

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members, first of all I would like to take the opportunity to welcome the newest officer of this hon. House the new Clerk Assistant, Mr. Malcolm Rowe, and wish him well in his new position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: And I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today a former Governor of the State of Maine and now the Ambassador of the United States to Canada, Mr. Kenneth M. Curtis. Ambassador Curtis is accompanied by Mrs. Curtis and the United States Consul General in Halifax, Mr. Thomas Wilson. We bid them a warm welcome and trust that their visit to our Province will be an enjoyable one and an informative one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that Cabinet has recently approved the continuance of our special assistance programme to sawmill operators for the current season. The programme provides working capital to sawmills during the cutting season when lumber sales are normally at the lowest point. Now this will be the fourth year that my department will participate in such a programme and its continuance is due mainly to the excellent results achieved and the low number of losses experienced. An evaluation of the 1978-1979 programme revealed an acceptable increase in lumber production directly resulting from the assistance provided. Current figures also show that 95 per cent of funds advanced have been repaid.

MR. J. GOUDIE: The new programmes will be effective December 15th of this year, but my staff will be available to accept applications as of December 3rd, 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, for our part we welcome the announcement. The programme the minister has just told us about is not new, as he says, as he acknowledges, it is simply the reintroduction again this year, or the continuation this year, of a programme which came in three or four years ago. I believe Mr. John Lundrigan was the minister concerned and I understand it has worked fairly well. And I think, that being so, we ought to welcome its reintroduction or its continuation, whichever is the correct phrase, and we do so.

I must go on to add that, of course, it will do nothing to solve the problems of the sawmilling industry in this Province and this is not the place, I know Your Honour would agree, to debate the matter, but such things as the problems we have heard about in Roddickton and Main Brook, or the problems being encountered by the former sawmill operation at the foot of Gambo Pond in Bonavista North district, the difficulties with the sawmill operation in Bay d'Espoir, the former Ralland Enterprises mill, the continuing difficulties which I understand are being experienced in Hawkes Bay with Newfoundland Forest Products, I believe it is called.

A number of other large sawmill operations throughout this Province and a number of the intermediate sized ones are not in good shape and they are not getting the kinds of assistance which we think they ought to get. But that aside, the fact remains that

MR. B. ROBERTS: this programme which tends to help the smaller operators by what amounts to inventory financing. The government are in the banking business, if they were a bank they would be taking section 88, the security to it. It is amounting to banking business; the government buys the inventory during the winter months when sales are down and then as the inventory is sold the government gets their money back. This programme has worked fairly well and so we welcome its continuation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) flowing from a number of statements that have been made by him and by others over the past several weeks or indeed months. But most specifically in the document dated September 5th., discussion paper on bilateral issues with the Federal Government, there is an anticipation here that a recommendation with regard to Lower Churchill development will be ready and I am quoting, 'by year's end'. May I begin by asking if the timetable is still in fact in place?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this refers to the feasibility studies which are presently underway by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation which we expect will be completed early in the New Year. 'At year's end' did not contemplate that the report would be in by December 31st, although we perhaps should have been a little more precise. But at all times that I have made statements about this in the past year, and the Federal Government is aware as well, it is contemplated that before the end of the fiscal year, before March 31st. we should have the final report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation on the feasibility of both Gull Island and Muskrat Falls.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMESON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to get into a hassle with the hon. minister over wording, but certainly 'year's end' does not say fiscal and I have examined Hansard over the last July and August sessions and it was quite clear, to me at least, and I can show the references, that we were talking about the end of 1979. However, slippage apparently has occurred so we are now talking, I take it, the end of March 1980. Could I ask the hon. minister if at that time it will be a completed picture which will give the options vis-a-vis the Gull Island site and the second site, Muskrat Falls, I believe - I am not sure what the official title is of it - and that they will both be put down and that the government will at that time have made, that is the Government of Newfoundland, a conclusion, a very specific conclusion as to the direction in which it wants to go or will it just lay these two options and say, 'Here they are,' and then we would have to again go through the assessment of them to decide which is the best one to choose?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this is purely a report being completed by officials and this government anyhow would not leave that type of decision to the officials of government. They will set out the options and it will then be a political decision as to which option this government, and the Government of Canada, will end up taking, whether it be Muskrat Falls to be developed first, or Gull Island to be developed first will have to be one of the major decisions, whether it be a transmission line laid by submarine cables across the Strait of Belle Isle or whether it be a tunnel, that will be another decision. The political decision will obviously be influenced greatly by the economic analysis to be contained in this report. But ultimately the options will be set out. We hope to have all the information necessary by March 31st., to permit us to make the decision and to permit us to go to seek the necessary financial assistance from the federal government to see electricity from Labrador flowing to the Island part of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: I understand, of course, that it is the government which must make the choice but is the hon. minister saying that if, for instance, there is a clear analytical conclusion in the report, that one option is clearly more desirable than the other, that the government might, in fact, go against the findings of the Committee? I realize to a degree that is a hypothetical situation but I think it is a quite important and valid one at this age. In other words, in the past the government has said in most of these instances that it relies upon the experts. Does this suggest that even if there is a clear preference expressed for one or the other location as a start, that the government might well go in a different direction and as a result in a sense negate much of the work that has been taking place over the last year?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to rely upon experts, it is another thing to abdicate your responsibility in making this type of decision.

I have yet to see the experts' report that I would accept or feel that I had to accept in its entirety. Because usually these reports, and particularly a report of this nature, are based upon certain underlying assumptions, and usually there will be a choice of assumptions and often these assumptions relate to social, economical and, in fact, political matters. And while at times we may be prepared to leave the economic factors to the experts, and lately I am not sure we should even do that, we are not prepared to leave the social and political decisions to the experts. We, Mr. Speaker, the elected representatives of this House, are the "experts" as far as this Province is concerned in terms of making social and political decisions. And that is why I underline the fact that we will look upon the options provided by the experts but we will make the decision ultimately as to what is the best way to go for the

Mr. Barry: prosperity and the well-being of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. member for Windsor-Suchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. member for his first year lecture in political responsibility, of which I am perfectly well aware, I wish that the Government of Newfoundland had been equally well aware when they rubber stamped most of the rate increases for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: - the Utilities Board and put the burden on the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: That statement may well come back to haunt him. Let me in my final supplementary, however, put it to the hon. minister this way, we now know that unlike the first statement, which said that the report would be ready by year's end, we are now not going to get it until the end of March. At that point the government must then decide on the kinds of actions it is going to take and then open negotiations with the Government of Canada for assistance. I put it to the hon. member in assessing the economic impact of this particular project that we are not going to see a start on the Lower Churchill in 1980.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: 1981 or 1982.

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

MR. BARRY: I am not sure whether that is wishful thinking on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. There is nothing that I have said that would indicate that is the case.

MR. NEARY: A change of government would be the only way the Lower Churchill will get going.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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



MR. BARRY: When the hon. member for - the former member for Bell Island (Mr. Neary) who ran to the South Coast in terror before the last election -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: - By invitation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! The hon.

MR. NEARY: I did not get eighty dollars an hour either while I was down there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: The Leader of the Opposition has referred to this government leaving it to the experts with respect to rate increases for petroleum products. I think we have already had statements of the Leader of the Opposition quoted back to him, statements that he made while in the Government of Canada, in which he -

AN HON. MEMBER: That has nothing (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, how is it that it has nothing to do with what he is saying, when it is a reference to his relying upon - when it is referred to his relying upon the so-called experts, and being prepared to accept the fact that world energy prices that will dictate what the price of energy is in Canada, which the Leader of the Opposition accepted when he was in Ottawa, but somehow now he has flip-flopped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Well, maybe that is why, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. BARRY: - maybe that is why he is Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. That the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - saw the flip flop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

They saw the flip flop that was made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

If I could complete the answer, Mr.

Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Would you permit an answer to your

question?

AN HON. MEMBER:

By all means.

MR. BARRY:

When you are ready.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

The information being prepared by the

Lower

MR. BARRY:

Churchill Development Corporation,

I expect to receive portions of the final report before it is put together in one package and I expect to have and to be able to go to government with information on the various features of the Lower Churchill Power Development between January and March. The final report, the latest I expect to have it in will be the end of March. By the time this report is received, however, I hope to have my colleagues in Cabinet briefed reasonably thoroughly on what to expect from this final report and I would anticipate that there will be no undue delay, following the receipt of the report, before a final decision is made as to what is the best route for this Province in meeting the energy needs of the late 1980s and 1990s for this Province. And I am still reasonably optimistic that we can see a start on the development of the Lower Churchill power in 1980. All the factors are not within our control but there is nothing changed, Mr. Speaker. There has been no serious slippage, that I am aware of, in the timing of this report. I have always spoken of late 1979 or early 1980 for the receipt of this report and that is still on schedule as far as I am aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans,

followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Over this weekend the Premier in addressing a gathering in Stephenville, in a news report after and a statement, indicated that the government's, his position now with regard to the Buchans-Burgeo-Southwest Brook road is that it is now a priority, that the Province is going to DREE for funding on that road and that it will one day be the second Trans-Canada. Now, in view of the fact that less than a month ago the present minister met the Buchan's Action Committee and wanted to talk about the concept of the Howley road - not particularly wanting to talk about the Southwest Brook road - and in view of the fact that I have excerpts of letters from the Minister of DREE, the hon. Elmer MacKay stating that, number one,

MR. FLIGHT: the Province up to this point in time, which was about a month ago, had not made requests of the Department of DREE, that that road was not even on the Province's shopping list for DREE funding, and he went on further to say that he was not convinced that it was an economically viable approach, the question I want to ask the minister is, in view of the Premier's statement this weekend in Stephenville has the Department of Transportation and Communications rethought their approach to the Southwest, Brook-Buchans road? What is the minister's position, now, in light of the Premier's statement in Stephenville this weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: (Sims)  
Communications.

The hon. Minister of Transportation and

MR. BETT: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the Premier's statement and until such time as I have heard some of the local radio

MR. BRETT: stations commenting on it and I understand there were some comments in the paper, but I have not actually heard what the Premier said and until such time, I do not believe I should comment on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this might sound like a tongue in cheek supplementary but I have to ask it. The minister is the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I presume he decides the policy of Transportation. I presume we do not go from a month to month basis in planning, and a month ago he was not aware of the government's intention to do any work this year on the Southwest Brook road. Is the minister standing here and telling us that he is not aware of the plans of the Department of Transportation to include that road as a priority item in the DREE shopping list, that he is not aware of the Premier's intention to have that road built? I realize it is unreal to have to ask this kind of question and the answer we just received is unreal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Has the minister indicated to the House that he is not aware of his own department's long-term road building plans?

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

MR. BRETT: The hon. member is well aware that I did not say I am not aware of the long-term plans of the Department of Transportation and Communications. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I have not heard the Premier's statements and I refuse to comment upon rumours.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, followed by the hon. the member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the hon. minister indicate whether or not he has received correspondence from the Buchans Action Committee asking for clarification on the Premier's statements and pointing out the utter confusion that has been caused by the minister's approach and now the Premier's approach on that very crucial problem, that road that will mean so much to Central Newfoundland and the Buchans area? Would he indicate whether or not he has received correspondence from that Action Committee requesting clarification?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any recent correspondence from the Buchans Action Group, not within the past two or three days.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, and it could not come at a more opportune time now that we have the United States Ambassador to Canada sitting in the public gallery.

My question, Sir, involves marketing of Newfoundland fresh fish to the United States. There is very great concern in my own district today about the stories that are coming out that there are problems in marketing Newfoundland fish in the United States market. As hon. members of the House know, there are five fish plants in my district which look to the United States to market their produce. Could the hon. gentleman tell us if there is any foundation to these stories that the fish market in the United States is soft at the present time? And just how serious is the situation? Could the hon. gentleman tell the members of the House?

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

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. House, regrettably, how serious this situation is to which the hon. member just referred. I might point out just for his information, that I have been out of the House for the last eight days sick, and have not had time

MR. GOUDIE: in the few hours this morning to catch up on what has been happening in either my own regular line department or the Department of Fisheries, of which I am acting minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Perhaps I could zero in on the

MR. NEARY: Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, whoever that is right now, I do not know. But I will ask the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not in.

MR. NEARY: Well, perhaps the Acting Premier or the Government House Leader could tell us if there is any foundation to these stories, that seem to be very serious, that are coming out of the United States that the market is soft at the present time, that there will be problems in the near future in marketing Newfoundland fish in the United States and as hon. members know most of the fresh fish produced in this Province is marketed to the United States in the form of cod blocks, Could the hon. gentleman enlighten the House as to whether or not there are any problems?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the situation with the markets in the United States are, you know, a continuing thing, sometimes they are up and sometimes they are down. The present situation with respect to the marketing conditions in the States is something that we are aware of. This information has come to light today and we are making enquiries with respect to it. I do not think at the present time there is any need for any great imminent concern with respect to it but I would like to assure the House that the government is monitoring the situation and keeping its eye on it very carefully.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed the hon. gentleman could not give the House any details, any real information about this situation, which seems to be very serious. Could the hon. gentleman tell us if it is just a temporary thing or how long this situation involving difficulties in the market in the United States is going to last? Could the hon. gentleman give us



MR. NEARY: some hint of what is going on? Is it going to be of long-term duration or will it just be a temporary thing? Could the hon. gentleman tell the House?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The first thing, Mr. Speaker, before the matter gets out of all proportion, the hon. gentleman referred to it as a situation, the situation in which we now find ourselves. Now, that is his definition. Obviously there is a matter of concern when we get reports of that nature but I would hasten to indicate that we are not quite sure at this present time as to whether or not a situation, as he referred to it, exists. If it does exist we are going to do everything we possibly can, both here and through our representatives in Ottawa with respect to the matter. The only thing I can tell the hon. member right now is that from time to time the markets for fish in the United States have their high points -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) knows that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - and have their low points. But the hon. member may not be aware of the fact because when he was in government they did not keep as close an eye on it as we do. This government now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - you know, has it under consideration and is monitoring it, not weekly, not daily, but hourly.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Do we, at the present time, have the specialist teachers in the Province to enable us to implement the grade XII programme in September 1980, or for that matter, in September 1981?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) for his question and to take this opportunity to welcome him back to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I first made a ministerial statement in the House on Grade XII in August, no final decisions on how and when senior high school will be reorganized with the addition of Grade XII will be made until at least the end of the year. A network of committees involving people representing the different agencies which share responsibility for education have been at work since last winter doing research and making plans. Those committees will be making reports and recommendations around the end of this month and based on those recommendations government will be in a position to make final decisions on how and when senior high school will be reorganized.

The committees have been working under a target timetable set by government which would have the beginning of the reorganized high school programme starting with Grade X phasing in next September 1980, with Grade XII actually being taught for the first time in a school here in 1982-83. Now, it will not be until final decisions are made on the reorganized curriculum and other matters that we will know just what teachers are required. Obviously, we have in the Province now, many qualified teachers who are competent to teach certain subjects and these teachers will be able to effectively teach some of the new courses which are contemplated. For example, a new course in Newfoundland history will be able to be handled by many of the history teachers who are now teaching in our schools.

Part of the preparation for the actual implementation of the new senior high school will involve a lengthy in-service programme for ~~3394~~ teachers and we will not actually

MS. L. VERGE: go ahead with the new programme until and unless we can see that adequate teacher preparation will be carried out. If it should happen that we are short some specialists in subjects like, for example, home economics or industrial arts, there will be a couple of years lead time to try to get proper specialists in line because Grade XII itself will not be actually taught at the earliest even under the target timetable until the school year 1982-83.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the question that I was asking was whether we do have trained specialists now. Studying

MR. J. HODDER: one of the minister's committees which she just referred to which is the one committee that has done some work, the report of the Sub-committee on Curriculum Re-organization, in reading that report I notice that the report suggests and I know it is not a final report but there is certainly an awful lot of work gone into it, but the report suggests courses in fine arts, bookkeeping, typing, home economics and industrial arts as the minister referred to. Now, the minister said in her answer to the first question that Grade XII would not be implemented until we were sure that we had those specialties. My question to the minister now is have there been any studies done by any of the curriculum departments? I know that we have unemployed teachers in the Province but I also know that many of the unemployed teachers in the Province are not specialists. I am also aware that the Grade XII programme will require specialists, particularly guidance specialists in all schools, even the smaller schools, because I notice that there is a different programme for the smaller schools than for the larger. So what I am asking the minister is: do we have these specialists in the Province, how soon can we get them and have their been any studies by her department to let us know just what type of people are available and what type of specialists are available in the teaching profession who will be required? And I think particularly of the ones I have mentioned who will be required to teach the Grade XII re-organized program.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well questioned!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If I might, I believe perhaps I should point out to hon. members that the Standing Orders are quite clear in that questions as well as answers should be fairly brief. I believe I have been very flexible today and I would ask all members to keep the Standing Orders in mind when they are asking or answering questions.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's questions I want to reiterate that no final preparations are in place for the start of the new high school programme. Part of the work that the committees are embarking on, I have not seen their final recommendations or reports, is recommendations on the courses and specialists which will be needed. I will be in a better position to comment on the exact points that are raised after I receive those reports and recommendations which should be very shortly.

MR. J. HODDER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fort au Port followed by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. J. HODDER: I notice from the minister's answers for the first time she is

MR. E. ROBERTS: She has admitted now.

MR. J. HODDER: putting no time limit at all. Now we were talking about September 1980 as a target date and 1981. With a question such, as this, whether we have the qualified teachers in the Province, would the minister tell me whether there are any plans to re-train, perhaps, some of our unemployed teachers who will be needed in those specialist skills like guidance counsellors and industrial arts, particularly in the rural areas of the Province where none of these people exist now? And the second question I must ask is whether the minister indeed feels that the Grade XII programme can be implemented in September 1981 or 1982 with the circumstances that we now face in the schools of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister for Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, my statement about the uncertainty of the timing is entirely consistent with what I said in this House in August. I have said from the beginning that no final decision on the timing or the method with which the new high school programme will be implemented would be made until the end of this year, after we had received the reports from the committees which had been at work since last Winter.

As for the possibility of a shortage of specialists who will be required, obviously we have a number of these specialists in the Province now who would also continue their work in high school even after the addition of Grade XII.

As for the possibility of retraining some unemployed teachers, this is something that has been discussed and it has also been mentioned to me by The Newfoundland Teachers' Association which is concerned with this situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River. I think I indicated a final supplementary, unless the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) wishes to yield? There are about two minutes left.

MR. HISCOCK: Do I lose my question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes. Do not -

MR. HISCOCK: No.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Seeing that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not here I would like to direct my question to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall). I would like, if it is possible, for the President to get this information for the House. I was rather concerned that the NLC ended up making a decision November 16, reneging on a privilege, as they said, that Newfoundland and Labrador clubs had with regard to the extension of the hours of being open from one o'clock to three o'clock. I would like for the minister to provide the House with the information on, number one, what would be the total number of accidents in St. John's last year? How many break and entries were there in St. John's last year?

Mr. Hiscock: How many rapes were there in St. John's last year? How many impaired drivers were there in St. John's last year? And how many speeding tickets were given out last year? And, then, also, how many of those took place after one o'clock?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to give the hon. member complete information right now, but we only have two minutes to the end of Question Period. So the hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - I know the hon. member does not even presume that any minister of this government, as good as this government is, would have this particular information at his fingertips, so I will take notice of it and find what information, such as the statistics, maybe there, for instance, the hon. member has asked us what speeding tickets were given after one o'clock? He asked how many - God help us - rapes were committed after one o'clock and the other things. We have statistics on crimes that have been committed and offenses have been committed, but I do not think it is categorized as to what time of the day they occur.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: It might be more appropriate if the hon. member would place that question on the Order Paper.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: When I gave the question I did not expect the President of the Privy Council to have it at his fingertips, I expected him to go back and get the research done, in that I would like to include armed robbery after one o'clock?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: I take notice of the question, but I do have the tall the hon. gentleman - you know, he asks these questions and then at the end of it, which of these were committed after one o'clock? Now I do not know if that information is available but certainly if that information is available, Mr. Speaker, we will bring it before this House at the earliest possible moment and table it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the Annual Report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act, and this is the report for the financial year ending March 31st., 1979.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Justice, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," and a bill, "An Act To Amend The Legal Aid Act, 1975."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Control Act, 1973."

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Mineral Act, 1976."

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move a motion;  
WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada; and WHEREAS there are a number of areas



MR. HODDER: of the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the provincial average; and WHEREAS more than half of those now unemployed are in the fifteen to twenty-four year old age group; and WHEREAS a study of the economic potential of Stephenville, Port au Port, St. George's area, the Udell Report, stated that in 1978, between eighty and ninety per cent of the labour force in the district of Port au Port were unemployed during December of 1978, and an estimated thirty to forty per cent are without work during the inshore fishing season; and WHEREAS many other areas of the Province suffer similar rates of unemployment; and WHEREAS the resources already known and available to our Province could, if properly used and developed, provide full and permanent employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador labour force; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House fully debate all aspects of the unemployment situation in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a select committee of this House be appointed to work with labour, the academic community and business associations as well as interested individuals regarding the development of job opportunities in those areas of the Province where unemployment is the highest.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to have this motion, perhaps, put forward on the Order Paper so that we might be able to get a chance to debate it during this session of the House, perhaps shortly.

I would ask the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! It is my understanding that the hon. member is presenting notice of a private member's motion and the decision as to when that motion should be debated would have to be decided on Private Members' Day, I would think. So we will leave it at that stage.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with respect, it is a private member's motion and my hon. friend has given notice as is required but I understood he went on and asked if the members opposite would give leave to allow it to be placed higher on the Order Paper. As it now stands it will naturally go at the bottom of the Order Paper and all I can say is we on this side are prepared to have this put at the top of the private members' list. It cannot be called except on Private Members' Day, of course, but we would like to see it at the top of the private members' list so it would be the next order called and that could be done, surely by leave of the House and this, I would submit, Your Honour, is an appropriate time to ask if such leave is granted.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest it is not the appropriate time. The rules with respect to Private Members' Days are that the motions are put on the Order Paper in accordance with the time of their receipt. I would suggest that this particular motion will be put on the Order Paper in accordance with the time of its receipt, after the ones that are there and when Private Members' Day comes then it is a matter of determining these things, determining the precedence.

But in the meantime, not everybody who has matters on the Order Paper is here present I do not believe. If the hon. gentlemen opposite feel that the motions that they have put on the Order Paper now are inferior and they do not warrant debate, it does not necessarily mean that the hon. gentlemen here on this side feel the same way. But it is a matter that should be decided on Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point raised I would like to take the matter under advisement. We can deal with it later today if necessary but for the first part, the motion is accepted as

November 26, 1979

Tape No. 1357

NM - 4.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): a notice of motion or a private member's motion, the same as any other private members' motion when presented under Notices of Motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Just so we are clear.

MR. ROBERTS: you have taken this under advisement, the question of when it is appropriate to ask for leave.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, that is fair enough, and I would simply submit in return that it is an appropriate time to ask for leave, if it is granted. I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite may not all be here, but perhaps not all on this side are here, and, you know, the House can act by unanimous consent at any time if it so wishes. It would also be appropriate, of course, to raise it on the Wednesday. Obviously, hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid of this motion, do not want it debated, but if it is not in order to ask now we will raise it again next Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) That would be my suggestion, to raise it again next Wednesday.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question number 56, regarding physiotherapists, placed on the Order Paper by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 31.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 31, Bill No. 58. 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." We are on the amendment.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on Friday in connection with this act, which is a very important act for this Province. I think it is certainly the only act that has come before this House since I became a member.

Somebody once said that if six people had spoken on any one piece of legislation in Parliament, then everything

MR. THOMS: that could be said about a particular piece of legislation would have been said by that particular time. However, I think in connection with this particular act, the Municipalities Act, all fifty-one members of this House could speak on the bill and everyone could have something new to say.

I have not had the opportunity to read this act as extensively, as thoroughly, as I would like to have had. I made some points on Friday. I notice the press did not consider them all that important, but I am still going to repeat some of the things that I said on Friday, and as well, of course, my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was not in the House on Friday and he would probably like to hear some of the comments I have about this act as well.

I think one of the points that I did bring out - we saw before the Public Accounts Committee, as I said, a minister of the Crown, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan), say that under the Public Tendering Act he could have been in a position to save the people of this Province thousands and thousands of dollars, but because of the strict interpretation put on a particular section of the Public Tendering Act, he could not do that. So what do we find now? We find that the government is bringing in a Municipalities Act - the consolidation and revision of this act - that has exactly the same provision in this act that is in the Public Tendering Act, and that is a situation where there is an extension to a contract and you cannot negotiate downwards. The minister interpreted that particular act to mean that it could negotiate downwards. In other words, somebody came along and said, 'Look, I have N number of loads of gravel here, - This is an extension to the existing contract - I want to get rid of it, it is no good to me, I will sell it to you for \$3.' The minister would have to say to him, 'No, I am sorry, we cannot buy it from you for \$3 - we have to pay you \$5 for that.' That is the way the Public Tendering Act was interpreted. And what do we have? We now have a minister -

MR. THOMS: we have a government which brings in an act with the same wording. In other words, councils cannot give extensions and negotiate downward and that particular section of the act should be changed. The particular section that I ended up on Friday and this is a particular section of this act that - I have not heard the President of the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities mention this, I have seen a news release come out, I have read an article in the newspaper where the president was urging that this particular piece of legislation be put through the House as quickly as possible but I would doubt very much if the Federation has made it public in this Province that every councillor accepts a liability when he becomes a councillor, not only a joint liability but a several liability. In other words, one particular person, one particular councillor can be held responsible for the acts of the whole council. They can go after one person. They just cannot go after them jointly, they can go after them severally. In other words, they can sue the one with all the money. I wonder how many councillors in this Province realize that when they are giving voluntarily of their time and effort that they face this responsibility, this liability under this act? I do not see and I have not seen the President of the Newfoundland Mayors and Municipalities making this known throughout the length and breadth of this Province. Well, I can assure the minister and I can assure the government that anybody who is going to be running for council in the district of Grand Bank from now on will realize what an onerous responsibility is being placed on him by this particular act.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will scare them off.

MR. THOMS: Of course you will scare them off and they should be scared off because they are never informed of it. Did the minister in Gander, did he inform the convention out in Gander that councillors would be accepting this type of responsibility? Would he ever do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS:

It is not a question of scaring people.

Why did this government amend the University Act so that members of the Board of Regents and the Senate of the university are not liable? Why did they do that? Why not give the same protection to councillors who give their time and effort in this Province to serve the people of this Province? Is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) suggesting that we should not advise the people of this Province of this onerous and unfair responsibility that they are undertaking when they put themselves up for election to the town and community councils in this Province? Is the minister suggesting that we should hide it and keep it hidden? Keep it covered up.

DR. COLLINS:

I contend that they are conscientious enough (inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

I doubt - how many do we have sitting on the other side of the House right now? I doubt if half the people over there have read this act or will ever read the act. Obviously, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) did not read the act or he would have asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) to amend Section 430. He was the one who was in before the PAC screaming about the wording of Section 430. He, obviously, did not read the act. But then, of course, I heard people on the other side of the House speak on the Matrimonial Act who obviously had not read the act as well. So there is nothing unusual about that.

The other one that I mentioned on Friday was the one that I called and what could be termed, tenure, to town managers, town clerks and department heads of municipalities,

MR. THOMS: taking the responsibility of what happens to council employees out of the hands of the council. They have given them tenure. They can only be dismissed or suspended (a) with a two-thirds vote of council, a two-thirds vote of council, and secondly, if they grossly misconduct themselves. They have the same protection - town managers, town clerks, department heads - they have the same protection as a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or a university professor. Why? why? Why does the minister think that the councils cannot run their own affairs in this Province, they cannot be responsible for their own employees? Let them make a decision whether a man should be hired or fired or what have you.

Mr. Speaker, another section that I would like to bring to the attention of the minister: In saying this I am not suggesting that a council should not be able to charge arrears on taxes - I would like to point out to this House that I am bringing these particular sections, these particular points, to the attention of the minister hoping that they are constructive, hoping that the minister will consider them constructive and will, hopefully, bring about some amendment to the act. It is not a question of wanting to delay or anything else, but this particular sections says that arrears can be charged at the prime rate of interest charged by the chartered banks the first day of January in each year. So, what do we have here? We have anybody who is in arrears of interest being charged - what is the prime rate, 15, goodness knows it might have gone up, it might be 16, it might be 17 for all we know, the interest rates are going up so quickly since May 22. You can hardly turn around without getting a notice from your bank, now the interest rates have gone up another percentage point. I certainly have not received one lately saying it has gone down a percentage point, but on top of that, on top of that, the minister has seen fit to put another 3 per cent - it is not enough that on arrears they can charge 16 or 17 per cent in this Province today, but on top of that 15 or 16 per cent they can now charge another 3 per cent. Mr. Speaker, we have an unconscionable



MR. THOMS: Transactions Act in this Province which defines what is an exorbitant or an unconscionable interest rate to charge. It just might be that a court would find that this is unconscionable. It is certainly something that should be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that I cannot read the act, but somehow or other in the particular one that I have certain of the pages are upside down. Mr. Speaker, certainly the act itself, in many respects, is upside down so I am not surprised.

MR. BARRY: Stand on your head, it will be easier to read.

MR. THOMS: What is the shah of Mt. Scio saying? Mr. Speaker, I have had another section in this particular act which gives me some concern and that is Section 141 of the act, which provides for a penalty where any person who fails to pay any tax he is liable to pay in accordance with this part or (b) to collect and pay to the council any tax he is directed to collect and pay over by this part. He is

MR. L. THOMS: guilty of an offence, on summary conviction to a fine of not less than \$25 each day. Now, Mr. Speaker, our Companies Act has the same provision practically for somebody who is doing business in the Province and without having registered to do business in the Province, the penalty is \$25 a day for every day that that person does business in the Province without being so registered. I do not know of any occasion in this Province where any mainland company has been fined that \$25 a day. Now, most of the companies that come in from the mainland to do business in this Province are big companies. You would not hurt them too badly by imposing the penalty in the Companies Act. Charging them \$25 a day, you would not hurt them too badly!

But, Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a section that was in the other Act and I know that in my district the magistrate is actually imposing this penalty. Somebody owes the council \$100 and the magistrate will impose that \$25 a day. So the \$100 gets all out of proportion, it becomes \$500 that they have to pay, the amount of the arrears plus the \$25 a day fine. Now, Mr. Speaker, to me it is kind of ironic that John Jones Limited, from Calgary, can come in here, can do business illegally, really, illegally, for which they should be fined \$25 a day, but never are. But still you let somebody who is struggling on a fixed income in Grand Bank, or Fortune or Lamaline or St. Lawrence, go to court and the magistrate has no hesitation whatsoever in fining him \$25 a day for every day that the money is not paid. No hesitation whatsoever! I think that is a section that can be looked at. I think it leaves it wide open to - you cannot call it abuse because the magistrate would not abuse the section but he is applying the penalty that is there. I think the penalty is too harsh! And what happens is that a person, because he has not paid it - and I have had situations, I can give you actual situations like this where the penalty has far exceeded the amount of the arrears. I can give the minister examples - I can give you an example right out of my own district. And what happens? The person cannot pay it.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many sections in this Act that need some clarification. Of course, we will get a chance during the clause by clause. These are some of the more important ones that I would like to point out at this time. I would like to have had a few moments to spend speaking on the curfew which is something that - especially somebody with young children-I would like to have had time to say something on that. We have a situation in Section 271, in connection with a meeting to replace councils, which is a throwback to the dark ages, I mean, where the secret ballot is taken and thrown right out the window. No longer is a secret ballot secret anymore, where councillors can be replaced by a show of hands.

MR. L. THOMS:

I think that should be changed.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, all fifty-one members of this House could speak on this particular act and everyone of them could say something new if they wanted to. I think it is an act that we should give a lot longer view to than have, I think the minister and the government and we have not had the opportunity as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly support a delay just so we could clean up the act and I do not mean to be punny there either. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms)

Is the House ready for the question then on the amendment?

The question has been called.

Shall the words proposed to be left out stand apart of the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion, those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay". In My opinion, the 'Nay's' have it.

Shall the words proposed to be inserted by the amendment be there inserted? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion, those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay". I declare the motion lost.

Now, back on the main question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Is it agreed?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have not heard from my colleague in the Common Room. Anybody else?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion, please rise?

MR. ROBERTS: Valiant fighters for democracy.

Mr. Flight, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Fred Rowe, Mr. Edward Roberts, Mr. Neary, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Moores, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Warren, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Bennett.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion, please rise?

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and Industrial Development, the hon. Minister of Social Services, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Staggy, Mr. Collins, Mr. Carter, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Dawe, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Woodrow, Dr. McNicholas, and Mr. Baird.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Clerk hand me the results?

I declare the motion lost.

The main question, second reading.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few moments on this bill. I believe they are the truest words I have heard from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) who was on television, I think, it was Wednesday or Thursday night, when he

Mr. Warren:                   made a comment on Hear and Now , he said,  
"We will defeat this bill regardless. We will defeat this six month  
hoist. And when it comes before the House we will pass it." So  
here is an example that regardless, before there was a full study done  
with the municipalities, his mind was made up, when this bill  
was brought in, that regardless it is going to be passed.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things there that I am in favour of. Number one is Section 527. When the election is called in mid-November, any resident in a community for thirty days prior to the election is eligible to vote. Now, under the old act it was ninety days. So this part of this act, I am completely in agreement with because, as you know, in past municipal elections, residents living in an area usually moved in there at the opening of a school year and they were not eligible to vote.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) mentioned Section 21, the vacancy of a mayor. When the mayor for personal reasons or any other reason decides to resign, even after being in the Chair for only a short time, the deputy mayor automatically fills the slot whether he wants it or not. Mr. Speaker, that is a burden on the deputy mayor. He is there to fill in in the absence of the mayor but not for probably three and one-half years. I think it should be up to the council to have an election by the good graces of the minister and have their own mayor elected.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned with Section 233. It may sound very minor. It is concerning curfew. Section 233: 'The council may make regulations prescribing the hours during which children below the age set out in the regulations are permitted on a public road, park, place of amusement or public assembly, whether alone or in the company of a parent, guardian or other adult.' Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is definitely intruding in people's lives. I believe that the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) could very well remember that Corner Brook tried to bring in such a curfew some years ago and it pretty well backfired. It is practically impossible to bring in such an act. And here in this particular bill, the minister is saying, 'Let us bring in a curfew if the councils want to.'

Mr. Chairman, take, for example, a small community such as Admiral's Beach, St. Mary's - The Capes. If Mrs. Smith is planning to go down to the store at 8:30 P.M. and she wants to take along her twelve year old kid because she finds it lonely walking on the streets where there is no electricity, that could mean that the municipal

MR. WARREN: council could come out and say,  
'Okay, Mrs. Smith, take your kid off the street. He is not allowed to walk down the road with you.' Mr. Speaker, I think it is going a little bit too far, in particular, saying that the council can decide whether the kid can be accompanied by an adult.

We have too many cases now, Mr. Speaker, where the government of this land is holding hands with the people of this Province in the wrong way. We saw a bill going through third reading not too long ago on the Matrimonial Act and I am afraid we are going to see this bill going through the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is high time for this government - granted, they have a majority in the House, but let us not use that majority in a way that is not always for the well-being of the people of this land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have asked an official from the minister's department to get me some



MR. WARREN: statistics on the population drop of 307 incorporated communities in the Province. I was told that it would take a long time, he would not be able to get it for me. Fine. So within a matter of an hour or so I did get my own staff to do it so it did not take that long after all.

I want to bring out to this House, and members on the opposite side who are not aware of it, that there are 117 communities in this Province with less than 500 people, that is incorporated communities, with less than 500 people. There are 89 communities with between 500 and 1,000 people. And there are 49 communities between 1,000 and 2,000 people. And as we go up the scale the number gets smaller naturally and we only have 24 communities with populations over 5,000.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the property tax I want to illustrate that these 307, I think it is 307, or 309, 309 communities, that it is practically impossible for those smaller communities, less than 1,000 people, to survive. How in the heck, Mr. Speaker, could a community of 11 people, I think the smallest incorporated community is 11 people, bring in a property tax to look after the water and sewerage, and have finances to carry on as a community council?

Those 11 families, Mr. Speaker, I would estimate would be paying in excess of \$700 a year property tax for this community of 11 people to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on further by going back to my district and also to part of the district of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. In his district, also, we will find this example that I am going to illustrate now. In Makkovik we have 14 or 16 homes owned by private individuals. Private people have split their bow, they have raised their money, they own their own homes. Now, the other 60 and 70 homes there are owned by government. Those homes are owned by government. The people are paying taxes - excuse me, the people do not pay any kind of taxes,

MR. WARREN: they are paying a small monthly rent.  
But this act says that government are not responsible for taxes.

Now, do we expect the Andersons,  
and the McNeils in Makkovik to pay property tax and the other  
70 or 80 families there not to pay any taxes at all because they  
are living in homes that belong to the provincial government?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good question, how many own their  
own homes?

MR. WARREN: 12 or 14.  
Take Davis Inlet, for example, probably  
an extreme example -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did the minister hear that?

MR. WARREN: No, maybe he is not paying too much attention  
now. But anyhow, in Davis Inlet there are 99 per cent, Mr. Speaker,  
99 per cent - in fact, there is one home in Davis Inlet that is  
privately owned, every other home is a home belonging to this  
provincial government.

Now, where are the taxes going to come  
from? Is the R.C. School Board going to pay all the taxes for  
that community?

Mr. Speaker, I believe when the minister  
brought in this bill he was either half asleep or fully asleep.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure his predecessor  
knows the same thing. He has been on the Labrador Coast and probably  
he did not know at that time whether the houses belonged to government  
or they were privately owned.

MR. STAGG: Grants in lieu of taxes.

MR. STIRLING: Does that mean that you are agreeing? Does  
that mean that you are agreeing to that? Grants in lieu of taxes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes or no?

MR. STIRLING: Yes or no? Answer and say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would give leave for an answer from the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) if he would like to give an answer? \_\_\_\_\_

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Okay.

Mr. Speaker, we can go through other communities in North West River, which the Minister of Rural and Agricultural Development (Mr. Goudie) represents. We have two communities there, a split community, an Indian side, and a non-Indian side. On the Indian side there are four houses that are not owned

MR. WAPPEN: by government. What happens in this place? Do the residents on one side of the river pay for the whole community? Mr. Speaker, I think there have been questions now to the minister from groups in North West River asking for that community to be divided up into two municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on. You can go to any community, you can go to Trinity Bay and find a community of 350 people, you have probably one or two stores and the people there own all their own homes but each day, day by day, they are just getting along. Probably their annual income is about \$5,000 or \$6,000. Are they expected to pay property tax and the community council in their community expected to survive on the property tax?

Mr. Speaker, in Nain, Labrador, there are three fairly well established businesses. The biggest one is the one that is operated by this government, roughly to the tune of \$2.5 million a year. There are two other smaller businesses there that are at least making a living. Now, when this property tax comes into being the government operated store there that is making over \$2 million a year does not pay any taxes to the municipality but meanwhile Mr. Evans and Mr. Haynes who own two small stores are going to have to pay taxes to the municipalities to help the municipalities survive. This is really unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the minister should seriously look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have an extra bit of time left yet. I want to talk on Section 310, Regional Government. I believe if the minister would recollect back a few months or probably a year to last January, the words I am going to say now may come into his mind. Anyway, it says here that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order constitute a regional council for any region.

MR. STIRLING: Including St. John's.

MR. WARREN: Including St. John's. Mr. Speaker, last year every community council in Labrador, the ones with a population of 1,500 - 8,000 down to a population of 217, every community council in Labrador from Nain to Labrador City down to L'Anse-au-Clair in the Straits they met in North West River, they combined, they formed a combined

MR. WARREN: council because they wanted to get more recognition from government. They wanted to have a look at regional government, whichever form it may take, they wanted to have a look at it and as of yet they have received nothing but a negative attitude from the present minister. The present minister has said to me in this House when I asked the question — we are paying the municipalities, the Federation of Municipalities x number of dollars to operate and we are not going to support the combined councils. The minister said that to me.

Mr. Speaker, here were a group of people, here were the councils from Minisinaikwa in Labrador getting together and wanting the government to pay recognition to them and wanting the government to look and see if it was feasible — they did not ask for it — see if it was feasible to have a regional government or some other form of a combined government in Labrador and as yet this government has not paid them five cents to even operate to put a brief together. Mr. Speaker, now I have left one side of the coin and on the other side of the coin, Section 310 says that if the Lieutenant-Governor decides to constitute a regional council, they may do so. Now, here were twenty-five or thirty people elected democratically, elected by the voters from the different councils and then elected by the councils combined, coming to the government for help and asking them to look into it

MR. G. WARREN: and now on the other hand, 'Oh, no that is not right, we will appoint so and so , whether the people want them or not! Mr. Speaker, we are losing our democracy. I think it is a downgrading of our democratic society to expect, on orders from the minister, to say to somebody in Main, 'We would like for you to come on this regional council'. I think it should be up to the people of Main who they want -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G WARREN: - it should be up to the people of Chance Cove who they want, not up to the minister who he appoints. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will agree and I am sure the former minister will agree also that during the past several years - I am sure they are not listening, Mr. Speaker, but probably they will read Hansard tomorrow - maybe they will agree with me that during the past several years they have received some good delegations from councils throughout this Province. And I believe some of the delegations that came from the various councils throughout this Province came in with a genuine desire to sit down with the minister and talk about the problems back in their communities. And, in lots of cases, as a member of one of the councils in Happy Valley/Goose Bay said we have received an excellent reception and we went back to the communities with some things and probably the potential of getting projects that we would not have gotten if we did not come in. Now, my point is that if this new tax Act comes into being where are the smaller communities going to find revenue to have a delegation come in and sit down with the minister and discuss a community problem? Mr. Speaker, I am just thinking of probably taking the community of Mud Lake in my hon. friend's district that wished to come in here as a community of about 214 people, to sit down with the minister to discuss some problems. Now, the property tax is not going to allow them, unless they are going to tax the 214 residents to the hilt.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, take a community council in Mary's Harbour which is very difficult to get out of, you have to fly out to Goose Bay first or to St. Anthony, from St. Anthony to Gander, from Gander to St. John's, it would probably take you two days to get here and the expense of hotel accommodations, the expense of air travelling which is the most expensive anywhere in North America. I would like to know, probably the minister could take a note of it and when he does finish up the debate he could come back with an answer, where are these communities going to get the funding to come in and sit down with the hon. minister as they have done before? Surely goodness the minister does not expect a community council of six, a council who got elected to cough up \$500 or \$600. I mean surely he is not expecting that is he?

Mr. Speaker, there is another part of this Act that has an effect on the staff of the various community councils. This Act, in particular, has very much to do with the staff. Now I have been in contact with, I think it is eight or nine town managers throughout the Province and they have-as of today they do not even know that this thing is being debated. They have not even received a copy of it and there are parts in this that are affecting the staff, affecting the town clerk, the manager and they have not received a copy of this Act. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the minister that although the six month hoist has been defeated, I would suggest that more copies would go out to the communities, to the managers and to the councillors outlining that this Act is before the House. Has any correspondence been ongoing with mayors and the town managers asking for feedback to this Act or was this through the regional municipalities? Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: there are a lot of communities, incorporated communities within this Province which did not attend the last municipality conference in Gander. They did not attend the one before that. They do not know that this act exists and do not know the implications. They do not know what is going to be brought into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the whole idea behind this act is to turn people from getting involved in municipal politics? That is the question I have been asking myself since this act was brought into the House. If this act comes into being it means that a small community like Joe Batt's Arm or Fogo Island, for example, is going to be charged fifty or sixty dollars a year, whatever the case may be. Is that going to cause friction in these small communities? The people are going to have to pay the property tax in order for them to have a town council. Now, if they do not pay the property tax they are going to be taken to court and so on, the councils will not collect their money and as a result will fold.

I am just wondering if - I am sure it is not - if Municipal Affairs and Housing is trying to renege on the small communities, trying to say to the smaller communities, 'If you fellows do not pay your taxes, if you fellows cannot survive on your own, to heck with you.' Because it appears that that is what happening. I was speaking to two people from a community council in a small remote area of this Province this morning and this is what they had to say, 'My goodness, what are we going to do if we cannot collect the taxes from the so and so people in the community? How are we going to survive?'

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is going to come out - in the municipality directory there are five or six in there inactive. I am just wondering, in two or three years down the road, how many of those 309 municipalities will become inactive because of these regulations?

Mr. Speaker, I believe



MR. WARREN: there should be more serious consideration given to this act. I am sure there are backbenchers on the other side of the House who have reservations about this act. There are ministers who have reservations about this act. Let us not allow the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Cabinet decide on the future of this Province, we should decide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak at length but I have to say that it is with pleasure that I support the new municipalities bill. Most of our towns in Newfoundland, and Gander is one of these, have been demanding and waiting for a revision of the Local Government Act of 1972, for quite a number of years. They have been crying for more autonomy and control of their own affairs, managing their own financing and making their own decisions.

I would like to mention just a few of the improvements provided under this new act. It would take hours to discuss all of them. Under this new act a town council does not have to secure the minister's approval of its budget. A council does not have to get approval to borrow unless it is for more than 20 per cent of the town's revenue or for capital purposes. A council does not have to get the minister's approval to set its property tax, business tax or poll tax rate. A council does not have to obtain approval to grant an exemption or partial exemption or a deferral of taxes.

MRS. H. NEWHOCK:

I would also like to point out that under this act a town council is given broader scope to make regulations without prior approval. The council can, under this act, pick salaries without prior approval. A council may designate remuneration for mayors and/or councillors hibat to an idea not even entertained by government before. A council may charge taxes on unoccupied and unused land owned by certain exempt groups, organizations and churches, etc. And another good concept is the five year forecast of anticipated capital expenditure requirements.

I note there has been disagreement expressed to Section 92, subsection (1) "Wherein a council or a particular councillor using monies for purposes other than those which the money was approved by the minister is to be accountable for such money." Although this may appear to be a severe action to take, nevertheless it will make councillors more conscious of the responsibility they have in making decisions. And I am sure that the minister in enforcing this clause will give every consideration to all the circumstances.

I hear some disagreement with imposing the property tax in towns and communities where residents have water and sewer services only. I would like to point out that property tax in such towns can not be instituted within months. It will take years and years for all the properties to be assessed and even when they are the new rate is determined by the amount of money needed by the community or town so that that property tax could well be set at a figure which would total no more then the poll tax or a service fee being charged at that time, especially since with this type of revenue there will be a commensurate grant.

I have heard some residents of towns complaining that by paying \$12 a month - a total of \$144 a year - and to this is added a \$60 poll tax or service fee that they are, in fact, paying a total of \$204 a year and that by paying this amount they are being charged more than some people in other towns being taxed on the property assessment basis and they feel that a property tax would be much less for them.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Now, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains, he mentioned a loss of revenue on properties owned by government. Now, Gander has quite a number of such properties, quite a number and it is a large chunk of our revenue and we receive a grant in lieu of taxes. So I am sure that this could -

MR. STIRLING: Will the member permit a question?

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Yes.

MR. STIRLING: would the minister agree that the Province should do the same thing that the federal government does in Gander on provincial government owned property?

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Well, I do not know if I entirely agree under all the circumstances because I think some towns receive other considerations but I would say where there is no other consideration, then the Province should pay a grant in lieu of taxes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Show me a case for consideration. Under normal grants (inaudible) that is where they get revenue grants, operating grants, snow clearing grants (inaudible) and everything.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Well, I said where there are no other considerations given.

MR. N. WINDSOR: (Inaudible) under consideration.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Yes. Under this new act, also, I note that the Department of Social Services will pay taxes for residents who are dependent on social assistance and I think this is a good move also. I do think that this new act is a step in the right direction it is simple and understandable. I well remember some of the contradictory clauses in the Local Government Act and thank goodness these will be clarified under the new act. This new act deals with different categories of municipalities, establishing more concise

Mrs. Newhook: procedures for regional and service sharing areas, although I would have liked to see a little more autonomy for towns, of say, 10,000 to 15,000 population, which have all of the expertise provided by comptrollers and town managers, and office managers, and their town engineers, and their public service departments, their town planning, and Local Improvement Associations and what not.

However, I can see that we have to try our wings before we learn how to fly, and so, therefore, I look forward to the minister's wise decisions in this regard in the future. I commend him for the mighty task of compiling this new Act. And I give it my endorsement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the introduction of Bill 58 or the introduction of any tax may not be the end of the world, but I would like to suggest that the introduction of property taxes in tiny little communities may be the end of rural and outport living in Newfoundland. It might very well be the end to outport life.

Not very long ago, or I should say, just recently, and since this government have been in power, its approach has been freeze on spending, as is so evident with the Fisheries Loan Board. While the government implements, introduces, while they decide they are not going to spend any more money, they point the finger at tiny little people in rural areas, and they say, 'You must increase spending.' Now I also realize that this is not going to come into effect immediately. It is going to take a little while to blend this into the structure of our society so that government can reap the benefits and communities, hopefully, will reap the benefits of property taxes.

I feel myself that people in the rural areas most certainly have not been well enough informed about the implications of this bill, and the property tax. I speak basically on the tax, I express an opinion basically on the tax because I must say there are quite a few things within the bill that are acceptable and desirable, and, of course, there is an awful lot in there that is just an override

Mr. Bennett: from original council governing and local councils.

This government went into power, if I understand correctly, on the assumption that there would not be an increase in taxes of any form. They went into power, in my opinion, in disguise, because now they are coming in through the back door to implement a tax on property in rural areas, which are the life's blood of the Province, rural areas are the life blood of this Province. People in the of St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, and most of the larger centres where we have a tax base, where we have industry, where we have a real cash flow probably, these people could stand higher taxation. But I am convinced that the people in the rural areas of this Province cannot stand it, people who are depending on the fishing boats.

MR. STAGG: How do the fellows get rich who are there, the fellows on the (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: I do not know what you were doing before you came in here 'Mr. Stagg', I am sure, or Mr. Member for Stephenville, the hon. member. I worked in a tiny little community and I carried on a business, a very successful business, I might add. It might be one of the reasons that I became elected to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Because the people in that little community, and in that rural district of St. Barbe believed you know, they look at me and they say, "Well, that fellow has been successful in business, I wonder if government is not business?" And in their wisdom they gave me a vote and here I am. It might be to their detriment, mind you, I do not know. Given a few years of hard work, I am satisfied to work for the district, I am satisfied to work for the government.

MR. BENNETT: I really do not have a lot of hang-ups about a political machine. I really do believe in people doing a job. If I want to employ a carpenter, I employ the best one and pay him \$10 an hour.

I would like to go back to what the hon. minister - I carried on a business in a tiny rural area, and I pioneered it, in the form of a service station, the first one ever in that area, and a motel, the first one in that area. And every little bit of tax was a burden. I was paying \$40 a month for a sloppy water system in my business.

AN HON. MEMBER: A month?

MR. BENNETT: A month - \$40 a month.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. BENNETT: In Daniel's Harbour.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: Yes, \$40 a month. What is wrong with that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) lot of money.

MR. BENNETT: I did not complain. It stopped me starting the old generators and pumping up water from a well, starting up a pump to pump water and supply people who might happen to be along to stay at my motel overnight.

But every tax that was inflicted on my operations gave me a shudder and made me realize I have no business trying to pioneer. I have no business working in Daniel's Harbour in a business, I should be in Corner Brook or St. John's where there is some real cash flow. But you hon. gentlemen who travelled that Northern Peninsula, you needed a place to stay and we provided that place to stay. We pumped our own water until we were fortunate enough to have a water system so-called installed, and I paid \$40 a month water tax for the mud and the dirt where I hope we are going to have a better system installed very shortly, property tax or no property tax.

MR. BENNETT: Rural areas, Mr. Speaker, already pay through the nose, more than the cities, and what do they get out of it besides garbage collection? They do not get the medical services, they do not get the communications. Speaking of communications, they are lucky if they get one channel television. The telephone system in many cases, leaves a lot to be desired. They are pioneers in their own right. And if they did not go out and pioneer and live in these communities and develop the fishery - work in a pioneering manner and do without things like medical and legal services, Your Honour - if the people in these areas were to go into the cities and say, No, we are not going to develop, most governments would try to encourage people to go out and develop these rural areas - I think they would - to go out and exploit the fish and the timber and the land so that we could ship into the cities and into the main centres. And now we are going to destroy that by placing property tax on a lot of these entrepreneurs.

MR. STAGG: Tell us about resettlement.

MR. BENNETT: I will. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this property tax is resettlement in disguise in the worst kind of way. You are going to see more people, Mr. Speaker, move out of rural areas and into the urban areas and the Fort McMurray and Grand Prairie and Alberta and Toronto areas. You are going to see more of them because they are not going to be able to live there and maintain their properties. And I hope that when the hon. minister establishes the rate of tax to be inflicted on people in rural areas, I just hope that he is a poor man working for the minimum wage so that he will have some compassion in his heart for the people who live and work and try to maintain a decent standard of living in those tiny communities that you are going to inflict the property tax upon.

It is going to cause people in those rural areas to have not so attractive homes, not so comfortable homes as they have had in the past. I would suggest that they will not continue to upgrade and build better properties.

MR. BENNETT:

I would like for the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor), to realize property values in those communities are not the same as they are in the larger cities - in the urban areas and in areas where you



MR. BENNETT: have industry. Property values are not the same. You build a house in Trout River, Cow Head, Plum Point, any of these - this is the area I represent so I know these areas very well - you build a property there for \$40,000 and if you want to sell it next year, you are lucky if you can sell it. You will not get \$30,000. If you build a home in Bellburns and it costs you \$40,000, which it is getting to be, a few of these homes built today - \$30,000 over a period of a good number of years - they are not built right overnight, because they have not got the mortgage system in any of these places to accommodate the financing - but if you build in Bellburns and it costs you \$30,000 and you try to sell tomorrow, you are lucky if you can sell, let alone get \$20,000 for it and it just cost you \$30,000. If you build it in St. John's and it cost you \$30,000, tomorrow it is on the market for \$50,000 - appreciation - and you can keep on building properties in areas like these, and you can have the appreciation go into your pocketbook, if you like, but when you sell property into the rural areas you are not going to have appreciation, you are going to have depreciation, and you will have paid tax, tax, tax plus -

MR. STAGG: That is Liberal philosophy. That is Liberal philosophy.

MR. BENNETT: I do not care whose philosophy it is, I do not care whose philosophy, I am just concerned about a government, Liberal or Tory or otherwise, inflicting property tax on tiny communities and it is going to hit these people like a bombshell. It is going to hit them in the rural areas like a bombshell, and you people will not know what hit you when the next election comes around and I start using this in my district. You will not know what hit you, because people are going to be - they are going to be very adamant. They are going to be upset. They are going to be very concerned.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible) a man has a right to be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: Unusual for him.

MR. BENNETT: I want my district to know what goes on in the House of Assembly, what goes on in their government, and I think those people, the electorate, Tories and Liberals and NDP, are all alike, they are all taxpayers and they need to know. And they are all voters and they should know. I do not think they are being given time in the districts to know what is involved in that piece of paper.

MR. THOMS: They are not being told either.

MR. BENNETT: They are not being told. I am a little disappointed we are not getting more coverage from the press on this, again. I wish we could get more coverage. I have called six communities, mayors in the district, I have called six in the St. Barbe district, and they do not know what I am talking about. When I mentioned this bill and the introduction of tax, they do not know what is happening. I wish they did know. So today I have asked that we should have somebody sent out into the district. It will probably be too late for them to express an opinion over the airways, the news media, because it will probably be gone through the House of Assembly. I am suggesting that our rural areas do without. I know because I lived it. They do without so many things, and if you are going to try to bring them up and inflict the tax on their properties, on their barns and on their shops and their homes in small rural areas where they have not yet got decent schools to go to - I was pretty happy to see a bill, the Minister of Education's bill on education - all that money - I would like to see about that much spent on education in my district - \$12 million. We probably do not need all that in one shot, but spread over a five-year period we need it for sure. We need a lot of money. We have several schools that need replacing. So, I feel that people have not got the services, and I feel that people are not going to have the services in small areas where you have fifty families and where you have, yes, up to 500 families probably. I know that we do have, in the district of St. Barbe, we do have two, mind you, two and only two lucrative communities where there is a fair cash flow. I think, probably, most hon. gentlemen

MR. T. BENNETT:

are aware Port au Choix is a lucrative, viable, good cash flow community, a good fishery. Daniel's Harbour has got a good tax base, it has got a mine but when you come into Cow Head and you come into Trout River and you get up to Plum Point and you see the way that these people have to struggle for a livelihood, I would not want to be the minister who would inflict tax on the properties that they have put together by the sweat of their brow. Most of the homes they have built come from their own labours. With the ski-doo's and their chain saws they go into the bush when they can get a permit, if they can get a permit to cut, they go in and they cut the timber and they build their homes and as they do and they put the carpet on the floors they pay the tax and they pay it on the gasoline to haul it into the rural areas. Now, with the inflationary structure that we have in this country, not only in the Province but in the country generally, with the inflationary spiral that we have on the cost of living, I do not think that the government needs to introduce anymore tax on, especially rural areas, tiny areas. Because every gallon of gas if you go back to a pump next week you do not know if there is going to be another ten cents but, regardless, the government gets their cut just the same. If you buy a board, a carpet, a shingle anything where the 11 per cent is involved the government reaps the benefits. Government has not got to inflict more tax, government's just automatically get more tax. I know that we are demanding more from government. I know that people are demanding and we want the services and we need the services, but to go out and take the bits off the table of the little fellow in some place like Portland Creek or Trout River and make him pay property tax on a home or on a little two-bit chip stand he is trying to create, I cannot support it! I just cannot!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (BAIRD)

Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: We have a lot of people who presently live in urban areas, we have a lot of people who live probably in St. John's who came from around the bay and they are building their second home, their retirement place. They are living in the city of St. John's or Corner Brook and they are paying the tax on their property. I pay a lot of tax in Corner Brook. I have a tiny piece of property and I pay sufficient tax there in the city of Corner Brook. I have nothing left in the rural area. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. gentleman way over in the corner says, I do not know why you have him over in the corner I think he should be up around the front somewhere -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fort au Fort is a good place.

MR. T. BENNETT: But contrary to what he was suggesting in a subtle way, I have liquidated any business interests that I have so I could work for a district and work a few years at least. For a few years of my life I would like to work for the people of the district that I represent. And to support the infliction of tax on to the backs of the people who cannot make a decent living for themselves in my district, to me that is no way of doing the job that I have been elected to do. So you must understand why I am so opposed to inflicting tax on people in rural areas. To me it is a terrible, terrible thing to do!

And what I started to say a little earlier, so many people and undoubtedly probably half of the hon. ladies and gentleman here, members in this house already have started to create, develop properties in rural areas where they might retire to at a later date. Well, they are lucky, they might very well be getting income enough to support it. But we have fellows working down on the waterfront and in other sources of employment, in the warehouses and these people want fair play and they want to go out and have a second home where they can retire back to when they are older. And if they are going to be paying \$200 or \$300 tax on that property it is going to discourage them from having a place to hide away when they get old and want to be left alone. We have been recognized too long as a have-not Province and I cannot

MR. T. BENNETT: see where this is going to improve conditions. It might improve conditions in the bigger centres like the city of St. John's, Corner Brook, and Grand Falls, it might very well, it might very well take some of the tax burden off some of the larger areas and spread it into the communities. It might also make us in the rural tiny little areas, do with less if there is any way we can do with less, because all we get, basically, in rural areas, in St. Barbe district for the dollars that we pay in tax at the moment, just about all we get, anyway, is a garbage collection. We have many places along the coast of St. Barbe district where we have no water systems, we have many places where we have half-developed, half-complete, half-finished water systems. We have about two or three sewerage systems in the district along there and I understand that if we want to have these systems introduced to our communities we are going to have to be prepared to pay for it, to pay for the tax and we are just not able to afford to do it, not able to afford it on our incomes that we have in those tiny communities, where we work six months or three months, if we are lucky, or two weeks if we are lucky. In that district of St. Barbe at the present, and I have done this study myself so I know what I am talking about, the district of St. Barbe is more than fifty percent unemployed at this time. I would like to have seen as much effort put into a bill to create employment in St. Barbe. I would like to have seen a bill introduced in this House to create employment with the same effort as it took to engineer this, I would like to see it go into development, creation of employment. I would like to see a study done in my district, along with many other studies, on why we cannot have land available so that we can pay tax on it, why we cannot get a licence to fish so we can pay tax. I would like to have studies done in that manner. There must have been a lot of work go into this here, this bill 58, There must have been a lot of work go into it but there is going to have to be an awful lot more work go into it in order to collect the money from the people in the tiny communities. And I am wondering if you are going to get people to act on Community Councils if people who are going to serve have to inflict a tax on their neighbors

MR. T. BENNETT: who are less fortunate than ourselves.

What I find in a lot of these areas is the leaders of the communities who become the mayors and councillors are also the most prosperous. They seem to be the guys who are the sawmillers, they seem to be the guys who are the business people. In the rural areas, mind you, we have not got lawyers and doctors or auditors. If we want the services of a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, we have to come all the way from Plum Point or from St. Anthony, for that matter, all the way up to Corner Brook. I doubt if there is even a lawyer in St. Anthony. I do not know if there is.

MR. THOMS: There are none in Stephenville.

MR. T. BENNETT: There are none in Stephenville the hon. member tells me. I know there are no lawyers on our coast and if you want the services of a lawyer, a dentist, a doctor and many, many other services of every day life, you have to get in your car and drive many, many miles and pay for that heavy gas tax, and that heavy rubber tax, and that heavy car tax from which the government already receives a substantial revenue without having to - you should not have had to pay the tax on your house before you left to go into Corner Brook to seek the services of a legal councillor, or a doctor or any other of these services.

MR. BENNETT: So I think there should be a lot of consideration given, a lot of thought put into it, and as I see it, it is about the end of freedom. We did have a tiny wee bit of freedom left in those rural areas but it is gradually, slowly, but surely disappearing, and it is not for much longer, and I feel the government to be taking themselves off the hook and inflicting the burden of the collecting of taxes onto the backs of the people in the communities. If they can get people to serve on a community council, to go out and collect this tax, then government will be lucky. They are dumping their responsibility, of course, - the responsibility of collecting tax - they are dumping it onto the local municipalities. We have so much red tape, red tape for everything you do. If a man wants an acre of land from the Crown it takes him years and years and years and years. This is going to be similar in red tape. The introduction of tax in rural areas, the collecting of it - you are going to have to set up a battery of lawyers, you are going to have to set up a battery to go in and collect the tax off these people and sell off the properties of people who cannot pay their tax, because as I understand it now, it looks like there are going to have to be foreclosures and everything else. If you are subject to tax, it is a law of the country, if you are subject to tax, you must pay it. If you cannot pay, your house is on the blocks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAIRD: I would like to support Bill 58.

I imagine it is much easier to be on the opposition side trying to criticise than it is trying to do something.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is lots to criticise.

MR. BAIRD: I would like to commend this government for having the initiative and the guts to go up and take issue and bring in a bill such as this whereby we have heard the hon. gentleman on the other side say that in four years time we will damn well know it. Well, I think we should have the guts, and I have, to

bring in what should be legislation to govern and never mind going by the whims of a lot of individuals. I think it is time we had the fortitude to bring it in, and I am glad to see the minister and this government bringing it in - number one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear;

MR. BAIRD:

I wonder are we talking about the good of Newfoundland or are we afraid of our necks four years time when we face the electorate? We have heard enough about the little fellow in the small areas, you cannot do this, we are going to take the bread from his table. I was nearly in tears there this afternoon for a while. I am sure that in Humber West, and many other areas, we have some people there too, who have not too much bread on their table, but they still have to pay their taxes, maintain their services. We have a situation in Humber West, right in Corner Brook itself, the population was 30 thousand, now it is 26 thousand. You ask the people why it is 26 thousand? They go into the outlying areas, 'Why? Less taxes. Somebody has to pay for it. They still want water, they want sewerage, they want this and they want that. Somebody has to pay for it, and I suggest that everybody shoulder their burden and help pay for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear;

MR. BAIRD:

No doubt any bill that is brought in, especially one of this magnitude, when you get to the clause by clause, everything in the book is probably not what we would like it to be, but we are talking about the principle of the bill in second reading.. I am one hundred percent for it and I will rise or fall in four years time on that bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Sims)

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Humber West stole a few of my lines there. I am not sure our House Leader knew he was going to speak but nevertheless I will forgive him for stealing a couple of my lines and I will try to rephrase them so that they are parliamentary. I felt obliged to get up and make a few remarks when I



MR. STAGG: interjected earlier and my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) indicated I was making some personal remark about rich people in rural areas. I merely said, "How is this bill going to affect the rich merchants in rural areas?" That is a general comment I wanted him to address himself to and he immediately decided he was going to

MR. STAGG:

tell us all about how he divested himself of all his properties and so on. I do not know, I must have struck a rather responsive cord or raw nerve or something.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) address yourself to that.

MR. STAGG: Maybe I will address myself to that to some extent. I think we do have a lot of very rich people in rural areas. Newfoundland has more than its share of millionaires, more than its share of people who are living off their interests, who have gone out into small communities and having had to pay no taxes, having existed on DREE grants and this kind of grant and other kinds of grants and just generally looking around for handouts from various government departments and various governments and being relatively successful at it, have built up quite a great deal of riches. Well, I think this bill, once we get out into these communities, you are going to have some of these people paying their fair share and I think that is good. They should pay their fair share.

I would also like to back up what my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) said, that this government in four years time will go to the polls and this property tax that all the various members have addressed themselves to so far, this will be one of the key issues in the Liberal re-election or - re-election! How can you talk about re-election of the Liberals, they have been out for so long now - but in the Liberal's election campaign they will say that Bill 58 should read, "An Act To Re-elect the Liberal Party" because they are going to use the same type of approach to it that they used on the authorities in 1975, when we saw these newspapers put out, both by the Liberal Party and the Reform Liberal Party, saying, 'Elect us and we will do away with school tax, and we will do away with this tax, and we will do away with that tax. and neglecting, of course, to tell the people of the Province that they were the ones who brought it in in the first place -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - and that we have been merely going along with what they brought in. Now, this is the sort of satire and song that the Liberal Party has been used to using over the years, trying to -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the electrical rates?

MR. STAGG: And the electrical rates. There are all sorts of things that the Liberals have been responsible for over the years. The electrical rates in this Province, just imagine how we are selling the power from Churchill Falls and the money, \$500 million a year going into the coffers of Quebec because of the Liberal Party. Well, I suppose, there is some blessing to it because that is why many of us are over here and that is why the remnants of the Liberal Party, the party that is in great decline now - and the NDP are chortling, chafing at the bit to get to the next election where they can become the official Opposition in both Canada and in Newfoundland. So we will welcome the NDP as the official Opposition for about fifteen years while members opposite go into a state of decline like the Liberal Party in England.

MR. FLIGHT: As just witnessed in St. Mary's-the Capes in the last by-election.

MR. STAGG: Oh, yes, my colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who this morning indicated to me that there were going to be two candidates down in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir who are going to lose their nomination fees. And I said, "How much will you put on it?". And he said, "Fifty dollars". He said, "I will put fifty dollars on it". I said, "You are on".

MR. DINN: And he is trying to weasel out of it now.

MR. STAGG: And now he wants to come back and say, "No, no I do not want to bet."

MR. FLIGHT: Two to one on it.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: "I do not want to bet."

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Relevance, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe -

MR. STAGG: Yes, I guess so.

MR. SPEAKER: - the hon. member for Stephenville might be straying a little bit from the topic.

MR. STAGG: Yes, I may be straying from the topic somewhat, Mr. Speaker, but I could not restrain myself from this spurious interjection from the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). He got to me, not Twomey from Exploits either, Twomey may get him yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of chortling and caterwauling - chortling and caterwauling, they are not necessarily compatible terms-but I have heard a lot of caterwauling, at least, from members opposite talking about no consultation with the municipalities. Well, I believe that my colleague here spoke at the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, he told them what it was going to be all about. The Royal Commission on Municipal Government, this tome that I have here before me, we have all had this, we have all read this. I suppose hon. members opposite have all read this. I must say that I have read it twice, even though the pages are rather clean. It is just testimony to my own personal cleanliness, that is all that is. All members over here, we have all read it, we know about it.

MR. STAGG: We had the Royal Commission going around this Province several years ago. The people of this Province and the people who are interested in it at the municipal level, they know what is coming. I circulated it to the members of the Stephenville Town Council and to the Town Manager and the Town Clerk. I took that initiative myself. I do not know if hon. members opposite have enough initiative to do that sort of thing themselves, but if they do not, well, so be it, so be it. They then have to say, 'well, you do not know about it because the government did not circulate it.' I say they do not know about it because you did not circulate it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: What good would it have done?

MR. STAGG: What good would it do? Well, you are saying that it was not done and if you are getting no feedback from your municipalities it is because hon. members opposite have been too busy campaigning in by-elections. The members of the Liberal Party get elected to this House so they can go campaign in federal and provincial by-elections. I think what they should have been doing is circulating copies of Bill 58 to their constituents and finding out how it was going to affect them, and I submit that under the Election Expenses Act that all the expenses of the members opposite, who are supposed to be here in the House, should be totalled up for the member for Burgeo-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) and just see, he might be over the \$25,000. We might get him unseated, who knows.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is already looked after  
(inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Already looked after, I see.

Well, I just may get an order on that. Now, where was I?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nowhere

MR. STAGG: Yes, yes, I was suggesting that hon. members opposite may have been derelict in their duty to their constituents, in that they had not circulated the bill, and I submit that that is correct. Now, I circulated it to the members of the Stephenville Town Council and to the Town Manager and so on,

MR. STAGG: and I was complimented by it - complimented on my action by them, saying what a great member you are for doing that sort of thing, and I suggest that hon. members opposite - they have missed the boat now, they just have not done it.

MR. J. CARTER: So modest.

MR. STAGG: Yes, yes, modesty - well, I am as modest as I need to be. There were two comments came back on the town manager's role and the role of the town clerk, and these are matters that I have brought to the attention of the minister and he has given me adequate and satisfactory explanations on both.

MR. L. THOMS: (Inaudible) I would like to hear it.

MR. STAGG: You would like to hear it?

MR. L. THOMS: It is one of the points I raised.

MR. STAGG: One of the points you raised, yes.

Well, one of the points raised was under the new bill, 'The town manager can be excluded from meetings of committees of the council if they want it so,' I think that it is not a bad idea. There was another matter about the town clerk and the treasurer, which was a rather complicated thing and I must admit that I was not all that concerned about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Section 58 (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Section 58, That is what the hon. member is worried about, Section 58. So they were comparatively minor matters, and I am satisfied that the legislation in no way needs to be changed. The town councillors say it is a marvellous piece of legislation. So, who is going to profit from this, who is going to profit? I submit that the people in rural Newfoundland are going to be the benefactors of this. Now, initially, they are going to be told by their members, many of the members opposite here in whose districts they will have property tax and water and sewerage tax for the first time, they are going to be told that this is the big, bad Tories who are coming in and going back on election promises and just generally deserve to be defeated in the next election.

MR. STAGG:

Well, hon. members opposite may be right. All of them may get re-elected the next time around, and what will we have? We will have the same figures as we had before, so I submit that hon. members opposite are probably astute enough politically, small 'p' politically, to take advantage of this bill and to use it as a re-election vehicle as they used the school tax matter in 1975, and will probably dedicate a disproportionate amount of their time in trying to destroy the bill. You know, I have seen situations out in the Bay St. George area, particularly in the district of Port au Port, where people are quite concerned about the lack of water and sewer facilities and

MR. F. STAGG: the picking up of waste, garbage collection so sometimes they form these waste disposal committees which, in effect-the fees for them are higher than if you had incorporated municipalities. It does not make sense! So somebody in those communities, whether it be the elected officials or the community people or the member, I do not know-I was out there for a while myself and I was not successful, and the present member does not seem to be having anymore success, but it is a consideration that people in rural areas are going to have to make and they are all going to have to bite the bullet, if they want these services of water and sewer facilities and wells and garbage collection and street lighting and recreation facilities that are associated with the parks and recreation commission they are going to have to pay for it. Previously, it was the old pork barrel method which was the, as I understand it, government guaranteed loans -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) currently.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, and currently too. And we want to get away from that and I think we should get away from it.

MR. DINN: Special grants.

MR. F. STAGG: Special grants and special interests where a community council or a town that comes in and is able to put enough pressure on the minister or may have a political advantage over somebody else may come in and may appear, at least, they may not it depends on the government that is in power or the particular minister, but they may get an advantage over their fellows. So if you think that your colleague, whichever side he is on, is getting an advantage over you well, then, you are immediately in there parading into the minister's office and the minister, all he has time to do is to deal with outraged delegations and outraged members because people are getting these Government Guaranteed Loans. I know when I was first elected in 1971, I was just a mere stripling at the time, I was contacted by a community council that had been given -

AN HON. MEMBER:



MR. F. STAGG: Well, it depends on which part of the coast you are from, striplings are over our way. Stripling, I think, may be correct though. The hon. member over there is embarrassing me now and it is not easy to do. I was asked by a community council who, coincidentally, had gotten approval for the negotiation of a Government Guaranteed Loan of \$125,000 or so about the first week in October 1971 - a rather coincidental time since the election was held in 1971, and he said to me after I got elected, of course, in spite of the Government Guaranteed Loan or whatever -

MR. THOMS: Come up 1975.

MR. F. STAGG: Well, I have to come up to 1975, I am starting back when I was a neophyte at this business and then I will work my way up to my present stature as a person who knows it all.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) neophyte (inaudible)

MR. F. STAGG: You were a neophyte, yes. So anyway they asked me, 'So what are we going to do with this \$125,000?' They said 'We cannot pay it back'. And I said, 'Well, boy, if you cannot pay it back you are going to be bankrupt', and I said, 'Do you want to be known as a community council that is in bankruptcy?' and they said 'No'. 'Well, I said, 'Well, then you had better refuse it', and they did. Well, I learned very quickly, of course, that you do not turn down these things because government's never renege on these loans, they always pay them off, and very quickly we got the refusal changed into an acceptance. But there seems to be no order to those things, it is completely within the purview of the member and his relationship with the minister, and whether you are on the government side or the Opposition side what you get or what you do not get. That is the accusation that can be made and maybe rightfully so in some cases. So I think the quicker we address ourselves to that the better and that communities that get these services will have to be responsible for raising a reasonable amount of it themselves. Because up to this time we have seen the rather grotesque situation arise many times where there have been millions of dollars given to a water and

MR. STAGG: sewer system, and the people have not in any way been briefed, they do not know what is happening. All they know is that the government is giving them a couple of million dollars, but they still have the same attitude towards taxation. They say, "We will take it, we want it and we will take it, but we certainly do not intend to pay for it", so government is forced, eventually, to face the issue on these things because there are some people in the Province who have always paid their way. I know that for years it was known on the West Coast that the Town of Channel-Port aux Basques was always a town that paid its own way. That was known as a sort of a legendary community within municipal circles, that the Town of Channel-Port aux Basques always paid its way. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Town of Stephenville is in the same position. The Town of Stephenville pays its own way. It is one of the model communities, where property tax, which was instituted in 1953, and it was done properly by a vote of the people -

AN HON. MEMBER: Now, therein lies the difference.

MR. STAGG: Therein lies the difference. Well, in 1953, the people of Stephenville decided to incorporate and shortly thereafter the town council decided they were going to have property tax. It was not done by plebiscite, it was done by the councillors deciding they were going to have a property tax, so I may have misled hon. members to some extent on that one. In any event, we have had property tax in Stephenville for quite some number of years and, as a result, we have a good community. We have many of the services that are associated with towns and cities that are larger, and it is a good place to live. People in all parts of the Province are going to have to learn and are learning that, if you are going to have these services, you are going to have to pay for them. You sometimes run into some ludicrous examples of people trying to avoid tax. I know of several examples of people who have moved from an urban area to a rural area in an attempt to avoid property tax. They build a beautiful house,

MR. STAGG: and find that they have to get water. Well, the conventional wisdom is that you just sink a well point or dig a well and you get water but not always does this happen. You do not always get water, so I know of at least one person who drilled a \$6,000 well to find nothing, found it was a duster. So, there are many examples of this, people who are trying to avoid taxation and really are hoisted on their own petard to some extent. This bill is characteristic of this kind of government.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. STAGG: It is characteristic, that is right, and hon. members opposite will give the characteristic type of answer to it, because you could easily go around this Province and through cheap political trickery - and this is not attributed to any hon. members opposite, of course, because that is unparliamentary - but it would be possible for hon. members opposite, if they wanted to, or some of their friends or some people to go around this Province and use this point only and say that if we were elected, we would not do anything like this. I submit, yes, if they were elected, they would not do anything like this because there would be no rural parts of this Province if the Liberals were still in power. There would be no rural parts to this Province, because we would have been resettled into ghettos, ghettos, that is what we would have been.

MR. FLIGHT: Ghettos in Alberta.

MR. STAGG: Ghettos in Alberta? Some of our people are presently working in Alberta, that is correct. Mr. Speaker, that is why we have this country called Canada where you have free flowing of people across provincial borders. Many of our people are presently working in Alberta. It is a tradition that we are going to reverse. It is a tradition that we are going to reverse, and I submit that by the time hon. members opposite have to go back and face the electorate in about 1983 or so - because hon. members can be relatively safe until then - we will show that there is, indeed, a very significant reversal in the trend of outward migration to places like Alberta, and they are going to be coming back. They are going to be coming back from Alberta. You know, there are no Liberals in

MR. STAGG:

Alberta. They are going to be coming back from Alberta and you know there are no Liberals in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, there are no Liberals in Alberta. There are only Tories in Alberta who are going to be coming back from Alberta. Everyone who comes back from Alberta is a vote for the P.C. Party and the P.C. tradition.

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

I assume the hon. member for Stephenville is about to make a point relevant to the debate.

MR. STAGG: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about hon. members opposite and the resettlement programme and how, if they were still in power, there would be no need for the Municipalities Act because there would only be a dozen or so big towns in the Province. And probably the population of the Province would only be about 100,000 if hon. members opposite and their cohorts had had their way.

So this is a bill that envisions there being a lot of big towns in this Province, a lot of prosperity. And the people of this Province are not going to have any problem paying their property taxes. Unemployment is down, is that not right, Mr. Minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Unemployment is down. Wages are up, everything is up. And we are ready for the obfusatory - that is a nice word, is it not? - remarks that hon. members opposite are going to try to put across to the people of this Province concerning this bill. They will be on the open line. They will be trying to persuade the Newfoundland public that people on this side are not sincere in their dedication to this Province. But the people of this Province know differently.

MR. FLIGHT: Joe Clark is doing a good job at it.

MR. STAGG: Yes, Joe Clark is doing a good job but Joe Clark is going to be Prime Minister of Canada for a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He is going to be Prime Minister of Canada an awful lot longer than the hon. member is going to be the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) I will tell you that because the hon. member for Grand Bank is going to be a one-term member, one term. The people of Grand Bank when we getting our travelling medicine show going around this Province showing the people of the Province how P.C. times are good times, Tory times are good times, the hon. member for Grand Bank is going to have to look for a banker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): Order, please! Relevancy.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member for Grand Bank should not be speaking if he is not in his seat.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite get to me I must say. They have a new tact as well in discussing this bill. They lament the fact that the press are not covering them. Well, as I know from sad experience, through the quality of some of my speeches, the press will give you the coverage you deserve. And in the case of hon. members opposite, who have most to say in this House, the press are not covering them. They are getting the coverage they deserve, which is practically nil, and, obviously, it is being perceived by the public of this Province and by the press that this is a good bill. This is forward looking legislation. This is legislation looking forward to the year 2000, because we will still have this bill in pretty well the same form with a few minor amendments by the year 2000, when some of us may be getting ready for our old age pension. Personally, I will then be closing in on fifty in the year 2000 and I might even consider retiring from politics. All hon. members opposite are going to be gone because of the characteristics that they evidence every now and then of opposing forward looking legislation of this type. So we are going to be here, they are going to be gone and let us get on with the job and let us get home for Christmas. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on the bill, bill 58. Before doing so I feel that the hon. member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is trying to compete with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Oh, no.

MR. WOODROW: And doing a good job at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I find no harm in it.

MR. WOODROW: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not mind being mentioned in the same breath as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as far as being colourful

MR. STAGG: is concerned but I would not want to associated with too many of the ideas that he espouses to.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Having heard the member for Stephenville for a number of years, I would say there is no danger he will ever be associated with any ideas, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Perhaps I should take the matter under advisement, but I think I am prepared at this stage to rule that there was not a point of order, and I ask the hon. member for Bay of Islands to continue.

MR. WOODROW: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make note of the very passionate plea made by the member from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett). I feel that every word he said was sincere, and he certainly has been a very, very hard worker all his life, and I can testify to that. I am sure he is sincere in his remarks. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the minister and the government on the bill, and I should call it a very progressive bill because it certainly is going to touch the lives of everybody in the Province. There is no doubt about it, it is going to help some and do harm, maybe even cause hardship to others. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people living in the urban areas are going to be the benefactors of this bill. It so happens in the Province at the present time there are eleven urban districts in the St. John's-Metropolitan Area, there are two urban districts in Corner Brook, an urban district in Grand Falls, one in Gander, and in Stephenville, that makes eleven urban seats. My district, Mr. Speaker, is as all the members know, a district that is half urban and half rural, and in fact I am not one bit at all bothered about the urban part of it as far as this bill is concerned. I think the urban part

MR. WOODROW: of the district is indeed going to be the benefactor -

MR. NEARY: Are you for it or against it?

MR. WOODROW: — of the bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in replying to my good friend from LaPoile, I am trying to face the issue. That was why I was elected - to be honest with people. Try to do what is right. And I have also noted the concern of the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) because he is in a completely rural district, and he must be concerned as well as all other members in rural districts.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, I must say that a lot of wealthy people, and I am thinking first of all of the City of Corner Brook, they left the City of Corner Brook, they went and built magnificent homes, as the hon. member who is occupying the Chair at the present time knows, they built magnificent homes along the Trans-Canada Highway in places like Steady Brook - all due respects to my hon. friend from St. Barbe South - and farther up the highway, and, of course, a lot of other people went to Pasadena. By the same token, a lot of others from Corner Brook went and built along the South and the North Shore of the Bay of Islands, in the rural part of my district.

MR. NEARY: Is that drive-in theatre in your district?

MR. WOODROW: I must also say, Mr. Speaker, because I think it relates to the bill, a lot of people have strived, they have worked hard, to build homes in places like Benoit's Cove, Lark Harbour, York



MR. L. WOODROW:

Harbour, Meadows, Summerside, Gillams and other places. A lot of these people have really worked hard and in many cases they own their homes, so we certainly have to give thought to those hard-working people. Now what I am getting at here - and I feel

that the minister probably in his reply will be mentioning these things - if a person is on social assistance he is able to get his water rates, or what have you, paid for. But what about, Mr. Speaker, the hardworking poor of this Province, the hardworking man who is probably getting the minimum wage? Now is there any allowance going to be made for him? That is one of the things that concerns me. I hope in fact there will be some allowance in some way or another made for him.

Now in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the people of Corner Brook, the people of Gander, the people of St. John's have a tax base but what tax base, for example, do the people in a place like Gillams have?

AN HON. MEMBER: Lark Harbour.

MR. L. WOODROW: Lark Harbour is another one, Margaree, for example, and Badger's Quay. In fact, I noticed this morning as I was listening to the news the people in Badger's Quay are looking for a tax assessment already. But I think a lot of the people in the smaller communities, and I have to agree with my hon. friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), are going to find it very difficult. They will not find it difficult, as the hon. member has said, in places like Port au Choix and Daniel's Harbour, I believe, and Port Saunders, but they are certainly going to find it hard. I feel sure that when the hon. minister speaks, when he gets up to close off the debate, he will probably tell us there is going to be a ceiling on the taxation.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, the sky is the limit.

MR. L. WOODROW: That is going to be -  
Is there going to be a ceiling on it? In fact, not because a fellow worked and strived to get a home, it does not mean he has money. He probably put the last cent in his home. In fact, I have seen it even

MR. L. WOODROW:                   happen in the city of Corner Brook.  
If you happen to paint your house, if you happen to do up your front garden or something, they slap it to you. In other words, give it to him because he probably has got a nice garden, or maybe if has a rec room, "Okay, give it to him," in fact, instead of giving him credit and saying, 'This fellow is trying to beautify the city of Corner Brook or beautify some other place.' Well really, you know, they say, 'Just slap the tax on him'.

Now, as I said, perhaps the most important thing is that I would like for the minister when he responds, if he is in a position to do it - perhaps he is not, I am not saying he is - but if he is in a position to do it, I would like for him to tell us, for example, say all the homes - I will take the community of Benoit's Cove, for example - are all -

AN HON. MEMBER:                   How about Lark Harbour?

MR. L. WOODROW:                   No, not Lark Harbour because Lark Harbour has not had water and sewerage. You have to have 50 per cent water and sewerage before the taxes are imposed.

AN HON. MEMBER:                   Fifty per cent water!

MR. L. WOODROW:                   Yes, and/or I suppose. But will there be an equal assessment for everybody?

AN HON. MEMBER:                   (Inaudible) going to be assessed, yes.

MR. WOODROW:

Another good point, Mr. Speaker, I should make, I am wondering if the taxes should be based on income. For example, the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), let us say he is living out in -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: -Gillams. No, let us say he is living out in Gillams.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to live in Gillams.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, nice spot. Well, suppose he is making \$50,000 a year and his next door neighbour is making, maybe, \$25,000 a year; will they both be equally assessed?

MR. ROBERTS: If they have equal property, under this bill, yes.

MR. WOODROW: Yes. But really I probably missed my point there. I am asking the minister, did he ever consider taxing people on income rather than on property? That is a good point to consider.

MR. ROBERTS: Government has the power to do that.

MR. WOODROW: Yes. Well in any case, it is a good point. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that we could talk for a long time on the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Well do! We are going to be days on the bill yet.

MR. WOODROW: Yes. And furthermore, and let us say during my sojourn to my district -

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman made one of his rare visits.

MR. WOODROW: - over the weekend where I attended -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I heard of mass meetings to get the member home.

MR. WOODROW: - a Lions Club charter night in Curling.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman braved the Lions.

MR. WOODROW: Another Lions Club in Curling, another service club.

MR. ROBERTS: A good organization.

MR. WOODROW: I must say I was really pleased and some people spoke about this bill and they are certainly concerned about it.

MR. ROBERTS: Praised it, no doubt.

MR. WOODROW: And I will agree that a good many people - maybe the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities know about it, maybe some of the councils - but I think the ordinary man in the Street, I wonder does he know about it.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman is making a very good point and the answer is, he does not and that is why we are here debating it.

MR. WOODROW: Well, in all fairness, in fact, he certainly should know about it. I understand the hon. minister is going to travel during the Summer.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. They will know about it when they get their tax bills.

MR. WOODROW: Well, you know, it is not -

MR. ROBERTS: And the government will know about it shortly thereafter.

MR. WOODROW: Yes. However, I have to say that it is a progressive step. In fact, I sat down in company with the minister and other members and we went over the bill from page to page to page. As I said, really what still bothers me most is how is the property tax going to be levied.

MR. NEARY: What bothers me is how you are going to vote.

MR. WOODROW: Well, now the hon. member knows that he does not have to bother about me.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there are those who say one should not bother with the hon. gentlemen opposite, yes.

MR. WOODROW: I did very good in the last election; I got a majority of 1,000.

MR. NEARY: Reminds me of a caribou (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: He does not worry any more about me.

MR. NEARY: That is my charitable nature.

MR. WOODROW: In the meantime -

MR. ROBERTS: How does the hon. member feel about regional government? Would he tell us about that?

MR. WOODROW: Regional, no, I am not going to go into that,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The bill does.

MR. WOODROW: But, yes, I would say - and I am thinking now of two communities, the communities of Lark Harbour and York Harbour - this bill is going to do them a whole lot of good -

MR. ROBERTS: hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - because at the present time there are 300 feet between the two communities and they should become one community.

MR. ROBERTS: And the hon. gentleman -

MR. WOODROW: There should be one community hall, one mayor.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, why is that not done?

MR. WOODROW: One, we say, one clerk.

MR. NEARY: If they want to do it (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: One snow clearing, for example.

MR. ROBERTS: Why is it not done?

MR. WOODROW: In fact, in many cases, as I say, it is going to do good.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I agree but why is it not done now?

MR. WOODROW: In cases like that, you know.

MR. NEARY: Why is it not done?

MR. WOODROW: What?

MR. NEARY: Why is it not done?

MR. WOODROW: Well, I mean, the minister will have the power now to amalgamate.

MR. NEARY: The big stick now.

MR. WOODROW: No, no, not necessarily. He will have the power now to amalgamate Lark Harbour and York Harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: When were these two incorporated?

MR. WOODROW: Oh about, roughly speaking, ten years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I see. Are you sure?

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure?

MR. WOODROW: I have not got the exact date but I can get it for you.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if it was after 1972, that great watershed?

MR. WOODROW: No, no, no. I would say around ten years.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if the hon. gentleman perhaps could check.

MR. WOODROW: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate the hon. minister and the government. I also want to congratulate all who have spoken about this bill because I feel that they are -

MR. ROBERTS: They are trying to serve their country by keeping the debate going.

MR. WOODROW: -concerned about it. This is a real big step in the Province, and I hope as we take this step that we will be doing a lot of good for our people in the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

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

First I would like to congratulate the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) on his usual excellent after-five speech when there is no press here. I thought he did a masterful job, and I am also happy to know that he is concerned about election expenses. I was just making a note here because being somewhat involved I made a note here that for his participation in that particular election, of course, on a per diem basis we have to figure out now his professional income plus his MHA's income which, according to the polls, showed very little result in the St. George's area. But just a few brief comments on that. But certainly there is one other point that I should not pass over at this stage, pertaining to that great speech. It was him suggesting that the Liberals were going to use this particular new proposed act as part of the next election platform. I will speak personally for a minute. First, being an ex-mayor and being somewhat responsible for introducing property taxes in our own municipality, and stating that in the riding I represent about 84 per cent of the residents there pay property tax now, I would certainly compare my plurality with the member from Stephenville's any time.

MR. STAGG: Your plurality?

MR. HOLLETT: Well, whatever you want to call it.

I would like to go back to the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), and I think that he hit a very real point in relation to this bill, and that is the lack of consultation. If there is one big loophole in it to date, that is it; not in the bill itself but in the manner in which it is going to be implemented. I can remember back quite a

MR. HOLLETT:                    few years when the hon. the Premier was minister. He was a great supporter of and participant of consultation with the municipalities. I believe, if I remember correctly, he was a gentleman who helped set up the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee, and if it was not the Premier, certainly the hon. member from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) as minister certainly participated in this type of liaison between government and municipalities. Contrary to what has been said by some people, this particular act I did take the liberty to get copies and circulate in my own riding. I found even in municipalities of Burin and Marystown, which have been involved for quite some time, the councillors are not studying it. I am not condemning this act at all and I trust that we all look at it very thoroughly on each division as we go down through, and certainly I for one will support what I feel is good simply because over quite a few years there is a lot in here which, as a person, I worked for and had a lot of support in this Province.

MR. STAGG:                    (Inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT:                    Thank you, although coming from the member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) I do not know if I should accept that or not. In all seriousness, this consultation aspect does bother me somewhat. I have taken the time to talk to a lot of representatives of municipalities in the areas that I travelled in over the last three weeks in particular, and I was very surprised how little they really knew and the long-term implications. That is from the large towns to the small ones and in the small ones, in particular, I think everybody here will agree, they do have the problem of not full-time town managers and other type staff who can take it - how does it apply to us, how does it apply to a region - sort of a breakdown? I think that is terribly important and that is primarily why I supported the amendment, because when we look around this Province right now, and we look at it - for some strange reason to date the most I have heard is just on the property tax aspect of it. You know, there are many far-reaching aspects of this bill that



November 26, 1979

Tape No. 1384

GH-3

MR. HOLLETT:                   deserve considerable thought and  
discussion before we are all happy with it. But the smaller  
communities

MR. D. HOLLETT: certainly are the ones that are in a turmoil over this bill. I do not blame this directly on the minister at all; there was a time frame, I am sure, in which he had to operate. However, as I said earlier, I am surprised that either (a) this was not circulated totally and preferably, I think, a condensed version could have been circulated. When I say a condensed version, the real points that are here, and I am sure that the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing have the capabilities to do this because in the past they have done it with housing programmes, consultation and many other programmes that I can mention. On the bill, like I said I will not go into article by article or item by item, but I do find that now that a minimum amount of coverage by members of this House, and I am sure we have all had the opportunity to visit our district and say something on it in the right audience and otherwise, but the more it becomes known to the people and what bothers me most is what has been known as not necessarily the fact, Mr. Minister. This is where I am afraid that there is going to be a large reaction to what probably, when we go through it will be basically a good piece of legislation for the future. I am afraid that we could welcome it with a negative reaction against all the good points in it, certainly some I personally have already received some, and as a suggestion I really think it is terribly important that those municipalities are reached because I have taken the opportunity to contact people who are on the Federation of Municipalities right now. I have heard Mr. Smith's comments, I have read some of them, but I can assure this House that his comments are not shared by all the members of that executive. As a matter of fact, there are members of that executive who have not even read this bill yet. I do not know about seeing it but I know they have not read it, which certainly is not indicative of the cross section that we have in this Province.

So I will finish on this point today and just reiterate again the importance of the elected councillors and, equally important, the people who live in all municipalities, large and small, in this Province, I feel they have a right to know just how this is

November 26, 1979

Tape No. 1385

RA2

MR. D. HOLLETT:

going to affect them in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Adjourn the debate.

MR. HOLLETT:

I would like to adjourn

the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate has been

adjourned. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that

the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at three o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at three of the clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

NOVEMBER 26th, 1979

QUESTION #56

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

- (a) How many physiotherapists were recruited outside the Province in 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979 to date?
- (b) In what provinces or countries were these physiotherapists recruited?

ANSWER

(a)	1974	- 9
	1975	- 16
	1976	- 13
	1977	- 14
	1978	- 11
	1979	- <u>13</u>
		<u>76</u>
(b)	Other provinces	- 44
	United Kingdom	- 29
	India	- <u>3</u>
		<u>76</u>

NOVEMBER 21, 1979