



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 58

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Wednesday

13 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it concerns the remarks made by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). I am rising at the earliest possible moment because I had to get a transcript of his remarks and they were not available until just a few minutes ago. It concerns the withdrawal of the offending statements that the hon. member had made. I will repeat them verbatim. He finally said, "Mr. Speaker, I do confess to a terrible weakness, namely, my inability to see the magnificent fairness of your Speakership. So I withdraw unequivocally."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was able to hear the patronizing tone the hon. gentleman delivered those lines in, but I certainly was not able to repeat them because they were practically inaudible. But Hansard did pick them up. Mr. Speaker, this is just a case of the hon. gentleman persisting in trying to belittle Your Honour, and his withdrawal lacks the key elements of humility and remorse and, therefore, I think it is totally unacceptable. I do not know what we can do with the hon. gentleman. Perhaps if we were to have him publicly flogged that might solve the problem, but certainly it does not seem to be any good to call him to order. So I will give these to Your Honour

and let Your Honour decide what is best to do with them.

MR. TULK:

To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

That is not a point of privilege. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is again wasting the time of the House, trying to take this place on his back. It should have been raised at a far earlier opportunity, if he considers it a point of privilege in his own weak mind. If he considers it a point of privilege it should have been raised at the earliest opportunity. But, unfortunately, when Your Honour asked the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to withdraw his statement, which he did, the hon. member was asleep. He should have been awake and raised this so-called point of privilege at the earliest possible opportunity. He has not done that and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege anyway. Wake up, boy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, to that point of privilege.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I only wish to speak on one aspect of the argument, not the substantive aspect, but the one aspect of the argument put forward by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and that is with respect to its being brought up at

the earliest possible moment. That is the aspect of it on which I wish to speak briefly. The substantive matter I leave to Your Honour.

With respect to the earliest possible moment, obviously the earliest possible has to be the moment when the hon. gentleman hears or becomes aware of something that is said. And if he did not hear what the hon. gentleman said, either because his mind was on something else, matters of great moment or matters of concern to his constituents, or the hon. gentleman opposite spoke in so soft a tone that the hon. gentleman could not hear, whatever the reasons might be, the earliest possible moment, obviously, is the moment when one becomes seized of something. So I would just suggest the earliest possible moment argument is one when somebody becomes aware of something. On the substantial matter, I leave it to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I did hear the remarks of the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage yesterday and I must say that I had some doubts about whether I should comment further, but I did give the hon. member the benefit of that doubt. As far as I am concerned that matter rests at that and there is no prima facie case. I did have an opportunity to review Hansard with respect to the point of order raised by the Premier in regard to statements by the Leader of the Opposition that the Premier be reprimanded. Looking at the context of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, there does not appear to be anything unparliamentary in that remark itself and I rule there is no point of order.

There is one further comment on another matter that I would like to bring to the attention of hon. members. I would like to remind all members that it is not permitted to bring food or coffee or other drinks into this House, but, I understand that has been done.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, even Your Honour can see that the Premier should be reprimanded. In order to condemn the Government of Canada for its factory freezer trawler decision, at this time I would ask leave to present the following resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking for leave to give notice of a motion but there is no leave to depart from the Standing Orders which now require Statements by Ministers. There is no unanimous consent, there is no leave to depart from the regular business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand that motion can be made by leave and that leave is not granted.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the hon. gentleman this. If he is going to give leave in this House - I think we have had this debate before and I think Your Honour has made some statements on it, and it is in our Standing Orders - before leave can be granted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, should they not at least know what that leave is being asked for?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We know.

MR. TULK:

You know?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

The Premier is now into soothsaying, glaring into crystal balls, Mr. Speaker, how do they know what the resolution is? Mr. Speaker, under Section 30 of our Standing Orders it says, "A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover." Now, we would contend that this is a matter, a case of urgent and pressing necessity and that in order for us to know whether leave is going to be granted, and in order for Your Honour to know whether leave is going to be granted or not, it has to be explained just what it is that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is asking leave for. Standing Order 30, Mr. Speaker, that is what has to happen.

Now they cannot be gazing into crystal balls, and neither can Your Honour, of course. So it has to be explained just what it is that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do under Section 30 of our Standing Orders.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, really there are two aspects to this. One is covered by Standing Order 30 - I think it was 30 which hon. gentleman said. Obviously the question there is really that a notice of motion is given and if there is leave then the matter will be debated or the notice will be given.

MR. TULK:

Previously explained.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Previously explained, agreed. Previously explained. But, obviously, previous to that, it is implied whether there is unanimous consent to even do that, whether there is unanimous consent to depart from the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders require that the order of business be Statements by Ministers and then Oral Questions and, when we get to number four, Notices of Motion, there is no problem. What is obviously implied is does the hon. gentleman have leave to depart from the Standing Orders, and that is a prior consideration. The hon. gentleman obviously can give notice of a motion, but he does not have leave to depart from the Standing Orders - the only things

which can interfere are points of order or points of privilege - which now require the House to proceed to Statements By Ministers.

MR. BARRY:

If I could speak briefly to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We have to ask for Your Honour's protection here. We have restrictions on how we operate within this House. But these rules are set for all sides of the House and all sides have to comply with them. Now if you look at Section 29 of the Standing Orders, it deals with twenty-four hours notice of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, or for placing a question on the Order Paper.

And then Section 30 says, "A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice." Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Acting House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) is suggesting that it is implied that there must be leave given for us to get up and explain a case of urgent and pressing necessity. That is to eviscerate, Mr. Speaker, the meaning and the content of Section 30. Basically what members opposite are doing is just confirming the fact that they are playing games on this factory freezer trawler issue and they do not want a resolution before this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I call to the hon. gentlemen's mind Standing Order 14 - they all have to be read in context, you cannot take one without the other - "The ordinary daily routine of business in the House shall be as follows except where priority has been given previously by the House to other orders." And priority here can only be given by unanimous consent. "The ordinary daily routine of business in the House shall be as follows except where priority has been given previously by the House to other orders:" - and it is - "(a) Statements by Ministers; (b) Oral Questions," and so on. The ordinary daily routine of business is established, and no priority is given by unanimous consent to depart from Standing Order 14.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

One final submission, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

One shot at the point made by the Acting House Leader, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 14, obviously where it says, "except where priority has been given previously by the House," contemplates priority such as provided for under Standing Order 30, where it is recognized that there may be a case of urgent and pressing necessity which can only be determined once it has been explained by the one attempting to move the resolution, Mr. Speaker. This is a serious

matter. It impacts upon the ability of the Opposition to deal with the urgent and pressing necessities of the day under the Standing Orders, Mr. Speaker, and we ask that you give serious consideration to this.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) were really serious in his resolution, obviously he would have, before the House opened, consulted with this side of the House so that we could have had the unanimous consent he wants. So he is just playing games.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we did consult with the Premier on factory freezer trawlers before and he broke the agreement. He made an agreement and broke it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. Referring to our Standing Order 30 there has to be unanimous consent, there is not in this case, so I rule that matter out of order.

MR. BARRY:

With respect to Your Honour we have to appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The motion is that the ruling of the Speaker be upheld.

All those in favour, "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The ruling is upheld.

Before I call for Statements by Ministers, I have great pleasure in welcoming to the House Mr. Richard Baker, Deputy High Commissioner with the British High Commission in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to inform the hon. House of my department's plans to call early tenders for highway improvement and construction projects under a cost-shared agreement with the federal government.

As this hon. House is aware, this is a practice which has been followed during the past several

years by the Department of Transportation to carry out major work on the Province's highway network. This approach to tendering improves the economic stability of the construction industry and provides employment for many Newfoundlanders throughout the Province.

This announcement will allow the construction industry to take advantage of our short construction season and will give them lead time for preparatory planning, and, Mr. Speaker, as I have previously indicated on a number of occasions, these projects, indeed, need to be carried out.

This early tendering policy has been on ongoing practice of my department for several years. Between November, 1983, and March, 1984, my department tendered projects of the 1984 construction season valued in excess of \$12 million.

From November, 1984, to March, 1985, my department early tendered projects for the 1985 construction season valued in excess of \$28 million.

The value of the early tendering programs of government is obvious and is an approach to economic stimulation that I am confident will continue.

I wish today to make the hon. House aware of my department's plans, through this early tendering policy, to help stimulate the construction industry in the Province during the 1986 - 1987 fiscal year.

Today, I wish to announce to the House that my department will call during the weeks ahead several

tenders for projects in line with this policy with a combined value of approximately \$29 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

These projects will include:

A continuation of the four-laning of the Trans Canada Highway West of St. John's to beyond the Foxtrap intersection, including a complete interchange at the Foxtrap intersection;

Complete the paving of the Trans-Canada Highway from Port Blandford to Terra Nova National Park, including improvements to bridges at Middle Brook and Salmon Brook, as well as the railway overpass at Port Blandford.

Complete paving of the Trans-Canada Highway from Gander to Glenwood;

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Construction of a major interchange structure at Nicholville intersection in Deer Lake;

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Construction of a new access from the CN Marine ferry terminal at Port aux Basques;

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Paving of the roads from Trepassey to Peter's River and Salmonier to Colinet along with upgrading and

improvements to the road from St. Bride's to Branch;

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

To complete the paving of Route 436 from St. Lunaire to L'Anse-au-Meadow; and

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

A continuation of construction from Wabush towards Churchill Falls on the Trans-Labrador Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to point out that during the last fiscal year, my department expended approximately \$91 million on capital projects throughout the Province.

As all members of the House can readily see, this is indeed an excellent policy which benefits the travelling public in the Province, the construction industry, and the thousands of residents of the Province who are employed in this industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Nr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

I never cease to be amazed at the excessive use of words in the

Department of Transportation.

This Ministerial Statement contains two and one-half pages, Mr. Speaker, and over half of the statement is trying to justify the concept of advanced tendering. Now, I am sure there are arguments for and against advanced tendering, but I do not see why every time the hon. the minister gets up in this House he has to use up half of his Ministerial Statement on empty words which are totally irrelevant and meaningless.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

One-half the statement telling about a policy that has been in effect for years is a foolish waste of time for this hon. House.

I notice that the hon. the minister has still not changed the folly of his ways. I just took a quick look down through some of those construction jobs which are going to be tendered. He has found his way outside the Overpass, which is a rare occasion for a member of a Tory Government. From St. John's to the Foxtrap intersection, by coincidence, happens to be in a Tory district. Port Blandford to Terra Nova National Park, by sheer coincidence, just happens to be in a Tory district. The little bit of paving between Gander and Glenwood, the worst section of the Trans-Canada Highway, which was promised on the eve of an election in trying to get a Tory seat out there, I suppose is not wanting to make a disgrace of themselves completely. They had to deliver



on some of their millions of dollars of promises. The Nicholville intersection in Deer Lake, just by sheer coincidence, is in a Tory district. The marine ferry terminal at Port aux Basques, by sheer coincidence, is in another Tory district. The paving of roads from Salmonier to Colinet, by sheer coincidence, a Tory district.

Mr. Speaker, like the story about the creation, I hear that when the Creator had finished with the creation, there was a little handful of dirt and mud left over. He threw it down. It was supposed to be Newfoundland. A little handful of left-over mud was thrown up to St. Lunaire and L'Anse-au-Meadow, this happened to be in a Liberal district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this hon. House of Assembly today of the progress which my department made in creating employment opportunities for students during the past Summer. You will recall that government allocated approximately \$2 million as part of a federal/provincial employment creation program for students. This program has now

concluded and, in my opinion, has been a most successful one.

MR. SIMMS:

Listen to this. Just listen now.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I am making this statement today is because of some queries that came up from the Opposition and -

MR. SIMMS:

They are all queries over there.

MR. POWER:

- some very undue criticism about a program which helped many Newfoundlanders and which they clamoured as much as they could -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

- to try and put the programme down. But the proof is in the pudding, Mr. Speaker, and here is the proof. There were approximately 1,252 projects approved which created in excess of 5,400 jobs for students in 425 communities in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

So 1,252 projects in 425 communities for over 5,400 jobs. The programme the year before, if you want a comparison, when there happened to be a slightly different government in Ottawa, had 578 projects approved for 3,600 jobs.

MR. SIMMS:

Shame!

MR. POWER:

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the main objectives of the Summer Employment Experience Development (SEED) was to create employment opportunities for students that would be career related and, as such, provide valuable work experience which would assist them in locating permanent employment upon graduation. In that regard, students were employed in a variety of occupations all around the Island and in Labrador. Examples of career related employment included: divers, pharmacists, engineering assistants, fisheries quality control officers, community planning co-ordinators, mechanic assistants, recreation co-ordinators, social workers, and researchers in our tourist industry.

It is also encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that students were employed in the private sector, all levels of the public sector, and non-profit organizations. My department has received correspondence from participating employers indicating their extreme satisfaction with this program.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our employment creation initiatives are not restricted to young people, as is evidenced by government's \$2 million recent announcement to get involved in special fisheries project and \$3.5 million contribution to the Canadian Jobs Strategy. This, too, is a co-operative effort by both levels of government which will create new employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders during the balance of this fiscal year and provide training opportunities to ensure that the skilled needs of industry are being met.

Mr. Speaker, there has been concern expressed as a recent date that the new Canadian Jobs Strategy or the fishermen's programmes will not work because they are not rural oriented or because there is a training component in them that makes them somewhat restrictive. Mr. Speaker, I will be able to make further announcements in the next week or two showing exactly how successful those programmes are and showing that those programmes are designed for rural Newfoundland. The 425 communities who took part in the Summer programme are only small in comparison to how many communities will take part in the Canadian Jobs Strategy and in the Fisheries programme.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, try as I might, but I cannot get too enthusiastic or too optimistic about this statement made by the minister. It is hardly an earth-shattering statement.

This government, Mr. Speaker, have become so desperate now that they have come to making progress reports. I expect now that we will get a progress report on the Trans-Canada Agreement. As soon as they complete ten miles we get a progress report. So they have to make two statements. One to say that the job is starting and

the other one to say that it is finished. Mr. Speaker, that is how desperate they have become.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is just an indication of how inefficient, how incompetent, how bankrupt of ideas this government is in terms of dealing with youth unemployment or unemployment at any level.

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous. This is not a statement. It is just a ploy by the government, a little bit of window dressing to give the impression that they are trying to do something to deal with the unemployment problems in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is totally inadequate and the minister should be ashamed to stand in his place and make that statement here today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about career training. That is fine but look at the careers that these young people are being trained for. Where are they going to find the jobs tomorrow? It is one thing to train people, but where are they going to find the jobs tomorrow?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

A bit of window dressing, that is all, Mr. Speaker, and a clear indication of a government that is adrift.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

#### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. The Premier last evening in an interview with CBC Television indicated that he was not definitely informed until Friday morning of the federal government's decision on FFTs, factory freezer trawlers. He stressed the word 'definitely'. Now, would the Premier explain, therefore, how it was that he was able to prepare a detailed response? I think he said he stayed up all night Thursday with his staff preparing a detailed, lengthy and specific response including references to the conditions that were in the announcement that was read out by Mr. Crosbie on Friday morning. Indeed, I think the Premier was presenting his response to these conditions in the House before Mr. Crosbie had a chance to complete reading out his announcement down at the Hotel Newfoundland.

Would the Premier indicate whether this is not confirmation that he was in fact informed beforehand, that he had input into those conditions beforehand, and that he has been misleading this House in his earlier statements?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I get a great charge out of the Leader of the Opposition. I mean, the political judgement of the hon. gentleman is just unbelievable. I have heard from quite a few of the Leader of the Opposition's cohorts over the last number of weeks, and days

especially, and they have openly expressed what a stupid, unpolitical move the members of the Opposition made when they voted against factory freezer trawlers. The hon. gentleman persists in trying to find some discrepancy in the way the announcements were made, and so on, to try to recoup some political advantage back that they lost last week when they voted against factory freezer trawlers.

I have explained to this House, Mr. Speaker, that forty-eight hours before the announcement the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) was told, it was hinted to him by Mr. Crosbie, our Minister in the Federal Cabinet, that a decision was coming, but we had no details of the decision. On Friday morning we were given a copy of the statement that Mr. Crosbie was going to make. After we got a copy of the statement, we did up our response to that statement and produced it here in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened. There was a hint given verbally by Mr. Crosbie forty-eight hours before and the details of the announcement were given to us on Friday morning. Because we happen to have a little competence over here, we were able to respond to that statement later on Friday morning here in this hon. House. Now I know the Leader of the Opposition is hurting and smarting under the fact that they voted against factory freezer trawlers, but that is his problem. He can search until he is blue in the face but he will not find any discrepancies in the way this thing was handled. We have done our utmost, even without the Opposition, to try to have this decision another way. We were not successful, but we fought

the good fight without the Leader of the Opposition and without the Liberal Party, and we will continue to fight fights which are important for Newfoundland and in our best interests.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

In the House of Commons this past Thursday, the hon. Erik Neilsen said that the broadest consultation had taken place with respect to this decision. Mr. Morrissey Johnson, in an interview with *The Globe and Mail*, said that no doors were ever closed to the Premier and that all doors were opened by Mr. Johnson himself whenever the Premier wanted them opened. Mr. John Crosbie, at 10:32 a.m. last Friday on the *VOCM Action Line* said there had been four months of intense consultation. So I will ask the Premier, in light of his statement that there was no consultation, is the Premier saying that Mr. Erik Neilsen is lying, that Mr. John Crosbie is lying, that Mr. Morrissey Johnson is lying, that everybody is lying on this issue except the Premier? Is that what he is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, by the way, I spoke to Captain Morrissey Johnson this morning and he informed me that he did not utter the words that the Leader of the Opposition said he uttered yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. BARRY:

What! What!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I talked to Mr. Johnson on the phone yesterday and he said he never did say that the Government of Newfoundland was informed ten or fourteen days before. So I would like to know where the Leader of the Opposition gets his information.

MR. TOBIN:

He made it up!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Neilsen said that it was the broadest consultation? I do not know what Mr. Neilsen meant by that. We made our presentation to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, to the Minister, we made our presentation to the Atlantic caucus, so I suppose that is the broadest consultation that Mr. Neilsen is talking about. I cannot put words in Mr. Neilsen's mouth. The Leader of the Opposition will have to go and talk to Mr. Nielsen about that. And as far as Mr. Crosbie's comments go, you know, we went to Mr. Crosbie and made our presentation to him. Mr. Morrissey Johnson helped us organize a meeting with the Atlantic caucus and we made our presentations. I suppose that is what the three gentlemen are talking about. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Liberal Party of Newfoundland voted against our resolution which said, "Oppose factory freezer trawlers," and now they are trying to recoup political advantage because they voted for factory freezer trawlers. They made a political error in judgement on the other

side, led by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) knows different, and a few of the other members know different politically. But the Leader of the Opposition, his political judgement - it is too bad. I am sorry.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a moment ago the Leader of the Opposition it seemed was considered to be going on a bit too long with his question, and I would suggest that the Premier is giving another speech and I would ask the Speaker to rule on the content of his reply.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are rules in this House and there is a rule as it relates to supplementary questions and supplementary questions do not have a preamble.

MR. BAKER:

And answers, too.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And answers as well. But if a supplementary question is going to be allowed to have preambles, then obviously the answer could also extend a little bit beyond. So I was only responding to what the

Leader of the Opposition had to say, which was out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the Premier was answering the question.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Premier to explain his contradictory statements yesterday. We do not have Hansard, it is a bit late today, but we have obtained an extract from the tape -

MR. SIMMS:

I have it.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I know you have it but I guess you instructed Hansard not to deliver it to us.

MR. SIMMS:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) had it when he rose on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

We have an extract, anyhow, Mr. Speaker, where the Premier says -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! In a supplementary there is no need for a preamble. Maybe the hon. member would ask his question.

MR. BARRY:

There is no preamble, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Premier to clarify -

MR. SPEAKER:

I did not hear a question.

MR. BARRY:

How could you with the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) yelling and bawling and hollering?

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe the hon. member would ask his question.

MR. SIMMS:

I only replied.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, could you keep the hon. the member for Grand Falls quiet?

MR. SIMMS:

Grow up and get on with your question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier to clarify his contradictory replies to answers yesterday where initially he said, "So, Mr. Speaker, there were no meetings on it." This was referring to the factory freezer trawler decision when we asked for minutes of those meetings. And then he went on, "I did go up to Ottawa on this issue. On September 11 we had a meeting with the Prime Minister." And then he went on, "from September 11 onto now," Mr. Speaker, he indicated that the lobbying was done through the Minister of Fisheries and through the presentations that were made.

Now what was the situation? Did the Premier have any meetings? Was there only one meeting with the Prime Minister of Canada? Did the Premier consider this issue of so little import that he only went

to talk to the Prime Minister of Canada once? Did the Premier meet with the Prime Minister of Canada more than once on this issue or did he not? Would he clarify his contradictory remarks?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely ridiculous. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition as I said before, is hurting. We have had I do not know how many meetings, as I said to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. We had meetings with the Prime Minister, we had meetings with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielsen), we had meetings with Mr. Crosbie, we had meetings with the Atlantic Caucus. I do not know how many meetings I had with the Prime Minister and people in his office. I do not know the exact number there were so many of them. There were innumerable meetings, all kinds of meetings. The first meeting was on September 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We just cannot have a debate if there is going to be questions over and back directly, so I ask all hon. members to address the Chair.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the Leader of the Opposition's question to me I never said a word, never opened my mouth. I allowed him to ask the question. But when I get up to

answer, all I can hear is somebody barking across the House at me who will not allow me to answer the question. I am telling the Leader of the Opposition that I had innumerable meetings with the Prime Minister, with the Prime Minister's staff, with the Minister of Fisheries with the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General (Mr. Crosbie). We have had so many meetings over the last three or four months on this issue that I have done hardly anything else but have meetings on this issue to try to outdo three or four provinces. As we all know we are outnumbered as related to provinces, and that is why there are no factory freezer trawlers in the Gulf. The Quebec North Shore did not want factory freezers in the Gulf, PEI did not want them in the Gulf, New Brunswick did not want them in the Gulf, Nova Scotia did not want them in the Gulf, but they would all like to have them off Newfoundland. We had four provinces and a corporate lobby opposed to us, so we used every single means at our disposal, from meetings with the Prime Minister to meetings with the Deputy Prime Minister, the Acting Minister of Fisheries, with the former Minister of Fisheries, with the Atlantic Caucus, and with our minister in the federal cabinet to oppose them. I do not know exactly how many meetings all told. They were held both with the Prime Minister and with other ministers but they must have numbered somewhere between fifteen and twenty to thirty or forty. I do not know exactly how many, but there were innumerable meetings with the Prime Minister and with the federal government at all levels. Now, I know that hurts the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, because he approved factory freezer trawlers in this

House. I cannot help it if the Leader of the Opposition is hurting. You know, if the cap fits wear it.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I ask again the question I asked yesterday. Would the Premier indicate the times and the dates when he had these meetings with the Prime Minister and would he indicate what were contained in the minutes of those meetings? If he will not do the latter, will he give the times and the dates when he had those innumerable meetings? Because the Premier is changing his story now that he has been caught out, now that he has had to say in this House he only got in to see the Prime Minister on one occasion, on September 11. Will he tell us dates, Mr. Speaker, and will he table that tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What a lot of foolishness! The first meeting with the Prime Minister I think was around September 11. I do not know when the other dates were I will have to look up my schedule and get them.

Here is this government that has fought, has gone out and gotten the Federation of Labour, the Federation of Municipalities, the Union, just about everybody, every large organization in this Province, and the only ones who did not support us were the Leader

of the Opposition and his party. That is why he wants dates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Every single other person in this Province supported it except the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. Shame on them! And now they are trying to wiggle out of it, asking for dates and minutes of meetings and so on, as if we did not do anything. Too bad, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would like to pose a question to the Premier. I would like to quote from his statement of last Friday and it reads, "We have seen this FFT policy reversal in the fishery based not on an objective assessment of all the facts but rather on the force of a political lobby effort in Ottawa, the like of which we have never witnessed before."

I would like to ask the Premier this: Apparently the Premier knew he was being outmaneuvered, that the lobby against Newfoundland was succeeding, so what did he do to counteract it? Why was Newfoundland kept in the dark and just what did the Premier do to counteract the lobby the like of which he had never witnessed before?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.



PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, as I indicated in the answer to a previous question, we had four provinces and a large corporation in Atlantic Canada lobbying the various ministers. What did we do? We contacted every single minister of the federal Cabinet. We contacted every MP of the House of Commons. We went and talked and briefed the caucus of the government from Atlantic Canada. We talked to all the ministers: the Minister of Fisheries, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, every single Cabinet minister and every single MP, as well as the Senate of Canada. That is what we did, Mr. Speaker, to try to counteract the lobby against us. We contacted every single person who had any say or would have any say or any influence over this decision.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell us who outmaneuvered us? By whom was the lobby waged? Was it the federal MPs? Was it the Nova Scotia government? Was it National Sea? Who outmaneuvered us with that lobby, Mr. Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the people who outmaneuvered us were the Government of Quebec and the fishing interests in Quebec; the Government of New Brunswick and the fishing interests of New

Brunswick; the Government of P.E.I. and the fishing interests in P.E.I.; in Nova Scotia, the Nova Scotia Government and the fishing interests in Nova Scotia; and in Newfoundland, the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

According to the Premier, Ottawa does not understand the Newfoundland fishery. Who is to blame? Is Mr. Crosbie keeping Mr. Mulroney and company in ignorance? Is it the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) who he was proud of yesterday? Just who is to blame for Ottawa over this past four months not understanding what the FFT issue would do to Newfoundland? Whose fault is it? It is yours 'Charlie', it is yours.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is really hilarious! I think all one has to do to find out what happens in Central Canada is to read The Globe and Mail editorial of yesterday, or to read The Financial Times of two or three weeks ago, or to read two or three other editorials of the mainland newspapers. It is the same way on the seal fishery when you start talking about Central Canada. We all know the Government of Canada is made up of individuals from various parts of Canada who are elected, and individuals mainly

from Central Canada who are in the bureaucracy. There is an attitude in Ottawa, it was there fifty years ago and it is still there today, because of the nature of this country. The only reason why this political experiment works at all is because some powers are decentralized to the Provinces, otherwise there would be a complete lack of understanding of the periphery and the hinterland of the country. Now that is not news to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) or anybody else. Unfortunately, the hon. member and his Party assisted in that lobby in working, because people in Ottawa who have that kind attitude, like came out of The Globe and Mail article yesterday, can also say, "Sure, even the three political parties in Newfoundland could not agree on this issue. Two of the three parties did, but one of the political parties did not even agree with what the Premier and the government was doing." That would add more fuel to their ignorance of our problem! So the Liberal Party indirectly contributed to sustaining that kind of attitude towards the fishing industry. The fishing industry is not like the automotive industry or the agricultural industry, and the Eastern Canadian fishery is not like the Pacific fishery and, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that. I can give the hon. member, if he wants to come down to my office, a lecture on Canadian politics and attitudes, if he would like to, because obviously he does not understand Canada.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon.

the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier knew that there was a great, overpowering lobby going on. I am wondering, did the Premier attempt to engage the most successful lobbyist in Ottawa? I want to ask the Premier did the attempt to engage the most successful lobbyist in Ottawa, the former Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Moores, or was he working for our opponents? Were we beaten to that punch, too?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would love to answer that question. The double standard that the Liberal Party has! The other day when we talked about having hired to advise us on the offshore negotiations a former Premier of Alberta, we were roundly condemned by the Liberal Party of wasting money. We were wasting money, and how much more was Mr. Lougheed getting here and there and somewhere else? I would like to see the Opposition, three or four weeks ago, if we had gotten up in this House and said we hired this one or that one to do our lobbying. "What is wrong with you? What is wrong with the Government of Newfoundland? Are you not capable of putting forth your own case? Why have you got to get somebody else to help lobby your cause for you?" The very Party who wanted to sign away the offshore, now wanted to sign away factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Speaker. Oh, oh oh! What have we got here? A double standard! If we had come out and said we had hired some sort of a lobby group, they would have been the first ones saying we were wasting taxpayers' money and therefore

that we would have been admitting our own incompetence.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Thank you.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). In preamble to it, I would like to indicate that I think most of us saw an excellent exercise of democracy yesterday when thousands of people all across the Province ran for municipal election, thousands of men and women - a good number of women - and some excellent people were elected. My question is with regard to that because as the campaign continued it became apparent to me that, at least here in St. John's and a few other places that there was a considerable amount of spending going on with regards to these campaigns. I have even heard unsubstantiated reports that in excess of \$15,000 has been spent by individual candidates in the St. John's area.

My question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs is: Is he alarmed by this increase in spending? Does he have anything specific he is planning to do to address this problem?

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, whether or not

I am alarmed at what monies were spent by individual candidates in the campaign is totally irrelevant. If there has been any irregularities with regard to spending I am sure it will be addressed to the judicial system.

MR. FENWICK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
I think the minister missed my point there. I am not suggesting that there were irregularities. I think it is perfectly legitimate for people to donate to individuals running for council, and it is perfectly legitimate for them to receive this money to use it to try to get elected. My question, similar, of course, to the question I have asked on the provincial Election Expenses Act, is that individuals on councils end up making very critical decisions in terms of zoning, bylaws, in terms of building permits for individuals, and they are in a position to do good for a considerable number of individuals and, if there is an instance where these individuals have been involved in the financing, we should at least know about that.

My question to the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Question! Question!

MR. FENWICK:  
- the question I am getting to is: Is the minister willing to look at a change to The Municipalities Act, and to the City of Corner Brook Act and the City of St. John's Act in order to require individuals who run for councils

to divulge their spending and, more particularly, where this money comes from?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, we have not had any representations at the departmental level to look into this particular matter. We have spoken, just as recently as yesterday, with the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. They have not made any representations to the department concerning that matter. But if any representations are made, well, we will have to have a look at it at that point in time.

MR. SIMMS:

Besides that, it is none of your business.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am surprised, since I wrote the minister about a week and a half ago about this particular issue and asked him to look into it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. FENWICK:

Okay. It is not from the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, but it is the people of St. John's, Corner Brook and the rest of the Province I am

worried about. Are you or are you not willing to look at changes to The Municipalities Act to provide for disclosure of where these contributions come from?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. gentleman a moment ago, if representations are received from any councils across the Province, or from the Federation regarding this particular matter, we would be only too happy to discuss it with bodies concerned. At this point in time we have not received any representations and the issue that the hon. gentleman raised is a hypothetical one, obviously. If it ever materializes we will have a look at it.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

I have a question for the Premier, supplementary to the questions that were asked just now about FFTs and consultation and lack of it and so on. I want to ask the Premier, when he was talking to Captain Morrissey Johnson this morning, did he ask Captain Johnson to explain what he meant and how this jibes with what the Premier said earlier when he said there were all kinds of meetings and consultation?

Captain Morrissey Johnson, on the Open Line Programmes on Friday morning said, and I quote, "There

has been too much public debate on this matter and not enough negotiation." Did the Premier ask my Captain, my member in the House of Commons, what he meant by that? If so, how did the Captain explain it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think the hon. the member will have to direct that question to Captain Morrissey Johnson. We have been discussing the matter of FFTs with the federal government since early September. I am not going to try to interpret Captain Morrissey Johnson's remarks, I will leave that to the member for Bellevue. The member for Bellevue approved FFTs and so did all his colleagues over there. If they want to see more FFTs off Newfoundland, that is their problem. They can mince around and split hairs on this little word or that little word that Captain Morrissey Johnson said or Mr. Crosbie said or Mr. Nielsen said, it is not going to change anything, Mr. Speaker. There are four factory freezer trawlers and we are against them.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The Premier said publicly yesterday that he had outmaneuvered the Opposition on the resolution opposing FFTs. Mr. Speaker, he admits in that very word 'outmaneuvered' that he was after all merely playing a game with that famous resolution that he brought in, that, on an issue so vital to Newfoundland, it was,

for him, all one-upmanship. That is all the Premier believes in, play-acting, deception, all a pitiful attempt to score political points. He wanted to cover his own pathetic lack of action, of course, with his federal colleagues.

Will the Premier now admit that the resolution was a cover-up for the fact that he knew the decision had already been taken? Will he now admit that fact and, for once, come clean with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and then perhaps we can move on to some action against FFTs? Admit that, 'Brian'. Stand up and be a man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can swear on a stack of Bibles 10,000 miles high, and on each 1,000 mile there might be an FFT, that the first indication we had that the decision was going to go against us was in a verbal communication between Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Ottenheimer, and that the facts of the decision were not known to us until Friday morning, at which time we composed a response to those facts and presented them here in the House. I know you are all smarting, I know it is hard to take, but you people, on the opposite side of the House in the Liberal Opposition would not support our resolution, you went against it, and that is out there all over rural Newfoundland. We have done our polls, we know, and the Opposition know we know. Now they want to try to accuse me of

personal deception, and my personal deception here in the House now is supposed to override the fact that 90 per cent of the fishermen of Newfoundland know we were against factory freezer trawlers, with the NDP member, and that the Liberal Party were in favour of FFTs. And now they are trying through this mechanism, to try to get in the press 'Defection by Peckford.' Therefore, they will try to erode away that factual view out there, which is we are against factory freezer trawlers and the Liberal Opposition are for it. And, Mr. Speaker, their tactic will not work. It will backfire like the one last week.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, can you quiet them down or do you have to throw them out to quiet them down?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to remind the hon. member that there is only time for a very short question.

MR. TULK:

If they will be quiet, Mr. Speaker, I will get it out very quickly.

The Acting Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Erik Nielsen, announced an FFT licence for FPI. The provincial government, by the way, owns a

major portion of that company. Does the Premier expect us to believe as Newfoundlanders that Mr. Nielsen made that decision without consulting the shareholders of which the government is one? Or is it that he is afraid to stand up and admit that he was afraid to take on his Tory buddies in Ottawa and that he carried on a charade in Newfoundland in order to cover that up? Why does he not stand up and admit it? Come on boy, be a man!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Too bad, too bad, Mr. Speaker, too bad. The Acting Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa made a policy statement. We did not know the details of that policy statement or anything about it until it was delivered to us Friday morning at which time we made a response, Mr. Speaker. Now that is the truth of the matter. That is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. What the Opposition are trying to do, trying to establish - and they cannot do it, Mr. Speaker - ever since this House opened, are allegations on this, that and something else, and now it is an allegation of deception by me. It is just not going to work, they are going to fall flat on their face. Go get your polls done like we do and find out what the Newfoundland people are saying. The Newfoundland people are saying that the Liberal Party is a disgrace, it has let Newfoundland down on the offshore, and now it has let them down on FFTs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Today is Private Members' Day and there is a motion in the name of the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is rather appropriate that this resolution, or at least most of this resolution, comes up for debate the day after the municipal elections in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Because of one section in the resolution, we would have liked to have debated it a week ago; however, I am very pleased to introduce the resolution today, the day after the elections.

I think that the topics of municipal affairs, municipal financing and the structure of municipal government in the Province are crucial topics at this point in time.

The resolution is particularly important now that we have new councils elected and ready to carry on the work of their municipalities.

I think the resolution can be broadened a bit even. It involves relationships between levels of government. We have heard for quite some time in this Province, and I suppose ever since

Confederation, about the relationship between the federal and provincial levels of government. We have had nice times and we have had conflicts, we have had consultation and we have had confrontation, and the relationships between these two levels of government have varied. The same thing has happened, Mr. Speaker, in the relationship between the provincial and the municipal levels of government. I think that there is a parallel here.

I would first of all like to point out to members opposite, particularly to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), that when he is dealing with municipalities in the Province, he consider the situation if he were on the other side of the fence. I am sure, especially with recent happenings, if he were to consider the relationship between provincial and federal governments and say to himself, 'how would we like it if the federal government were doing things unilaterally and so on? How would we react?' I would suggest that he think of this parallel between the provincial and federal governments when he is dealing with the municipalities of this Province.

The question, really, at this point, Mr. Speaker, is what kind of relationship do we, as elected people here, want with the municipalities in our Province? Do we want conflict or do we want consultation? Do we want ad hoc development or do we want planned development, or do we, in fact, want development at all? I think that these relate to the relationship between the provincial government and the municipalities.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we just came through a rather exciting day yesterday with the municipal elections. Elections were held in a number of municipalities that far exceeded the number of municipalities that held elections four years ago.

For the most part, where the elections were held, there were good contests with large numbers of individuals running for election and large numbers of good individuals running for election. However, this is really the beginning, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons touted for the increased turnout and the record number of people running for municipal councils in this Province is the publicity campaign that was undertaken. I must say, in my way of looking at things, it is about time that kind of approach was taken to municipal elections.

The Federation of Municipalities, in their brief to government, requested a number of things. One of the things they requested was a joint publicity campaign on behalf of the Federation of Municipalities and the provincial government, through the Department of Municipal Affairs, to encourage people to run for municipal office. Mr. Speaker, that was done and perhaps contributed to the record number of candidates. I am very, very pleased with it. As a matter of fact I was one of the individuals sitting on the executive of the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities when this brief was prepared and one of those that suggested that we undertake this publicity campaign this year. So I was very pleased to see that it was done.

What I would like to point out,

Mr. Speaker, is that the publicity campaign is largely a cosmetic solution to a problem and it is not really the solution to a problem. Mr. Speaker, as I will outline in a few minutes, there are problems that exist. The publicity campaign, Mr. Speaker, is the easy thing to do and perhaps people responded. It is the easy thing to do, the cosmetic thing, the surface thing to do. But if you look at the brief presented by the Federation of Municipalities you will see that there are several other things that went along with this cosmetic approach because the cosmetics were only to stir up interest and get people wanting to run for municipal office. To go along with that there were a number of other things that were suggested that really get to the root of the problems that exist here in this Province with our municipalities. These other suggestions are, perhaps, not as easy to do.

The types of problems the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is well aware of. As an example, the imposition of the complete assessment costs on municipalities. The way that that was done and the timing of its inception was something that created a great deal of consternation amongst a number of municipalities in the Province. This is a problem that upset a number of municipalities in the Province and is still there gnawing at them. It was a decision that was made in the middle of a financial year for municipalities.

I have to point out that municipalities, by law, have to make out their budgets for a year before the end of the preceding year. In other words, this



December these budgets will be submitted for approval for the next year so that the 1986 budgets are presented to the Department of Municipal Affairs for the 1986 year at the end of 1985.

When this happens, there is also something else. Municipalities are not allowed to budget for deficits or surpluses. If, in fact, in their budgeting a deficit shows up, then they must raise the taxes to balance the budget. Also they cannot budget for a surplus. When they make out their budgets for the next year if they find that they do not need as much money as they have got coming in - I do not know if there are any municipalities in that situation - then they have to lower the taxes or spend the extra money. They cannot budget for a surplus. So you find municipalities on rather precise and exact budgets.

All of the sudden, part way through the year, they are told, 'Well, hold on now. You have an extra expense now.' The Department of Municipal Affairs is going to impose an extra expense upon municipalities after their budgets have been prepared.' This is the manner in which it was done. The timing was all wrong. It was a dictatorial decision taken after no consultation with municipalities. There are no municipalities that asked that the cost of assessment be passed on to the municipality. There were municipalities that asked that the assessment department be looked at, to be made more efficient and this kind of thing, but not a single municipality in this Province came to the Department of Municipal Affairs and said, 'pass on the cost to us in the middle of the year after we have our budgets all made out.' Not a single

municipality in this Province asked that be done.

As I pointed out a little earlier, I was a member of the Executive of the Federation and the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities when this whole issue was discussed. These are the facts with regard to that particular decision. So there is a problem. There are many other problems that I will get to in a moment.

The Federation also suggested that there be a study of municipal financing and municipal structures undertaken. The last one was done quite some time ago and they felt that the time was right for another study of municipal structure in the Province. That request, I assume, has not been carried out. I think that the Department of Municipal Affairs feels that well, perhaps, at some time in the future, but this was not a proper time to do that study. This was one of the things that was requested by the Federation.

I could outline some of the other problems. I could go into the details of the water and sewer financing and the fact that at one point the municipalities were required to pay a minimum of 15 per cent on their capital costs and capital expenditures and now it is put up to 20 per cent. It is suggested that they speed up this repayment of money and so on. So there are problems.

I thought about this quite a bit and talked to a number of municipal leaders in the Province, quite a few mayors, councillors and so on. I think it is, perhaps, time that we looked at municipal financing and, indeed,

of necessity municipal structure in this Province in a new way. First of all, we have to realize that there has to be co-operation and communication, number one. There has to be co-operation and communication.

I think that in the past year there has been perhaps a little more co-operation than in the past. I have no doubt about that. There is a little more co-operation. A little more consultation. There have been more meetings between the minister and his officials and the Federation of Municipalities and, indeed, I believe this year for the first time in a long time the Premier actually showed up to a Federation meeting. I think the reason he showed up to this one was because there was kind of an absolute guarantee that there would be no embarrassing questions asked and all this kind of thing. But anyway he did finally show up to one of these Federation meetings. I think it is an indication that there is a willingness there to, perhaps, get together and handle the problem. But co-operation is needed.

There have been cases recently where it seems to me that sort of co-operation between government departments and municipalities has not been what it should be and I would like to point out one example and that has to do with the water supplies in Central Newfoundland. I feel that somehow there is something missing in this water supply problem with these municipalities and I am going to refer not to three municipalities, but to six.

MR. FLIGHT:

The member is right.

MR. BAKER:

We had a problem in the water supply that started with three municipalities taking water from the same watershed. We were told it was an internal problem within the systems and we will flush the systems and so on and eventually the chlorform count will go down and we will lift the boil order and that boil order, of course, just a couple of days ago was lifted in the towns of Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop's Falls.

But, Mr. Speaker, one thing in this House that really has not been gone into is that that is not the end of the problem. The fact is that shortly after that same problem showed up in the water supplies of Botwood, Northern Arm and Point Leamington - the same problems.

At this point, I would have thought, had I been responsible in some way for this situation as the Minister of Health (Dr. Thomey) is - four of these communities happen to be in his riding - if I were sitting in a position, looking at this, I would say "Well boy, there is something wrong here." This is not normal for the coliform count to go way up in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls, but I can explain that by the fact that they are in a common water supply. But when you look at the other three communities you find that they are getting their water from two other, different water sheds. It seems to me that the problem there is much bigger than simply flushing out the water systems. I think this is an area where there should have been more detailed examination and more co-operation between the government departments.

Time is so short, Mr. Speaker, I

have not even started what I wanted to say. I have been handed a little note here and I wish there was a little one in front of that.

However, I would like to go on in the short time that I have left to point out and to suggest a solution to a lot of the problems facing the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). I am really serious about this. I think it is an approach that should be taken and he should heed the advise in this particular resolution and put a halt to what is being done and sit down and look at the municipal structure.

My suggestion is this, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the towns in Newfoundland, there are some of them that are extremely viable financially and some that are always seemingly on the edge of bankruptcy. If you look at this, you will see that the ones that are viable are the ones that in the beginning, right from day one, have been provided with their water and sewer systems. The Town of Gander, Grand Falls, Buchans, Stephenville and so on, were provided with their infrastructure - their water and sewer systems. The residents of Gander did not have to go and pay for that then. It was put in for them, then they had to pay for any expansion or upkeep and so on. So they became viable municipalities.

On the other hand, right next door in Appleton, you have a municipality that has to put in a sewage treatment plant - and there is a contradiction here that I find rather amusing, but anyway - they had to put in a sewage treatment plant because their sewage was going into the Gander River. They have a water and

sewer system put in, but their income is simply not enough to pay off the cost of this water and sewer system, and yet, out of the money that they get, some of it will be taken to pay off the capitol costs of the water and sewer system. Now I would suggest that there is a gross inequity. You have on the one hand, the Town of Gander where a water and sewer system was given to it to begin with and the Town of Appleton much smaller, having very little revenue, no tax base at all and they have to pay for their water and sewer system. What a gross inequity and this appears all across the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. In my wrap-up, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with this in greater detail because I do not have the time now.

I would suggest that in this Province, that we look at the possibility of setting up a municipal services utility that is really like a Crown Corporation. This utility would be responsible for providing the necessary services for municipalities in the Province. The details, as I say, I will go into in the next section when I finish off. But this would provide the advantage to municipalities of: knowing what is going to be done two, three, four, five years down the road - being able to plan. If they have a five-year road program, they could be told that for five years this amount would be provided for water and sewer or so on, not being subject to the political vagueries that are in play right now where you never know from one year to the next what is going on. That more money be put in to this particular municipal services utility and the minister have a look at some ideas and try to work

these in with the ideas of the municipal services utility which I will explain in detail later.

Have a look at the position taken by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, who put out a summary of a municipal economic development program that is entitled, *If Municipal Services Work, The Economy Will Work, Putting Canadians to Work*. Their idea is that money put into municipal services is not wasted money but is money well spent which will be returned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I know that is exactly what you are going to say. I have another twenty or thirty minutes which I will use next Wednesday to clue up the debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess, Mr. Speaker, the first observation that I would like to make, regarding the remarks that the hon. gentleman made a few minutes ago, is that he has gone out of his way to avoid his own resolution.

MR. TULK:

He has what?

MR. DOYLE:

He has gone out of his way to avoid speaking to his own resolution. I was kind of hoping, Mr. Speaker, that he would confine his remarks to his own resolution. I do not believe he read the resolution into the record, as a matter of fact, so I want to take the opportunity to do

that just now, Mr. Speaker. It reads:

WHEREAS municipalities of this Province are now being forced in a dictatorial manner to pay the total property assessment costs for the Province; and

WHEREAS some grants to municipalities have been drastically cut during the past three years; and

WHEREAS this unfair shifting of the tax burden from the Province to municipalities will force municipalities to reduce services and increase taxes; and

WHEREAS this may cause problems in the November municipal elections;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the government immediately set up a Select Committee of the House to fully examine the effects of these increased costs on municipal government in the Province; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, until this examination is complete, the grants that have been cut, and the cost of assessment, be returned to the previous formulas.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was a little bit disappointed that the hon. gentleman he did not confine himself a little bit more to the resolution that he had placed on the paper back some weeks or months ago. And I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Gander (Mr. Baker) must feel a little bit subdued today in introducing the resolution I guess, Your Honour, if the hon. member for Gander had known what the final statistics were going to be today with respect to the tremendous amount of interest that had been shown in

municipal elections this time around, that this resolution would probably never have been introduced and that at best it probably would have been worded somewhat differently.

MR. FLIGHT:

Will the minister permit a question?

MR. DOYLE:

I have a lot to say in the next fifteen or twenty minutes and if you want to give me leave after that I will answer any questions that you have.

I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Gander did not walk into the House today and admit manfashion that this resolution is all wet, it is totally wrong. He is totally wrong, also, in the assumptions that he is making, that there would be massive, massive problems this time around in getting people to offer themselves for municipal election. That was his first mistake, admitting that some months ago, thinking that there was going to be massive problems in getting people involved in municipal elections. I am very surprised that he did not admit his mistake and apologize to municipalities all over the Province. I believe what the hon. gentleman tried to do some months ago, when he put this resolution on the floor, he was trying to plant the seeds of doubt, trying to plant the seeds of dissatisfaction in our communities and towns all across the Province. Today, Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. gentleman - and I quite disappointed he is not here to hear my remarks - I am very disappointed that the hon. member did not apologize to municipalities for what is an

inaccurate, careless and irresponsible resolution. At the time he made this resolution, it was irresponsible for him to make it. But, no, Mr. Speaker, he did not withdraw the resolution, so I will have to simply point out to him where he has gone wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I sat for twenty minutes and I listened to the hon. gentleman for Gander introduce his resolution, speak to it, and I never uttered one single syllable. We have members all over the House talking at the same time and I would ask that the Speaker bring the members to order.

MR. W. CARTER:

On both sides, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! Could we have silence while the hon. member is speaking, please?

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out to the hon. member for Gander where he has gone wrong. I would like to reprimand him, really, for the inaccuracies contained in the resolution and I certainly hope that he is going to be around long enough, Mr. Speaker, to learn something about municipalities and to learn something of how government has responded to municipalities, during the last six years especially. And when I say during the last six years especially, I guess what I am really saying is since this present administration took office.

Now to begin with, Mr. Speaker, the very first part of the hon. gentleman's resolution is very

inaccurate. It is false. It is totally wrong. He says, "WHEREAS municipalities of this Province are being forced in a dictatorial manner to pay the total property assessment cost of the Province." And that is totally inaccurate, Mr. Speaker, it is totally wrong. I am not going to say that the hon. gentleman deliberately placed that on the Order Paper to mislead anybody, but I believe sincerely that he is probably a little bit ignorant of what government has done with respect to the property assessments. If he were around and if he was prepared to be a little bit attentive, I was going to tell him what government has done with respect to the assessment costs to municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first "WHEREAS", as I said, in the hon. gentleman's resolution is totally untrue. Municipalities are not paying for the total property assessment costs. Now, that is the first mistake he has made. Municipalities in this Province are at best paying close to 50 per cent of the total cost of that service the government provides to municipalities. The cost to each municipality for that service is based on a fixed percentage of the total value of the taxable roll which is .0002 per cent. He knows full well that approximately two months ago the government of the Province decided to freeze at .0002 per cent the contribution that municipalities make toward the cost of having these assessments done, Mr. Speaker. That amount does not even represent, as I said a few minutes ago, 50 per cent of the cost of doing assessments in the Province because it costs government approximately \$1.5 million to do assessments each year for municipalities and as a result of

that \$1.5 million expenditure that government makes, municipalities pick up approximately \$20,763,000 as a result of that service that we provide. But it has to be made perfectly clear that the first "WHEREAS" in the resolution is totally untrue, inaccurate and false, because municipalities are not picking up 100 per cent of the cost. They are picking up .0002 per cent of the value of the taxable roll and that is not anywhere near 100 per cent of the cost.

It is on the basis of doing that assessment that the municipalities, the towns in our Province, get their tax incentive grants. In other words, it is because of the policy of government to give every municipality in the Province forty-five cents for every dollar that they collect in property tax that our municipalities are able to provide services to their own respective towns.

Mr. Speaker, I have to point out as well, and again I wish that the hon. the gentleman were here in the House to hear it, it was this government which gave municipalities in this Province their very beginnings.

MR. FLIGHT:

What!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that it was this government, back in 1979, which introduced the new Municipalities Grants Act. And who was it introduced in this Province also, Mr. Speaker, the Tax Incentive Grant for municipalities? Who was it introduced the Road Mileage Component for municipalities in

this Province if it was not this government? Who was it introduced, Mr. Speaker, the Social Assistance Component for our towns? It was this government. Who was it brought into effect, Mr. Speaker, the Per Capita Grant for towns right across this Province? It was this government.

In 1979 when this administration took office, Mr. Speaker, municipalities in Newfoundland were just about starving. It was this government which recognized the plight of municipalities in the Province and came up with the new Grants Act.

There are a couple of statistics that I would like to point out to hon. gentlemen in the House. The total unconditional grants to municipalities back in 1979, when this government took office, was \$10 million. Today, six years later, that has gone from \$10 million up to almost \$40 million. That is an increase.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

He said it was a cutback.

MR. DOYLE:

Well I will try to explain the hon. gentleman's rationale to that point in a few moments. But the total unconditional grants to municipalities back in 1979 was \$10 million and today it is close to \$40 million. That is an increase of 400 per cent in a five or a six year period which amounts to, probably, an 85 per cent or a 90 per cent increase per year that this government has given to municipalities all across Newfoundland.

Then the hon. member has the gall and, as the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) would say, the brazen face to stand in the House and to say that the Government of Newfoundland has engaged in cutbacks to municipalities over the last number of years. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for getting up from his seat today and not making any reference at all to his resolution. When I got up to speak he walked out of the House, down to his office, because he just does not want to hear the truth. So, Mr. Speaker, that is something that the people of this Province should be aware of: \$10 million in unconditional grants to municipalities back in 1979 has gone to \$40 million in 1985.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, that is some cutback, is it not? Got any more statistics?

MR. DOYLE:

Yes, I think I will do just that. I am glad the hon. member said that because I had a few more statistics that I wanted to make available and, again I wish the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) were here because I want to talk about Gander for a moment, his own district. Let us talk about Gander. The hon. member who introduced the resolution today is from Gander. How did Gander do under this particular New Grants Act? Well, in 1979, when the New Grants formula was introduced to this Province, Gander was receiving \$150,000 per year. As soon as this New Grants Act was brought into effect, Gander, in one fell swoop, with the stroke of a pen, went from \$150,000 up to \$909,766 - an increase of \$729,000 with the stroke of a pen. As soon as this government said, 'We are introducing a new Municipalities

Act," Gander went up over \$1 million from \$150,000. So that is called a cutback, Mr. Speaker! That should prove, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Gander is really trying to cloud the issue. He is trying to make politics out of this particular issue.

Let us talk about a few more towns. I can cite 100 cases if the hon. gentleman wishes. For instance, what happened to Grand Falls? When this particular grants formula came into effect, Grand Falls was getting \$184,000. They went from \$184,000 up to \$951,000, with the stroke of a pen, for an increase of \$730,000. Happy Valley-Goose Bay went from \$185,000 up to \$717,000, an increase of \$531,000, with the stroke of a pen. Harbour Grace went from \$184,000 up to \$234,000.

MR. FLIGHT:

What about Windsor, Millertown, Badger?

MR. DOYLE:

Do you want to know a little bit about Windsor? Okay, let us go to Windsor. Let us talk about Windsor, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. gentleman wants to know about Windsor. Well, let me tell him about Windsor. Under the old grant system Windsor was receiving \$169,000 in 1979.

When this government took over and said, "We are bringing in a new grants act," Windsor went from \$169,000, with the stroke of a pen, up to \$378,00, for an increase of \$208,000 - if he wants to know about Windsor.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member

for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of information. Would the minister tell the House how much of that \$359,000 that Windsor actually received by way of grants, cash in hand, that was not intercepted and that was not applied to old loans?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, how am I expected to know that information right at this moment? This happened seven years ago. But I can get him that information and I can assure him that Windsor did get this money. They went from \$169,000 to \$378,000.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order there is no point of order.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the resolution, for the couple of minutes that I have available to me, in which the hon. gentleman talks about municipal elections and how many problems we are going to have trying to get people involved in municipal elections. I would like to give him a couple of statistics that he can chew upon for a while and I would like for him to try and digest these statistics because they are very, very important.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981, when we had municipal elections in this Province, we had 1,116 candidates come forward and offer themselves for municipal elections, 1,116 candidates in 1981. Here it is 1985. We had elections yesterday and we had 1662 candidates come



forward in 1985 to offer themselves, which was an increase, I believe, of around 550 people, a full increase of 50 per cent. And the hon. gentleman has the gall in his resolution to say that because of some of the steps that this government has taken that we were going to have problems in November getting people to run for municipal elections.

Back in 1981, when we had elections, 56 per cent of the councils that were actually eligible to hold elections held them, 56 per cent. Yesterday, 70 per cent of the councils eligible to hold elections held them. And the percentage has been very, very good indeed as well, Mr. Speaker.

I do not immediately have available to me the statistics which indicate what the overall turnout was, but I believe it is fair to say that the turnout has been very good when you consider the fact that in places like Marystown we had 81 per cent of the vote turn out to vote for their respective candidates. In Trepassey we had an 88 per cent turnout. In Buchans we had an 64 per cent turnout which was very, very good. In Catalina we had a 65 per cent turnout. Down in Lawn we had a 76 per cent turnout.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. DOYLE:

So I do not believe that indicates in any way that there has been any great disgruntlement with this government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would submit to members on the other side that when the Speaker calls order and their time is up that they listen and that they sit down and respect the Speaker in this House. Is the minister trying to take the place on his back as usual? They are like a crowd of mad dogs over there, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

How many councillors were elected in Badger last night?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! Could we have silence, please.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I will ask all hon. members to be quiet, please.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. minister or anybody else to tell me about municipal/provincial relations. Mr. Speaker, I have been there. I know what it is like to suffer as a mayor under the present administration that we have in St. John's. I have been there, Mr. Speaker.

I know about the political interference. I know who gets the money and who do not get the money. I know whose got the minister's ear and who does not have the minister's ear. I know, Mr. Speaker, the way that those people are treated and, as an aside, Mr. Speaker, I also sympathize with the hon. the minister because of the lack of credibility that he has around the Cabinet table. I saw evidence, Mr. Speaker, where that hon. gentleman went to the Cabinet meeting and fought admirably to get water and sewer projects, to get road pavement, to get capital money for places in this Province, and he was laughed out of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. He was totally ignored.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
How do you know?

MR. DECKER:  
He promised me he was going to go on our behalf and ask for something. He could not deliver. That is disastrous, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, that is an

aside, Sir. I will come back to the main resolution.

Do not let anybody tell me about the municipal/provincial relations. Just ask me. Who are those people who tolerate, suffer and anguish under a Tory administration? By and large, Mr. Speaker, they are volunteers. They are volunteers who are caught, suspended between the people in the communities in which they live and the government in St. John's. They are in a no-win situation, Mr. Speaker.

If they do not deliver the local people turn on them. They cannot deliver because it is by decree that unless they are lipping and lapping with the Tory administration they are not going to get anything anyway. In order to get capital grants for their own town, they have to sell their own conscience. They have to do away with their own mental capacities. They have to become a group of yes men, synonymous to the ones who sit on the other side of the House. Mr. Speaker, they have to become something less than they would want to be.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to be a mayor in a small town in this Province today. There is a wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we get people who are dedicated enough to their own communities to offer themselves, to go into the trenches and to take on the horrendous fight that they have to take on, to battle against this government in St. John's. They are volunteers and they are having a very, very difficult time of it. They are volunteers and they are saddled with a minister who even if he wants to do something for them he is unable to do something because

he has no weight in the Cabinet. He can ask for what he likes. He probably has a bit of physical weight, yes, but he has no influence. He is just like the hon. Premier is in Ottawa. He can shout and scream all he likes, but he is going to have to take what is given to him.

There is a lesson here, Mr. Speaker. The same relationship exists between the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and his Cabinet as exists between the hon. the Premier and Ottawa. Let me tell this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that this is not very good for the municipalities in our Province today. Those volunteers who give up their time freely, in many cases, caught between their own people and between St. John's, unable to deliver and they find themselves powerless. They are up against professionals who will use every trick in the book to cheat people out of their own money.

I can name dozens of towns and communities in this Province who have applied for capital funding, 60/40 funding, who have applied for government guaranteed loans, who have applied for different kinds of money. Very rarely, Mr. Speaker, do they ever get an answer that says, 'No.' They very rarely get an answer that says, 'Yes.' The problem is, Mr. Speaker, they very rarely get any answer until it is too late to do anything about it anyway.

Last Spring I stood up in this House on - I do not know how many occasions - and I asked the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs when was he going to announce capital works for the district of the Strait of Belle Isle? When was he going to announce capital works for the other districts in

this province? Always, Mr. Speaker, we saw professionals at work - delay, delay, delay. Do not give any answers until after the hon. House of Assembly has closed its session for the Spring. Then, when we had no public forum on which to get up and criticize, the announcements began to trickle in. The announcements where a few people who had given up their ability to think, who had thrown their hats into the ring with the Tories, who were prepared to swallow all the propaganda, who were prepared to swallow all the hogwash, give up their own self respect, accept what was given out to them, that is all we saw of those who got anything, Mr. Speaker. It is a sad day for this Province.

One of the worse examples that I have seen in recent times is what my colleague, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) addresses in his Private Member's Motion. He draws the attention of the hon. House and the people of Newfoundland to the passing on of taxes. How many times have I heard the hon. the Premier promise the people of this Province that there would be no tax increases? How many elections have we seen fought on that phony issue, Mr. Speaker? Only to learn, shortly after the election, that the taxes were passed on by a devious route and my friend from Gander has pointed out the most devious way of all, where taxes were unloaded from the Province and passed over to the people of the municipalities, just because this government is too gutless to impose its own taxes directly. It tries to push the responsibility off on the backs and the shoulders of volunteers, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have seen. The same thing all over again we saw with

the School Tax Authority. A government too gutless to go out and collect taxes for education, unloaded it on the backs of volunteers, an indirect taxation which is more vicious and more devastating than any direct taxation that we ever wish to see, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this as illustrated in the assessment, where the cost of the assessment has been passed on to the municipalities.

My colleague from Gander has been trying to do something about that. He put forward this motion. The hon. minister gets up and all he can do is throw some figures which he takes out of context.

The real problem, Mr. Speaker, is a problem which is real to every Newfoundlander; we are being continually taxed. We are being taxed, Mr. Speaker, beyond all reason. They are unloading the taxes from the Province and they are putting them on the backs of volunteers. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker that there are Cabinet meetings devoted to trying to find some devious way of transferring more taxes from the weight of the Provincial Government, where it belongs, unto the municipalities, unto the school taxes and unto the school boards, Mr. Speaker.

I would venture to suggest that one of the reasons the other side is so anxious to get all those school boards elected is so that they can hand more taxes over there. What they would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is the day when this administration could actually lower taxes and if there is any way to scheme some of those taxes from any department.

For example, the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, is trying to find some way to put this out to the forestry units around the Province so that they can take the taxes and this government here in St. John's can look lily white. But Mr. Speaker, they can look lily white on the outside but inside we know that they are scheming, they are increasing taxes practically every day that goes over our heads. They do it in an indirect way. They force it off on volunteers who have to face the people day after day, the very people who voted for them. The volunteers are getting the blame for increasing those taxes, Mr. Speaker. It is what my friend for Gander (Mr. Baker) is trying to address. He realizes that there is a problem out there, this passing on of taxes to the municipalities.

But, Mr. Speaker, something even worse, I suppose, than the passing on of taxes is the example of the gutless way that those hon. members dealt with the pornography law last Spring. Concerned people in this Province were crying out for pornography laws and we saw the administration shirk its responsibility, duck its responsibility and pass it all over to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the day is going to come when you will not be able to buy a Playboy magazine in Roddickton. You will have to drive fifteen miles to Conche to get it. What a shirking of responsibility! What a bunch of cowards! If we need pornography laws, the buck has to stop over there and not with some group of volunteers who are trying to do something for their town. The buck has to stop over there. They

cannot wash their hands free of it, Mr. Speaker. We see the passing on of taxes, we see the passing on of pornography laws.

Let me point out something else, Mr. Speaker. As a former member of a town council I found it to be extremely devastating. The hon. minister knows about the intercepting of grants. If he were here he would know exactly what I am talking about. Mr. Speaker, the provincial government, by law, is required to pass some monies to the municipalities. I can name communities and towns in this Province who have had a rough time with their councils. The people have quit in disgust because of the relations with the provincial government. And you get, Mr. Speaker, a new group of councilors coming on.

Goose Cove in the Strait of Belle Isle is one example right now. Goose Cove, within the last few months, have had a group of people take over the council. It is not a town council it is a community. They saw the problems their community was having and dedicated people decided to offer themselves fully to serve on the community council. Mr. Speaker, the first grant that they were to have come in from the provincial government, to pay their light bills, to pay their employees and to pay the legitimate accounts that they owed was intercepted by the Department of Transportation because Goose Cove owed \$1,200. They are not denying that they owed \$1,200, but it was a result of a previous council which was completely disorganized and where relations had broken down completely with St. John's.

The new council was saying, "Give

us a break. Let us pay this back so much a month." No, there was to be no give, no take, the complete grant was intercepted. Now, that is only one example, that is happening all over this Province wherever a council gets itself into some kind of difficulty. They cannot look to their minister for co-operation and support. I know the reason why now, Mr. Speaker. It is because he has no influence, and if he wanted to help them, he would be laughed out of Cabinet, as he was laughed out of Cabinet when he tried to get \$.5 million to pave the little bit of road in my district. He was laughed out of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, property taxes were forced on many of the smaller towns in this Province completely against their will. The taxes were forced because the councils were told, 'If you do not have property taxes, you will not get any capital funding whatsoever from St. John's.' That is what they were told.

I can name communities in my district, Mr. Speaker, that are actually taking in less money through property taxes than they would have taken in under the old service fee arrangements. But they were forced into taking property taxes, an unpopular decision, a decision which made them actually take in less money than under the service fee. But, because of the lack of concern - the lack of knowledge, I should say, because they are taking in less money; obviously, it was a mistake - communities were taking in more money with service fees than they are taking in with property taxes, yet they were forced into the decision by a callous government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen a tremendous turnout of candidates offering themselves in this municipal election. I can tell this hon. House why we had so many people offering themselves in the municipal elections: Mr. Speaker, they are angry out there! We have an angry people out there! They have finally seen through the bluff. They have finally come to their senses, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to be heard. I pity the members on the other side. I pity the poor Minister of Municipal Affairs. Because we have just seen elected in this Province a new slate of town councils, Mr. Speaker, who are angry. They are mad, they are vicious, and they have every right to be! They are going to scream at the tops of their lungs!

I do not know if anyone has taken the time to see the number of committed Tories who went down to defeat in that election yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I knew they had seen it, Mr. Speaker. The whole landscape is littered with defeated Tory candidates in the municipal elections. This, Mr. Speaker, points toward a new dawn, the new age that we are fast approaching. We have taken the municipalities and filled them with a vast majority of Liberals and a few NDPs thrown in for good measure!

I know my time is up. I know you are looking at me, Mr. Speaker. I am about to sit down, but I want to leave this word, that the die is cast in the municipal elections, Mr. Speaker. The tide has started to come back in again. In a few days we are going to see the land flowing in red once again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank the minister for yielding.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I thank the minister for yielding to a private member on Private Members' Day.

Mr. Speaker, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has now gone through the door and I would not blame him. He asked, 'How many Tories went down to defeat in yesterday's election?' He goes on to say, 'The die is cast.'

Mr. Speaker, there was no president of the Conservative Party went down to defeat in yesterday's election. I wonder what happened to the President of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador yesterday? Ask the member from Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Mr. Speaker, what happened to the President of the Liberal Party? What happened to him? Where is he to? Mr. Speaker, yes, the die is cast and the die was cast well. Not only did the Liberals bottom out in the provincial elections, we can now see, Mr. Speaker, the same thing that is going to happen to the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Barry) is what happened to the President of the Liberal Party when the people of this Province

get a chance to start marking Xs once again.

The poll that the Premier referred to today, Mr. Speaker, reflects exactly what happened to the Liberal President and other Liberals who were pursuing the elections yesterday in various parts of this Province.

MR. FENWICK:  
Including Labrador.

MR. TOBIN:  
As my good friend from Menihek reminds me, including Labrador. Ask the member for Menihek what happened to the Liberals. Neither one was elected, he told me, on the council down there.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that was put forth by the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is a resolution that is totally infactual. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the resolution has so many inaccuracies that the member would not even read it into the record of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I just had another list passed to me of some prominent Newfoundlanders and prominent people in the Liberal Party who used to be councillors and mayors who are no longer around.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me say that in my own district I was especially pleased that the person who was mayor of Burin for the last four years again topped the poll. The person who was mayor of Marystown for the last six years is again back in office, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, I think we have got to try to get to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and read it into the

record of the House that the hon. member for Gander who proposed it has not got the courage to do it but now, Mr. Speaker, has the courage to stand in the galleries.

"AND WHEREAS this may cause problems in the November municipal election." Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1981 there were 1,116 people offered themselves for council. In 1985 there were 1,662 people offered themselves for council, up over 50 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that causing problems for the November election? It is up over 50 per cent.

Then he goes on to talk about the grant system. Mr. Speaker, the operating grants for council: In 1979, \$20 million. In 1984, \$70 million. An increase of \$50 million since 1979. What about the capital? What about the capital, Mr. Speaker? In 1979 they were getting \$10 million. In 1984, \$38 million. Mr. Speaker, those are the type of policies that promoted in excess of a 50 per cent increase in people running in the election, which is not as the resolution states, Mr. Speaker. My friend and colleague for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Mr. Speaker, was the former mayor of that town.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He did a good job.

MR. TOBIN:  
As well, Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) was the mayor. As a matter of fact I happened to be a deputy mayor at one time.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What? Did you really?

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

I never got to be mayor, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the deputy governor.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I was deputy governor as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Running for governor superior.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk in terms of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I can tell the member for the Strait of Belle Isle that I have been associated with councils in this Province. When we had, Mr. Speaker, a member in the House of Assembly that could extract funds from this government, that had the ability to be able to persuade the minister and other people and officials that the need was out there, we got things done.

However, Mr. Speaker, how can the member for the Strait of Belle Isle come in here and complain that his councils cannot get things done because of government. If he is worth his salt, Mr. Speaker, I can take a million dollars, at least, in my district for water and sewer every year. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) does the same thing. The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), roads, Mr. Speaker, no problem. Is the member not admitting, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot give the type of representation to the people who sent him in here to have them represented? That is what he is admitting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

He is very weak.

MR. TOBIN:

I can talk, Mr. Speaker, about water and sewer in Marystown, three or four locations in Marystown, roads in Burin, Mr. Speaker, road upgradings, Winterland and Salt Pond, Parkers Cove, Baine Harbour, Red Harbour, Mr. Speaker, and more to come. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I will have more money next year. I can tell you what, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), if he is representing his people, Mr. Speaker, he should be able to have money.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) better watch his bobber. Ask the member for Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, and myself about the feeling of the people of Swift Current where they were the other evening as it relates to his stand on factory freezer trawlers. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the feeling out there was far from being hospitable toward the member. I can assure you and there were a couple of their from North Harbour.

MR. MATTHEWS:

UIC to fishermen too.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, that was the other issue, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Bellevue will account to his people for was the way he acted on the resolution dealing with UIC programmes. Like the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), Mr. Speaker, he has left the Chamber. I tell you I do not blame him either, Mr. Speaker, after the conversation



that my colleague for Grand Bank and myself had the other day with some of his constituents.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Make no wonder he left.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have in front of me a list of people who ran for councils in various parts of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT:

It is a Tory contract list. Does the member know the list of people who got jobs?

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about list that exists for jobs. I do know that Mr. Rompkey kept a list one time. I do know that Mr. Rompkey kept a list one time of how many people he employed, and gave political appointments to, Mr. Speaker, but I do not have any list. I have no access to one. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is familiar with that list or not.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am sure he is. That is what kept him alive for three years.

MR. TOBIN:

I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody going to run for council yet, in Bonavista twenty-three people offered themselves for election. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT:

Ask about the member from Bonavista South who ran.

MR. TOBIN:

Do not worry about the member for

Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), he will be around when you are long gone.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Bay Bulls, Mr. Speaker, twenty people.

MR. FLIGHT:

Badger, (Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, Channel - Port aux Basques, twenty-one people. Catalina, nineteen people;

MR. FLIGHT:

What about Badger?

MR. TOBIN:

Burin, Mr. Speaker, we had twelve people; and the list can go on.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Sixteen in Lawn.

MR. TOBIN:

The list can go on. Badger -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Zero.

MR. TOBIN:

You must represent Badger. Mr. Speaker, I can account for what the list says and for my own district. I can tell the hon. member that in every town in the district of Burin - Placentia West there was an election and I can also tell the member that everyone who offered themselves in the district of Burin - Placentia West for Burin and Marystown Town Councils were very able and capable people. The same thing, Mr. Speaker for the whole Burin Peninsula. In the elections, Mr. Speaker, there was a ninety-eight per cent turn out in Trepassey.

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) gets up in this House and talks about the Tories gone down to defeat in yesterday's election. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what his politics are but I know in my own district we had a good many people return, Mr. Speaker. We had the Mayor of Burin top the poll, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what his politics are; I do not know if he is a Liberal or a Tory or a NDP and I am not concerned, Mr. Speaker. I know that one person who was elected in Burin yesterday I do know her politics, she is President of the district PC Association in that area. I know in Marystown, Mr. Speaker, one of the people elected to Council was my co-chairman in the last election campaign and the vice-president of my PC Association.

Mr. Speaker, if the people vote for them, if they offer themselves, obviously, Mr. Speaker, to be part of our team, they are indeed very credible candidates and the people of Burin and Marystown elected them and there were probably NDPs elected and Liberals elected. It does not bother me, Mr. Speaker. If anybody in this Province wants to offer themselves to serve on a Council, I believe they have every right to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Even Walter Milley?

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, even Walter Milley. If he wants to run for Council, Mr. Speaker, he has that right. For the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle to get up in this House today and to brand people, Mr. Speaker and say the Tories went down in defeat or the Liberals were back.

What nonsense! What an insult, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this Province who want to offer themselves to have to subject themselves to have to be dragged up in that type of a debate in the House of Assembly. The only thing left for us to do, Mr. Speaker, is to respond and lay the facts on the table, which I am trying to do, not in any way, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on the people who offered themselves. For the member for the Strait of Belle Isle to stand up in this House and bring up partisan politics in municipal elections. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is disgraceful!

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is still smurking because his favorite candidate lost in a certain area of this Province.

MR. TULK:  
Where?

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, the member for Fogo, the member who told the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and others to vote for factory freezer trawlers comes in this House again and starts yapping across the floor. The member, Mr. Speaker, who sold out Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders and betrayed his native Province by voting for factory freezer trawlers to go out in the Northern cod stocks and take our fish that would be used for the inshore plant and the inshore fishery in this area. That is the man, Mr. Speaker, who will hide behind the newspaper and so he should! When the plants in this Province are barred up in a few years time because there is not enough fish out there on the Grand Banks or among the Northern cod, there is the man that will be more responsible than anyone else

in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the invisible hulk for Fogo.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The invisible hulk. Oh a good man alright, who stood up in this House and was counted.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the tax system in this Province. The members get up and talk about the tax system and how high the taxes are in this Province. Well Mr. Speaker, if they had their way they would probably be higher. They wanted to sell out the offshore, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) left this caucus and went over there because this government would not sign a Nova Scotian agreement where we would sell out Newfoundlanders birthrights in the offshore oil. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the revenues that will now come because we got control, because we got our hands on the levers, Mr. Speaker, the revenues that will now come will obviously have a great effect on the municipalities in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Party in this Province had their way, our hands would not be on any levers as it relates to the offshore.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Tell the 'gofer' from Burin - Placentia West (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Unparliamentary.

MR. TULK:

Would the Speaker remind him that

we are speaking about municipalities and ask him to keep to the subject. If he gets upset that is all right. We do not mind. It is much more profitable to read a paper than to listen to him but we have to keep him on track.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order but I think the hon. member might make some other comment rather than 'gofer' which is not quite acceptable.

MR. TULK:

Is that unparliamentary? I know it describes the hon. gentleman but is it unparliamentary?

MR. CALLAN:

He is the hon. 'gofer'.

MR. TULK:

The hon. 'gofer'.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would say it is not an usual type of comment.

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that the House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tulk) is indeed smarting, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that he has brought into this House shame on his colleagues by voting in favour of factory freezer trawlers. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, he could not equate the difference between the revenues from the offshore and how they will apply to the taxation system for municipalities.

MR. TULK:

What has that got to do with it?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude. What has it got to do with it? It has all to do with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The Speaker brought me to order about some language which I suppose he felt was distasteful that I was calling the hon. gentleman. It may have been true but it was distasteful. But I wonder if the Speaker could perhaps bring the hon. gentleman around to speaking to this resolution? Or does he have to do this every day? Does the Premier instruct him to do this every day because he is his g-o-f-e-r.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member is -

MR. FLIGHT:

Tell us about the MPs in Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Tell us about the four Tory MPs.

MR. TOBIN:

What we have, Mr. Speaker, is lips almighty. He is too close to that microphone. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a typical example of the House Leader trying to stifle my time. The fact of the matter is they wanted to give away the offshore, they did not want the municipalities in this Province to have any tax base from

the people, they wanted Mr. Speaker, to sell out our fishing rights just the other day and stood in this House, Mr. Speaker, which would mean that the municipalities would not have any taxation base again. That is the action, Mr. Speaker, of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). That is the action -

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe the hon. member would speak to the motion.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a tax base. The fishing industry is a tax base that will create jobs and will give taxation to municipalities. I am talking as well, Mr. Speaker, about the revenue that will come from offshore oil that will deal with the taxation system.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

His time will soon be up so I will give another minute to sum up, but is the hon. gentleman not questioning your ruling? You asked him if he would be relevant and he went right back to the same subject again.

MR. DAWE:

No he is not, he is relevant. He is talking about taxation. Read your resolution.

MR. TULK:

Get yourself straightened out.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. member now has one minute left.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to speak in this House when you have the goofer from Fogo (Mr. Tulk), muscle mouth from Fogo, getting on with this kind of foolishness. The fact of the matter is we want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the resolution, that there is not a word of truth in, before this House today. We want to deal with the taxation as it affects the people of this Province. We have not been permitted to do so, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of the member for Fogo.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is up. I will take my place but I think that that resolution, Mr. Speaker, has no basis in fact and should not be allowed to stand in the House. I am not surprised that the member for Gander would not even read it into the record.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my pleasure to speak to this motion, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a very good motion to bring in. I especially liked the end of it - the whole thing actually -

but where it says, "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this government immediately set up a Select Committee of the House to fully examine the effects of these increased costs on municipal governments in the Province:

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that until this examination is complete the grants that have been cut, and the costs of assessment, be returned to the previous formulas." I will get into the rest of it in a few minutes.

What I am amazed at, in a lot of ways, is talking about how there have not been any cutbacks and how municipalities have not been affected. I have to speak for the town of Stephenville especially because I have been waiting for the opportunity.

When I first got elected in April the first major problem we had was the town of Stephenville getting slapped in the face a number of times when they applied for funding. I was kind of dumbfounded or in disbelief because the town of Stephenville has ran its affairs very well over the years. They have applied for many grants and so on over the years and have made proper representation.

I was handed a number of things by the town of Stephenville that they applied for and they never got a thing. The 60/40 programme was zero dollars. With the stroke of a pen Stephenville got zero dollars from about \$400,000 or \$500,000 the year before.

Many questions were asked. Why would that be? They were asked by every councillor there and many of my constituents. I did not know what to say to them in a lot of

ways. I did not want to say that maybe because they elected a member of the Opposition that they might not get their money, but I decided to give them a few more weeks and try to get an answer from the minister on why Stephenville would not get its proper funding, or at least some funding, to be able to carry on their programmes.

Well, the council tried, I tried and a number of other individuals tried to find out the reasons and were given none whatsoever, only that, 'Well, you applied but we only had so much money. I am sorry, but you cannot have any.' The surprising part of it though was districts next to me got a ton of money compared to what Stephenville got. The question kept being asked: How come Stephenville was not getting any money? I still did not have any answers and people out there still do not have any answers.

The council that just got elected are going to have to deal with this problem because they are now getting nailed to the wall. It is becoming clearly evident that because they have a member in Opposition that they are going to have to fight a lot harder to get some funding.

I do not mind that. I am certainly going to be doing that for them. But I am somewhat amazed when I hear the minister get up and say, 'There have not been any cutbacks. We spent \$40 million.' I would love to know where that \$40 million has gone. Stephenville would love to know and there are a number of districts around this Island that would love to know because they have not been getting anything. Maybe it is the wrong application

that we have been filling out or something. It must be because -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The wrong colour.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The wrong colour. We are going to have to change the colour of the paper because they have not been getting any response whatsoever from the minister. There has been a number of other things applied for and they are starting to get the same response. I hope that this does not continue because if it does I am wondering about the fairness of this administration.

In the Motion is, "Whereas municipalities of this Province are being forced in a dictatorial manner, to pay the total property assessment costs for the Province." In my first discussions with the Council this summer, thrown at them was a new assessment cost which the Town of Stephenville was going to have to bear and a lot of other municipalities. The increase cost over five years is going to be \$278,785. To me that increase of cost to the municipality of Stephenville and the other municipalities is going to have to be born by the local taxpayers who are now paying to the hilt as it is. So for the minister to get up and say everything is honky-dory and that municipalities do not have a problem is more than misleading, it is not true.

Many of the problems I have said I had has been that the Town of Stephenville has tried to initiate discussion with the minister and his officials and have had a great problem with that. I sincerely hope that that clears up very shortly because they have now prepared their budget and will be

applying again. It is going to have to stop because the voters of Stephenville in their very good way put someone in there to represent them and I do not think that the votes of Stephenville or Gander or anywhere else should have to suffer for exercising their democratic rights. This appears to be the issue in a lot of ways now for municipalities.

I am very pleased to see over 1,600 candidates running for the municipalities. It is wonderful to know that the Opposition here is going to have a good lot of help to help get rid of the present administration. We are trying and we are doing a very good job, as a matter of fact, and we are going to do a better one. It is nice to know that we now have a lot of other people getting out there and starting to put their voice out there in helping us out because we appreciate seeing all these people coming out and getting involved in politics and facing what the people who have hung in there over the years have been facing. They are now going to face what this administration has been doing over the last couple of years, cutting back in districts to municipalities.

I would not be so up in arms and right happy about more people running if I was the administration over there because it shows a lot of good interest in people who want to change things I think. They are going to feel the brunt of that in the next couple of years. As I get back to Stephenville again, this summer after receiving notice that they were going to receive no funding under 60/40, they wrote to the minister, I wrote to the minister, everybody wrote to the minister

asking for a meeting. "Sorry, gone on vacation." Wrote to the Deputy Minister - "Gone on vacation." It is not much use talking to anybody else, the decisions are being made by those top officials.

The funniest thing is was that there was a policy committee or whatever they call themselves, travelling all over the Island and by gosh, they came through Stephenville one time, but the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) was not there. Many people asked me why he was not there because they were looking forward to the opportunity to meet him so that we could see who this fellow was and we could have a chat with him about 60/40. It would have been nice to have ten or fifteen minutes so they could say "You tell us why districts right next to Stephenville went and got over one million dollars and we got zero?" That is a very fair question, an answer I am sure must be there somewhere. We have been looking very, very hard over the last few months. But he did not come into Stephenville, there was not enough seats on the plane maybe, I am not sure.

MR. BAIRD:

He was in and you were out on a fishing stage somewhere.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I was on a fishing stage somewhere, trying to talk to inshore fishermen and trying to figure out their problems.

MR. DECKER:

We were the ones doing that.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, we are the ones doing that. But I was just a bit amazed because we could not get a hold of

anybody there while trying to find out what was going on. I am a bit amazed because I think that that is a big responsibility being Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think he should who are having the problems and try to give them a proper answer.

They are still trying to find out the reasons, by the way. They just applied for an incinerator program that is suppose to be 75/25 cost-shared and zero dollars again. They do not know what is going on. I do not know what is going on. We are going to have to find out. In the next couple of years, I hope this trend does not continue because the people of Stephenville, like a lot of other intelligent people around this Island, voted for a good Opposition and they have one and they should not have to suffer because of exercising their democratic rights. That appears to be what has happened over the last number of months. I hope it does not continue.

I like this line: "A stroke of the pen," I really like this. I think there is a wizard operating in there in the Municipal Affairs Department because with the stroke of a pen you can wipe out one municipality because they voted for a certain member. I am a bit wary of that kind of strategy or procedure that they have here now because there is really not credibility given to how that money is allotted. There is a great number of people who have expressed their doubts to me in the exercising of this authority by the Municipal Affairs Department.

I am hoping, with this good motion of my colleague here, that the administration here will consider

looking at the effects of these cutbacks that they have made and their policy of distributing this money because the town of Stephenville does not have any answers and they are looking and there are a lot of municipalities doing the same thing. I am sure that the minister is going to consider this request by my hon. colleague to have a Select Committee set up to look at the effects of these increased costs that he is now giving to municipalities. I am sure that he is going to do that in the near future.

I also have to go back there to the motion again. "WHEREAS this unfair shifting of the tax burden from the Province to municipalities will force municipalities to reduce services and increase taxes." That is exactly again what is happening. I am a bit amazed that the minister can get up and say, 'We have increased this and it is hunky-dory. Everything is wonderful and fine' when that is not actually the case. The case is that a lot of municipalities are suffering badly and are going to continue under this administration's policies of giving out money depending on who you have elected. So, I am somewhat amazed. I think that this motion is a very good one. It has a lot of value to it and I think it is one that the administration over there should consider.

I must respond to one comment. It was expressed from the other side that it is a shame that the people in the Opposition over here have supported this FFT and all this whole type of thing which is totally false. It is a shame in this Province when people who



exercise their democratic right and who pay taxes to support provincial government cannot even get a fair share, even a portion of the tax dollars that should go to them. That is what the shame is. I think that the people in the administration on the other side should think that over.

I have constituents in Stephenville as well as my colleagues here who have their constituents and they have exercised their right. They should be able to get at least as fair share of this doling out of dollars that the present administration does. If that is not the case well then I am sure the people of this Island will not continue to be brought and will do something over the next couple of years, and we will certainly make sure of that, to get off this attitude that prevails now - either vote our way or you get nothing. If that is the attitude, that is going to have to change. We are going to change it, I will guarantee it. We will make sure that there is a lot more fairness, as a matter of fact, brought into the whole system. Right now there is not very much especially for Stephenville because we have been doing so much and trying to at least get a meeting or a dollar or you name it from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. We have no luck whatsoever.

I am really amazed at it. I hope again that he will change his attitude. I think that this motion is a very good one and I am sure that the hon. members on the other side are going to look at it very closely. The stroke of the pen - I will finish off here - is a very good line to be used by the minister because the next time around, if they continue this

policy of doling out money to people who are members of the administration and not bothering with people of the Opposition, then the stroke of the pen will be what wipes out the present administration and puts in a much fairer one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives me an opportunity to say a few words about municipalities and about the municipality, part of which I represent, which is the city of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) who introduced the resolution, of course, he and his colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) were dispatched by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he stood on his feet, went through the WHEREASES in the resolution and not only refuted them, but the Minister of Municipal Affairs handled them very well in that he indicated and showed, by statistic and by fact, that most of the 'Whereases' and, indeed, the resolution, are false and that they have no foundation in fact. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), who brought it in, obviously did not believe in his resolution. He certainly was not very forceful. He did not mention his resolution at all during his speech. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) did the same thing. As a matter of fact, the

member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), who just sat down, did not address the resolution at all, did not mention it and, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that they would avoid the resolution, because there is no truth to the resolution.

I would like to take this opportunity in debate to first of all, congratulate the members of the St. John's City Council who were elected last evening, the Mayor of St. John's (Mr. Murphy), who was returned by acclamation, the Councillors-elect, Shannie Duff, Ray O'Neill, Dorothy Wyatt, Dave Barrett, Andy Wells in my ward, Ward 1 - he represents part of my district - Eric Gullage, Bruce Tilley and Tom Osborne, who represents another part of the district of Pleasantville.

Mr. Speaker, although we do have to have people who lose in an election, I was sorry to hear and see Jim Fagan, last night, who served on the council for some twenty-four years in the city of St. John's, go down to defeat. Obviously, some people have to be defeated. But I want personally, in this House of Assembly, to thank Jim Fagan for the yeoman service that he has done for and on behalf of the people of the city of St. John's. During his term as city councillor, he also served as a member of Metro Board for many of those years as a representative of the City Council on Metro Board. The other councillor, of course, John Tessier, whom I have worked with over the past four years, was another councillor who was an incumbent and was defeated - defeated by a very good candidate, by the way, in the person of Eric Gullage, who had served on council before. I look forward to working

with the new City Council.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we are dealing with here today, I would like to deal with it from the point of view of the municipality, part of which I represent.

The City of St. John's in 1978 received no municipal capital grant from the provincial government, not a penny. Now, they had the fire department paid for but they received no municipal grant. When the municipal grant system was brought in in 1979, and, as a matter of fact, that was as a result of a Royal Commission on Municipal Government, that municipal grant system gave the City of St. John's in 1980, \$2,656,897 by way of the General Municipal Assistance grant and by way of the Tax Incentive grant, it gave them \$4,623,197 for a total of \$7,280,094.

Mr. Speaker, out of that came the cost for the fire department. There was a \$4 million cost for the fire department, but the net result of the new municipal grant system to the City of St. John's in 1980 was upwards of \$3 million. Also, Mr. Speaker, we can include in that, several other ancillary grants that go along with that, such as the Bowring Park paving debt charges, etc., and other grants, Fort Amherst water main that was put in during that period, the Avalon Arena debt charges, and so on, for a total of about \$4 million, over and above what they received prior to the introduction by this administration of the new municipal grant system.

So, Mr. Speaker, not too many people are aware that prior to 1979, all the City of St. John's

received, really, from the provincial government by way of municipal grants was payment for the fire department, and no other grants were given to the city. After 1979, these grants came into play and, Mr. Speaker, the grants have gone up continually on a year-to-year basis from \$7 million at that point in time, all the way up to \$10 million at this point in time. Now, we have to subtract from that, of course, the fire department. But, Mr. Speaker, that is quite an improvement. It shows the lie to the resolution that municipalities in this Province, the biggest municipality being St. John's, have been cut by way of municipal grants, Mr. Speaker. In fact municipal grants have gone up for the City of St. John's and not only should we be looking at municipal grants but we should be looking what this provincial government - and I must add with the assistance of the federal government - has done for the City of St. John's.

Just last year, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation approved \$9 million by way of a grant for the construction and reconstruction of Logy Bay Road, Torbay Road, four-laning to the airport, and Portugal Cove Road. Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of things that are done in a co-operative manner with the municipalities in this Province. I do not think very many people know, and I think partly it is our fault, as members who represent the City of St. John's, it is partly our fault that we do not get out there very often and blow our horn with respect to what we are doing to and for the City of St. John's with respect to getting things done.

The Bay Bulls Big Pond water

system was a water system put in by the federal and provincial governments and it cost something like \$35 million, \$10 million paid for by the Province. That is the kind of thing that we do behind the scenes in working on behalf of the people we represent in the City of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, that is just a run down of some of the things that are being done which, Mr. Speaker, refutes - I am quite sure the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), before this resolution comes to a vote, will withdraw just about everything that is in this resolution and probably will even vote against it because he knows there is no real truth to any of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It says;

"WHEREAS municipalities of this Province are now being forced in a dictatorial manner, to pay the total property assessment costs for the Province." The hon. member who was a councillor should know that the Province pays 50 per cent of the assessment costs in all municipalities in the Province. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only municipality in this Province that pays 100 per cent of its assessment costs is the City of St. John's. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) laid that out in factual form, he laid it out in dollars and cents, and Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gander who was a councillor in Gander should know the difference. That is not true and it should be withdrawn as a preamble to the resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, that is number one.

It is weak resolution. The resolution really does not do anything. What the resolution was

purported to do, what it meant to do, the purpose of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, brought in by the member for Gander, what to spread that seed of doubt in councillor's minds, in people's minds who were thinking of running for municipal election, to set that little seed, to plant that seed. They have done it in other cases, Mr. Speaker, just by way of explanation. They have done it with respect to the offshore. Oh, we will never get the offshore. We will never get an agreement because you cannot negotiate so we negotiated and we got an agreement on the offshore. This is a similar sort of resolution. You will not get concrete platforms, the companies will control concrete platforms. There is no way the provincial government will be able to dictate to anybody, especially to the multi-national oil companies, that we will get concrete platforms but we got concrete platforms. Mobil came out and announced concrete platforms were the way to go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition attempts to do is plant a seed and it reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a cartoon that I saw in the Armed Services one time. When I was in the Airforce you get certain training on munitions and, of course, you get training with respect to the M1 rifle, I believe we were using at the time, shooting. You get to know how to throw a grenade, Mr. Speaker, where you just pull the pin and throw the grenade. It reminds me of Liberals, who are guys who pull the pin and thrown the pin. That is what Liberals do. I mean everything that they do blows up in their face. Offshore, you will never get it. You will never get an agreement on the offshore. We got an agreement on the offshore.

You will never get concrete platforms. We got concrete platforms. You cannot do this.

Mr. Speaker, this is the exact same sort of resolution here. The hon. member was foiled. What he meant to do was plant that seed of doubt in the minds of people who wanted to run for municipal elections but Mr. Speaker, it did not work. Not only did we get people turn out, but we got record numbers turning out at the polls, Mr. Speaker.

1981 - 1,100 people, the hon. the minister said. This year, 1985, 1,600 people. I mean that fact alone indicates that this resolution is totally false. It is untrue. It is not necessary. If the hon. member reads it and perceives what is happening out there in the Province of Newfoundland with respect to municipalities he will look at that and say, Mr. Speaker, he will say, "I was wrong. I have to vote against that resolution because it does not make sense."

The second "WHEREAS", "WHEREAS some grants to municipalities have been drastically cut." Well let us have a look at St. John's. \$7.2 million, \$7.6 million, \$7.9 million; 1983, \$7.7 million. Mr. Speaker, 1984, \$8 million, 1985, \$10 million. Mr. Speaker the hon. member by fact, he cannot take facts and make that true. If it is not true the hon. member cannot put it in there - he put it in there. He knows it to be false. I have proven in the biggest municipality in Newfoundland that the grants have gone up. He says they have been cut. He is wrong. He should admit that and get up and vote against his own resolution. That is what he should do, Mr. Speaker, if the

hon. gentleman were a man.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. member is making a very good speech, he is incorrect but he is making a very good speech. He is in full flight and he has two members over there on the other side who are making all sorts of noise interrupting him. I wonder if you could ask the two hon. gentlemen over there to be quiet.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I just walked into the House and when I did the two hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman who just stood up made some comments which I thought deserved a reply. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is not point of order. This side is being provoked by that side.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Do you see what it takes to get the hon. gentleman to his feet?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the member for Fogo continues to do this in the House, raise spurious points of order and he should be showing example to some of his new members in the House. He is the Opposition House Leader in the House and they are supposed to look to him for some guidance. They looked to him for some guidance last week with respect to factory freezer trawlers and got sucked in by the hon. member in voting against the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should keep quiet in his seat and obey the rules of the House and if he cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, he should remove himself from the House.

Mr. Speaker, the third "WHEREAS" here and "this may cause problems in the November municipal elections". Well it certainly caused a lot of problems, Mr. Speaker, we got a record turnout and a record number of candidates. So, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. "AND WHEREAS this unfair shifting of the tax burden from the Province," which I already proved was false, Mr. Speaker, "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this government immediately set up a Select Committee."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what they always fall back on. Let us set up a Select Committee. Do you know what I mean? Nobody knows anything. Nobody knows how to do anything. You have to set up a

Select Committee so we can go out and ask somebody what we should do.

Mr. Speaker, we got elected here to lead. We got elected here to take the concerns of the people we represent to this House of Assembly and do things. Every time we get a problem or a perceived problem, hon. members opposite want to set up a Select Committee and go out and ask somebody. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is time. They are elected now. They represent the people who elected them and they are to come in here and show some leadership. They are not doing that.

So, Mr. Speaker, that resolution as proven by a Minister of Municipal Affairs is totally false. He has totally refuted what the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has said, Mr. Speaker, and proved the resolution to be false. Mr. Speaker, I will be here next week and watch the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) because, Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. member for Gander realizes now he made an error, not a severe error, it is not one that will aggravate him for the rest of his life, but he made an error. He brought in a resolution that has no truth to it. That it is totally false, and he being the man that he is next week when he gets on his feet to vote for or against this resolution will vote against it. That is the kind of man I perceive him to be, Mr. Speaker. He is one of those types.

The second BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED is that "until this examination is complete," that is the select committee again, "that the grants that have been cut," which were not cut, "and the cost of assessment," which is false in the first preamble, Mr. Speaker, "be

returned to the previous formulas." Well what does he want us to do, go back to the full cost? We will charge all of the municipalities full cost of assessment. Because it has been changed. The hon. member does not know it has been changed to 50 per cent now. So he wants it to go back to the full cost. Is that what the hon. member wants us to do?

Mr. Speaker, if that is what he wants us to do, I can say to the hon. member that we are not going to do it. We have cut it down to 50 per cent. Now the City of St. John's pays 100 per cent of its assessments. It has its own Assessment Department and it pays 100 per cent of its assessments, which gives me an idea. Now the hon. member may have done something bright here, because when I go to look for monies for the City of St. John's I have to have all of the arguments. One of the arguments that I have not used is that even though the city has its own Assessment Department and does all of its assessments, since the provincial government pays 50 per cent of the assessments done in other municipalities, why should not the provincial government pay it for the City of St. John's? So, Mr. Speaker, that may be one thing that will come out of this resolution. The resolution itself is false. It should be defeated. The hon. member, I know, will vote against his own resolution. But the one bright thing that came out of this resolution, maybe, is one of the points that I have not gotten on to since I got into politics and it is the fact that the City of St. John's pays 100 per cent of the assessment costs and, maybe, just maybe, since they do that, and the provincial government pays

50 per cent of the assessment costs in all other municipalities that, maybe, I can persuade the government, I have to think about this now because there are so many things that I am looking for for the City of St. John's, I have to think about this, maybe, I can persuade the government to pay 50 per cent of the assessments for the City of St. John's. I am certainly going to think about that.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not here now, but just recently we had a public meeting down in Roncalli School. We all were invited down there members representing the district, representatives from the Departments of Health and Environment etc., we sat there on the stage

MR. FLIGHT:

That is not relevant.

MR. DINN:

Well this has to do with municipalities and serves to municipalities. That night, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and make a wonderful political speech, but it did not address the issue. The issue was the problem with water in the Roncalli School. The hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and make a great political speech, some people commented on the speech, but they said, was he at another meeting or was he here? Did he know what the issue was tonight? The issue was water for the school. Well, we addressed the issue, Mr. Speaker, and that is the kind of thing that we do. The City Council said, "We cannot see our children have bad water in this school. We have got to do something about it." And the

provincial government got up and said, "Well, City Council, if you are willing to do something about that problem in the school, we will help you out and pay 50 per cent of the cost." That is the kind of co-operation that goes on between the provincial government and municipalities in this Province.

With respect to the problem out in Central Newfoundland and the water system out there, Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question. When the problem was identified to the member representing Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) he came in, Mr. Speaker, and got money to do an investigation, get that system cleaned up, Mr. Speaker, and now he has a consulting engineer having a look at that problem. When that report gets back I am sure that the member who represents Grand Falls and the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) who represents the other municipalities in the area will see to it that the water system in Grand Falls is as good as any water system in North America, Mr. Speaker. I guarantee you that, that the member for Grand Falls and the member representing Bishop's and Botwood, they will bring their weight to bear on this government to make sure that the people in Grand Falls and even in Windsor, Mr. Speaker, will be looked after and that they will have a reasonable, healthy supply of water in those municipalities in Central Newfoundland. I have no fear of that.

Mr. Speaker, I have just about covered, I believe, my twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. DINN:

So, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that -

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. DINN:

Okay, Mr. Speaker. I do not need leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

There were a good many buddies got defeated yesterday.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, we just heard the hon. member talk about the biggest municipality in Newfoundland, the City of St. John's. I am sure that the new people who are elected to the councils today in Burgeo, in Ramea and places outside of St. John's are going to be very sympathetic to the plea that he is making for St. John's. I know I speak with a little bit of experience because I have been a municipal councillor and I know something of what the problems are with getting people to serve as municipal councillors in Newfoundland. So, when I stand to speak, Mr. Speaker, it is to support my colleague from Gander

(Mr. Baker).

When he talks about the reduction in the assessments and the increase in the property assessment fee, it is true. This is the thing that has happened. I know the town that I was a councillor for, over the past four years their revenues have been reduced by indirect taxation really that was to be put on the people by this government, by the reduction, first of all, in the grants and, secondly, in taking the property assessment grant and taking it, in the case of this town, from \$28,000 up to \$136,000 over a four-year period.

So you mean to tell me that this is not an increase in the assessment. That is and it is there and this is why this motion now is as valid as it was before. You can talk about the fact that there were more people voted in this election and there were more candidates, but the thing we must remember about this, and it would be possibly an interesting statistic to find out, how many of the 1,600 candidates were new this year. Did they have the experience? I am willing to bet if you did a statistical review you would find that people who had served as councillors before were backing away from it because of the fact that they just had taken enough and they were forced into a situation where they had to put oppressive taxes on the people where this government has not passed the taxes but they have passed it along to the municipalities. As my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle said, an unfair, indirect taxation which those of us who are councillors had to put on people because this government did not do it.



Every municipality in Newfoundland you will find, if you want to check it, has had a decrease in the amount of the grants coming from the government.

Mr. Speaker, it is reaching time so I adjourn this debate.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

It now being six o'clock on Private Member's Day, the House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.