultation the hon. member talks about, that is what we are doing, consulting. We are talking to the city of St. John's seeing if they can see the light.

MR. STIRLING: You do not mind forcing the people of Bonavista North but you do not want to force people in St. John's.

MR. DINN: Forcing people in Bonavista North to what?

MR. STIRLING: Force a property tax.

MR. WINDSOR: But they have property tax. They had it for 100 years.

MR. STIRLING: That is right, but an unfair one.

MR. DINN: The communities in Bonavista North who come in looking for water and sewer systems, who have to look after the responsibility of water and sewer systems, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows well, and the hon. member could learn by going down and just asking a few questions about what is going on, that they cannot afford to operate their systems. They want the system put in and then they cannot afford to operate it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. DINN: This gives an opportunity for a council to be able to operate it.

MR. STIRLING: How? How?

MR. DINN: We are in the position in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pay for it like everybody else.

MR. DINN: To pay for it like everybody else, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave?

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Leave was granted.

AN HON. MEMBER: No leave.

MR. DINN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: He cannot take it.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for LaPoile could never take it.

MR. SPEAKER Order, please! I understand that leave has now been withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if the Government House Leader wishes I would be agreeable to an adjournment at this time.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is a good idea. Move the adjournment.

MR. R. MOORES: There are out-of-town members who might want to go home.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. R. MOORES: I am not forfeiting my right to adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I realize that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is going to participate in the debate anyway, is he?

MR. R. MOORES: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: I would prefer if we went on because we do have a lot of business to get on, unless the hon. gentleman is really not prepared to speak then we would co-operate, you know.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, I am always prepared to speak. Than you very much. I am just pointing out the nature of my reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) West Coast over there.

MR. NEARY: The Government aircraft is standing by.

MR. R. MOORES: I have read the bill, the first sixty-five pages of it, and then I sort of sped read a few other pages of it. I am not sure what that means really. There seems to be a lot of emphasis here this morning on you should read the bill or some other member should read the bill or you should have read it more carefully. I think fundamentally each of us as legislators has a responsibility to make ourselves familiar with a piece of legislation. But for us to become authorities on it in the last few days, or the last few hours, in some cases I believe is being somewhat unfair by a minister or any of our colleagues.

What I have decided after reading this legislation is two very important principles; number one, that this government is being quite devious in its efforts to inject or impose regional government

Mr. R. Moores: upon the people of any region as specified
in the Wheilan Commission in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And, number two, that they have used this legislation
and manipulated the opportunity of submitting it to the House as a means
of dictating certain changes in the regulations and certain changes in
the municipal laws that they are themselves too cowardly to confront
head on either with this House or with the municipalities. And we saw
a very, very clear case of that, it was only a fleeting moment in the
House but it was a clear case. When I was not in my seat to speak, the
Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), noticing that, jumped to his
feet, then sat down, and the minister stood up to close the debate. Now
if this government and this minister wanted meaningful debate to carry
on in this House, then what was his intention?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Minister of Municipal
Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: The point of order is quite straightforward and quite brief and quite simple, Your Honour. I think Your Honour will confirm that when that incident took place, I was sitting in my seat; Your Honour, not seeing anybody else on their feet, looked towards me, and I immediately stood up and when I saw somebody else stand up, then I sat down. There was no attempt on my part to cut off debate. I welcome the debate, if the hon. gentleman has something to say.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman, Sir, knows more about the bill we are putting through the House than he knows about the rules. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. Every time Your Honour looks at somebody, does that mean he gets up? Your Honour looked at me while the minister was making a point of order and I felt compelled to get up because the hon. gentleman said every time Your Honour looks at somebody you have got to get up.

AN HON. MEMBER: A sneak job.

MR. NEARY: It was meant to be a sneak job. My hon. colleague is right, Sir. So there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I would have to say there is not really a point of order here but in any event perhaps it should be pointed out clearly again to the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores), who has raised the point in his debate, that the Speaker, whoever is occupying the Chair at the time, normally would recognize whoever is standing and at that particular occasion, if you might recall, there were several members standing and I was not quite sure what was happening. But in any event on one occasion there was nobody standing except the Minister of Municipal Affairs and therefore I had no choice but to recognize him. But following that, leave was granted by the hon. member for Carbonear to allow the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower to continue his speech and I think that will rest the case right here and now.

The hon. member for Carbonear may continue his comments.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The whole problem, Your Honour, is that you looked at too many people the one time.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There certainly was no intention, Mr. Speaker, on my part, or I am sure on the minister's part, to question your decision on that matter. Mr. Speaker, I want to get as quickly as possible to the point of the attitude of the government and the attitude of the government as expressed by the minister in this whole legislation. Now I have sat here this morning and I have listened to the members on the government side say very clearly that this is a giant step forward in municipal law in this Province, that at long last the government of this Province has finally gotten its thing together and have come forward with a consolidation of all the little bits and pieces of legislation and regulation surrounding waste disposal committees, local improvement districts and what have you. The fact in itself that laws are consolidated are not modifications in those laws. The fact that laws are consolidated does not mean that this government or its ministers contributing anything in the way of new legislation, of reform in the thinking, the attitude of local government in this Province.

Since the inception of local government on a large scale in this Province on or around 1948 - 1959, no cheaper form of management of local affairs has ever been devised by man in the democratic world. No cheaper form! You have seven men, in most cases, managing and regulating a community, taking all the backlash and nonsense that they can take, all the mudslinging, and in most cases they do not even get the courtesy of support from the government or the minister of the day. And that does not only apply to this administration or the Moores' administration, but right back to Confederation. Local government is a godsend to the government of the day. I know, because in 1967 when I was only a boy of seventeen - just eighteen, I think, just old enough to vote - I ran for community elections in Carbonear and without being boisterous I introduced at that time what we know in Carbonear as municipal campaigning, that

MR. R. MOORES: the issues were presented for the first time in almost twenty years. And the issues at that time, the issues that I brought out to the people to get myself elected, have not changed to this day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you get elected?

MR. R. MOORES: No, I lost by five votes actually. To this day in this Bill there are no modifications. Point out to me one essential change in the regulations of municipal government in this

MR. R. MOORES: Province that has not been either theoretically or practically already been used, been implemented by local government? The exception might be that now town councils have to present their budgets or do not have to present their budgets for current expenditure to the minister for approval. That has been the case been the case for the last fifteen or twenty years. All you people do, all the minister does is approve it if there are no capital borrowings or if he feels in his opinion that the current expenditure cannot be balanced and there may have to be borrowings to balance it. Now where is the big change there? You have not, for instance, even approached the problem of a poll tax which has been declared by every freethinking, volunteer local government member as a bloody nuisance. They do not want it they would rather not be bothered with it, and yet the minister incorporates in this new liberal reform modified regulation a \$20 poll tax and how the exemption is there for any young fellow who is unemployed and cannot earn \$2,300, or whatever it is, a year. Last year, for instance, the town of Carbonear collected the magnanimous sum of \$1,200 in poll tax. It would not even pay for the paper they used in their typewriters. Most of it remains unpaid, most poll taxes. In fact I would almost suspect that even my poll taxes when I was a resident of Carbonear as such have not been paid. They probably are in arrears!

What then exactly does the Minister of Labour and (Mr. Dinn) mean? What does the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) mean when he says that this is a new step forward in municipal government. You have not, by this Bill, changed one iota of thinking in the minds of the local government people. If you introduce legislation, for instance, with real autonomy, I would venture to say that in the next municipal government elections in 1981 or 1982, whenever it is, that you would get people of far greater, higher equality becoming involved in local government. And that is not the case now, I grant you, and the Minister of Labour and Manpower need not look at me critically. That is not the case now! I have

MR. R. MOORES: three town councils in my district, I have one local improvement district, and I can tell you now that they are not anywhere near being managed in accordance with the wishes and desires of the people. And I am not just referring to taxation; people do not always criticize councils because of taxes, they criticize them because of a variety of things which have always been ignored by the government, by the way. I noticed, for example, I brought a petition into this House sometime ago for the removal of the council in my district, in April or May of that year. I noticed, too, that that council was cleared and never did the minister come to see me or any of his officials. They never, ever came to see the prime critic of that council, the person, the organizer of the petition. They never went to see anybody who was opposed to council. Now just to finish that point, that council, by the way, later resigned and all of them, quite frankly, never got elected. I might say to follow the Minister of Labour and Manpower's lead, that that community went five to one Liberal in the last election.

MR. NEARY: Democracy won out.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is letting you know that he was right.

MR. R. MOORES: And on that point too, Mr. Speaker, I meant to make a comment on the Minister of Labour and Manpower's (Mr. Dinn) statement about the simplistic notion that he has that regional government in his district was of such great importance that it determined his election and Opposition members lost. Let me tell you something, that two years ago I would wager with any man in this House that the member for Mount Scio would not even win his nomination if I were in university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: So my point being that if you were simplistically determine why or why not you got elected and the Opposition member lost, I would suggest that you come outside the overpass in St. John's,

MR. DINN: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: I was, yes, that is why I said that two years, while being at university I would wager that - never mind. I am just speaking in terms of these foolish attitudes the minister as to why he got elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay' carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, November 19, 1979 at 3:00 P.M.