

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to express a very serious concern about interference with the environmental monitoring project for the spruce budworm spray programme.

MR. NEARY: What a joke!

MR. MURPHY: Some of my field staff employed on the project in an area near Glenwood have been pursued, questioned and bothered by unidentified persons and certain test materials have been removed by an unauthorized individual. There is also evidence that government property has been tampered with resulting in the loss of valuable samples and information. I am hereby issuing a warning that these occurrences pose a definite threat to the monitoring project as they could render the studies invalid. Besides the incidents described, I am very concerned that the presence of inexperienced persons in the vicinity of the sampling equipment may cause false results. For example, certain flying insects could be attracted to such people resulting in unnaturally high catches in an insect trap. Conversely, birds might be frightened away from a trap in location thus producing a false picture of the local bird populations.

A monitoring project represents a heavy commitment of staff and operating funds by both the provincial and federal governments. Approximately forty people are involved and much money has already been spent since the project began on May 1st. Monitoring of the spray programme is being done not only for the government's benefit but also to protect the health and environment of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: There is no doubt about that.

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

MR. NEARY: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must require that hon. members not interject.

MR. MURPHY: The report will be made public as was the report on the 1977 monitoring project. Future decisions by the government concerning spruce budworm control programmes will be based in part on these reports. No other monitoring is being conducted in this Province. I strongly request anyone who may be involved in such acts of interference to seriously consider the implications of ruining the monitoring project and jeopardizing the obtaining of meaningful results and to forthwith discontinue any such activities.

MR. NEARY: That warrants a ministerial statement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish we had had the benefit of a copy of the release, but we did not have that, of course, not to the best of my knowledge anyway.

I was interested to hear the minister's statement. We all are. We of course on this side do not recommend, condone in any way anybody breaking the laws of the land. However, people are oftentimes led by example. The way I understand it is the insecticide and herbicide act in this Province is quite specific, and to the best of my knowledge the Minister of Justice or no other member of the government has taken any action, in any way, in any geographical area of this Province to enforce it, none People have been phoning the Mounted Police and everything. They say it is out of their hands, they cannot do anything about it.

Now then, we are told that the purpose for the spray is for the health of the people. Now what authority says that, please? Where is your health authority on that one, that it is for the

MR. NOLAN: benefit of the people? Now the minister continuously has refused, on at least one day that I can recall, four or five questions on just this subject and others from the Leader of the Opposition, and there was no reply.

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

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

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, look what has happened.

MR. NEARY: The constitutional expert.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Conception Bay South in responding to the ministerial statement just issued by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment is ranging into the field of the spray programme per se and into other areas not covered by the ministerial statement, number one. Number two, the hon. member is entering into the realm of debate. The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs is concerned as he said in his statement about the environmental monitoring programme being carried out in Glenwood, which was specifically mentioned in the statement, and actions being taken by citizens there. And the statement does not address itself to the spray programme, whether it is a good or bad spray programme, whether it should happen or other acts under provincial jurisdiction or federal jurisdiction. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member is ranging into the area of debate and somewhat irrelevant to the particulars of the statement at hand.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps the hon. member toward whom the point of order was raised wants to speak on it. That was my understanding.

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4742

NM - 4

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

May I say, again I do not have a copy of the minister's statement, but it related to the spray programme. He related to the health of the individuals. He related to the environmental hazards. This is what I was addressing myself to. What am I supposed to talk about in replying,

Mr. Nolan: as the hon. member suggests - the energy programme for the Province? We are quite prepared to do that at the proper time.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, as I understand the subject matter of the Ministerial Statement, in general, was the monitoring of the spray programme or the effects thereof. With subject to subject matter, I think the hon. member was within the subject matter. I would point out that the nature of the remarks on a comment by a Ministerial Statement are quite specifically suppose to be comment thereon or a request for explanation. Debate is precluded. So I draw this to the attention of the hon. member.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that apparently some people have, according to the minister, have done or committed some action or acts that are preventing the programme from going ahead.

MR. NEARY: The Tory spray.

MR. NOLAN: Now the fact is, is it an illegal act that was committed, or acts?

AN HON. MEMBER: Or is it just for publicity?

MR. NOLAN: And the other question is - if you honestly believe as a parent that the life of your child or children or your parents was in danger, how would you react?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to announce that my colleagues in Cabinet have approved the appointment of Peter G. Withers to the position of Chairman of the Board of Directors of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - and as Commissioner of Housing. Mr. Withers is at present the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and will be succeeding in his new position Mr. Albert Vivian who retires on July 4, 1978.

MR. NEARY: Retires under duress.

MR. DINN: Mr. Withers, 44 -

MR. MURPHY: Talk about building supplies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Withers, 44 years of age and a native of Carbonear, is a career civil servant, having joined the public service in the Department of the Auditor General in 1950. He transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Assistant Director of Local Government in 1967, was subsequently promoted to Director of Local Government Affairs, Assistant Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and was appointed as Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in June 1976.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Mr. Withers will bring to this position the experience and expertise required to further develop and expand vitally important housing policies in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, we listened with interest to the comments made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and we welcome, of course, the appointment of Mr. Peter Withers to the Chairmanship of the Board of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. NEARY: One of their buddies they have got to put in there.

MR. F. WHITE: We have found Mr. Withers to be very understanding of the municipal structure in this Province. And I am sure that if he is left on his own, Mr. Speaker, and not interfered with by the minister that he will probably do a very good job as Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. WHITE: And that is our concept of that, Mr. Speaker; if Mr. Withers is given the chance to do something down there I am sure he will without having to phone the minister every hour to get approval.

MR. PECKFORD: A competent man.

MR. NEARY: Or take orders from Craig Dobbin.

MR. F. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with Mr. Vivian, I think the Minister owes the House a little more detailed explanation about why Mr. Albert Vivian is leaving, Mr. Speaker. We have had - I do not want to connect the two, but with reports going around about investigations into the Housing Corporation and so on, I think the Minister owes the House a complete and full explanation with respect to this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: And, of course, we would also like to know -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) that investigation will never take place.

MR. WHITE: We would also like to know, Mr. Speaker, who the new Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is going to be. I assume it is going to be Mr. Clarence Randell, a very efficient young man from Central Newfoundland and we will look forward to seeing whether or not that comes about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: \$1,500 to bring him in from Gander.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. H. COLLINS: It is too bad. We could make them retroactive.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have got the answer to Question No. 85 in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). What are the names of those persons who as of a current date are members of the Board of Management of The Hospital at Carbonear? Showing in each case (a) The date in which he was appointed; (b) The term of his appointment; and (c) The title of the position held, be it chairman, vice-chairman, member or otherwise? And what is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of (a) a per diem allowance; (b) travel, meal, and accommodation expenses; and (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect? The period of appointment: first of all, let me give the names; the Chairman of the Carbonear Hospital Board is Mr. John Rorke, and the date of his appointment is April 1, 1976. The members are Mr. G. Earle, Mr. S. T. Jones, Mr. L.F.C. Pike, Mrs. Patricia Rorke, Mr. L. McNarama, Mr. A. Douglas Moore, Lt. B., Dr. A. T. Rowe, Mr. Harold Dawe, Mr. William Saunders, Sr.,

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. O. Parsons, Mr. Calvin Greene, Mr. John D. Anderson, Mr. Wendell Harnum, and Mr. G. Cummings, who represents the Department of Health, in terms of per diem allowances, nil; travel, meal and accommodation expenses, out-of-pocket travel expenses only; annual salary in connection with the performance of duties in this respect is nil.

I also have the answer to question number 88 which deals with the board of the Grand Falls hospital. The chairman of the board there is Mr. Jack Baker; members are Father Grace, John Moore, Eric Cumby, Robert Newhook, Walter Critchley, Hubert Smith, A. K. Evans, Mr. J. Forbes Browne, Dick Duder, Walwyn Blackmore, Garfield Young, Retis Hancock and Hubert Barnes. And the same terms and conditions apply; there is no per diem, there is no salary, out-of-pocket expenses are paid.

And question number 89 deals with the Carbonear hospital which I have already answered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Premier, Sir. Although it is a matter of health, affecting the health of the Province, I direct it to him as the leader of the government because I believe it is becoming an extraordinarily serious matter and will become more and more serious as time goes on. From reports, Sir - and I do not have any inside information, obviously, so the thing can change from minute to minute or hour to hour - from reports, Sir, it seems as if the lab and X-Ray technicians have now settled in for a long, hot summer together with the Treasury Board because of the recalcitrance

MR. W. ROWE: of the Treasury Board and so on on these reasonable demands. Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell the House what procedures and what things are being done, what procedures are being taken in order to insure that this most vital aspect of the medical services of the Province is going to be performed in at least some kind of a satisfactory way for the people of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the strike of the lab and X-Ray technicians is one of great concern to us. It is one that seems to have reached an impasse between Treasury Board and the union itself. In a normal strike situation, of course, these run as the normal course of events. In this particular regard where health and safety of individuals are of paramount importance, we hope that it is going to be resolved. I know of the Department of Labour being involved. I have not had an update on exactly what has progressed there, and Treasury Board are in continuous contact and the President of Treasury Board can bring us up to date on exactly what progress, if any, has been made. But it is something that concerns the government and something that hopefully will resolve itself in the normal way.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: The answer, Sir, was not very satisfactory. I did not hear any specifics as to what the government is doing or is trying to do with regard to providing some alternate procedures to guarantee at least a minimum level of health service in this regard to protect the health of our people. Is there any truth to reports that I have heard, Sir, going around that the government

MR. W. ROWE: intends to bring in legislation during this session of the House, or perhaps in the Fall session of the House, in order to prevent by legislation strikes in certain aspects of the Civil Service including, for example, lab and X-Ray technicians?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there is no general intention to bring in that sort of legislation at this time. There may have to be some changes depending on circumstances at the time, because the one thing that this government or no other government can do is have citizens' health in jeopardy. But we certainly hope it does not come to that. That has happened in the past, but hopefully it will not come to that. But I would

PREMIER MOORES:

like to ask the Minister of Health to reply as to what precautions are being taken on how the hospitals are presently operating.

MR. NEARY:

Why do you not ask one of the page boys?

You will get more satisfaction.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the situation has not changed too much in terms of information which I can give and what I gave about a week ago. With the lab and X-ray technicians' strike some of the smaller hospitals in the Province, and mainly the cottage hospitals, the government operated hospitals, the strike will and is posing some difficulties to us there by virtue of the fact that there are not management people, there are no qualified management people in those small hospitals to be able to take up the slack and do the work which normally would be done by the people in the bargaining unit.

In the larger hospitals across the Province there are a number of management people who can very effectively, very efficiently carry out the role of the people in the bargaining unit. How long management people can continue that exercise is open to conjecture, I suppose, but I would venture to guess that they cannot go on for too long because we are in a period in Newfoundland now with the Summer coming on, the Summer here, in fact, where people are looking forward to their vacations and so on and so forth, so time would be limited.

With regard to what plans are in place, we have in the larger hospitals across this Province a number of boards, practically all of the larger hospitals are operated by boards of management where we have good administration in place, and in addition to that those people are doing and are capable of doing a tremendous job, not for the government or for the House of Assembly, but for the people of Newfoundland. And I am sure that they will be able to cope with the situation through the contingency plans which they have put in place.

With regard to matter specifically related to negotiations, I am sure my colleague can allude to that. I understand

MR. COLLINS: that some additional things have been put on the plate in terms of an offer to the bargaining unit and I am sure my colleague would explain that.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of much information I can give.

MR. NEARY: You have not said anything yet.

MR. COLLINS: Well, if the hon. member figures I have said nothing, that is fine if he does not understand it. I did not think we had to put everything in baby talk but if he wants it in baby talk I will go over it all again. But, Mr. Speaker, as I see it that is about all the information I can give and I would hope that the health needs of the people can be met.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I understand that the Minister of Labour, Sir, is out of the Province so presumably there must be an acting Minister of Labour. Is that correct? The President of Treasury Board is acting as Minister of Labour?

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh my God!

MR. DOODY: All the X-ray and Lab technicians will be sprayed now.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would not address this question to the Treasury Board President because, of course, he is an interested party, I am not saying there is any divisions in the government because they are all collectively responsible, but he is obviously personally involved in this as minister and I would not ask the question of him. But what I wanted was a resumé of the state of negotiations and whether in fact an impasse has been reached, as mentioned by the Premier, or whether there is room for negotiation on both sides, whether the parties are deadlocked and have refused now to sit down one with the other, or whether there are still negotiations going on. But I hesitate to ask the Treasury Board President, Sir, since he is the party who is intimately involved.

June 22,1978

Tape No. 4745

AH-3

MR. NEARY: Ask him if he is going to appoint a conciliation board to look into himself.

MR. W. ROWE: It is a ridiculous situation. I would ask the Premier if he can give the information, if not if he would take notice of it for tomorrow, and secondly, Sir, I would ask him if he would not mind in the interest of the people appointing one of his other colleagues as acting Minister of Labour and not have an interested party also acting as a man who should be above the battle and should be involved in

June 22, 1978

Tape 4746

DW - 1

MR. W.N. ROWE: watching rather than participating
in these negotiations?

MR. S. NEARY: He never thought of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. S. NEARY: Conflict of interest.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer it in as unbiased a way as possible. The situation is the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower, Mr. Blanchard, over the weekend, this past weekend worked with both the Treasury Board negotiators and the union negotiators to try to reach some sort of a settlement, some sort of a compromise. He found, as I understand it, that he could not accomplish that and he asked whether or not Treasury Board had anything else to offer or any other solution to offer. And yesterday morning we offered the union, since it was apparent that we could not come to any agreement through negotiations, we offered the union binding arbitration by the appointment of an arbitration board. To the best of my knowledge the union has not replied to that as yet, but it is in our view a very sensible way of resolving the dispute where arbitration is binding on both parties. I am sure as soon as the union has time to consider and get back to our people through the deputy minister who is co-ordinating the effort, that I will be able to inform the House or inform the public as such. But to the best of my knowledge there has not been a reply from the union, or at least neither one has been reported to me.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Which hon. gentlemen have asked for supplementaries?

A supplementary, the hon. member for
Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Sir, would the Premier or the Minister of Health be good enough to give me a little information? If I may be permitted a very brief preamble, I have had a number of calls in

MR. NOLAN: recent days from people who have been delayed from going into the hospital. One I can think of, for example, is a gentleman who recently suffered a heart attack, was brought in, had angina pains and so on, went through the various tests and he is now, as anyone who has suffered from that problem in their own lives, very, very concerned. He was ordered by his doctor to go in to have various tests done, just Wednesday past, in fact, and he cannot do it. It has been put off for a month. So the question I am trying to arrive at -- and I know the minister could not provide the adequate information today, but perhaps he would do it tomorrow -- is how many people are now being put off directly because of this unrest in the labour situation in the hospitals? I mean, how many people medically are on 'hold' is what I am asking, and I would like to have that information from all the hospitals concerned if the minister could have his officials get it, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would not expect me to be able to provide that information now but I will give him the undertaking to look into that during the afternoon, evening and morning to see if I can give him a realistic statement on it.

MRS. MCISAAC: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, hon. member for St. George's, then a supplementary hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. Then I will recognize an hon. member on a different subject.

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health this question:

MRS. MCISAAC: I think I understood him to say that the larger centres or the larger hospitals in Newfoundland are equipped to handle emergencies as far as the management is concerned, or supervisory staff may be equipped to handle emergencies. But I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he can tell me whether or not the hospital in Stephenville and the one in Port aux Basques would be equipped to handle emergencies such as if a person was brought in, an accident victim or somebody hemorrhaging or something like this, are they equipped to type blood and in other ways are they equipped to save the lives of those people? Because if you come in hemorrhaging naturally you certainly do not have time to get shipped into Corner Brook or St. John's. Now are the supervisory staff in those hospitals equipped to handle that type of an emergency?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: It is my understanding, and I have not seen too many exceptions to this rule yet, that in the event of emergencies anywhere that the members of the bargaining unit have undertaken to have people return to work to take care of any particular emergency. How well that might be working is difficult for me to say at this particular moment because I suppose getting one back to work would first of all depend on whether the hospital administration could make contact with the lab and X-ray technicians. In some cases it is a lab and X-ray technician, and in other cases it is a lab technician and the X-ray technicians is another person. I would certainly undertake to have a look at those two hospitals for the hon. member the same as I have done for the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) if that would be satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: The final supplementary on this subject. Hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, then the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

June 22, 1978

Tape 4746

DW - 4

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary
for the Minister of Health and again it is a kind of question
that he may not be able to answer at this point in time
but I would like

MR. SIMMONS:

him to, at the very least, take it under advisement or check out for me a case similar to the one made reference to by my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), I had representation yesterday from a parent who had arrived in town on the instruction of a doctor who had referred the daughter of the parent concerned, a ten or eleven year old daughter, in for attention to a kidney problem. Now I understand that the matter is already critical - I understand this from a doctor - and that she should have had attention by now, and I understand there are very serious medical ramifications if it is not attended to within a few days.

The x-rays had been done in the sending community some days ago and were forwarded here. The family arrived in town only to find out that the x-ray was in another hospital and the doctor could not get access to it, And I have just learned now in the last half hour that the family is gone out of town again, somewhat in desperation and not knowing any other way of appeal or way of changing this.

I raise it out of a matter of concern for the youngster. I understand that if something is not done fairly soon she could lose a kidney because of the delay in getting attention to the problem. I wonder if there is some mechanism whereby we can have that kind of an emergency attended to.

MR. F. WHITE:

The minister, would the minister get her in?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member said when he stood in his place, he would not expect me to have the information on every case of people coming to St. John's or being referred to the different hospitals. If he would like to let me have the name and the circumstances surrounding the case, I will certainly have a look at it and be glad to.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the Environment, Sir, the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us about the controversial car wrecks. Have the government managed to sell them yet? The car wrecks down here at the Octagon are creating an eyesore and I believe there is a pile out in Central Newfoundland and another bunch of car wrecks out in -

MR. MURPHY: Western Newfoundland. Eight-seven locations.

MR. NEARY: Eighty-seven locations. Well has the government succeeded in selling these car wrecks yet?

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that in the past few weeks there has been negotiations going on with I think three companies for the disposition of these car wrecks. Our only part in this now, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have informed the House on many occasions, is the amount of money that is available and that is the hold-back from the previous company who had the contract of something like \$6.88 and that is available to the company that will make the contract with the bank representing the former contractor. So I think everybody is aware of that. We publicized it enough. There are no controversial car wrecks anymore. They are there unfortunately. We feel worse about that than anybody else. I can understand the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) being quite concerned. His brother-in-law is right in the middle of the thing trying to get the contract but outside of that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: - it is being negotiated in an honest manner, not with my department but with the people representing the contractor. Anything else I cannot do, Sir. I just say there are approximately 20,000 car wrecks that we would love to get out of the Province, as I imagine would everybody in that part of the country insofar as we can do it. But I think all the facts are known. It has been discussed time and time and time again. So I mean as far as I am concerned, and my final statement on the thing is that negotiations are going on and we hope pretty soon, Sir, that negotiations will be completed to at least get clear of the car wrecks that are existant now and perhaps come up with a new programme to rid the Province of any more in the future.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that the hon. minister referred to, Sir, I am afraid is no longer negotiating. He is not in the middle of any negotiations with the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman should apologize to this gentleman because, Mr. Speaker, one of the hazards of being in politics in the Province is that nobody belonged to you is allowed to make a bid or tender on anything, well then it is time to give it up. But anyway,

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman, Sir, managed to hang up the phone and told this gentleman, "I have taken enough so and so - unparliamentary language - off your in-laws in the House and therefore I am not going to talk to you any more."

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, that is right.

MR. NEARY: And hung up the phone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Ignorant.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. gentlemen may well have a matter which they wish to debate sometime, but they will have to pick an appropriate motion and not the Question Period to so do.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I would love to debate this with the hon. gentleman, Sir. In the meantime, I understood from the answer the hon. gentleman gave that there are no firm -

MR. MURPHY: Final answer, incidentally.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: I gave you my final answer.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, he is not going to answer.

MR. NEARY: The final answer? Well, will the hon. gentleman give me a final answer on this? Mr. Speaker, I read the statement the hon. gentleman tabled in this House there a couple of weeks ago that he said satisfied the Auditor General for the Auditor General's criticism of Affiliated Marine Metals in ripping off the public treasury through falsifying reports and fraudulent claims. Has the minister requested the Minister of Justice to investigate these false reports that were made, these fraudulent claims that were made on the public treasury? Has the minister asked for a police investigation into this matter? Mr. Speaker, does the hon. minister intend answering that question?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Another cover-up!

MR. SIMMONS: Go back to Florida, 'Ank'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman another supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The dollar that was put on every licence in this Province, Sir - well, the hon. gentleman thinks it is funny.

MR. MURPHY: It is crazy, not funny. It is crazy.

MR. NEARY: I would say somewhere between - let me see, my estimate is about maybe a couple of hundred thousand dollars that was ripped off and the hon. gentleman says he is holding back \$103,000. Where is the difference going to come from if there are shortages?

MR. MURPHY: From my pocket. I will take you down to the Starboard Quarter and buy you a steakette.

MR. NEARY: Oh, very, very funny!

MR. MURPHY: Yeah!

MR. NEARY: But what about the public treasury?

MR. MURPHY: The same way with the building supplies on Bell Island (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, what about - well -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - my understanding is that justice has been done in that case. The culprits have been brought -

MR. MURPHY: They have not paid back the money.

MR. NEARY: No, but the culprits have been brought to justice.

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

MR. NEARY: What about the culprits in the case of Affiliated Marine Metals?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must require the hon. gentleman

MR. SPEAKER: from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and all hon. members, when the Chair calls order to desist even if one is in mid-sentence. Now I will ask the hon. gentleman to pose, unless he has already done so, the question for which he was recognized.

MR. NEARY: No. Well, my question, Sir, is what about this dollar that was put on the licences in this Province to collect car wrecks? We no longer have a car collection programme going ahead in this Province, what happens to the dollar? Will it be taken off the licences now? Will it be refunded to the people who paid it? What about this dollar that was put on for the specific purpose of collecting the car wrecks around this Province?

Oh, mute. All of a sudden, mute.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Name him.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Ministerial Statement.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Ank Murphy'.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The minister will recall that some three to four weeks ago he met with the delegation from the Port Blandford to Jamestown - Winter Brook Rural Development Association concerning getting funds in this fiscal year for reconstruction, upgrading and paving of roads in the area. Subsequent to that meeting I presented a petition of 2,000 signatures as to the same matter. My question to the minister is, can the minister indicate whether there have been funds allocated by the provincial government to date to start reconstruction and paving of the roads in the area or if not, will there be funds made available in this fiscal year for the reconstruction, upgrading and paving of the roads from Port Blandford to Jamestown - Winter Brook?

MR. WHITE: Of course there will be funds, the minister always (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY:

Mr. Speaker, my recollection of that particular meeting which was an excellent meeting with a good group of people who were very concerned and rightly so, was to the effect that we were not in a position to make a commitment on paving at this time. I do remember concern about a bridge which had to be done which we undertook to do and which is being done before we can get into a major effort down there.

We also undertook at that time, I think, to make sure that gravel and liquid calcium would be applied. There were some areas which had been overlooked last year for some reason or other which we undertook to make sure would be done this year. These things have been committed and will be done.

As for paving of that particular area, I am afraid that that is in jeopardy at this particular point. We do not have

MR. DOODY: enough funds to do all the requests that we have for paving. We will certainly make every effort that we can to do it as quickly as we can. It is in that area with another 2,500 miles which have to be paved in the Province and that is quite apart from the fact that there are many, many areas of Newfoundland, Labrador particularly, and on the Island which have no road connections at all. When one takes all the demands into consideration and tries to allocate the funds that are available, it becomes extremely difficult. However, under the circumstances we will do everything that we possibly can and we sincerely hope that the people in that area will be somewhat better off this year than they were in previous years and hopefully in the very near future we will be in a position to accommodate all their desires.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in that meeting the minister will recall that he made some reference to the amendment to the DREE agreement and I am wondering now whether the minister is in a position to inform the House as to whether or not this area will be included in this DREE agreement and this amendment to the DREE agreement that the Province will enter into with the federal government shortly?

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

MR. DOODY: It becomes very difficult to discuss the various DREE agreements that we have the privilege of entering into. It sounds as though we are passing over all the road problems and all the communications and transportation problems of the Province of Newfoundland into the hands of the government at Ottawa and as much as

MR. DOODY: we would like to be able to do that we know that that is not so. The road communications, the transportation problems of the Province are ours and any assistance or help that we can get from the Government of Canada through DREE or through any other area, any other department, such as the Department of Transport who have entered into the three year, 50-50 agreement on the Trans-Canada, is certainly very welcome. To say that this particular road or that particular road has been referred to DREE is really an oversimplification, because it simply shifts the responsibility in a sort of a temporary or ad hoc basis from one government to another. The responsibility for that particular road and that particular area is the responsibility of the Province. Now there is no question about it at all that we will be discussing that with DREE and we will try to do everything that we can to get it included in a DREE arrangement or a DREE agreement or a sub-amendment or sub-agreement, but I would be less than honest if I did not say that there is a limit to the amount of branch roads or off/side roads that the Government of Canada will get involved in, DREE particularly. They have made it abundantly clear to us, Sir, that they have no desire or intention of becoming what they refer to as the Municipal Affairs Department of the Government of Canada and they have tried to keep their road agreements in that area.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Province of Newfoundland has been extremely fortunate in getting the road agreements that they have with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which from the start has been most sympathetic and has gone, I think, above and beyond the call in providing us with funds to help reconstruct and pave roads in the Province which we certainly would not be able to do without the help of the Government of Canada.

MR. DOODY: We certainly will be pressing the Port Blandford area as we will with many other areas of the Province, but I would be less than honest if I did not suggest that it is quite impossible to suggest to the House that DREE will come through or can come through on all these programmes and projects that we ask them to assist us with.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary, the hon. the member for Conception Bay South; followed by the hon. the member for Eagle River and the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. NOLAN: I would like to ask the minister two things really; One, is he prepared to table in the House a list of his capital works projects? What work is he going to do on what roads this year? And also to give us some information regarding if not oil, certainly sodium chloride - is that what you call it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Calcium chloride.

MR. NOLAN: Calcium chloride?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sodium chloride.

MR. NOLAN: Well, we will give the minister the sodium chloride but the people are interested in calcium chloride, at least some are at the moment. I am thinking specifically of the road in Seal Cove and the Dunfield road and Foxtrap. I mean, would the minister be good enough to spread the wealth around a little bit so that some people who live in the Conception Bay area might benefit from his political largess?

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

MR. DOODY: I am not in the business of dispensing political largess.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: I am in the business of trying to provide within the limited funds that are available those road conditions and road improvements which are within the responsibility of the Province of Newfoundland. We are doing that as much as we can and as well as we can.

On the calicum chloride effort, that part of - I assume that the hon. member is referring to Seal Cove in the Conception South area, not Seal Cove in the White Bay area which I have already taken very great pains to look after and protect in dispensing my political largess, and everyone knows what a nest of Tories there are in Seal Cove in that area. We have also entered into discussions, serious discussions to look after the residents of Seal Cove in the district of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Look please, Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: You know how sensitive I am.

We are looking at and actively pursuing improvements in the road, the access road to Seal Cove down there in Hermitage in the district of my friend for Fortune Bay (Mr. J. Winsor), it is near Hermitage in the district of Fortune Bay, and we are making considerable progress in helping these people in contributing toward and dispensing our political largess. Another great nest of Tory support, Sir, is Seal Cove down in Fortune Bay. I remember very well the results in the by-election they came through after an address by my friend, the Minister of Justice, who swung that vote down from, I think, it was seventeen down to seven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) But, Sir, we are going to dispense our largess to all of the Seal Coves in this Province as quickly as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Order 7

MR. SPEAKER: Order 7, the adjourned debate on Bill No. 50. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 50 is a very important piece -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. WINSOR: - it is the most important piece of legislation probably affecting the region, the St. John's Urban Region for many years. It is particularly important to me. My district of Mount Scio takes in the densely populated part of St. John's North of Elizabeth Avenue. I then go out to the community of Portugal Cove, taking in the unincorporated area of Penetanguishene, over to St. Phillip's, and then back up the Thorburn Road. As you can see this bill certainly affects all parts of my district, the City of St. John's which obviously is being reported in the press as very strong in opposition to this bill.

And I have two incorporated communities, recently incorporated ones, Portugal Cove and St. Phillip's, and again another active Concerned Citizens Group led by Mr. Fahey in Airport Heights. So as you can see it certainly affects my district very greatly.

First of all, before I get into my remarks -

MR. PECKFORD: Would the hon. gentleman just speak up a little bit because I cannot hear you very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: It is difficult to hear the hon. member.

DR. R. WINSOR: Sir, I will try to talk a little louder.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps by leave the hon. member might speak from another seat.

DR. R. WINSOR: I am used to being very close to the people I speak to through most of my working day, and it is rather difficult for me to shout.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. R. WINSOR: First of all, I would like to congratulate those two new councils, the Council of St. Phillip's and its Mayor, Mr. William Tucker. They have an excellent group of people, very concerned and very deeply interested in the future of their town. Also in Portugal Cove, Mrs. Carol Mitchell, and she also has an excellent group of people. And I think we are very fortunate to have such an outstanding group of people volunteer for a community service in these two areas.

Now before I get into my remarks on Bill 50, I would just like to go into a little background, Metro Board has been, of course, very important in my district. In fact, all areas up until recently, when St. Phillip's and Portugal Cove became incorporated, were under the control of Metro Board, with one exception, the community of Portugal Cove.

There have been, and I have had many complaints from constituents about the autocracy of Metro Board and difficulties in dealing with them, but overall the Metro Board I have been quite happy with, and I think the majority of people have. There have been problems but two of the reasons for these problems are that Metro Board has been entirely an appointed body. I think that in itself particularly when they started to levy taxes on business establishments, certainly upset a lot of people, and certainly in this day and age taxation without representation is just not tolerable. The other

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4751

AH-1

DR. R. WINSOR:

reason I think that Metro was a bit unpopular was because of the fact that they had the unfortunate job of enforcing regulations laid down by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, good regulations, certainly needed and I am particularly referring to the agricultural land freeze and protective forest, productive forest and this sort of thing. It certainly affected, and as my colleagues on either side of me, the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), I think we have all faced these problems over the last few years. Even though the overall benefit for that region was the main objective and was good and was needed, it did affect the individual who lived in those communities for many years, had land sometimes in the family for maybe over 100 years, and when the time came for the son to build a home obviously it created resentment when they were turned down. In many cases it was not just the fact of not having the three and one half or five acres, it may have been a part of the land freeze that - the land itself was not amenable to farming but it was used as a sort of a buffer area, as protection, so it was very difficult to explain to people. I know Metro Board had the same problem. I intervened in some cases but it was difficult to convince people that, here it is, look you have five or ten acres but you cannot build there, you cannot sell it, so you have to go and find a lot in Newtown or some place in St. John's, if you can find one and get \$10,000 or \$12,000, it is just out of their reach. So one of the things I think government will have to do, I know it will be expensive, but for many reasons and I think one of the main ones, the humanitarian one, is the fact that we are going to have to establish some sort of land bank or at least a subsidization so that if people cannot build, at least they can sell their land and get a substantial return from it which then can then reinvest in some sort of building lot of their own in some other area.

Now it is significant that St. Phillip's for many years has been under the control of Metro Board and Portugal Cove had not.

DR.R.WINSOR:

I think anyone who disputes the value of Metro Board in that area can compare the problems of both communities today. There was resentment, again for the reasons I have previously stated, but the overall result is that a community now like St. Phillip's undertaking local government has many less problems than a community like Portugal Cove where they were allowed to build uncontrolled for many years. The expense and other technical problems of supply and services to a community like Portugal Cove are going to be immense because of these lack of controls over the past few years.

But it is rather significant when one says that here is Metro Board, so hated, but it cannot be, Mr. Speaker, because last Sunday, certainly all communities were quite concerned about the effect of Bill 50 on the status of their council and in most cases I think it was just not having the bill explained properly to them. I know the minister and I and Mr. Withers, the Deputy Minister, spent last Sunday afternoon with St. Phillip's and last Sunday night with the town of Portugal Cove, with their town councils. Yesterday I noticed the St. Phillip's town council issued this release, and I would like to put it into the record of this House, June 21, 1978, "The St. Phillip's town council met with the Hon. Jerome Dinn, Mr. Peter Withers and Dr. R. Winsor on Sunday June 18th regarding Bill 50. After much discussion before and after the meeting with the minister it was decided

DR. R. WINSOR: that the St. Phillips Town Council would go on record as supporting Bill 50 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: - to implement a regional government in the Northeast Avalon region. But council wishes to note they had some reservations regarding the proposed power of the regional council. The St. Phillips Town Council is now preparing a submission requesting amendments to Bill 50 and when ready this submission will be presented to the minister and our two M.H.A.'s, Dr. Ray Winsor, and Mr. John Nolan."

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: Now, Mr. Speaker, certainly when we received this submission from the St. Phillips Town Council it will be given every consideration and knowing the capabilities of their town council I am sure that they will be good recommendations. And whether it is too late in this session to implement these amendments, if necessary certainly they can be given every consideration in the Fall or at the latest next Spring.

But again, if Metro Board were so unpopular, here is a community that is now in favour of regional government. And again, a community like Portugal Cove, which had never had the control of Metro Board, has, I think publicly, at least up to a week ago, after its meeting with the Northeast Avalon communities group came out against it.

So I think it is rather significant that the one that knew and had experience with Metro Board the most is now in favour of regional government.

Now back in November of '75, just after the general election, I think one of my first duties as a member was to attend a meeting at the Roncalli School with the Henley Commission. I think that was November 5th., 1975. There was quite a bit of discussion in the district about the hearings and certainly a lot of

DR. R. WINSOR:

debate went on at that time.

The Henley Commission submitted its report to government in October of '76 and since then there has been continuous debate as to the recommendations. I think there were fifty-one recommendations of the Henley Commission, ranging from an enlarged city concept to regional government and many, many others, as most members of this House are aware.

But the two main points of the Henley Report, of course, one was the expanded city concept and the second was regional government. Now the expanded city concept was not accepted to this point by government mainly because of the strong opposition by the surrounding communities, and plebescites in some areas but certainly we were quite aware of public opinion and certainly there had been enough coverage in the press from Kilbride, Mount Pearl, Airport Heights, and Wedgewood Park, etc. Now the expanded city concept I agree with in the final analysis. I think this will come as a natural course in time. But the city has to project an image, the city council, to make these areas realize that being part of St. John's may not be all that bad. Really it is up to city council to sell the concept. We cannot legislate these areas with the majority of public opinion against it at this time. But maybe in ten, fifteen years, maybe less than that with a good PR job by the city, that those people will not object to having the expanded. -

MR. DINN:

Fifty-three recommendations.

DR. R. WINSOR:

The minister just told me there were fifty-three recommendations, not fifty-one. Thank you.

So I think in the long term, for the future of St. John's, the expanded city will come. What form it will take or what areas, I think that too will sort of evolve as time goes on. And I do not think it is something that can be

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4752

NM - 3

DR. R. WINSOR: legislated. I think it will have to come from the desires of the people in the area.

After the Henley Commission was made public, and there was a lot of debate, we attended and certainly I think all the St. John's area members attended meetings with the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. I think we had four full days discussing the recommendations of the Henley Commission. Now after very thorough debate, very thorough debate, finally the federation made recommendations to the minister and one of the main ones of course was regional government.

DR. WINSOR:

And pretty well all the communities in the Northeast Avalon were at these meetings. In fact, the unincorporated ones were invited I think to the third and fourth at my request because of the Airport Heights situation and there were others. The Hogan's Pond Local Improvement District was also there. So pretty well everyone had part in the decision making process up to that time. I am not saying that everyone at those meetings agreed with the concept. I think there was general agreement on regional co-operation and regional government in most cases. There were one or two people who were against any form of regional co-operation and I do not think there was any appeasing them.

From that we came up with Bill 101, and you all know what happened there. There was strong objection by city council, and I think there were considered objections and fairly reasonable and certainly some members of our caucus felt strongly that the bill should be withdrawn, as it was at the last minute with the co-operation of the minister, and then we got to work. We had, I would imagine fourteen, fifteen meetings over a period of time, every two or three weeks, to go over all the protests of the different councils pertaining to Bill 101 and we now have I think an excellent compromise in Bill 50. It is not the complete answer - we will never come up with a piece of legislation that will suit everyone - but at this time, taking all aspects of the problems of the region, I think this is the best possible compromise that we can get at this time. It will not be adequate forever; there will be amendments. The St. John's City Act I think had seven amendments last year, fifteen this year. There is a constant process of change for any of these municipal acts. As conditions can change, so does the act and this is a fact of life so nobody need to fear that this act is going to be entirely unchanged over the years to come. In fact, maybe by the Fall there will be amendments. Many people feel, certainly those who advocate the Report of the Henley Commission

DR. WINSOR:

with the expanded city, that this act does not go far enough. Of course, many other councils feel that it just goes too far. I think when people stop to consider the intent of this bill and the valuable points that are in it, that once they consider them they will realize that this is for their benefit and the benefit of the people of the St. John's urban region and of St. John's, because what benefits one part of this area will benefit the others - we just cannot be independent one of the other.

Now the purpose of the bill of course is the framework of regional government in the Northeast Avalon region and this is to supply municipal services which are considered to be of a regional nature, such as water and sewerage, transportation and fire fighting this sort of thing. And of course the second one would be to control development in the unincorporated areas. This again is a function that Metro Board has carried out. Now it really will make no change to these areas in the sort of status of government if they change now from a non-elected group to a body that is now two-thirds elected. The powers that the new regional council will have are no different than what Metro Board had in the unincorporated areas.

There are many advantages to regional government and I think I would like to list five or six of them because one hears so many negative aspects of regional government and how we are taking away the powers of the local councils and all that. I think many of the things I see reported in the papers are not accurate; however, if they are accurate they do not sort of take in the full context of what the particular section of the bill is doing and therefore there is a tremendous educational process going to be needed for the public to really understand what is in this bill.

One of the main purposes of this bill is to provide services to smaller communities that they would not be able to provide for themselves or get in any other way. I am thinking of such things as accounting services for small

DR. R. WINSOR: incorporated areas, engineering services and planning services, and anyone who has had any contact with municipal government realizes how important these three functions are. And certainly it would be almost impossible for an area like St. Phillips, Portugal Cove, Torbay to hire that sort of expertise and certainly to get people to come in on a consultation basis is extremely expensive.

Then the other main advantage of regional government, of course, and one I have not heard put forth before, is to promote the economic development of the area. There is very little that a small community like Portugal Cove or St. Phillips can do in the sense of stimulating industry in the area, but with the regional council certainly this could be one of the main benefits, that of an organized approach to economic development, and can benefit all the smaller areas of the region.

Regional waste disposal - I have heard the minister many times, and I think in his talk the other day, refer to Robin Hood Bay and the absolute mess that that is in. It is a disgrace to any civilized society. And I remember last summer, I guess, when we had a strike and I was going up there with some garbage from my own house, and the stench was just completely out of hand. And how in this modern society that that sort of condition is allowed to exist - I gather that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have looked into the incineration process and hopefully will start one in that waste disposal area shortly and will use it as an example to all the councils in the area that use this waste disposal site to see how clean this sort of thing can be with proper organization and planning. And as far as the health hazard is concerned it would be absolutely nil where now we have a potential explosion on our hands. And rats evidently

DR. R. WINSOR: abound up there, particularly the two days a week that they cover over the garbage site, and I guess roam wide looking for food, and one of these days they are going to create a real problem for some child. But that is just a couple of them.

 Then you get into regional parks and recreational facilities, but there is no need to elaborate on that; I think that is obvious.

 Another, I think, important one which again has not been given the attention it needs is the fact of regional tax collection. You have a small community, again I will use the two in my district, and setting up the tax collection facilities, if we had a proper accounting system with regional government these communities could combine their bookkeeping problems and services with the regional council and the bills could go out from one central agency. It would certainly save a lot of duplication of effort and in the final analysis make the services cheaper to the communities involved.

 Then the other obvious one, of course, is the water and sewerage systems to smaller communities aided and abetted with the facilities of the regional council and, again, regional transportation and firefighting. These, I think, to anybody who just stops and thinks about it certainly can be done a heck of a lot more efficiently on a regional basis than for every community to have their own firefighting station or their own transportation system. And in most cases it would mean they would never get them if left to their own resources, but certainly on a regional basis these things will be in time available. And as we have to consider that by 1991 we are going to have 65,000 more people - and that is not that far away - and when you consider 65,000 more people in that region it is going to make some.

June 22, 1978

Tape 4754

EC - 3

DR. R. WINSOR: ...of these areas fairly densely populated and certainly these services will have to be provided even if at this moment they may not be entirely necessary, but ten years down the road they will be.

Now I will get into some points of the bill I would like to bring up and one we hear a lot of is taxation.

Dr. R. Winsor: I noticed in the paper this morning a comment by the Deputy Mayor of St. John's about where there had been no financial sort of an assessment made of the cost of regional government to the area in projection. But I think the Deputy Mayor must realize that many of these cost projections are fairly inaccurate things, and I think he is probably very familiar with one now and it concerns the parking garage, that things can certainly multiply in cost fairly rapidly. And no matter how carefully a cost analysis is done. I have not been privileged to any information other than anyone else in St. John's City Council or on this side of the House or that side of the House, if they want to go look for it, but we have a pretty good idea what the manpower will have to be with the regional council when you consider that Metro Board now has about thirty-six employees, and you are talking of regional water services with a board which they have now taken over, maybe another twelve or thirteen employees, we are going to need maybe another couple of more planners, and I would estimate a force of about seventy-five people. And when one considers that size of a force to govern a population of over 200,000 people in the St. John's Urban Region, or to supply services of many different types compare that with the staff at City Hall, it is a very spartan force. So I do not think anyone who is concerned that this is going to be a very expensive operation need really have no great fear. I think the savings that will accrue from just more efficient supply of services will certainly more than make up cost of salaries and for expertise which in many cases if we did not have regional government would have to be there anyhow. We would certainly have to have a water and sewer board. So we are not creating more, we are just putting that now under the regional government.

So in effect, basically I think the other thing that I heard city council, and certainly it has been reported in the press - double taxation. Now I would like to quote again from a statement by Mr.

DR. R. WINSOR:

John R. O'Dea. "Nothing in bill 50", declares Mr. O'Dea, "gives authority to the regional council to impose property or business taxes in the city of St. John's or in any incorporated area." Mr. O'Dea noted that the legislation would give the regional council the power to establish by regulation any parts of the unorganized areas in the region as designated service areas-which they have the right to do now, by the way - and to impose upon the residents taxes and other charges in accordance with the Local Government Act, 1972. "Furthermore," he pointed out, "Metro Board already has those powers and imposes business taxes in all parts of the Metropolitan area under its control and property taxes in designated service areas such as Anne Jeanette, East Meadows, and Donovans Industrial Park."

Now in unincorporated areas, and I want to refer particularly to Airport Heights, first of all there will be no taxation of private residences in an area like Airport Heights until they are provided with water and sewer.

MR. NEARY: How do you know that?

DR. R. WINSOR: This has been certainly indicated to me in many discussions with the minister and with the department. I am absolutely sure of that.

MR. DINN: That is the practice of Metro Board and that is what is carried out in applications for designated services.

DR. R. WINSOR: Now if the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would just sit back and keep his ears open rather than the other part of his anatomy he might learn something.

MR. MURPHY: Right. It also would be a change.

DR. R. WINSOR: I repeat again, there will be no taxation on private residences in an area like Airport Heights until they receive water and sewer services. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, they will not be forced to have water and sewer until they have a plebiscite. And when an area through a plebiscite indicates by 75 per cent to 80 per cent approval of water and sewerage, then that area will get it. But if

DR. R. WINSOR:

they do not it will not be forced upon them. And until they decide to accept it and pay the user fee they will not be taxed on the private residence basis. I think that should allay a fear which I had many people call me about from that area. They will only

DR.R.WINSOR: pay basically for what they receive. Also, as I said before, Metro has the power to declare an area a designated service area and to charge taxes if they supply the services. So really there is nothing for that part of my district to be afraid of .

If anyone feels that certain services are not needed, and certainly water and sewerage is a basic right in most parts of the North American context, I can bring the hon. gentleman to an area about maybe four or five hundred yards from here, the place where you are now sitting, and every morning there is a bucket brigade from their house with raw sewerage thrown into a river which goes into a bog and that bog then flows into Kents Pond and goes on down through the city. Now I just do not think that sort of thing need exist anymore in our society, and I hope to God when we get regional government this area I am thinking about - I am not going to mention the name of the street because it may embarrass some of the residents, but it does exist. If any hon. gentleman wants to see it I will take him, but it is not a very pleasant sight that close to what we consider one of the most modern parts of St. John's.

Now in section 9, the makeup of the regional council, the chairman, the appointed chairman, I am glad to see that it is to be Mr. John R. O'Dea, a man whom I have the greatest respect for, who has been very, very good to me as the member for the district. I found him very decent to deal with. He is concerned about the problems of the people. He is available and I think he is probably the most competent person we could get to not only have run Metro Board but now to run the regional council when this act is proclaimed. We have four members appointed. In large by government, and then four elected at large in St. John's, and there are six from the outlying areas and these six, of course, will be chosen from areas yet to be decided but I understand it is to be done on the population density so that everybody pretty well in these areas will have equal sort of representation. Menley recommended six in St. John's and of course that was at the time when he also was stressing the expanded city concept. Again that is up, I think, for the

DR. R. WINDSOR: city to handle in its own way over the next few years to try to convince these people that this would be an asset to them.

The reason for appointments, and many people have complained about this, that this is again autocratic by government, we are controlling the regional council, we have ulterior motives to do so. This is not so, Mr. Speaker. In the formative years we have had a high influx of funds in that area, over \$50 million on things such as the Northeast trunk sewer, the Waterford Valley trunk sewer, the Rennies Mill trunk sewer and then the Bay Bulls water and sewer system. There is earmarked about another \$50 million to be spent in this area over the next few years. A lot of this is DREE money but quite a substantial percentage from the Provincial Government. So obviously government has to have some input if we are spending these large amounts of public funds. The other advantage of these four appointed members, and again I refer to the Henley Commission, is the fact that Mr. Henley felt that these four people could actually be neutrals, in a sense they could referee problems between competing communities in the region. It stands to reason that this is so. If a person is appointed he has an overview of the whole St. John's urban region or Northeast Avalon region, where somebody who is elected from one part, one of those six councillors, say, from outside may be a member of another council and have a tremendously strong desire to see something done in his particular area. Obviously everyone is built that way and very few of us have the ability to always have the overview, that we have to put our interest of our own constituents first and certainly these four appointed people will have a tremendous, I think, control to referee that sort of dispute on the regional council.

DR. R. WINSOR:

Another point: I would certainly like to go on record, and I certainly feel I have the assurance of the minister and of our government, that there will not be a political hack appointment on these four people. They will be people with expertise in municipal politics and will be put there on the basis of their knowledge, not on the basis of their politics, and certainly I think most of us on this side of the House will certainly see that that is the way it will be.

We have now Metro Board with six appointed and this was done of course, and I do not want to bring politics into this speech, but it was done by the former administration, fifteen years ago. It served its purpose well and possibly at that time where municipal politics was in embryo in Newfoundland this was the only option they had. Now we have grown, I think municipal politics have matured to the point we are ready for the elective regional government concept.

One other point I would like to mention, the fact that I have heard complaints that the minister has the power to defer elections for up to six months - oh no, that the elections would have to be within six months and then the minister would have the power to defer elections up to twelve months. Well certainly the six months time period is reasonable because there will have to be enumeration of the residents of the area and the physical set up to hold the election, time for the potential councillors to do their politicking and to get nominated and so on. And the fact that the minister has the power to defer elections for twelve months I think, to my knowledge, has only been used twice before, once in the '65 municipal elections when it conflicted on the same day as the federal election, and obviously there certainly was no ulterior motive of the minister at the time to defer an election but it was an absolute necessity. And then last year in Mount Pearl where we had to take a plebescite in New Town to determine the wishes of the New Town people, whether they wanted to amalgamate

DR. R. WINSOR: with Mount Pearl. So those two cases are examples of what that power is there to do. Certainly I just cannot see any minister - and be it that some day we may not have as decent a one as we have now, and we have a superb one now - what ulterior motives could the minister defer it? There would have to be specific reasons for that section to be in there and I think it is in there for very good reasons.

Now the other clauses I would like to mention briefly are clauses 32 and 33, the acquisition of municipal assets. Now one thing we have to remember is that the property of any council is not owned by the council, it is owned by the citizens of the community. And the Henley Commission recommended the basic policy of non-compensation in respect to the assets of a municipality if it was required for regional services. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it has already been paid for by the taxpayers of the area, or partially paid for. The regional council will accept the liabilities of that particular item, whatever it is, but certainly to make all the people of the region to acquire a previously owned asset by a municipality and then retax the people of the region, which would then make the people of that municipality contribute all over again to acquiring that asset.

There is a quote from Henley and I think this puts it in its proper context. "Mr. Henley also said, 'The new authorities are trustees for the people of the area, just as the old authorities were. Both the assets and the liabilities have always been public and they remain public.'" So therefore the citizen, and he is the one we are here to represent, and the ones that the councils represent, and I do not think the average citizen when he turns on his tap in the morning and he gets clear, clean water, is going to give a darn whether the city of St. John's owns it or the regional council or the Shiek of Aran

DR: WINSOR:

That is what government has to do and I certainly do not think it is a great concern of the people. It is a concern of the people-I did not mean it in that concept. I do not think the people are concerned as to who has the legal title to that particular asset as long it is available to their use. So, again, if compensation were paid people would pay for the second time. And again I think that thoroughly refutes that argument that we have heard so much about. And, Mr. Speaker, nothing in this bill-I represent both sides, I represent part of the city of St. John's and part of the urban region - and there is nothing in that bill-we have gone through this and we have certainly had expertise provided, we have had legal advice and good legal advice in our caucus - there is nothing in that bill to harm any residents inside or outside the city of St. John's. If there was I would not be standing here expounding the benefits of this thing and I am sure that many other members of our caucus would not. We believe in it, we believe in what the minister is doing, and he is doing a marvelous job. We have got to do more educating of the public about this because they are not getting the true story from our so-called concerned groups and in the way some of things have been reported in the press. We have got to meet with the councils individually. I do not particularly go for these mass meetings; very little usually is accomplished other than sometimes a good shouting match. But if we want to sort of have serious discussion and these councils want to have it, those in my district that we have approached or have approached me, the minister made himself available in Portugal Cove and St. Phillips. I have not had any requests from the Concerned Citizen Group of Airport Heights to meet with me on an individual basis, but that does not surprise me because I have been elected now for three and a half years and I have yet to have been approached by the Concerned Citizens of Airport Heights to have a meeting with them on any of their problems

DR. WINSOR: in that area, and I am sure that the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), who also has part of Airport Heights in his district has not. So, you know, we have to put these groups in the proper context: some are good and have the full and complete welfare of their people that they purport to represent; some, I would suggest, have motives that possibly do not lend themselves to the better interests of the people. We will meet if anyone - Hogan's Pond which has not approached me yet other than to get a copy of the bill and Airport Heights - I, and the minister I am sure would make himself available to meet with them, because I do think at this point many of the public are getting an incorrect interpretation.

But our responsibility now, Mr. Speaker, is to see this bill gets thoroughly explained in this debate and gets through this House and is - the word I guess is probated and proclaimed and that regional government starts doing what the intent in this bill is for it to do and and that is really make this area a heck of a better place, a cleaner place, a place with more services and something that will provide these services at a cheaper cost than they could do it in any other way. So obviously, Mr. Speaker, I do support this bill. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in this particular debate not primarily because it concerns the district which I represent, but standing more because I believe that this bill as advocated will set up a type of regional government that possibly will spread throughout this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of regional government that I envisage, for example, in the district that I represent and this why I want to speak to this

MR. LUSH:

particular issue today. Mr. Speaker, obviously this idea was conceived because the provincial government recognized that there was a problem in Newfoundland, a problem in the St. John's area, a problem in the Northeast Avalon urban region, a problem with respect to providing essential public services. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of concept, a concept for a regional government that will provide areas of this Province with essential services, water and sewer, transportation, whatever, there is no question about it that we need some form of regional government to be able to provide these services. And I am all for a regional government that will set itself up to provide areas of Newfoundland, all the communities of Newfoundland, with these essential public services. But, Mr. Speaker, to reiterate what some of my colleagues have said, it is not the concept of regional government that we object to, it is the concept of regional government as it is purported in this particular bill 50. It is bill 50 that we are taking issue with the government. It is bill 50; it is not the concept of regional government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from the outset I want to give three reasons why I am objecting to this particular bill, three reasons, and hope to elucidate upon the three reasons. The first one is the entire procedure that the government used in setting up this particular bill. I object to the procedure, number one. Number two, I object to the kind of regional government that is advocated under this particular bill. And thirdly, I object to the powers that have been invested in this particular regional government as contained in this bill. These are the three points that I want to address myself to this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the procedure. Number one, a regional government is something that I think we must have in Newfoundland, some sort of a regional structure so that we get regional management, so that we can provide all of the communities in Newfoundland in as much as possible, all of the areas in this Province with proper and adequate public services. This must be done. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that it needs to be the complex thing that is here,

MR. LUSH:

that is invested with so much power it is unreal, incredible. I am not sure that it has got to be that type. But, Mr. Speaker, the procedure because it is so important that we have regional management, then I think there should have been much more time put into this and much more time in allowing the councils around this area, the municipalities and the people to have some input into what type of regional structure they would like to see, The people, that is what it is for, Mr. Speaker. This is designed for the people and there are very few people in the Northeast Avalon urban region that know what this bill contains. Very few people know what it is all about and very few councillors, I maintain, know what this particular bill is about. There was very little input from the people that are affected by this bill, very little input. Mr. Speaker, this is why I say that this particular bill should not have come out as bill 50 as a document to be legislated and to become law.

MR. NEARY: All the people who have had input into this bill, by the way, were either fired out in the last election, municipal election and they were the only ones to have input.

MR. LUSH: Exactly. Right. This bill, Mr. Speaker, should have come out in the form of a White Paper. This should have come out in the form of a White Paper and circulated among the people concerned and meetings held with them to see what they thought of this particular structure. Give them some guidance. This should have been just guidelines as to what the government had in mind and then through a process of getting ideas from people, collecting information, getting submissions come up with the form of a regional government that the people want. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way it was done. It was done in a dictatorial, autocratic way, just thrown upon the people. And as I say the vast majority of the people in this area know not what is in this bill. They do not have a clue. They do not know what has been foisted upon them. They do not know what kind of trap the government is going to get them in by this particular bill.

MR. NEARY: By an arrogant, incompetent minister.

MR. LUSH: The people had no input into this particular bill at all. The people who are most affected by this particular bill have no idea what is in it, they had no input. It is just forced upon them, Mr. Speaker. And this should have been in the form of a White Paper and would have formed the nucleus of generating discussion among municipalities and concerned groups of people to get together and discuss the - what shall I say? - just the nucleus of what the government had in mind and then get information from the people in the form of briefs or whatever, get all the ideas they could from the people in the area to find out what kind of regional system, what kind of regional structure, what kind of regional management that they would like to see, but not so, Mr. Speaker. The government showed again its complete arrogance and its complete insensitivity -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - to the needs of the people of this Province. And that is what concerns me, Mr. Speaker. That is what concerns me, the arrogance of this particular government, and the incompetence. That is what concerns me. And, Mr. Speaker, this could have been a model. Approached in the right way, this bill could have been presented with unanimous consent by this House, because, as I said before, my colleagues and I are not against the concept of regional government.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Do not get carried away with that. Let us not get mistaken about that issue. We are not against the concept of regional government, some kind of regional management, some sort of regional infrastructure to be able

MR. LUSH: to provide the areas of this Province, the communities of this Province with the kinds of public services that they need and the kind of public services that they deserve. The procedure was all wrong, demonstrated the arrogance of the government and the insensitivity of the government. After all, this is set up for the people of this Province, not as a convenience of the government. This should be set up for the convenience of the people. And if we are going to set up something for the convenience of the people, something to make their lives easier, something whereby they can approach government to get the things done that they want to do without another level of bureaucracy, to make the access to the government much more simple, much easier, then we should have gone to the people to find out what kind of structure they indeed thought was necessary. But not so, Mr. Speaker, not so by this arrogant government. This is a bill that is now forced upon them and is going to be rammed through this session of the House, forced upon them and they not knowing what is in this particular bill. Well, thank God, we are going to try to tell them what this bill is all about, not that we are against regional government, but we are against many of the clauses and legislation contained within this bill. So, Mr. Speaker, I am against this form of regional government that this hon. crowd are advocating, one, because of the procedure they used in bringing in this form of regional government, a procedure which was divorced from the people. The people did not have a clue what was going on. Mr. Speaker, the procedure was all wrong. It is too bad, as I said, too, too bad that this did not come out in the form of a White Paper to invite discussion among the people, to invite municipalities and groups of concerned people to get together and to discuss the issues in the White Paper. But no, it has come out now as a bill that

MR. LUSH: is going to be forced through the House of Assembly and foisted upon the people.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, secondly, I find the system of regional government advocated in this bill to be not the kind, I think, of structure that we should have in Newfoundland. Now I do not know the structure, this is why. If I were in charge of this particular bill or given the responsibility of coming up with a regional form of government, this is why I

MR. T. LUSH:

would have gone the route of meeting with all the people that I could meet with, the people that were affected and to explain what regional government is all about, to explain the kinds of regional government that exist throughout Canada and from that to come up with a structure for this Province, a workable, smooth structure without minimizing the complexities of it. This kind of a regional government should be as simple as possible because, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are already over-governed and over-regulated and not at all in tune with the traditional life style of this Province. It is just amazing, Mr. Speaker. It is overwhelming when you talk to the people of this Province and find out how frustrated they are with the regulations that we have imposed upon them both from the Provincial level, the Federal level and now we have another level. Now we have another level and another level that is going to come in and further restrict the life style of the people of this Province. Another level, Mr. Speaker, another level and I do not know of anything that the people in this Province -

MR. NEARY: Here is the cutest man of all, the cutest minister of all. He has Bell Island and Holyrood left out.

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

MR. NEARY: Talk about cute.

AN HON. MEMBER: Washed his hands of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province as I said are over-governed and over-regulated. Here we are bringing in another level of bureaucracy, another level of bureaucracy and nothing to make the acquisition of public monies easier, nothing to make it more simple but another level of bureaucracy to make it more complex, more complicated. That is what we have done, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see a form of regional management that were less sophisticated, less complicated than this particular system of regional government. Mr. Speaker, there is no precedent across Canada for this kind of system, to my knowledge, that

MR. LUSH: this government is now bringing in, no precedent. Now maybe there should not be any precedent because Newfoundland is unique in many ways. Maybe there should be no precedent, but if we had studied all the forms of government, if our people had a chance to study all the forms of regional government and come up with this system, then we could say that is fine because the people decided that this is what we want. But that was not the case.

MR. WHITE: They do not even do the studies. They do not even take the advice (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: That was not the case, Mr. Speaker. What we have is a mixture, this regional government is a mixture of a two-tier, one-tier form of regional government -

AN HON. MEMBER: A mish-mash.

MR. LUSH: A mish-mash is right. We have municipalities and unincorporated areas, this is what we have, Mr. Speaker. Now maybe the idea was born out of the fact that the Whelan Commission stated that in this Province we had too many municipalities or in comparison to the population -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. member to refrain from having a conversation.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: I said, Mr. Speaker, maybe this born out of the fact that the Whelan Commission in commenting upon municipalities commented upon the excessive number of municipalities in this Province, more than any other Province in Canada on a per capita basis and that maybe this idea was born out of that. But, Mr. Speaker, what kind of an arrangement is it going to be?

MR. WHITE: Dictatorship.

MR. LUSH: Unincorporated and corporated areas, how are they going to work together? How is the regional government going to be able to tie that bag together, an area with fifteen municipalities and fifteen

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4761

JM - 3

MR. LUSH: unincorporated areas? How are they going to tie this bag together? It is going to be difficult, Mr. Speaker. As I have said, it is unprecedented in Canada of this two-tier, one-tier mixture, unprecedent and another level of bureaucracy for municipalities.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

I only hope that this system of regional government will work better than our system of municipal government is working. I only wish it would. I would like to see our municipal government operate first well.

MR. NEARY: They all -

MR. LUSH: Not through any fault of the elected people on the municipalities, Mr. Speaker, not through any fault of theirs, these elected councillors. They are working like slaves. They are working like trojans to try and make the system work. But they cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, they cannot do it. If I could allude, Mr. Speaker, just for one moment to a municipality in my own district, Musgravetown. But, Mr. Speaker, talking about municipalities, I would like to see that system working very effectively and it is not because of the elected councillors serving on these municipalities but because of the difficulty they have in getting co-operation and getting funds and understanding from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

I was going to allude just for a moment to a municipality, in my own district, of Musgravetown. One council, one incorporated area surrounded by fifteen or twenty unincorporated areas, Mr. Speaker, and I should have thought that the minister would want to demonstrate to the people all around that area, locally it is called the Goose Bay area, I should have thought that the minister would want for all of these unincorporated areas to look at the incorporated town of Musgravetown and say, "By golly, with the kinds of services they are getting, the kinds of treatment they are getting from government we should be incorporated as well." But, Mr. Speaker, the reverse is true because if we brought in this concept of regional government where it is an area where it would be a marvellous concept, some form of regional management. But I am sure if the people were given a choice to vote on this particular thing and on the basis of what they have seen with that municipal government in Musgravetown they would throw it out the window. They would not hear of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Go out, boy, and look after the wrecked cars. Look after the car wrecks.

MR. SIMMONS: He blows again.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Go look after the car wrecks.

MR. LUSH: Would not hear of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: The town of Musgravetown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: The only service they get is garbage collection and all of the areas have that, unincorporated or incorporated. That is the only benefit, Mr. Speaker. So the people are looking to say, "Why should we be incorporated? Why should we have a regional government when it looks like we get nothing anyways, nothing for this." So it is unfortunate that that is the situation throughout this Province. Municipalities not working because they are not getting sufficient funds and not only funds but understanding, Mr. Speaker, understanding of the problem that these municipalities have to deal with, have to wrestle with from day to day. That is the difficulty.

MR. SIMMONS: They are even asking, why do we have a minister.

MR. LUSH: Exactly. Exactly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this kind of mish mash of a two tiered, one tier regional government, it seems as though there was no thought went into it, no thought, ill conceived. A regional government, Mr. Speaker, nothing wrong with the concept, nothing wrong with it at all. We need it. But we do not need the kind of structure that is advocated in bill 50. We do not need that kind of structure. And, Mr. Speaker, the mixture of this two tier, one tier arrangement, I do not know how it is going to work. I do not know how this system is going to work. And I do not know the system to advocate, but I know this is the wrong one. I know this is the wrong one.

MR. LUSH:

The procedure was all wrong. If this government had gone out and met with the people and made this a White Paper they would have known what kind of system to have. They would not have come up with this two tiered, one tiered structure, Mr. Speaker, unprecedented in Canada, this two tiered, one tiered structure. Not like the county system in Nova Scotia, no resemblance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the idea -
I am just wondering whether regional government is not some kind of system that the government can use as an excuse for putting off things, for doing things. Blame it on the regional government. Now this is another level you have to go to. This is another level. This is another level you have to go to and by the time it gets to the minister a couple of years would have expired and the minister will be out of power and the new government in.

MR. SIMMONS:

Do not let them too far -

MR. LUSH:

I just wonder if it is not another step to promote procrastination, Mr. Speaker, delay in getting things done. It is certainly not a system that is going to expedite matters, not in this particular structure, not in this particular structure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, when the people look around and see how ineffective municipalities are working because of the lack of understanding of the government, because of the lack of understanding, the lack of sensitivity to the needs of our people, then I am not sure that they are going to want to buy this. It is unfortunate because this should have been the kind of bill that would have been a supreme example for regional government throughout this Province, so that all of us here could have stood up and lauded and praised the government and praised the minister for this marvellous document. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate it is not.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No. No. John O'Dea.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I feel that members to my left and right are joining in the debate in other than the proper manner. The hon. member is speaking and I will ask hon. members to refrain from interruption.

MR. SIMMONS: The hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is harrassing him, Sir.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what we have, as I said, is another beaurcratic structure, another red tape level. That is what we have. And Heavens knows, Mr. Speaker, that our people have enough red tape to go through now, enough bureaucracy in this little, over governed and over regulated Province. On three fronts, now it is going to be four fronts, the federal level, provincial level, municipal level and now with this regional government level, the kind of, as advocated in this bill. Four levels, Mr. Speaker, four levels of bureaucracy and each one of them coming up with rules and regulations that are completely restricting and stymying the initiative of our people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: It has got them stymied, Mr. Speaker. They do not know which way to turn. They do not know which way to turn. And I only wish I could go into the way that the people of the Terra Nova district are restricted in their living, following the traditional lifestyle of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Another level now, Mr. Speaker, another level of bureaucracy.

Well instead this bill should have come up with a well thought out, a well planned system of regional government that would meet the needs of this people, a smooth and fluid structure, Mr. Speaker, so we could get up here in this House, as I said, and laud it and praise it, but instead of that, Mr. Speaker, we have to condemn this bill. We have to condemn this bill outrightly.

AN HON. MEMBER: If he is it is a special education class.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, those are my two points for objecting to this bill, the procedure used, the procedure

MR. LUSH: used and then the kind of regional government advocated, this mixture of two tier, one tier structure.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you mean by a two tier, one tier structure?

MR. LUSH: I mean you have municipalities, right? In it there are municipalities and unincorporated areas. So with your municipality it is a two tier arrangement, your regional government, municipalities and then the one tier of course is where there are unincorporated areas. There is only one tier, the regional government.

MR. NEARY: You have Hitler over there at the head of it.

MR. LUSH: The regional government.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs, little Hitler.

MR. LUSH: The regional government, two tier, one tier. We have four levels of government in this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: Mussolini with a -

MR. LUSH: When this bill is through, An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region, once this bill gets through the people of this area will be well represented, well represented, Mr. Speaker, well represented, federal, provincial, regional and municipal.

MR. F. WHITE: 145 members.

MR. LUSH: Four levels of government. They will be well represented. At what cost? I have not come to that yet, Mr. Speaker. I will come to that a little later. But now I want to find what my - get back to my notes and find out what my third point was. Now I have it. My third point

MR. LUSH:

of objection, Mr. Speaker, to this bill was because of the unlimited power invested in regional government by this bill. The unlimited power. Power, Mr. Speaker, unprecedented.

MR. NEARY: Dictatorship.

MR. SIMMONS: Mussolini with a front loader.

MR. LUSH: They can do just about anything

in this area: Municipalities - take lands from them, take property from them, anything at all, Mr. Speaker, this regional government can do. Powers invested, Mr. Speaker, in this regional government through this bill are incredible. Incredible!

Again, no doubt, an outfit that is going to be imposing regulations and restraints upon the people affected. God help us, Mr. Speaker, if that has to spread, this regional government has to spread right throughout this Province. The people will never accept it, Mr. Speaker, never accept it. Never accept this -

DR. KITCHEN They will have to change governments.

MR. LUSH: -not under this structure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have said there is too much power; indeed I am not sure that any members here know how powerful this regional government will be. I am not sure we know how powerful they will be. We could only look at the general powers that were spelled out, we know they are pretty powerful. But, Mr. Speaker, there are many powers here not spelled out when they should be. The powers should be spelled out in this book, what the regional governments have. All we know, from looking at the generalities there, is that they are an all powerful outfit, and all powerful structure, an all powerful level of bureaucracy. But we do not know precisely how powerful they are because it was not all spelled out and this is where the bill is defective as well in not specifically spelling out the kind of powers that this particular level of bureaucracy would have. It fails to do that, Mr. Speaker, it fails to do it.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this going to cost? What is this level of government going to cost the taxpayers of the Northeast Avalon urban region? That is the question that we should direct ourselves to. What is going to be the cost of this extra level of bureaucracy. What is going to be the cost of it?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) nothing.

MR. LUSH: The regional government itself is not going to cost anything? There is provision here for paid employees. Let me take a look to see what they are. Well, first of all they are allowed to get a regional clerk and that salary is to be paid -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: - that man is, or that woman that person is to be paid such salary as may be fixed by the regional council -

MR. SIMMONS: It will be fixed all right.

MR. LUSH: - to the regional clerk. That is one position, Mr. Speaker. Then there is going to be a regional manager and a regional manager again, the salary is to be fixed by the regional council. So that is two; regional clerk, regional manager. Now this provision in the act that the regional manager can be a regional clerk, they can put these two together, but that is not likely, not likely too. But, Mr. Speaker, those are two salaried positions. Then going over further it says, "without limiting the generality of section 110, the regional council on the written recommendation of the regional manager" listen to this, Mr. Speaker - "the regional council on the written recommendation of the regional manager may establish the offices of a regional collector, a regional engineer, superintendent of works, inspector of buildings, chief of the regional fire brigade, regional treasurer, regional solicitor and such other officers as in the opinion of the regional council are appropriate and necessary to the administration of the region."

MR. F. WHITE: Empire building.

AN HON. MEMBER: About a hundred bucks a year there now.

MR. LUSH: That is section 111. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to cost that level of government, that regional government has advocated in this particular bill that is not going to cost any money not talking about the taxes, Mr. Speaker, that are going to administered on the people for services. Not counting that at all, not counting that.

MR. F. WHITE: You have to pay those people.

MR. LUSH: These are the positions, Mr. Speaker, so that is not going to cost any money for the regional clerk, for the regional manager and for the regional collector and the regional engineer and the superintendent of works and the inspector of buildings and the chief of regional fire brigade and the regional treasurer and the regional solicitor and such other offices. Such other offices, Mr. Speaker, such other offices. How long is the such other offices. We do not know, Mr. Speaker, we do not know. All of

MR. LUSH:

that is not going to cost any money, Mr. Speaker. That is not going to cost any money, no money at all. Then section 14, clause 14 here says something about money as well. "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may authorize the regional council to pay its chairman, vice chairman and the other councillors such annual or other remuneration as may be contained in the authorization." Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: They are going to be paid. (Inaudible) The Special Action Group were all volunteers, the Premier said.

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Volunteers, \$47,000 a year, volunteers.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I think I have dispelled the idea that this is not going to cost any money. I do not know but I might apply for a job there, get a look at the salaries and see.

MR. SIMMONS: Had my chance. They are all filled.

MR. LUSH: It looks like there is a job there for every MHA, if we want them, on both sides of the House by what I have listed, former ministers and -

MR. SIMMONS: Except we are all going to be busy over here after the next election.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: These fellows will need jobs.

MR. LUSH: No trouble now, Mr. Speaker, for ex-candidates and ex-ministers to get a job. No problem now, Mr. Speaker, with this structure. No problem at all.

Mr. Speaker, then what are going to be the salaries of those people? What are they going to be paid? We have no idea. We only know that it is going to be fixed by the regional council. The salaries are going to be fixed by the regional council.

MR. SIMMONS: 'Fixed' is the word.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, with these some fifteen or twenty specified jobs and then the others left wide open.

AN HON. MEMBER: The taxpayers will not be fixed.

MR. SIMMONS: The member is being far too reasonable. There have got to

MR. SIMMONS:

be fifty or sixty or seventy jobs at the very outset. You know that.

MR. LUSH: Oh, sure. Sure. But I just covered the ones that are specified. The ones that are specified, they are covered because the last one says and other officers that are needed that the regional council should see necessary to fill.

MR. SIMMONS: Some might not even be officers.

MR. LUSH: That is right, some of them might not even be officers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody knows what this is going to cost the taxpayers. Nobody knows what this particular structure as it is enunciated in this bill, as it is outlined in this bill, the taxpayers of this Province or of the Northeast Avalon urban region have no idea what this is going to cost. But I venture to say it is going to be an astronomical amount, Mr. Speaker, an astronomical and an outrageous cost to set up this level of government as outlined in this particular bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude, let me summarize by saying that I nor my colleagues object to the concept of regional government. I think the kind of regional government that we have outlined here is not the kind of regional government, in the meantime, that should be advocated for this Province. I think we need a less expensive, a less complex system of regional management, a system that is geared more to the needs of this Province, a system that is born out of, a system that will grow out of the demands and the needs of the people, not something that is forced upon them, not something that is foisted upon them by an arrogant administration. That is not what we want. This is why I have said this bill should be a White Paper so that we can get some feedback from our people. This should be a guideline as to what regional government is all about and this would start the conversation sort of thing, start the ball rolling in getting ideas from our people on what kind of regional system they would like to see.

MR. SIMMONS: The former councillor from Corner Brook should have some thoughts on this subject.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I object because of the procedure. It was not the

MR. LUSH: right procedure at all. It was an arrogant procedure. It was not a procedure of going out, talking to the people, getting information from them to find out what kind of government, what kind of regional government they would like to see and tell them the truth about regional government, tell them the truth about how much this is going to cost and what we are going to get in return.

Mr. Speaker, do we need - Mr. Speaker, I can tell you one thing, that if this is extended, if this kind of regional government is extended right throughout the Province therein lies the solution to our unemployment problem. We have it licked. If this system of regional government is foisted upon all of Newfoundland we will have our unemployment problem licked. It will be solved.

MR. SIMMONS: He should be the Minister of Manpower.

MR. LUSH: It will be solved, Mr. Speaker. It will be solved once we start hiring those regional solicitors and those regional collectors and those superintendents of works, once we start hiring those people, those regional clerks, and the regional managers and the regional engineers and the regional treasurers -

MR. NEARY: Ex-cabinet ministers.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there are not enough ex-cabinet ministers or ex-defeated PC candidates in the Province to be able to take up all those jobs once it is spread throughout the Province. It will go a long ways to solving the unemployment problem, a long ways.

MR. SIMMONS: You have the real reason. You have discovered the real reason.

MR. LUSH: It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, the cost of providing, the cost of administering this particular kind of government is going to be outrageous, the cost of administrating this regional government.

Mr. Speaker, so I object on the basis of the procedure that was used, Mr. Speaker, in setting up this regional government. Instead of a plan that should have been welcomed by our people and welcomed by both sides of the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Is that right? Now, Mr. Speaker, I object on the basis of the kind of regional government that is advocated by this bill, a mixture of the two-tier, one-tier arrangement. It seems to be unworkable, Mr. Speaker, seems to be unworkable, this two-tier one-tier, in St. John's we are going to have a two-tier. It is going to be this regional government and our municipality as well, another level of bureaucracy. Of course, in the other areas, the unincorporated areas they are just going to be a one-tier structure. They are just going to have the regional government and there is nothing wrong with that as these people need something, these unincorporated areas need something but I am not sure this is what they need, this kind of system.

AN HON. MEMBER: No plebiscite and -

MR. LUSH: And then, Mr. Speaker, the powers - one must object, if everything was alright, if the procedure was right, the powers and if you agreed with the structure, with the political structure, with the authority - or not the authority but the political structure, the arrangement, if you agreed with it you could not agree with the powers that are invested in this particular bill, the powers invested that the regional government was given in this particular bill. Then, Mr. Speaker, the two unknowns: how much power will they have, how much power? We do not know because it is not spelled out. There is only enough spelled out to frighten you. There are only enough powers spelled out to frighten a person, to make your hair stand on end. It is only enough for that, just enough for that. We do not know how powerful this regional government is going to be because the powers are not spelled out. The other unknown, Mr. Speaker, is the cost to the taxpayers and I am not talking about the cost in terms of paying for the services and the terms of taxes to the people. I am talking about the cost of administering this regional government, the cost of administering this regional government with all of the jobs that are available.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and others not listed I must vote against this particular bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4766

JM - 3

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that the hon. member is giving qualified support to the bill. It is true, as he says, that there will not be enough defeated Tory candidates next time round to fill all these jobs but there will be a fair number of defeated Liberal candidates and we will have to turn to them.

MR. SIMMONS:

He has been talking to Andy again on the phone.

MR. R. WELLS:

Come on now. That is not worthy of the hon. member, you know. That is not worthy, I suppose.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is very worthy. The last time you talked to Andy you did it here in the House.

MR. P. WELLS:

Yes. Well why not? Why not. You know. The hon. member is the one who plays with other people's telephone conversations.

MR. SIMMONS:

Tell us what Andy says. Tell us what the -

MR. NEARY:

Go down and make fun of your Cabinet meeting.

MR. WELLS:

The other people -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

- Mr. Speaker, are the ones who play with people's telephone conversations.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible) ignoramus.

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

I will have to call a recess if order is not maintained when order is called. Interjections are not permitted at any stage but they are overlooked, shall we say, if they do not interfere with the operations of the House and its progress or proceedings.

At this stage I think that they were very close to doing that.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, on the principle of this bill, first I would like to deal with the question of consultation. I do not suppose there has ever been a bill brought before this Legislature on which there has been more consultation. It started with the Henley Commission and I was representing the district which was St. John's South at the time, which was the present district of Kilbride plus what is now the district, or

MR. R. WELLS: most of the district of St. John's South, and we went to meeting after meeting, along with representatives of the communities, the town council, the Town Council of the Goulds, the Kilbride Citizens Committee, everybody else, Blackhead Road as it was then called and now Shea Heights, these people, and we all went, the Petty Harbour - Maddox Cove people and we had whatever input human beings could have into a discussion and that commission, the Henley Commission, held hearing all over the region and everybody who had anything and wanted to say it was permitted to say it and certainly the people from the district that I represent had their say and they had it fully.

After all these hearings, and after all that deliberation a report came out. Now everything that was in the report the government did not adopt. But it put out a bill last year, or brought before this House a bill to establish regional government which essentially took the recommendations of that report.

Now again you talk about consultation. A lot of people at that time did not like the bill. A lot of the members in this hon. House did not like the bill and urged the government to withdraw it so that there could be more consultation. And I was one who said all right to my caucus and to the minister, if that is what is wanted and this is a serious matter, do not put the bill ahead this year, give it another year so that the people can say what they want, make what representations they want and come up with the bill next year. Now I do not know about anybody else. Everybody is free to have meetings in this country if they want to. But as far as the PC caucus is concerned, for the St. John's area we got together throughout the past year, I do not know how many times but it was a lot of times and we talked about this particular bill and the concepts in it.

And finally with the minister taking advice

MR. R. WELLS: from everybody that was available to take it from, including those who represented the people concerned in our caucus and I do not know if he had representations from the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), perhaps he did or perhaps he did not, I know he had representations from community councils, town councils, from everybody, he then, and of course the officials in his department, he then came up with this bill. And this bill has been circulated and made aware, we have been made aware of it and we have had the opportunity to talk with the people we represent and get their views on it and this is the bill that is now before the House.

So I say this much and I want to put this on record insofar as Kilbride is concerned, the district of Kilbride, I have not had one representation or telephone call at all against this bill. I have sat down with the Kilbride Citizens Committee, headed by Mr. Albert Burke, and a number of outstanding citizens of Kilbride, and I have gone through it line by line. They are in favour of it. They want it to go through. And as late as last night I talked with Mr. Burke on the telephone again and we are going to have another meeting Monday evening to go through it again to see if there is anything that we are missing, or anything that they would want me to suggest in the committee stage that might be an improvement. If they do then I will suggest it, Mr. Speaker. But as far as the principle of this bill is concerned as it is now drafted and before the House, let me say categorically that they want it to go through and that is the word from my district.

MR. SIMMONS: Dictatorship.

MR. R. WELLS: Dictatorship? No, it is not dictatorship.

MR. R. WELLS: No bill ever came before this House to which there has been a greater -

MR. NEARY: You are saying the Goulds are in favour (Inaudible).

MR. R. WELLS: Well, they certainly have not told me they are not and they went to all the meetings.

MR. SIMMONS: They cannot reach the member.

MR. WELLS: They sure can reach the member. Let us put that in, my telephone number is in the book. Your friends know that, do they not? They managed to tape.

MR. NEARY: The member assumes because they did not say they were not in favour of it, the member is assuming that they are in favour of it.

MR. WELLS: I went to enough meetings with them.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: Just more of a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. Let it be clearly understood that the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is quite wrong when he says that it was my friends who were involved in the taping of the telephone call. It was rather not my friends at all who were involved in the taping of these telephone calls, but his friends who were not sure, his friends, his own friend who were not sure they could trust him anymore. Not my friends, Mr. Speaker, his friends who were not sure that they could trust him down the road. That is who taped his call. That is who has his number but his constituents have a little more trouble reaching him they tell me.

MR. WELLS: No, they have no trouble at all. To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, shall we say the hon. member's new-found friends -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! There is not a point of order before the Chair that really requires decision. I should really point out to hon. members that interruptions in debate can only be permitted on terms of points of order and points

MR. SPEAKER: of privilege. If explanatory matters come up that should be done by asking an hon. member if he will yield temporarily and of course we recognize that precedent.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Now then, Mr. Speaker, to go -

MR. NEARY: The member is making an announcement now on behalf -

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I am allowed to speak in this House. I do not -

MR. NEARY: Are you announcing it?

MR. WELLS: I am announcing nothing. I am speaking on a bill if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: I want it clear who is supporting your -

MR. WELLS: I will make clear. I am making the remarks. The hon. member will have his turn. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know I do not want this foolishness to continue. I mean, I want at least the right to make a speech in this House that I was elected to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! My understanding is that the hon. member is making it clear he wishes to make his remarks without interruption and of course the Chair can certainly give him that right which is clearly stated in our standing rules.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now to talk, Mr. Speaker, about the powers in this bill. It has become obvious in the St. John's region -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. WELLS: Now the hon. member is still talking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: What are we doing here, Mr. Speaker?

This is just pure ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. DOODY: There are some rudimentary rules and some basic principles in this House of Assembly which have to be honoured, Sir, sooner or later. Now if the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir refuses to listen to my colleague then let him leave the building. He has the choice, Sir. But the basic rule says that the hon. member is entitled to be heard in silence. He has asked for that protection on three different occasions and so far he has not been accorded that privilege. I think, Sir, that that is not quite fair.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister has raised a point of order.

I think he and the member are quite unfortunately misunderstanding the whole point of my brief interjection. He mentioned in the last five minutes a Mr. So and So. I did not get the name. It was mentioned that he had been talking on the phone to a Mr. -

MR. NEARY: Who was in favour of this.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I was simply asking who and whether, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Albert Burke.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, and whether -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, I think I now have the answer. It is Kilbride rather than the Goulds this Mr. Burke was speaking on behalf of Well, that is all I wanted to know. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please! In regard to the point of order, the point of order stems from the rule that if a member expresses the desire to be heard in silence, the Chair should then very strictly enforce this rule. It is of little consequence, the nature of the interjection, whether it is questions, whether it is heckling, whatever it is at that point. If it is not a point of order or a point of privilege, once an hon. member makes that requirement, makes that request, the Chair has no alternative but to enforce the rule and if an interjection is made after that, no matter what its nature, the Chair will have to call the member who is trying to make that interjection, or make that remark, to order and therefore to stop him from doing so.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that it has become obvious in the St. John's region for some time, and this has been pointed out by almost every speaker, that there has been need for an approach to providing services to the region, which the City of St. John's, for example, has been able to provide for a great many years to its citizens but which other smaller communities cannot provide because they have not got the money. I mean, it is no good for any of the smaller town, take Petty Harbour for example, to think that it can provide all the services to its citizens

Mr. Wells:

that the City of St. John's can provide. And it is out of this sort of thing that the idea of an overall government grew.

Now it seems to me there were only two choices then: that the services were going to have to be provided by some regional body or authority, that was one way, or expand the City of St. John's until it took in everything in the region. Now I would like to say a word or two about that for a moment. Of all of the meetings that I went to and discussions with my constituents over the last six years, the one thing that they made it very clear to me that they did not want, they made it clear to everybody else as well, is that they did not want to be swallowed up by the City of St. John's. So I think if we were here today debating a bill that would allow the City of St. John's to take in this region there would be a crowd down in front of this building and in the galleries that I think we would not want to face.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There will be.

MR. WELLS:

Well, maybe so, but they are not here today. But if we were going to expand the City of St. John's to take in this Northeast Avalon Region we would have some trouble on our hands, and I can guarantee you that, Mr. Speaker. And I know from talking to my own constituents over the years that that would be so.

So it seems to me that if we were not to do that then we had to look at some type of regional authority. And I do not think there is anybody who disagrees with the principle of the bill that there should be a regional authority. But everybody seems, not everybody, but a good many people seem to say, Okay, we agree that there needs to be a regional authority to give these services and to look after these services and maintain them and install them, but we want a different kind of regional authority. Now I do not know of any human institution that started off perfect. You have got to start with what you think is the best thing to do the job. And then as the years go by or the months go by or whatever you modify it to do the job better. Now that is exactly what this government is doing with this particular bill. And I think if we withdrew this bill now and brought it in again next year or the year

Mr. Wells: after or twenty years down the road, whatever government is in power, you would still have objection because people tend to worry about something new, especially if it involves taxation, especially if it involves interfering with powers in some way that somebody fancies he already has, be it a member of the St. John's City Council or any town council or anybody else, there is always a fear of something new and there is always a desire to say, Oh my God, you know, what are they doing now.

I remember very well -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is quite legitimate.

MR. WELLS: Yes. Oh, it is quite legitimate. And I am not beefing about it. I remember when the School Tax Authority was introduced in Corner Brook, the Vigilante Committee was formed. They hired lawyers and all sorts of people to fight it, and they fought tooth and nail because it was a new concept, and a concept that was not going down very well. This was back in 1956. And so we have in Newfoundland we have a very, very short standing tradition of municipal government in any form, Mr. Speaker, outside of the actual City of St. John's. And it does not surprise me and I think it speaks well for us in Newfoundland that we are not prepared to take new things without questioning and that is good. And this is why. I say that we had to start somewhere. We started with this bill, giving it power over the operation and construction of regional water supply, public transportation systems, and it will be a wonderful thing if the regional government can institute that, planning responsibilities in respect of the region that have been assigned to the Provincial Planning Board, fire protection, and any other facilities or services of a regional nature.

Now obviously they have got to walk before they can run, but I hope that whatever form of regional government takes over, in the next twenty years, I hope that twenty years in the future you will find that the region whatever it is called then or whatever powers it has I hope that it will be instituting police protection, fire protection, water and sewer services, and other services that we probably do not even

Mr. Wells: think of now. And it has to start somewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has the government really done? The government has said to the regional government or the regional council insofar as these regional services are concerned, and the first one is obviously the water and sewerage, you shall have the power to do it, the same sort of power that is given to a town council or to a city council in the Province of Newfoundland. You will have that power and you will have the power in the unincorporated areas like Kilbride, the community of Kilbride, you will have the same sort of power that you would have under The Local Government Act. So you can go ahead and you can handle that community just as Metro Board handles it now, or just as it would be if you had a town council. But in areas where there are town councils or city councils you serve their powers, but if you provide any services to them like water and sewerage you can charge them a user charge and they will pay you for it.

Now that is basically all this bill says.

MR. WELLS: it gives certain powers incidental to that like expropriation, but every municipality in Newfoundland has that power, the two cities in Newfoundland have that power, so there is nothing new or strange about that. Someone said in the debate the other evening if you want to look at the overall powers of expropriation in Newfoundland and modify them or alter them well by all means look at them and the regional council will be covered just the same as anybody else. But nobody can tell me that the expropriation powers given to the regional council are any different or any more onerous or great than the powers given to any municipality or city or authority in Newfoundland.

So really when you come right down to a nutshell, there is the power that is given; the power that is given to every other municipality and city under the appropriate city act or under the Local Government Act, and why should it not have these powers, Mr. Speaker?

You talk about the nature of the representation. Right now we have had the Metro Board for thirteen or fifteen years. Not a soul, really, beefs seriously or comes charging into Confederation Building about the Metro Board. Metro Board, I think, has done a good job in these fourteen or fifteen years and that was purely appointed. Now we are saying we are going to substitute from something, from the Metro Board, we are going to have fifteen people, five to be appointed and ten to be elected and there is something wrong with that. Where were the petitions before this House of Assembly the last fifteen years that the Metro Board was appointed and not elected? They were not here, Mr. Speaker. Now, when we elect two-thirds of them this is a terrible thing, terrible abuse, dictatorship on the

MR. WELLS: way. Not so, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that two or three years in the future, and I dare say this will come and perhaps the minister can tell us when he closes the debate what is contemplated, that two or three years in the future I would like to see an amendment to this bill brought in where the whole lot of the regional government, the whole crowd of them would be elected and there would be none appointed. But I think at this stage -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do it now.

MR. WELLS: No, I think at this stage when you are just bringing in something and you want a bit of continuity from the Metropolitan Board, I think it is a good idea to have five people at least appointed but I would hope that that would not last more than two, or three, or four years when they could all be elected.

MR. SIMMONS: You were in favour of Commission of Government, I bet.

MR. WELLS: What is that? No, I was not in favour at all. My family happened to be in favour of Confederation.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, the member would be in favour of Commission of Government.

MR. WELLS: No, the member would not be in favour.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: No. No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: So that that is what I hope will come in two or three years time, Mr. Speaker, and that they all be elected. So that insofar as the powers are concerned and insofar as the setting up is concerned, I think it is as good a start as you can make at this time.

Now, the other thing is that a lot of people refer in speeches to the terrible dictatorial powers given to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council or

MR. WELLS: given to the Government or the Province. Well, let us be clear about one thing, Mr. Speaker; all municipalities are creatures of the provincial government, that is the way Canada's constitution is now set up. The federal government has certain powers and the provincial government has certain powers and among the provincial government's powers are powers to deal with municipalities and local government so that every power there is with regard to local government rests here this afternoon, and a bill could be introduced today, passed tomorrow and given Royal Assent on Monday or Tuesday which could do anything under the sun, could wipe out if it wanted to municipal government in Newfoundland. Now, where is the safeguard? The safeguard, obviously, is in sensible people, we hope, elected by the citizens of Newfoundland to represent them in the House. But let us not kid ourselves, all the power is here, right here in this Chamber to do what ever we want as a group in this Chamber. With municipal government in Newfoundland, as I say, we could wipe out every municipal act tomorrow. We will not do it, obviously, because we are fifty-one sensible people.

But it is no good to say, it is pointless to say that the provincial government is taking too much power because the provincial government has the power and the BNA gives it to the provincial government. Because whatever government is in power it has the majority of votes in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and that is where the power is.

Fortunately, governments have not abused that power in Newfoundland and by and large municipal and local government legislation has been good. But when we talk about the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council having the power to do certain things, my answer is yes,

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, who else would have the power, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council in New Brunswick? Where else but the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council in Newfoundland would have the power to make the regulations and do such things as are necessary and cannot necessarily or not be necessarily be spelled out in an act to handle this regional government. And the same not only goes for the regional government, but every aspect of local government, city governments, St. John's and Corner Brook as well.

The power is here,

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, and until the constitution of Canada is amended this is where it will stay. So now you talk about consultation; there has been consultation, You are talking about power; it is nothing new, but power that still remains in this country, all over the country by virtue of the City Act and the Local Government Act. And there is a transitional period as I see it when the whole group of Regional Government representatives in this area will be elected.

Now to the future, Mr. Speaker, what will happen? I will go, for instance, to a meeting in Kilbride Monday night, this will be hashed through and we will go through the act again. If any sensible and worthwhile suggestion comes out of that meeting, and there may, I will come back and I will recommend it to the minister and I will recommend it to my colleagues in the PC caucus. I will say, Look, would you consider this for amendment in the committee stage? And if I feel strongly enough about it I will get up myself in the committee stage and ask that it be amended.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you think that it will be acceptable.

MR. WELLS: I do not know if it will be accepted. I am only-

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) big majority.

MR. WELLS: I do not know. That will depend on the majority in this House. I have no particular clout, but if I think that it is a worthwhile suggestion I will put it forward. If Mr. Fahey, for example, who is a respected person whom I know very well, if he or anybody else came along to me with a suggestion for amendment in the committee stage to make this bill better or more worthwhile, I will put it to the minister and I will put it to my colleagues in caucus; I will even put it to my friends across the House. That is the way things work. But if somebody comes to me and says would you withdraw this bill or would you ask your colleagues in government to withdraw this bill for another year, no, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I will not. I am for this bill going ahead, I am for any worthwhile amendments in the committee stage, I am for any worthwhile amendments six months down the road, a year down the road, two years down the road, no matter what. I am for that and I think you have to walk before you can run and I think that the only way that we are going to develop worthwhile Regional

MR. R. WELLS: Government in Newfoundland is to start at this point, which seems reasonable and sensible to me, and is favoured by a lot of people, to start here and if it has to be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. WELLS: Look, you know I am speaking. Shall I yield for a moment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member asked to be heard in silence and I ask both members on my right and left to adhere to his requests.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I do not want to challenge the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, but the Chair has placed me in a very awkward position in that I understood that it was a well founded tradition in this House that when a member allows an interjection, and the member on that occasion asked me for clarifications to what I was saying, I understood I was allowed to then provide the interjection. I was doing that in a spirit of the tradition of this House and I do not appreciate being lectured by the Chair for doing it.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark because the Chair was not lecturing. I did not ask you in particular, the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir, but I asked all members on my right and left to adhere to the request of the Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I would in any reasonable instance answer a question in debate. What was it the hon. member wanted?

MR. R. SIMMONS: The question to the member, he said that he would be willing to talk to members on the other side of the House about any proposal to change the bill. Now I find that kind of inconsistent and incredible in view of the fact that they would not even invite my colleague from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) to meetings because he was not a government member. Has the member changed his strips or not? Has the member changed

MR. R. SIMMONS: his stripes?

MR. W. WELLS: I do not find that incredible at all. If any hon. member over there wants to come and discuss this bill with me around the House I will certainly discuss it. But I must say when we were meeting on the bill I considered it was the group of Conservative members meeting in the St. John's area. It never came in my mind to invite anybody else, it just did not come in my mind. I thought this was the Conservative members -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is sad.

MR. W. WELLS: Maybe it is sad. I do not know. But I must say if we ever meet again on matters like that and the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) indicated to us that he would like to be present I for one would be only too glad to have him. I certainly have no feelings that way but when we were meeting I understood we were meeting as a part of a Conservative caucus concerned with St. John's area matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the question of possible amendments to the bill and the future insofar as Regional Government is concerned and the fact that it is always open to anybody to suggest to members of the House of Assembly on any side, both sides or any number of parties or independent members or anybody else who happen to be here, amendments or suggested amendments to legislation. I am sure

MR. R. WELLS: these will come in the future insofar as regional government is concerned. I am sure they should come. I think we will be able to improve regional government and I think when regional government gets into operation here we will all learn a lot. And when other parts of the country - or, rather, the Province want regional government, as they will when this gets working here and delivering services to municipalities in the proper fashion, they will want regional government and they will be able to build on the experience that has been learned in this area which is the largest and most populated regional area in the Province of Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it will come. Insofar as the protests are concerned, I understand, and I have asked a few questions around about this, that when regional government was proposed for Nova Scotia, for instance for the Halifax region, there was hell to pay, there were all sorts of objections. But when it was put in place and got working properly it worked well. The same way in the Toronto area and other areas of Ontario, big fuss and furor, but once it got in place and they saw what it could do it worked well and has been very satisfactory. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I think will happen here in this particular Northeast Avalon region. And I would say this, that insofar as people on this side of the House are concerned, and there is no need for me to speak for the government, but I think that the government and the minister will take careful note of representations that are made by anybody and if these representations can provide ideas and approaches to make regional government better once it is instituted, I think that these representations will be taken, considered and if they are good in the judgement of the majority of members of this House they will be acted on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, we have before us I think - what is it now? Number 85? Eighty-five pieces of legislation which should have been handed out to us-in fact, these ones were as recently as today. The rest have been handed out to us most of it in the last week or two and last year we complained bitterly that legislation was introduced in this House which we did not have time to thoroughly examine. We were given a bill one day and suppose to debate the next day in an intelligent fashion and also have a careful look at it. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Bill No. 50 has been done exactly the same way.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: It was handed out to us a couple of weeks ago, the first time we had the opportunity to see it. Many of the councils in the area concerned did not see the bill until just recently, a week ago, ten days ago, and the bill should, as far as I am concerned, have been circulated to them to allow them to study the bill, examine it, have some input into it. What we are doing here, surely as I see it, is taking a bill, taking some legislation in the form of Bill 50 and slapping it at the councils and saying, "Here you are, you have to live with it." Some of these councils were only elected in the last few weeks. It makes a mockery directly of council elections or incorporated communities - the communities of Portugal Cove, St. Phillips, St. Thomas's, various other ones - it makes a mockery of electing them, forming them, incorporating them only a few weeks ago, and before they have time to find their feet and get their act together and start acting as a council then to immediately, as soon as they are elected, impose Bill 50 on top of them which in essence will take away much of the powers, the way I see it, take away much of their powers and also will therefore be a structure over the top of them, an umbrella over the top of them, in which they had no input whatsoever.

Most of these councillors object, many of them object to the way it is done. The member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) was

MR. STRACHAN: discussing, for instance, and mentioned there was being co-operation from some of the incorporated councils, the newly elected councils. I know, for instance in the Portugal Cove one which he referred to that the councils only were given a call, one call from an M.H.A.'s to set up a meeting with the minister, and they met last Sunday - that was the first discussion held - this past Sunday, the first discussion held on a regional government for this area with these incorporated councils, newly incorporated council who have been in a place for - what now? - five, six, almost two months. The first discussion on a Sunday the day before the bill was introduced. How can you even talk about consultation! And surely the formation of a government structure such as this must take into place consultation with the people involved,

MR. STRACHAN: the people concerned, the councils and the people, the general public as well. I believe that most people in the area affected do not know anything about the bill, do not know what really is going to happen. It is complicated; it is complex. There are 149 sections to it. They do not understand what it is going to cost; they do not understand how it is going to be put into place. There are some questions and some sections which are very obvious and evident, but you notice that when the bill was first introduced, first spoken about, that the objections from people outside of the Legislature here was on a number of sections where power is given to the regional council, the regional council being appointed for a six month period then possibly for another year giving 1½ years of an appointed council forming this umbrella over the area with all the powers given to it.

Now we notice as time goes on - just today, for instance, or yesterday, the city council are now starting to ask deeper questions on exactly how much it is going to cost us, how we are going to support that kind of council, is it an over-regulated, over-governed body? For instance, I notice that Ray O'Neill, the Deputy Mayor there, states he considers that the salaries of the staff alone, if they were given the same salaries as city councillors, would come in excess of \$100,000, and that is only the council, without going through the appointments that my colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was discussing, without establishing the offices, the department heads - I notice they were all department heads - and on top of that there is a regional manager, the department heads and below that again, the council has the power to establish offices of regional collector, regional engineer, superintendent of works, inspector of buildings, chief of the regional fire brigade, regional treasurer, regional solicitor and other offices that they

MR. STRACHAN: deem necessary. So obviously, what we are talking about is a tremendous, giant structure, a mini-government virtually, although I will come to my discussion on that later on over this whole area. But what is worse is the absolutely arrogant way it is being introduced by the minister. 'Whether the people like it or not,' he has said in the Legislature - unbelievable to listen to - in his introduction, 'Whether people like it or not they are going to get it.' And I have never heard in government these kinds of statements of 'whether people like it or not, whether they want it or not, they are going to get it'. Surely, this is taking the power of the government far too far. Surely, what you are doing is the danger of removing yourself totally from the people and becoming virtually a form of modern dictatorship in a democratic country. You cannot do that. You cannot say that. As a government you have serious responsibilities and you cannot say that whether people like it or not they are going to get it, not in 1978. It is exactly the same as the spray programme, 'Whether you like it or not you are going to get it. It is not an individual choice, you are going to get it.' Surely I feel that the minister also in his method of handling it in which he introduced this bill exactly as he introduced his estimates, I think a year ago and an attack on his enemies, an attack on people who dared to criticize some sections of the bill, attacked people who were forming groups, attacked people who were questioning, asking legitimate questions, attacking outside the member, Mr. Fahey, who was organizing a protest against it on legitimate grounds. It is his right to go organize a protest. The minister came in with nothing but attack. Instead of coolly, calmly, quietly explaining the structure of the bill, the first thing he wanted to do was attack.

MR. STRACHAN: I remember last year when he introduced his estimates he tried that tack. He did not try it again this year. This year in his estimates he changed his tune altogether and did not try that method but back he comes with this bill and immediately takes issue with his supposed enemies as he sees them because they are there to question some of the sections. Surely that is being totally arrogant.

AN HON. MEMBER: The people are his enemies.

MR. STRACHAN: That letter, for instance, the arrogance of the letter which he sent to Mr. Fahey, the tone of the letter

Mr. Strachan: that he is not going to bow to the whims of people, that he is not going to have anything to do with that. The whole tone of the letter is a tone of arrogance. The minister is in over his head, totally out of his depth altogether. He is in over his head or out of his depth altogether on this bill. I feel that he has railroaded it through because I think what could be done very easily would be to discuss, sit down and have working groups, committees, meetings with the councils, the councils which are objecting, the ones that were formed two months ago -

MR. NEARY: Use that on the other end.

MR. STRACHAN: - were never given any opportunity at all.

MR. NEARY: Get a little softer kind of paper, put it out in the men's room.

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

MR. STRACHAN: However my main concern, Mr. Speaker, my main concern with the bill itself as I look through it, because obviously in Labrador one says, "What has this bill got to do with the member for Labrador, somebody representing a Labrador seat?" But we have been advocating regional government for years and years, talking about regional government, the concept of regional government. We have debated it for Labrador in this Chamber. I have debated it in the last three years. We advocate it. We support the concept of regional government. We do not support the method that is being done by the present minister. And furthermore the type of regional government set up, the type of operation set up with this Bill 50 is an expanded municipal services. It does not to me form the kind of regional government model which can be applied to other parts of this Province. It cannot be applied. It is not a model to be used for other parts of this Province because in essence what it does it is just an expanded municipal services, making sure that the power is held by a few, giving them rights and authority, the powers to appoint people, the powers to tax people without spelling out in detail the exact costs, what it is going to cost. The minister gave one example only of the water costs, for instance, but did not give examples of all of the other costs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us when he stands up and specify exactly the kind of sums, obviously he cannot be very specific, but he can give the kind of ballpark figures of what this bill will cost, this regional government structure that is being proposed here will cost the taxpayer, will cost, what the different sections will cost. That is not being spelled out. So what you are doing is evoking a bill, setting up a bill, overloading the people without telling them exactly how much it is going to cost.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$25,000 is not -

MR. STRACHAN: Furthermore, I also believe, and I felt this, that the history of municipal services or municipal government in the St. John's region is probably, and I can say very safely obviously, it is probably very backward; in fact, some of the communities were only recently incorporated a few weeks ago. Many councils outside of the St. John's area have been incorporated for years, many, many years. In fact, many of these councils are far more sophisticated in their operation than these councils in the St. John's areas which have just been formed and just trying to find their feet.

So what I am stating then is that it seems ironic to me that councils which were only formed a few weeks ago are then slapped in the face with this, in fact, many of them feel that the regional government proposed here or this expanded municipal services proposed here with the controls given in this bill virtually wipes them out.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: Many of them feel what was the need for going through the process of incorporating, and I know that from people I have talked to in some of the newly formed councils, when virtually what it does is wipe out and makes them feel that it was not worth the effort, that here they are trying to find their feet, here they are trying to go down the road so as three or four or five years from now they will have a council in place, they will have experience, they will have staff, they will be able to handle their own small area. And on top of this a bill is shoved out at them without giving them any time at all to have

Mr. Strachan: any input into it. Already many of these councils have got amendments ready for the bill; before the bill is even passed in this House, they have amendments ready for the bill. Surely it is foolish to me to have a bill which is being debated here, with councils outside of here having amendments ready to pass in to the minister so that when this

MR. STRACHAN: becomes law they want it amended immediately.

I mean surely in this case, the process of consultation that these groups with a working paper would have allowed them the opportunity to have input into the bill, rather than to form a structured bill like this, ram it through the House and then say later on, "Do not worry about it; we can change it. You give us your amendments." And two weeks, the two weeks it has been circulated, these councils two weeks, twelve days that it has been circulated, these councils are putting together some amendments, as yet as far as I see, very, very few people who agree with the whole concept of the bill, everything in the bill. There are sections of the bill that they disagree with violently, very strongly.

MR. MURPHY: We are talking about St. John's. You must be talking about Nain.

MR. NEARY: Go up in your own seat if you want to say something.

MR. STRACHAN: What are you talking about?

MR. MURPHY: How many hundreds of people in St. John's are going to be -

MR. NEARY: Go up in your own seat.

MR. STRACHAN: I met with the Council of St. Phillips. I met with the Council of Portugal Cove.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is lipping off from somebody else's seat.

MR. STRACHAN: I met with them. They were here. I met with them.

MR. PECKFORD: Did you explain the bill?

MR. STRACHAN: No. No. Not at all. But they wanted to discuss it with us because they had amendments ready. They were getting down and studying the bill and were questioning some of the sections. But then I discussed some of these sections of the bill with them before the minister did, because I was concerned about regional government.

MR. STRACHAN: The fact that it is a bill for St. John's does not give the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) the right to think that no one else can speak on it. It is a regional government bill and I am very concerned about regional government, extremely concerned about regional government.

MR. NEARY: Doody will not talk about Bell Island. Bell Island is excluded.

MR. STRACHAN: We have advocated, Mr. Speaker, we have advocated for a long time a regional government process, a model for regional government which could spread to other areas. We have advocated this. The Burin Peninsula, for instance, the people there want regional government. They have discussed it, talked about it, but I hope that the regional government process on the Burin Peninsula will not be this process here; that it will be a working paper that the bill before it comes in finally in form here, despite all the studies. You put all the studies together, you get recommendations, but the final bill put together here surely should have been discussed with the councils.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: If there was then why there are objections to some of the sections here? Almost unqualified. St. Phillips the other day said they agreed with the principle of the bill. Nobody is arguing that. But they said they have certain sections of it they would like to see amended and they want to see amended. Surely, if there are as many amendments in some of these troublesome sections, could it not have been incorporated in the bill?

MR. DINN: Pertinent (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: You are taking notes. I will get a few notes in a minute with you.

So what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is we feel that surely a small delay in this bill to allow them to change parts of the bill to spell out the costs, which is a very legitimate question; surely people ask how much is this regional government going

MR. STRACHAN: to cost us, that is quite a legitimate question. How much are we going to be taxed? If they question the appointment of people, surely these are legitimate questions. And surely I feel that people should be given time, answers, working groups, around the bill itself, to try to work out these kind of situations, work out these questions, give some answers, try to make amendments, instead of preparing amendments now and getting amendments ready so that as soon as the bill becomes law they will be coming in and looking for amendments to be made to it.

Section (9) is it where the appointment, surely if one is saying that people have the right to run their own affairs that a government should be in form, I cannot understand the justification at all. I seriously cannot understand the justification for the appointed positions and I would like to hear the minister later on, because we will have plenty of time to discuss it, the second reading now and the committee stage when we get down to all the clauses here -

MR. NEARY: July, August or September.

MR. STRACHAN: Regatta day will come and this bill will still be being discussed here.

MR. DINN: We have got lots of time.

MR. STRACHAN: Oh, lots of time. Plenty of time.

MR. DINN:

MR. STRACHAN: We have lots of time because we are going to make sure there is lots of time. If you had your way you would have it through yesterday or the day before. You will have lots of time, we will guarantee you. Lots and lots of time. Plenty of time. Plenty of time.

MR. DINN:

MR. STRACHAN: Sure. Absolutely. We are all set for it. We are dug in for the Summer.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have nothing else to do.

MR. STRACHAN: It is no problem at all; no difficulty at all. So if the minister wants we will be here until August or September until the people in the area, the councils will get time to study the bill; they will get time to have some input into it because the bill will not be law, because we will stand there and debate this bill and keep debating this bill. We can only talk at the moment for forty-five minutes on the principle of it but when we get to committee stage, we can keep going in committee stage ad infinitum. We are prepared over here, we have discussed it, to go on shifts possibly, on a shift arrangement so that we can always have men in here and people out, go on a shift arrangement to discuss this bill and to debate this bill.

MR. NEARY: All day, all night, Mary Ann.

MR. STRACHAN: So that people then will get the time anyway, regardless of what procedure is used, people will get the time.

MR. MURPHY: Do not worry about (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said I am deeply concerned that this, this model for Regional Government, this Bill 50 will not be used as a model. As I see it, we have a different situation than other areas of the Province; certainly in Labrador it would not fit at all. The bill is an expanded municipal services bill really, it is not a Regional Government concept as such that I can see. What we are talking about is time to satisfy a very different set of circumstances in Labrador and I would trust that the members opposite are going to have the time to bring in such legislation, but I would trust, just in case they try to squeeze something through, they would not want to use this as any kind of model to apply to other areas. I would hope that in any future bills of this sort there would be a great deal of consultation with active councils, with active incorporated groups who will be given the opportunity to have input, these new councils. These new councils have got to be upset, the minister must realize that.

MR. DINN: The hon. member does not want me to come to Labrador for at least five years, which is how long that takes, with all the consultations with lawyers and that -

MR. NEARY: Go away boy.

MR. DINN: - has to be done.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister does not know much about Labrador, that is for sure.

MR. NEARY: A waste of time and money.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister does not know that much about Labrador anyway.

MR. NEARY: Paying off your party to the -

MR. STRACHAN: So, Mr. Speaker, this was the question, surely I feel that this could have been done in a different way, it could have gone through this House very easily. I think it could have been agreed to by the councils, I think it could have been a different situation altogether had it not been given the method of attack, a method in which there was friction created, it could have been a bill which could have been discussed because there was no pride involved. Surely pride should not be a stumbling block in trying to discuss and allow people input into the bill. Surely I think that people who have objected to sections of the bill, I think the people have handled themselves very well, in a very reasonable, sensible, legitimate, legal way objected to it. But surely they have a right, they are arguing on some principles. I do not see them screaming at the minister, I do not see them screaming at government as such. They are arguing the principles, they want some sections changed, they are arguing some points, they want to know the costs, they want to know exactly what is going to happen to them in unincorporated areas, what is going to happen to the incorporated areas, the new ones, exactly what the power of a Regional Council would have over, for instance, St. Phillip's and Portugal Cove and the other areas there, what exactly powers does the council have. I think they are asking quite legitimate questions and I think that they have to, I think there is no pride lost in reconsidering this kind of bill, there is no pride lost in trying to allow people some time some kind of input into the actual bill itself. And that is what the argument was about, the actual bill itself, what we are arguing about is allowing people input into it so that the phraseology, the method of writing, the clauses and so on would be discussed

June 23,1978

Tape No. 4776

AH-3

MR.STRACHAN: at all times with people so that the bill would be an composite of people rather than a bill which is set up here and people will continue to start arguing on. Surely the arguments should not be held in public places,surely it should be to working committees. What we are talking about here is that we question the right, we are not against the Regional Government concept, we are totally for that kind of Regional Government not only in the St. John's area but elsewhere in the Province. It surely can work

MR. STRACHAN: but surely it has to be a process in which even the final piece of legislation must be discussed with the councils and the public involved. Surely it should be spelled out to people, everyone in the areas concerned because they are going to be taxed, it is a form of government which is being formed that they are going to have to deal with. There is going to be a bureaucracy of necessity. Surely they should have say into what is going to happen, exactly how it is going to be formed, even into the clauses of the bill.

We are not objecting to the studies that have been going on since, as the minister said, 1957. It was brought in in 1957 but never carried out. Surely what we are saying is that there have been studies, there have been plans, projects but what we are arguing about is bill 50 itself. Bill 50 itself should have been circulated in a working paper form. There should have been discussions not after it was drafted, but discussions before it was drafted. When it was put together then have discussions, working committees working with each of the councils and then filling in the bill and if there was opposition to some sections discuss it, debate it before it was brought in as legislation. Surely that should have been the form for bill 50.

The argument that Portugal Cove, St. Phillips and some of the others are putting to us is basically, they did not have a copy of the bill, they did not know what was going to be in the bill until the bill was formed. And that is a legitimate argument. As far as I am concerned they have a very, very legitimate argument.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!

Would the hon. member just

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): permit me a moment?

As this is Thursday and as it is five o'clock, I have to inform hon. members of the matters that will come up at the adjournment debate.

The first matter is job creation programmes which will be debated by the hon. member for Terra Nova with the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development. The second matter, unemployment in the Province which will be debated by the hon. member for LaPoile with the hon. Minister of Finance.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing that I would like the minister, and later on in the discussion I will get down to it, is that there has been some discussion about people being overgoverned, that here we are with a form of bureaucracy in which we have government, regional government, municipal government and as follows form all the boards and all the different things, we are being totally overgoverned. In fact, to me it often makes me feel, when I come to St. John's and in the period of time that I have stayed here, that in the St. John's area we are overgoverned and in the area of the Province I come from we have no government. So surely a regional government concept would be not to overgovern. The regional government concept should be put into place in areas where it is very, very difficult to govern, where it is very, very difficult to get out the programmes and projects. So surely regional government, as I see it, should not have started in the St. John's area but should have started in some of the other areas of the Province probably furthest away from the seat of government, areas which could be linked or tied together, areas which desperately needed it, areas which have no idea of government programmes. And I do not see that being done, I cannot see it being done

MR. STRACHAN: by taking a government department from here and setting up a couple of offices in Labrador City or an office in Goose Bay and putting in the odd civil servant. I do not see that as a form of decentralization which is good. If we are going to go the regional route which many of us have studied in Labrador - the people in Labrador West and in Happy Valley - Goose Bay often get together in discussions; in fact, I believe they have a paper ready which may even be presented - I do not know if it has been received by the members opposite - on regional government for the area. I am sure that can also apply to the Burin Peninsula, their type of regional government.

I am sure on the West coast and probably in Central Newfoundland and the Northern Peninsula area, that these types of areas are where regional government is really required and should be, as I see it, the starting place for regional government rather than the St. John's area, either of these places, it is immaterial to me. But surely regional government as a form should be in a form where one can help to govern the area wisely and logically. I see here what we are adding is another structure, another bureaucracy before it is all worked out and this is why I am deeply concerned about it.

I am sure that if we had argued for this and tried to get this regional government set up in Labrador, in this kind of form there would be many, many objections to it, it would be debated. All we want is our own government up there. In fact, what we are

Mr. Strachan:

trying to do is trying to look for a system in which we can hold the Province together through regional systems, because surely the problems which one area has are different from another area, and the bills cannot apply. It will have to be something totally different, and totally different concept.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill here essentially is an expanded municipal services bill rather than a regional government concept as we see it in any kind of political form. So it is a misnomer in fact in many ways to talk about it as a Regional Government Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: This is a specific region, I have no argument about that. As he says it is a Water Committee or a Water Board or because of basic problems with water in the St. John's area. What it is the region is spelled out - I do not think it is the boundaries are exactly spelled out - but it is a region, and therefore it is called regional government. I do not see it as a Regional Government Bill at all. To me the bill is very much an expanded municipal services rather than the City of St. John's expand, is what they are doing is to take it all in and have one big sweep. That is the way that I see it totally; rather than to have St. John's City expand, and there are people who are objecting to that, in this way, what they are doing is imposing another form. And I cannot see it exactly as a kind of regional government concept that would apply anywhere else in the Province, but I do not know if it will apply very successfully here. I think that is going to be seen. There are going to be some real problems I think come up in the application of this. I think it is holding over the heads of people that essentially the bill will allow the area to get money, I have heard that many, many times, in essence, what it will allow is to go to DREE or go to other groups and so on, but I think you can get that system now, I think, I do not know what the system is in the area here. But I wonder if the minister could when he gets up to talk on his bill and close this bill whether he could explain exactly how the money is envisaged coming in here, into this area, and exactly

Mr. Strachan: where the money will come from, and what the cost will be to the people for these expanded municipal services that are being provided for in the bill, exactly how this can be taxed, how people are going to be taxed.

I am also concerned in looking at it how this argument of double taxation as to whether you will pay one service fee and then pay another or pay water taxes, whether there will be a system of double taxation. If it is not then exactly how will it be done, and how will the other local councils be able to gain revenue or do whatever they have to do. Exactly how will that work? And I feel there are so many, many questions on that, questions on the whole cost part of the project which I do not think are clearly spelled out. I think the minister should, and that is what I expected him to do when he stood up to introduce the bill, that the minister would explain very carefully in very detailed some of the costs that people will be faced with. We say that it is going to be a user pay concept that people will be paying for what they use. But how will we pay for the buildings, the offices, the obvious tremendous structure which is suggested in this bill, the offices, the department heads, the offices of the regional collectors, the engineers and so on, how was that proposed? How is that envisaged to work? And where does this interface, with the council, for instance, especially the City of St. John's. Where does this interface with St. John's? The regional engineers, for instance, the collectors, the planning, that whole concept. Where does that interface? I am concerned as to how we can reduce the friction because there is going to be an interface, and the way I see it is that from the atmosphere created now or from discussions, obviously by statements by the Deputy Mayor and other councillors, they seem to have the attitude now that there is going to be a fight right from the start.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: I will leave that to the minister to argue. All I am stating is that if there is an interface, obviously what is going to occur is that there will be considerable friction right from the

June 22, 1978

Tape 4778

PK - 3

Mr. Strachan: start, and surely that is not the way that a regional government should come about. Surely it should be born out of the people rather than being imposed on top.

And that is our whole argument. Our whole

MR. STRACHAN:

argument here is that we are not against the concept at all. The concept is an excellent concept of regional government. But this kind of bill, this kind of situation here, this kind of structure is not what we would envisage. The sections in it, the appointed people, surely a regional government with appointed people for possibly a year and a half is surely a wrong way of bringing in a government. What you are saying is that people are not fit to govern themselves, people cannot govern themselves, they have not the ability to govern themselves, this is such a complex arrangement and bureaucracy that we are going to do is rather than govern themselves by an elected process, what we will do is we will appoint. And our question is that is a very serious error in the bill, as far as we are concerned, this idea of appointing rather than not having elections right from the start. I cannot see why elected people cannot do the job. I cannot see. I am sure that elected people could do a job just equally as well as some of the people who will be appointed. In fact, people who are very serious about it who will be serious in the regional government concept would be a very keen I am sure to run for office in this area, in this regional - this expanded region whatever you want to call it; it is hardly a regional government. They would be very keen to run, I am sure, and surely these are the people who you would want, the people with enthusiasm, rather than appointed people, because one of our real problems in government is that our bureaucracy often runs us and then the elected people have no control over them. One of the real problems, I always thought many years that there were three parties in this Province - that was before the rise of the small group from the NDP - but there was three parties in this Province, there was the Liberal Party - and I thought this in 1967 and 1968 when I first started dealings with the government - that there was the Liberal Party and the PC Party, and Confederation Building. The third party was

MR. STRACHAN:

Confederation Building because it

often seemed to me that Confederation Building and the civil service and the bureaucracies had far more power in their hands than the elected people had. They wanted to come in - and I always remember, for instance, working on a proposal for a fish plant down in St. Mary's Bay in 1968. I was doing a study in it at that time and prepared the proposal and coming into government here. Now what happened was that although the elected representative and the House agreed with it, the minister at the time agreed with it, the bureaucracy down below it did not fit into their plan and therefore they just sat on it. And although the proposal, the formal proposal that I submitted was very detailed and it was used as a model for all other proposals come into the department, it never came about because in effect it was sat on for a long, long time and in essence died a natural death in the end.

But I am often concerned what we are doing here then in this bill is setting up a bureaucracy, and by your appointed members therefore getting into a situation which your bureaucracy cannot be touched by the people, where the people cannot get at it, where the people have no hold over it, where people cannot decide serious questions. And surely what we not trying to do - or not saying in this bill is that the people in the St. John's area do not have sufficient knowledge about government that they cannot run their own affairs. A surely this must be a very wrong section in any bill where people have the power to appoint, give all the powers through appointment and call it a regional government. Because how can it be a regional government? It is no government when it is appointed. In a free country there is no government when it is appointed. One elects a government in a democratic system, one does not appoint a government. I am very surprised in fact that there was not more outcry. Probably people do not realize it in the area. It is getting close to holiday time, schools will soon be out

MR. STRACHAN: but I am sure that if this bill had come in in November or in the Winter active period when people follow the news, where the people watch television a lot, where people read more during the Winter season that this bill would have got more opposition than it is now because in essence what we are doing is -

AN HON. MEMBER: It has no support either.

MR. STRACHAN: Right. And I think what we are doing is that we are imposing a form of government on top, that we are not allowing it to go through the democratic process right from the start. It is almost like a slap in the face, as I see it, that what we are saying is that you are not able or capable of running your own government or your own area so therefore we must appoint. I am not satisfied with the minister's introduction here when he discussed this, and said, there

MR. STRACHAN: was ability for instance to change this, this will be changed as soon as possible, there will not be this control; but it does, in fact, allow a year and a half of an appointed board to rule this area, to govern this area with tremendous powers, absolutely tremendous powers which are necessary, very necessary, but not necessary powers for an appointed member, not necessary powers for anything else but for elected people, and surely the area and the people, the citizens concerned in the area, have the ability, have the education, have the understanding, the capability and the professionalism to run their own area. What we are saying in this bill essentially, by imposing these kinds of sections into it is that the people do not have the capability to run and govern themselves, that we have to do it for them, we have to show them the way and set it all up for them and later on down the road they can then do it on their own - we will turn it over to them. They can then get through once we have a system in place. And our question here is, What system is going to be in place? Who is going to be appointed? Who are the members for all these prestigious positions with these powers given to them? Exactly what controls will they have? What powers of taxation will they have? How much will it cost? Surely these are all very legitimate questions that people have a right to ask without being shouted at, screamed at or told that they have no rights at all, that if they are not elected representatives, like Mr. Fahey, if you are not an elected representative you have no right to question. Surely every person in the area has a right to question this bill, elected or non-elected. If all we are saying is that the only ones who have the right to question a bill

MR. STRACHAN: are the councils, then I think that it is totally wrong, absolutely wrong. Every resident, every citizen has a right to question the Act, the bill, what is going to happen to them, because it is going to govern their lives and they are going to have to pay for it eventually somehow. And so they have the right, and I think there is no way in the world you can introduce a bill such as regional government and tell people that 'whether you like it or not you are going to get it, and you should not be questioning because you are not an elected representative.'

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: To me that is a totally wrong, totally arrogant position to take.

MR. NEARY: You are not going to speak on this, are you? Wabana is not included and the other is Holyrood so forget it.

MR. DOODY: There is not too much of Labrador (inaudible) that is not in it.

MR. NEARY: No, but it is the principle of the thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, well, that -

MR. NEARY: Yes, but you cannot (inaudible) manage to get their two areas excluded.

MR. STRACHAN: That is what I am telling them. It is the principle of the thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

AN HON. MEMBER: But you cannot get into this.

MR. NEARY: He wants regional government in Labrador but not that kind that is in Bill No. 50.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I believe the hon. member is having difficulty in speaking.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the interruptions.

MR. STRACHAN:

Mr. Speaker, I said basically the points that I wanted to get across. As I said, there are talks now already of amending the bill. People are talking of bringing amendments in. I am sure that in a few weeks to come people will be coming in with lists of amendments to the minister, they want the bill to be amended, and to me it sounds crazy before the bill is passed, before it has become law, before it is passed in this Legislature that people are already talking of amendments. Surely these amendments could have been incorporated very quickly, I suggest again as my colleagues have suggested, if not the White Paper route certainly I would have thought before final presentation in the House here as a bill through working committees. I also do not agree with public meetings in many forms for these kinds of things, but I think the people who find it necessary and who want to have input will have input through a more serious form of working committees, because myriad times in public meetings all that occurs there is a platform for people to scream or shout at each other or get off what they want to get out of their system rather than be a working situation where positive and good practical suggestions are taken and implemented. And I suggest therefore, that the myriad times this would be the way to work. For instance, I notice in dealing with all the councils in Labrador that when they come together as a group, many times civil servants and elected representatives who meet with them find it is an impossible situation because in essence there was a great deal of competition, an intense situation and people will question. Rather than be worried about what the answer is, they are almost ready with the next series of questions. And, in fact, out of all the meetings that have been held, I often see very little coming out of it which is productive.

MR. STRACHAN: Most of the productivity and the work and the councils and the groups that are formed have come from working sessions, quiet working sessions and working committees. I would suggest that I have seen, I often believe, far too many sessions with large groups at public gatherings which provide nothing at all constructive. But it should go through a working committee stage, and that is exactly what we feel should have been done here. A working committee could have been held, the people could have been allowed some input rather than come in, say, like last Sunday where the minister met with two or three councils, I believe - two councils anyway the minister met with last Sunday when the bill was actually put together - new councils, people who wondered where their powers were all going, people who did not know what was hitting them. people who had serious, serious questions.

I feel that the minister would be well advised - and I do not know whether he has dug his heels in so far that his pride has taken possession of him completely - he would be well advised to bring this in at the Fall session. To me it would make sense for the bill to be in the form of a working paper, the councils meet, they will probably want to meet again and again and again, five or six meetings with these councils, and then come back to the Fall session and at the Fall session present it to the -

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!

I have to tell the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. STRACHAN: My time has elapsed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! Be leave!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, in concluding then, I would just like to indicate that I cannot support the

MR. STRACHAN: bill as it stands, I cannot support some of the sections of the bill and especially that appointed area. I think it is wrong for a democratic country.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) in or out?

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. DOODY: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is greeting me with his usual degree of enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points that have been raised over the past few days particularly, points probably which should have been raised over the past few years particularly, which I would like to address myself to for a few moments this afternoon, the concerns that a number of people have or seem to have and which hon. members opposite have used to some advantage and have played on.

One of the big bugaboos in this particular piece of legislation appears to be this lack of consultation thing which has been constantly harped on and constantly talked about. Now this to me and to many people who are aware and familiar with the situation should be something that many people in this area should be a little bit hesitant about singing out. I can remember not too long ago, perhaps four or five years ago when the Henley Commission was formed and subsequently held a series of meetings all over this area and many people who were concerned and interested in the St. John's area and in the various items that the Henley Commission recommended presented themselves at these hearings, discussed the matters of concern, put forward their viewpoints, raised objections, made suggestions, and the various meetings that I attended

MR. DOODY: I cannot remember seeing any of the hon. members opposite there. The hon. member for - He may have been from Bell Island at that time. I think that was before the great track event. In any event, Sir, many of those people who are suddenly showing a great deal of concern and interest and rightly so, are really telling this area, the people in it, the 160 some thousand people in it they were completely indifferent for the years that this bill was being formulated and the massive document on which it was based, the Henley Commission.

There were meetings, hearings, discussions week after week, briefs presented, arguments for and against. There was eventually a concise document prepared on the hearings themselves and on the opinions and impressions of the commissioners which was presented to government and it was studied and examined and discussed. Once again, not a great deal of input from any of the people who are making a lot of noise very suddenly.

And what is the noise being made about, Mr. Speaker? What are the points of interest, the points of concern, the points that everybody is so upset about?

MR. DOODY: And everybody being upset, of course, is in a sort of rhetorical sense.

The expanded city would make St. John's happy, the city of St. John's - and I do not mean the people who live in the city of St. John's, the citizens of St. John's - because I have lived here for a great many years and I have a great many neighbours and a great many friends and I do not hear them very loudly exclaiming or defending the views of some of the city councillors. And what is it exactly that the city councillors here are asking for? They are not against regional government. I have not heard anybody speaking about this. Who is against regional government? Well, what are they for? They are for an expanded city. They want the city boundaries to be expanded to take in those unincorporated and in some cases incorporated areas, wrap them within the tender embrace of City Hall and let them pray, pay and obey for the rest of their lives under that antiquated, terrible municipal tax structure and system that we have here in the city of St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Now I think that if the city of St. John's is really interested in expanding its boundaries, as well it should be, then it should get about the business of presenting a package that the people outside the city and living in that particular area are prepared to live with. The people in the many areas in the suburban part or the outlying part of the city or the outlying areas adjacent to the city are not all opposed to paying taxes. Many of them outside the city limits are paying more taxes now than people inside the city limits. So that is not a matter of concern. The matter of concern that has been expressed in various meetings that I have attended and the various discussions which I have heard or been privy to

MR. DOODY: is the type of system of taxation that we have here in the city of St. John's, and in order to get that expanded city boundary that is necessary in the long run, it is going to have to be done with the will and consent of the people who live in these areas out there. And the only way that is going to be done, Mr. Speaker, is by creating a climate within the City in a dignified and less contentious matter than we have now, that these people would be anxious and willing to get into. The people in Mount Pearl, the people in New Town, the people in Kilbride, the people in Wedgewood Park, are not in the least bit interested in becoming part of an expanded city of St. John's, would not have any part of it, Sir, would not touch it, not interested in getting involved in it, would not go near it. However, they, like everybody else who talks about the bill, say that we must have regional government and it is high time we had regional government.

Well, what kind of regional government do they want? The hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen)

shakes his head, scowls, frowns and dismisses it all with an abrupt gesture as complete rubbish and nonsense. Obviously, any argument that does not agree with the hon. member's rationale is rubbish and nonsense. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and myself have had some differences on philosophy and argument before and I have no doubt that we will again.

What else is wrong with this particular bill? Obviously, an expanded city is wrong. We are not making some of the city councillors and at least one of the city members happy because we are not rushing out pell-mell and driving inside the city boundaries those people who live outside and do not want to come in. Obviously that is something that is wrong with the bill, we are not forcing the city of St. John's down the throats

MR. DOODY: of the people of Mount Pearl or New Town or Wedgewood Park or Portugal Cove or those unincorporated areas, Kilbride. That is obviously wrong and that is not democratic and that is not reasonable, that is not consultation, that is heavy booting, jack-booted arrogance and ignorance, Mr. Speaker. So hon. members opposite are against that.

And what else, Sir, are we against? Well, Conception South is also against it. Conception South is an area with which I am reasonably conversant, very familiar. I have lived there for a great many years and had the honour of representing that part, which was then part of the Harbour Main district. Now why would Conception South be against this bill? because in Conception South, Sir, is a regional government now.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DOODY: Conception Bay South is a regional government that controls and governs Topsail, Upper Gullies, Kelligrews, Manuels, Long Pond; Greeley Town is not in; Peach Town is not in; Foxtrap is not in; part of Seal Cove is in, part of Seal Cove is out; Indian Pond is out; Paradise has a council of its own, so it is not in

AN HON. MEMBER: Topsail Pond?

MR. DOODY: Topsail Pond is partly into Paradise and partly out in the netherland, it is nowhere. And so, Sir, there is a Regional Government of sorts in place in Conception South. Now Conception South big rationale for accepting this government under protest, it was rammed down their throats at the time, it was appointed by the then government, the then administration against the wishes of many of the people in the community.

I have to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get. It is too bad I was just getting into the history of Conception South. Will somebody remind me where I left off, Sir, because I am getting warmed to this. It is a very interesting topic. I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! As it is Thursday the so-called late show is now the proceeding that we go into. The first matter to be debated is by the hon. member for Terra Nova, job creation programmes, with the hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

The hon. member

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, somewhere between here and the Chair some of the words on my question got a little mixed up, I think. By the way, my question to the Minister of Industrial Development was illustrating my concern, my grievous concern, and I am sure the concern of a lot of hon. members, for the high rate of unemployment in the Province and with that concern in mind I ask the minister would he undertake to pursue the possibility and the feasibility with his Cabinet colleagues of setting up a Select Committee of the House to come up with some efficient and some effective solution to our outrageously high unemployment. Not to study the problem, Mr. Speaker, not to study it, I notice the question was to come up with solutions to the problem because the unemployed, the 37,000 Newfoundlanders who are now unemployed, they are not interested in being studied, they do not want any long dissertations on the debilitating effects of being unemployed. This they know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: They know this all too well. It might be a good exercise, a good academic exercise probably to do this, to talk about the

MR. LUSH: debilitating effects of being unemployed and the demoralizing defects, all of this sort of thing, it might be a good exercise to impress upon those people who do not know what it is like to be unemployed or those who have forgotten what it is like to be unemployed. But, Mr. Speaker, my idea was to set up this Select Committee, members from both sides of the House to study, to come up with some solutions to the problem, to come up with some solutions in getting our economy moving and thus coming up with some employment strategy so that we can get jobs for our people, that was the idea. To allow this committee, one, of course, to probably study the people's Commission on Unemployment so that those of us, as I have intimated earlier, who have forgotten what it is like to be unemployed or never knew what it was like to be unemployed, it is a good starting ground to study that so that we know what it is like, that we know the debilitating effects of being unemployed, to start there but then to go further than that; to meet with business people, to meet with industry and to meet with labour, to discuss solutions to the problem, how we can get the stagnant economy moving so that we can create jobs. To meet with members of the federal government, to meet with them because they are going to have to become involved as well. I know they are involved now in their job grants but we are going to have to look to something more permanent, more effective, more efficient, we are going to have to come up with an effective and efficient employment strategy for the people who are unemployed, the 37,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are frustrated, worried, see no hope, Mr. Speaker. This Summer a lot of them face the grim prospects of unemployment running out and no prospects for a job. No prospects, Mr. Speaker, of putting bread on the table. The young people have no hope of finding a job so that they can pursue their education, no hope of getting back to the university this year, no hope of getting into the trade school or whatever, that is the grim prospect, Mr. Speaker, that they face this Summer. I do not think that

MR. LUSH: this House of Assembly should close until we take some positive action, until the government demonstrates its concern, its interest, its understanding, its sympathy, and its empathy for the unemployed of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for members of this House to leave here whenever it closes, if it does indeed close during the Summer; but if it does there is no need for members to leave this House without the government setting up this select committee to show its concern, take some positive action. Set up this selection committee so that during the Summer months this committee can meet with labour, business and with members of the federal government to discuss solutions to the problem. And come back here in the Fall session and give a report to the House. List the solutions. List some ideas. List some suggestions. Give some direction to the provincial government, to this particular government, and the route that they can take to get the economy of this Province rolling again.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with my hon. friend as far as the very serious concern we all have, I am sure I am speaking for all members of the House, about our high rate, extremely high rate of unemployment and I am sure we do not have to point out the problems. We know the problems and the problem areas and indeed a great deal of work has been done and is ongoing for a great length of time, I should say, since this started a couple of years ago in trying to get programmes off the ground to alleviate this terrific problem we are having in Newfoundland and Labrador and which of course is true in a great many other provinces as well. And I think I should mention some of the programmes that have helped greatly in our opinion, and in my opinion, such as rural development and rural development grants to assist small businesses in various parts of the Province. I should like to mention Hinds Lake,

DR. FARRELL: which I think will be a great help to the people on the Western part of the Island portion of our Province. I would like to mention the Linerboard because I think that was - the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) stated that the Divestiture Committee did not have many meetings. I think in my time in Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker, we have had daily meetings with different peoples and different portions of the Divestiture Committee and different officials concerning the Linerboard. It has been ongoing on a daily basis. And the increase in the fishery this year and the fishery programmes, an increase in its budget, will be of great help. And there are many other areas I could touch on. I do agree as I say again with the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in his concern and the Department of Industrial Development is certainly doing everything in its power through promotion, through meeting with different groups, and we are seeing different groups every day and I am happy to say that a great many people from outside the Province are very interested in the ocean orientated industries particularly. Now we are seeing people almost weekly in that area who are coming to visit us. We are sending people ourselves to areas, to seminars to point out our resources and our available possibilities for industry in the Province and I would, without any hesitation at all, and I did mention this to the hon. member previously in bringing this to Cabinet to see what possible merits and whether it would be feasible looking at what we are doing at the present moment, and discussing this with them on the possibility of a select committee of a nature which he has spoken about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The second item to be debate on the adjournment motion is by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with the hon. Minister of Finance, unemployment in the Province.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

June 22, 1978

Tape No. 4784

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, Sir, have been very critical and sometimes bitterly critical of the utter ineptness of the present government of this Province in dealing with increasing morale eroding unemployment in our Province, especially unemployment

Mr. Neary: among our young people. Many in the under twenty-five bracket, Sir, have never worked, and worse still have given up the hope of every finding employment. And yet, Mr. Speaker, while this is going on while we have record unemployment and the People's Commission on Unemployment gave us the real figures recently in their report, 57 per cent unemployment, only forty-three out of every hundred adults in this Province had a job. And so, Mr. Speaker, as they say, in 1977 there were more adult Newfoundlanders without a job than there were who had work. In 1977 the adult Newfoundlander who had a job was the exception rather than the rule.

And while this is going on, Sir, here we have a government bulldozing through this House inept and dubious programmes like the current spruce budworm spray fisaco, and the Regional Government Bill 50 that was discussed here again this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, the House is wasting its time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - on these abortive efforts, these abortive measures, and people sitting on the government side, Sir, the Premier and the Government House Leader, especially, have not given the House the opportunity to have a down to earth debate in this House on unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are not the ones, Sir, who call the Order of Business in this House. It is the Premier, the Government House Leader, and the members on the Government benches to Your Honour's left who call the order of business. And so far this session we have not had an opportunity to debate unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the minister can say, Oh, yes we had the Budget debate, and we had the Throne Speech debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the government bringing in measures, bringing in policies and programmes, bringing in make work projects that will help alleviate the high unemployment that we have in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Scandalous.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the government are hoping, Sir, are refusing to face up to the situation hoping that unemployment will go away by itself.

MR. NOLAN: Shame!

MR. NEARY: But with each month that passes, Sir, Statistics Canada and the People's Commission tell us that it is getting worse until it is now, Sir, completely out of control; it is cruel, and it is irritating to the rest of Canada, and it is the bitterest and harshest Newfie joke of all.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is disgraceful.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable for the Government House Leader and the Premier and his colleagues to allow another session of this House to draw to a close, another year go by without recognizing the existence of this number one problem unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is 'Doody's' fault. It is 'Doody'!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Action Group was supposed to - that is the People's Commission. The Action Group, Sir, was set up, we were told, to create jobs. They did nothing to create jobs, Sir.

MR. NOLAN: Only for themselves.

MR. NEARY: This Action Group has backfired on the government. It has even backfired as a public relations gesture or a public relations gimmick. Right from the beginning, Sir, it was a suspect as a waste of public money. And now it is proved to be a complete flop as a creator of jobs. And the Action Group should be dissolved. And this House as a whole, Sir, the elected members should get down to brass tacks on finding practical solutions to the unemployment problem in this Province. And we should also, Sir, look into the possibility of taking advantage, full advantage of federal programmes that we are not doing. Programmes, Sir, money in Ottawa, looking for programmes. And this crowd are sitting back on their haunches, either too lazy or the wind is gone out of them. They will not take the initiative and take full advantage of federal programmes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, since there is now no urgency to close down the House, Sir, after all of the school children have beaten us to their Summer vacations. My colleagues and I again, Sir, appeal to the Premier and to the hon. Government House Leader to place on the Order Paper for a thorough constructive debate before we give any thought to adjournment this most important matter of unemployment in this Province, especially unemployment among the under twenty-five, young men and women who are already hopelessly, Sir, reconciling themselves to a situation of joblessness for the rest of their life, and they want to spend their lives in this Province, Sir, and if they do manage to get an education, scrape through they are forced to leave the Province. And I think this is cruel, Sir, and it is a shame. It is about time that the government faced up to the situation. And anybody knows who has read the report of the people's Commission

MR. S. NEARY: on unemployment, that shows the real face of unemployment in this Province, Sir, would be ashamed to see this House closed without a thorough debate in this House on unemployment with constructive measures -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. S. NEARY: - being put forward that will alleviate the number one problem in this Province, namely, unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Collins) The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, firstly may I say that if there is one hon. gentleman in this House who has advocated the right to say that the opportunity to debate unemployment was not afforded in this House is the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. HICKMAN: If there is one debate that allows any hon. speaker to choose his or her topic and debate it in depth it is the Address in Reply debate, and there is a second one, the Budget debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman for LaPoile went for four and a half sitting days and never mentioned unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: And then, Mr. Speaker, we had the Budget debate and in the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NOLAN: A point of order.

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

A point of order has come up. I will have to hear the point of order.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, the Hansards will prove that when my hon. friend was speaking in the Throne Speech debate and the Budget debate that he made considerable reference in some detail to unemployment. Now surely even his colleagues over there

MR. NOLAN: will admit this. My friend the Minister of Transportation and Communications confirms what I have said.

MR. DOODY: Just to (inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: So surely the Minister of Justice above all others would not want to mislead the House, and that is exactly what he is doing as the Hansards will prove, Mr. Speaker, if you are willing to adjourn the House we can examine them and will prove my point. Surely the Minister of Justice would not want to convey a misleading impression such as he has just committed here and have it into the permanent records of this House.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Sir, I wish to confirm what my hon. colleague just said, Sir, that I have repeatedly, both in the Throne Speech and in the Budget Speech, on the late show, during the Question Period I have tried every parliamentary tactic, bit of strategy that I can to try to bring on a debate on unemployment. The government have refused to allow it to be debated. The kind of debate that I am asking for, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. gentleman is for the government to bring in proposals and platforms and policies that we can debate.

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

I do not really think that there is something -

MR. PECKFORD: May I speak to the that point of order, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are wasting his time.

MR. SPEAKER: Very briefly.

MR. PECKFORD: Very briefly, in thirty seconds or less.

The hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), a former

MR. PECKFORD: minister in the former government, and a person who is supposed to - he has been here long enough to learn the rules, has refused to learn the rules. He is totally ignorant of the rules and he has just demonstrated his ignorance again in this House this afternoon, as has the hon. member for LaPoile, total ignorance of the rules even though they are supposed to be the veterans in this House. There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Collins) Order, please!

On the point of order, I think we are dealing with a difference of memory and I do not think it is an issue that the Chair can settle.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen opposite have accomplished what they set to do. They just do not want a debate on unemployment. They will not let any hon. gentlemen debate it.

MR. S. NEARY: What are you going to do about it?

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that is relevant is this -

MR. S. NEARY: What are you going to do about it?

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

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. gentleman got up again and he talks about unemployment but not one constructive suggestion was given again in this five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Not one constructive suggestion. C-o-n-s-t-r-u-c-t-i-v-e.

MR. S. NEARY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has come up.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, Sir, if he is going to make an accusation ^{or} a charge, Sir, he should quote

MR. S. NEARY: me correctly. The hon. gentleman just made a statement that there was no positive suggestion -

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. PECKFORD: He cannot take it.

MR. S. NEARY: Let me remind the hon. gentleman that I did make one positive suggestion, and that is that the government take advantage of the federal programs that they are not taking advantage of.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S NEARY: For instance a program to cut the -

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

I have not heard a point of order and I think we are getting to an area of explanation and in any case I am afraid our time has run out.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday, June 23, 1978 at 10:00 A.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 22, 1978

June 23/78

QUESTION #85

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

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the Hospital at Carbonear showing in each case:
 - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
 - (b) the term of his appointment;
 - (c) the title of the position held, being it Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?

2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
 - (a) per diem allowance;
 - (b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses;
 - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?

ANSWER

Period of appointment - from date of appointment to March 31, 1979.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</u>
Mr. John Rorke	Chairman	April 1, 1976
Mr. G. Earle	Member	" " "
Mr. S.T. Jones	"	" " "
Mr. L.F.C. Pike	"	" " "
Mrs. Patricia Rorke	"	" " "
Mr. L. McNamara	"	" " "
Mr. A. Douglas Moore, LL.B.	"	" " "
Dr. A. T. Rowe	"	" " "
Mr. Harold Dawe	"	" " "
Mr. Wm. Saunders, Sr.	"	" " "
Mr. O. Parsons	"	" " "
Mr. Calvin Greene	"	" " "
Mr. John D. Anderson	"	March 7, 1978
Mr. Wendell Harnum	"	" " "
Mr. G. Cummings	"	April 1, 1976

2. (a) Nil
- (b) Out of pocket travel expense
- (c) Nil

June 1, 1978

June 29/78

QUEEN'S / 1034 # 103

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

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the Hospital at Grand Falls showing in each case:
 - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
 - (b) the term of his appointment;
 - (c) the title of the position held, being it Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?

2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
 - (a) per diem allowance;
 - (b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses;
 - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?

ANSWER

Period of appointment - two years.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</u>
Mr. A.J. Baker	Chairman	June 18, 1970
Father G.F. Grace	Member	April 1, 1978
John E. Moore	"	" " "
Mr. Eric Cumby	"	" " "
Mr. Robert Newhook	"	" " "
Mr. Walter Critchley	"	" " "
Mr. Hubert Smith	"	" " "
Mr. A.K. Evans	"	" " "
Mr. J. Forbes Brown	"	June 18, 1970
Mr. Ernest (Dick) Duder	"	April 1, 1976
Mr. Walwin Blackmore	"	January 22, 1975
Mr. Garfield Young	"	April 1, 1974
Mr. Retis E. Hancock	"	April 1, 1976
Mr. Hubert Barnes	"	July 17, 1974

2. (a) Nil
- (b) Out of pocket travel expenses
- (c) Nil

June 15, 1978

June 29/78

11111111

89

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

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the hospital at Carbonear showing in each case:
 - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
 - (b) the term of his appointment;
 - (c) the title of the position held, being it Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?

2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
 - (a) per diem allowance;
 - (b) travel, meal and accomodation expenses;
 - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?