

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1978

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. W. ROWE: Is the Premier coming in this morning?

Does the House Leader know? There is a question I wanted to direct to him.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not speak with him yet today. I understand he is going to Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: Well I am going to Corner Brook too but I am here.

MR. W. ROWE: There was a question I wanted to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, a grave matter, in my opinion, it is with reluctance I will ask the minister who is directly concerned the question himself, and let me see what his answer is, Sir. Let me preface the question by saying it is not a question, Sir, of innocence or guilt at this stage in proceedings. But the fact is, Sir, that grave allegations of impropriety and irregularity, which may be proved or disproved ultimately, have been made in sworn testimony by several public servants, at least two public servants, former and present public servants, against a couple of ministers of the Crown, two former Ministers of Public Works, Sir.

Now ministers of course are in a position of public trust. Does not the minister concerned, the present Minister of Labour, does not he think that it would be advisable to either suspend himself or have himself suspended until these matters of irregularities and improprieties or allegations that are being made are cleared up against him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I just returned—I was away for a couple of days—yesterday and it was my intention to talk with the Premier, the Premier is not in town today. It would be my intention not to make any comments because it would be my intention to appear before the commission at some point, whether by invitation or at my own request and say what I have to say there. So I will talk to the Premier in the next couple of days and see where it goes from there.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, a supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I say it is with grave reluctance that I am doing this, but does the minister not think, Sir, that he owes the House of Assembly some sort of an explanation. I understand he is going to give testimony before the commission itself, but does he not owe the House, upon which he depends for support, his very presence in the office is dependent on the support of this House, does he not think he owes the House of Assembly some explanation of these allegations of impropriety?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to appear before the commission because quite frankly I think I would get a much better hearing there than I would in the House of Assembly. And I will say what I have to say before that commission. As I say, I will talk to the Premier in the next few days and see where it goes from there.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the minister will appear before the enquiry and that is certainly welcomed news. His slight of the House is another issue but that is not the brunt or the central point of the question that has been raised by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition.

The question relates to the fact that the minister, the former minister of another department but now the

MR. SIMMONS: minister of a department which requires a large degree of trust and confidence by the public and certainly by his immediate staff, the question really, Mr. Speaker, is in view of the allegation—not what he is going to do about these allegations or whether he thinks or knows them to be true or false, that these are not the questions, Mr. Speaker—the question is very simply, in view of the fact that the allegations have been made and have been repeated, made in the first instance by a very senior public official who served that minister as deputy minister -

MR. W. ROWE: In sworn testimony now.

MR. SIMMONS: This testimony has been given under sworn conditions, of course. The question, Mr. Speaker, is whether in view of these allegations now having become public, the minister feels it would not be in the best interest, and here is the question, does he feel it would not be in the best interest for him to vacate the post until this matter has been cleared up? And I point out to him Mr. Speaker, by way of a brief preamble, the precedent in the British Columbia where a Minister of the Crown, Mr. Jack Davis, became involved in a charge and the Premier of the Province requested him to vacate the post until such time as the matter was cleared up. Does the minister feel that would be the appropriate course of action in this instance here?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have given the matter much thought, Mr. Speaker, but again, you know, the Premier is the gentleman who appoints members of the Cabinet. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to take any unilateral action without talking to the Premier. Like I say, I returned yesterday

MR. ROUSSEAU: from a trip outside the country on behalf of the Department of Labour on government business. I have not had a chance to talk to the Premier. I would do that, and I think it is a matter of courtesy to the Premier, since he appointed me to the position I now hold, it would be appropriate and a matter of courtesy that I talk with him first. I intend to do that I hope before Tuesday.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I thank the minister for his answer. I understand his wanting to talk to the Premier on a matter this grave and this important. Is it fair to assume from the minister's answer that one of the options he has considered in view of the circumstances we have described and he is aware of, is it fair to assume that one of the options he has considered in the past few days and will discuss with the Premier is the option of either resigning from Cabinet outright or vacating the post until this matter has been cleared up?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question, but again, I say that I will talk to the Premier and I hope by Tuesday have something to say along those lines. And I am just going to leave it at that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question - I would like to put it to the Premier, but in view of the fact that the Premier is not here I would like to ask the Acting Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, what action this government is going to take if any in barring Quebec workers from coming

MR. NEARY: into Newfoundland as Ontario has done in taking steps now to put legislation through the Legislature of Ontario retaliating against Mr. Levesque and the Government of Quebec for barring Ontario construction workers from going into the Province of Quebec. What is the stand now of this government? Because in the morning news I notice a Canadian Press story, I believe it is - yes, Canadian Press says that Newfoundland may be interested in this matter also - Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Ontario. So I presume that there have already been some dialogue or negotiations in connection with this matter.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to comment on any negotiations which may or may not have taken place, but obviously the Government of Newfoundland have some very real interest in this matter. It has been a recurring problem, particularly in the Labrador City - city of Wabush area that has been going on quite some time prior to the election of the Levesque government, particularly in Fermont where we have had on occasion Newfoundland tradesmen being summoned to court because they were working without a permit. On each occasion then I contacted the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Gerard Levesque, and as all of these complaints had been filed I think by the trade union movement, the Attorney General of Quebec or the Minister of Justice of Quebec took the appropriate arrangements and none of it ever came to fruition, But there has always been an indication to Quebec that if Newfoundland Canadian workers in the Canadian Province of Quebec have any of their rights violated and if they can constitutionally do it - and I have some doubts if they can - then certainly the Government of Newfoundland holds itself in the position and retains the right to retaliate if retaliation - which is a nasty word and not a very good word - but at least to take appropriate steps to

MR. HICKMAN: counteract that. As of now, as I say, the problem has been resolved whenever it has occurred but I do not think we should ever be in a position where we let our guard down at all. Any negotiations that have been ongoing, in my ministry I would not be the party to it so I am not in a position to advise the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as the action of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Levesque's government, in barring Ontario construction workers from working in the Province of Quebec strikes at the very basis of Canadian unity and will become effective, Sir, on July 1st, I believe, the legislation that is going through the House - which is at the beginning of Canada Week, by the way - as it strikes at the very basis of Canadian unity right at a time when we are moving into the celebration of Canada Week, could the Minister

MR. NEARY: tell the House if this government should not state its position on this very important matter, Sir? As the hon. gentleman indicates, it involves workers in Wabush and Labrador City and with our unemployment getting worse and worse that we should, if Quebec insists on going ahead with this legislation and enforcing it, we should send back across the Quebec border Quebecers who are working in Labrador City and Wabush. Should we not take a stand in the interest of Canadian unity if nothing else. The government, should they not make a statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: We are getting into a philosophical discussion. This is a two edged sword. I could think of one way to disenchant Canadians living in the Province of Quebec even more so than they are now, and that was if we tried the unconstitutional act of, to quote the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), "driving them back across the border." I do not know how long one has to be living in a particular province to be regarded as a resident, you know, duly domiciled in the Province and I presume therefore that if a Canadian from any other Canadian province came into Newfoundland and said, 'I now intend to live here permanently,' that the length of his or her stay in the Province would not be very relevant and that they would qualify. I think they have the right anyway, the freedom of movement across Canada. To me that is the fundamental question of unity and I would very seriously doubt if the government or the Legislature of any Province has the legislative authority to enact laws which would be deemed or designed to in any way curtail the free movement of Canadians from one province to the other.

But Quebec has been up to this kind of approach for a long, long time and it is not a Levesque -

MR. NEARY: Over a year.

MR. HICKMAN: Over a year. It is not a Levesque approach.

I would remind the hon. gentleman that the first legislation, the work permit

MR. HICKMAN: legislation came in under Prime Minister Bourassa. We had some very serious problems in Fermont a couple of years ago where complaints, as I say, were laid I believe on the insistence of the local unions in the area. But in any event they were laid against Newfoundlanders who were working as skilled craftsmen and tradesmen in that area. But in any event what government should do will have to be done firstly in the interest of Newfoundlanders and secondly in the interest of trying to keep this nation together. And I am sure we all take a great deal of encouragement over the fact that recent opinion polls indicate that a vast majority of Quebecers are not following the separatist line of their government. It is a very delicate balance that we have to play with right now and, you know, provocative statements may be the very thing that the hon. Rene Levesque would welcome from a province as is predominantly Anglophone.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary, and then I will hear a supplementary from the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. gentleman that we should work within the constitution, but I believe, Sir, that this government should make a public statement or write the Prime Minister of Canada because we are affected by, and will be affected by this situation and I would like to see Quebec, Sir, backtrack on their attempt to cause dissention and hatred among the workers of our nation in the interest of Canadian unity. But I believe the government here in this Province should support the legislation, the move that is being made by the Government of Ontario, and so should

MR. NEARY: New Brunswick, the provinces whose borders are on the Province of Quebec, that we should try to persuade Quebec to backtrack. That is all I am asking the minister to do now is within the constitution to write the Prime Minister or the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice for Canada and ask him to put a stop to this under our constitution, under the British North America Act, or this government here join with the Government of Ontario in trying to persuade the Government of Quebec to backtrack on this matter that can only cause dissention and hatred among the workers of this nation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and it is a serious matter and I will assure this House that government will very seriously consider what is the best approach to take with respect to this problem.

Insofar as the Attorney General of Canada is concerned, he does not have the right to tell

MR. HICKMAN: the Legislature of any province as to what laws they will pass or will not pass. There is a right vested in the Governor General in Council, the right of disallowance, which is seldom used by the federal government, but they do have the right to disallow provincial legislation. There was a request many years ago from here, one will recall, that a piece of legislation be disallowed, but even though it was a provocative bill, the I.W.A. one, the Governor General in Council would not disallow it. I cannot recall in the last twenty years a bill being disallowed by the Governor General in Council. What happens then, of course, is that any person has the right to take the appropriate case stated to the Supreme Court of Canada for a declaration that the law is ultra vires the province. But with respect to the Government of Newfoundland making its wishes known to the Government of Quebec I would think that that can be accomplished and should be accomplished if indeed the Quebec Government is trying to do something that its predecessors in office were doing more than what they are already doing.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, getting off the bigger question and getting down to more specific questions concerning this Quebec issue: The strike in Labrador City - Wabush will be resolved hopefully sooner than later and we are deeply concerned that many people, staff members, who had worked for eleven, twelve, fourteen, fifteen years were terminated. They were not laid off, they were terminated. And the discussion generally was that they would be replaced on the start up of the operations by Quebec workers. Now these are Newfoundland people who have been working there for years and years and they have been terminated instead

MR. STRACHAN: of it just being a normal lay off procedure. A number of them came back here, I have seen a number of them, and I am concerned that what Quebec is doing is exactly the same situation, is moving in or trying to move in workers in order to obviously gain footholds or gain numbers, because it is a numbers gain. I am wondering whether the minister could assure us that if this occurs that when the strike is resolved will the minister and the other departments involved make sure that a priority is given to Newfoundland and Labrador people to be rehired by IOC and Wabush rather than to hire people from elsewhere?

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

MR. HICKMAN: The question raised by the hon. the member for Eagle River is not one that requires legislation. What I gather the hon. gentleman is suggesting is that when the strike in Labrador City is finally resolved that there may be other pressures, economic pressures brought to bear which may result in Newfoundlanders with ten years of service with IOC and the Wabush companies not being rehired. I would think that my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Labour, who represents the area as well, and I am sure, that the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, are in a better position to exercise and exert economic pressure on IOC. And I have to confess I would be awfully surprised if IOC would succumb to that kind of economic pressure by the Government of Quebec or any other government outside of this Province. I would hope that this will not occur and I would hope that what we are hearing now is what so often arises, concerns and uncertainties when you have a protracted strike. People very naturally become concerned over their future. But if it should happen I feel reasonably certain that the hon. the Minister of Labour would hear about it immediately or some other hon. gentleman in this House and that being brought to the attention of government, whatever

MR. HICKMAN: definitive and effective action
is necessary we will take it.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon.
gentleman from Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: The people that I am referring
to were asked by IOC during the strike - the staff workers
and so on - if they would agree to voluntary termination of
their jobs; in other words they would be voluntarily
terminated, which of course, would mean that they could not
gain unemployment insurance. And I advised a considerable
number of them not to accept that and they were therefore
involuntarily terminated. And I understand that the ruling
came through from Sept Iles - it did not come through from
Labrador City or Wabush - the ruling came through from
Sept Iles that these people, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians,
be terminated and the question basically was that the number
was up. The union talks about it all the time - the system,
that the numbers came through and that was it and they had
gone.

My argument basically then is
can there be assurance that these people who have worked
many, many years

MR. STRACHAN: will be given their jobs back? There was no complaint from the local side at Labrador City about their work, there was no complaint that they could not carry out their duties, they were given excellent references. So can we guarantee that those people when the strike is over will be given their jobs back with the same seniority - twelve or fifteen years is a long time to work to have it suddenly wiped out - and to make sure that workers from elsewhere, from Seven Islands possibly or elsewhere in Quebec, will not be given these jobs?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: That, Mr. Speaker, appears to be a two pronged question. One is where a job that still must be filled is vacated as a result of IOC terminating the employment of some man or woman who has seniority for the purpose of filling it later on or after the strike is over by a resident outside this Province; there I think that the Province has and should and I know will exert whatever influence it has to prevent the occurrence of this very undesirable event.

The second prong of that question seems to fall more into the category of where if the company has come to the conclusion that that position is now redundant in the light of the demand for their product on world markets and that a redundancy clause comes into affect because the person is no longer needed, that would be a matter that I do not think any government, by legislation or otherwise, would have very much control over but again can only express the hope that this does not happen. But the first one, certainly government would respond very quickly and I would hope very effectively should that chain of events occur.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, followed by Trinity - Bay de Verde, Leiwporte, and Bellevue.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the substitute Premier, the House Leader opposite. In view of the announcements today that it appears that Newfoundland Light and Power are to get a ten per cent increase, and according to the submission of the Public Utilities Commission that because there is going to be a continual reduction in the use of energy, and this is apparently what is happening, people are using more - they are going cold or they are lowering temperatures and so on - Newfoundland Light and Power are going to have perhaps a ten per cent increase added to power costs, another \$100 a year, I understand, for those who have their homes electrically heated and so on, what is the current position of the government regarding the Newfoundland Light and Power for a company that wants a major substantial increase from the taxpayers and consumers, in view of the fact that they are using less energy as they were asked to do by federal and provincial governments, they have done everything that they could do and what do they get for it? They are going to be charged more. What is the position of the government on this, if this massive increase comes into effect, bearing in mind that it has increased by thirty per cent already this year?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that the costs to the consumer of electricity has raised by thirty per cent already this year. I saw, as did the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), a report in this morning's Daily News of the arguments that were advanced by a very competent council for the Newfoundland Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in which he indicated that the Newfoundland - which we all knew from reading the press - that the Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited is in effect asking for an increase which could result, if granted in full, the consumer paying an extra \$8 a month on an average for his or her electricity in the Province. That was his argument and I -

MR. MURPHY: The average increase was \$80 a month?

MR. HICKMAN: No. No. Eight dollars, e-i-g-h-t.

But in any event this was the argument advanced, as I understand it, by counsel for those who intervened and argued very well indeed. I would certainly not want to prejudge the decision of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. I would point out to this House that under the Public Utilities Act which has been in force in this Province since the early fifties, that at law the board of Commissioners of Public Utilities is obligated to approve a rate increase that will provide a reasonable rate of return to any utility coming before it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is reasonable?

MR. HICKMAN: Reasonable rate of return is one I guess defined by the board and in that respect I have no hesitancy in saying that the board in Newfoundland is far more competent

MR. HICKMAN: to make that definition than any board I know in Canada and that is why the chairman of our board is ranked as Canada's ablest.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, let us not be evasive. The situation on power for the Newfoundland Light and Power, someone has to be the culprit as far as the consumers are concerned. Newfoundland Hydro is a direct agency of this government. Now the minister and his government are faced with two choices, either, one, take a definitive stand against the Newfoundland Light and Power or, two, reduce the cost from Newfoundland Hydro to Newfoundland Light and Power so that it can be passed on to the consumer. Now stop passing the buck. I mean, what is the minister prepared to do and advise his colleagues in Cabinet on this matter?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to pass the buck or recommend to my colleagues in Cabinet that we pass the buck along the line suggested by the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), because his buck would mean an increase in the bucks that the people of Newfoundland would have to pay by way of tax.

MR. NOLAN: Newfoundland Hydro is making a profit according to you.

MR. HICKMAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, if we say to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro that you cannot have the increase recommended by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities they are obliged under their legislation and under their trust deeds of borrowings that have been done over the last twenty years that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro cannot operate at a loss under the terms of these deeds.

MR. NOLAN: Waste of Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if we decide - and it is within the sphere of government's right to say to Newfoundland Hydro, 'You shall not charge a particular rate to Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited,' if that results in a loss to the Newfoundland Hydro then we with taxpayers' money must make up that loss. So then what you do is you transfer the -

MR. NOLAN: Trim your Budget, that is (inaudible) Newfoundland Light and Power (inaudible) Public Utilities hearings.

MR. HICKMAN: - the money has to come from -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Fortunately, we have such a competent board that they can spot extravagance and take that into account in making their decisions. Is the hon. gentleman saying that the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities are not competent, fair? I would say we have the best -

MR. NOLAN: (Inaudible) what they are doing (inaudible) could not care less.

MR. HICKMAN: I take issue with that, Mr. Speaker. I say beyond all reasonable doubt that the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities in Newfoundland knows no peer in this nation for ability in that particular field, fairness and equity - none.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I should recognize the hon. gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is welcome.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has had in his possession now, or his departmental officials, the report of the C.I.D. on the Elizabeth Towers fire. Could the minister indicate, Sir, to the House, you know, what is the status of this report now and what action

MR. F. ROWE: his department is taking on this particular matter?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Exactly the same as I indicated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Am I allowed to answer a question?

It is exactly and precisely the same as it was when I reported to this House this time last week, that it had been reviewed by two prosecutors and that they had gone back to the investigating officers seeking a great deal more information.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon.

the Minister of Industrial Development.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of privilege in the Question Period - is that proper?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman brings up a point of privilege I must hear what he has to say.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, the allegations and insinuations that have been thrown across this floor at me have been absolutely disgraceful, harassing to me and my family who have suffered greatly from this. I know I am adding my plea to the questioner and to the previous questioner, who will have a lot to answer for one of these days, to speed up the results of these so I can get this allegation and insinuation off my back. I have been fighting for my life for five years physically and for other items, like blindness, and I am not standing there to accept these types of allegations and insinuations from people of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will hear from the hon. gentleman. I would point out that to now there is nothing sufficiently specific on which the Chair, in my opinion, could make a decision. I will recognize the next speaker. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wishes to make a submission before I finalize a decision, I will certainly hear him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

There is no point of privilege

from what the hon. gentleman said. There certainly is a
point of privilege for me now.

MR. F. ROWE:

Right.

MR. W. ROWE:

First of all, Sir, nobody is

making any accusations against the hon. minister. The

questions have been as to what was the cause of the fire in

MR. W. ROWE:

Elizabeth Towers, arson or not arson? That is the question. It has nothing to do with the hon. minister because hundreds of people's lives were at stake in that fire and it is an important question, a question which should be answered, number one. Number two, Sir, the hon. minister when he was making his so-called -

MR. NEARY:

His health had nothing to do with it.

MR. W. ROWE:

- point of privilege got up and talked about the previous questioner, whoever that might be, he was looking at me, and said I will have a lot to answer for at some point. Now what he meant by that I do not know but perhaps he might care to explain what he meant by it or if he has any charges to lay in any way, shape or form.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I will deal first with the matter brought up by the hon. gentleman to my left in which there was a submission on privilege, In my opinion there was no prima facie case and the matter is not one to which the Chair can give any priority of debate.

As I understand it now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not raised a specific point of privilege as such, but has asked the hon. gentleman to my left if he would wish to clarify to whom he may have been referring when he made a statement about somebody might regret this or that.

MR. W. ROWE:

And to what he has referred.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. minister could clear it up but he will not.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. gentleman wishes to make a brief statement with respect to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, then I will hear him.

DR. FARRELL:

Mr. Speaker, these allegations and insinuations which are harrassing me were first initiated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Those are the allegations that I was making, and I felt they

DR. FARRELL: were done deliberately to harass me and my family and I know they were. And it was obvious from the way they were couched and that is what I meant by those allegations.

MR. W. ROWE: That is the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. That is the point of privilege. I cannot stand here as a member of this House of Assembly and hear another hon. member accuse me of harassing him or his family when I am here trying to ask questions concerning a fire that started in Elizabeth Towers. I do not care if the hon. minister was involved or not, Sir. It has got nothing to do with it. I have no desire to harass him or his family or anyone else, Sir. It is a scurrilous accusation against me and the hon. minister should be asked to withdraw. I am interested in the cause of that fire which caused hundreds of people to be evacuated. Some of them on stretchers, some of them overcome by smoke, Mr. Speaker. I want to know what the cause of the fire was. I have been asking the Minister of Justice to tell us what the cause of the fire was, if he knows. He says he does not know. The Crown Prosecutor has looked at various reports and so on and that in due course the answers will apparently be provided. It is our duty to continue to press the minister on these matters.-

MR. NEARY: And we will.

MR. W. ROWE: - I would submit, Sir. But I cannot stand here and be accused, as a member of this House trying to do my duty, of making scurrilous or low accusations or harassing a member or his family, Sir. I cannot do it because it impedes me in my duty. And I would ask the hon. minister withdraw forthwith.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will now give a decision on this matter. There are obviously a number of facets or aspects which are matters of debate of difference of opinion which hon. members may debate at their will at an appropriate time. I think the matter which comes to the Chair now is the question of attribution of motives and an hon. member may take

MR. SPEAKER: the greatest exception to what an hon. member says, the greatest exception, but may not attribute motives and I think that is the area in which we now are. I would call upon the hon. gentleman to my left to withdraw any imputation of motive toward the hon. gentleman to my right.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to do so and I do so withdraw and I would second his suggestion that this investigation be speeded up for everybody's benefit as quickly as possible.

MR. WHITE: Speak to your buddies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the cover up.

MR. HICKMAN: ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act," carried. (Bill No. 81)

MR. SPEAKER: Order 7, the adjourned debate on Bill No. 50.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as we adjourned yesterday we were discussing the various apprehensions and fears of some people regarding the intent and substance and content of Bill No. 50, the grounds for such fears, if any, and the motivation behind the bill, the numbers of people who would be affected and in what way. We talked briefly of the history of the bill, of the five years of its making, the various commissions that were set up, the various meetings that were held, the various hearings, the input by various concerned groups and by individuals, and the amazing lack of interest by a great many people at that time who are suddenly, for some reason or other, greatly concerned, who are showing a great deal of interest in a bill in which they could very well have shown a lot of interest some time ago and perhaps have made some constructive additions to the content of the bill.

I heard only this morning on radio somebody is alleging that there will be an additional minimum \$200 tax charge to the people who live in the area who will be affected by this Northeast Avalon region, wherever that is. And, Sir, this is a complete fabrication. There is no substance in fact in that figure. I have inquired beforehand and I have checked again today and nowhere can I find documentation to suggest that a \$200 figure is anywhere close to being accurate. Why the gentleman did not say \$300 or \$250 or \$189.93 there is no explanation for, but it is just another scare tactic, another point to put before the public to mislead them, to raise their fears, to confuse, to hide the real issue, and the real issue is the fact that everybody in this House and outside who have discussed this bill agree that a regional government is needed in this area. Nobody denies that at all. But people opposite and others outside seem to feel what is wrong with the bill are the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are the water rates?

MR. DOODY: It is twenty-five cents a thousand gallons, I think.

MR. DINN: For water.

MR. DOODY: For water. That is the service fee. That is what it will cost.

MR. DINN: That is the user fee.

MR. DOODY: There are administrative costs that are now incorporated into the Metro board, into the Metro region. The Metro board is now paying salaries, collecting taxes and came through this year with a \$250,000 surplus.

MR. SIMMONS: Will you guarantee that twenty-five a thousand gallons will be the only charge?

MR. DOODY: At this point in time the only service that this regional government will be providing is a regional water system and those people who use that regional water system will be paying a regional water fee. Nothing could be more simple, nothing could be more clear, nothing could be more reasonable, nothing could be more sensible, but hon. members opposite insist that there is some deep plot afoot to bleed the taxpayers of St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who will pay the salaries?

MR. DOODY: The Metro board people are now receiving salaries and they come in with a surplus every year. Now what does that have to do with the people who are living inside the incorporated communities in this region? It has absolutely nothing to do with it at all, Your Honour, and people opposite know that; people who have studied the bill know that; people who have bothered to go ask the minister and the people responsible for this bill know that. But a whole bunch of doomsayers and self-servers in this Province, particularly across the way here, are making a political issue of this, trying to make some groundwork, trying to make some inroads into this area and they care not.

MR. DOODY: who they hurt or who they
frighten or how much disservice they do to this region,
And that, Sir, I think is pathetic, it is sad and it is
pointless, because the people will not be fooled by this.
You will see, Sir, and we will all see in a matter of a
year or two when this regional government gets into
operation that the people in Conception South will get a
water and sewerage system which they cannot afford to pay
for on their own. If they had to do it themselves they
would never do it. It has to be a regional system. The
people in Conception South would be the first ones to tell
you, and I know - I served and represented the district for
quite a while - that they cannot afford to pay the kind of
taxes that are necessary to put a regional water system and
a regional sewerage system in Conception Bay South.

MR. DOODY: The tax base is not there, the incomes are not there. Most of the wages earners in that area are working in the city of St. John's. They do not have an industrial base in Conception South. They cannot afford to pay it. It has to be done on a regional basis. The system is too big, too complicated and too expensive for that area to handle.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: It has to be done. And the capital cost of that installation will be borne by the Province. The capital cost of the installation will be borne by the taxpayers of this Province, and if the taxpayers of this Province are going to contribute toward a regional water system for the St. John's area then the taxpayers of this Province have a right to be represented on that board. And the only way they can be represented on that board is by appointment by the government of the day. And the five people who will be representing the taxpayers are quite clearly set forth in this bill, five appointed people who represent the taxpayers of the Province who will be paying the capital cost of that regional system. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) legislation.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, will you please ask the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir to apply himself to his problems and not to mine. When he gets on his feet he can pour some more vitriolic poison over the building if he wants to, that is his privilege, but I would ask him to please contain himself while I am trying to add a few words to the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) Order, please! The hon. minister has requested that he be heard in silence. I ask all members both to my right and left to adhere to that request.

Order, please!

MR. DOODY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another little attack on Mr. O'Dea. I suppose that is something that that gentleman will have to live through now for a few weeks or a few months or a few years.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) A point of order has been raised.

MR. DINN: They cannot listen to the truth.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Blocking my view. Blocking my view. I want to see the Speaker this morning.

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The minister again misconstrues something that I have said. I have referred a number of times to this document as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is making a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: I will make a point of order as soon as he and his colleagues stop jabbering over there so I can have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I have all the time in the world.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that remark, referring to another hon. gentleman as 'he' in the House.

MR. SIMMONS: I wish to make a point of order, Mr. Speaker. They are all ready now, Mr. Speaker. They have settled down. I wish to make a point of order. I am just waiting. The member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is wasting the time of the minister.

I have referred to this document a couple of times as the O'Dea Vacation Plan. It is no reflection on Mr. O'Dea, Mr. Speaker. If I had the opportunity to get a free ride like this I would take it too. As a matter of fact I would think less of him if he did not take it. He would be stunned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: No reflection on Mr. O'Dea, but a reflection, Mr. Speaker, on the people who had put together this vacation plan and then put it under the convoluted guise of a regional government plan. Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with regional government whatsoever and I ask the minister if he is going to quote me that he quote me correctly. And I know he is tender on this because he has been sucked into supporting it against his will. That is the word we heard in this district, against his will, but at least he can quote me correctly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the point of order?

MR. SIMMONS: Listen, you might hear the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to come to the point of order, please.

MR. SIMMONS: I already came, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel it is not a point of order, just a matter of explanation.

The hon. minister.

MR. NOLAN: Another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Another point of order.

MR. NOLAN: The hon. gentleman opposite in his remarks has made a couple of statements which I feel I should bring to the attention of the House. One, in his statements the other day, he was talking about Topsail and Island Pond being unincorporated, part of which being in Paradise and so on. What he neglected to state - and I am sure the hon. minister if he is going to give the facts would like to give all of the facts - is that there has been a petition in the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs made up by a former minister of his own government, signed by all of the residents in there, asking for a form of

MR. NOLAN: incorporation, which has been totally ignored. Secondly, in his reference to the people of Conception Bay South that they cannot afford it, maybe he would be good enough to explain how other communities have been serviced in this Province and how they have managed to afford it. Why are the people of Conception Bay South with whom he is allegedly so familiar, why is it that they must be the ones to bear the brunt of the expense?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NOLAN: What twisted reasoning!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel that is not a point of order. It is more of a question because it is a point that was raised several days ago. It had nothing to do with the point of order and should have been raised at that time.

The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: May I continue, Your Honour?

Thank you.

MR. DINN: You are going to have your hands full. Four million bucks for water and sewer in that area.

MR. DOODY: Now if the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) feels that the people in Conception South should pay the total cost of that water and sewerage installation that is planned for that area then fine, that is a

MR. DOODY:

commitment that he may feel that he is entitled to make on behalf of the people of that area.

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

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

MR. NOLAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs is making threatening gestures across the way. Now if he wants to say something or make a charge, let him do it publicly.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The hon. member made reference to what is the regional system, or what has it got to do with Conception Bay South. The fact of the matter is that last year, through the pleading of the people in Conception Bay South, \$2 million was spent on water and sewer, another \$1.6 so that they could be connected to the regional system, and this year \$2 million for more water and sewer. So the hon. member will have to answer to his constituents as to why we spend dollars and why we connect them to regional systems, not to me. And that is what I said to the hon. member and I will say it again, louder sometime.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NOLAN: I mean I look upon that -

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

MR. NOLAN: - as a sort of threat not only to me but also to the people of Conception Bay South and I ask for a withdrawal. Is this a way for a minister to behave?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. If that is a threat to the people of Conception Bay South, if threatening them with water and sewer is a threat then -

MR. NOLAN: Do not use the people of Conception Bay South for this plan that you are bringing in, or a bill you are bringing in. Do not try it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel that hon. members are raising points of order and more or less getting into a debate to interrupt the hon. minister.

A point of order that has been raised. I would ask them in future if they would raise a point of order please make it to the point and be sure it is a point of order instead of interrupting the hon. minister.

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Sir. It is quite apparent what the object of the exercise is. The point I was making, Sir, is that the people in Conception Bay South desperately need a water and sewerage system. I do not think that anybody will deny that. Certainly nobody in Conception Bay South denied it. The basic purpose and point in their accepting incorporation at all was a commitment by the government of the day to provide a water and sewerage system for the area, a commitment which was not kept and which is now being honoured. And the only way that it can be done, as I said, is through a regional system, a system that will serve not only Conception Bay South but various other communities in this part of the Province. And those people who use that facility will be expected to pay a service charge and I think the amount that the minister mentioned was twenty-five cents a thousand gallons. Those people who want to use that system will be entitled to do so and they will be asked to pay that amount of money which will defray the operating costs, the maintenance costs of the system, not an unreasonable request, a quite reasonable, sensible, logical request and that has to be administered by somebody. If St. John's uses part of that system, if New Town uses part of that system, if Mount Pearl uses part of that system, Conception Bay South uses part of that system, then obviously there has to be a common denominator somewhere, there has to

MR. DOODY: be an organization, there has to be an administration. And this particular point and purpose of this bill is to put into affect that sort of organization, that sort of administration. Maybe hon. members opposite would like to see a community or a regional water system that administers itself, looks after itself, that deteriorates on its own, that breaks down and nobody looks after - pointless, purposeless, pathetic.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said opposite that the proposed organization is an expanded metro board. Well that is partially true. This is an expanded and improved metro board. It is improved in many directions. It gives more scope and more power to the board, which in this effect is now a council with the majority of its members elected by the people. And I think it is a big step forward in the supplying of regional services. The regional water system is now in place. But I look forward, down the road, to other services that will be provided by this regional government. I may be overly optimistic and I may be expecting too much, but I think the time is rapidly approaching when we are going to have to look at a regional fire service, fire department for this region. How long can we expect a municipality the size of Mount Pearl -

MR. DOODY: New Town to exist without some sort of fire service, fire department, fire protection. And we look at that New Town, Mount Pearl area with the same sort of view that we look at Conception South, the tax base is not there. The people in Mount Pearl are now paying a higher taxes than they are paying in Grand Falls or Gander. They are still running at deficit I think. There is a limit to the amount of taxation that they can endure on the limited tax base that they have. Once again, it is a bedroom community, it does not have a tax base of its own. The people who live in that area work elsewhere in many cases, in most cases, but they need services and they should have services and they will get services through this St. John's or Northeast - Avalon Urban Region Council.

The references to taxation without representation are misleading, to be very charitable about it. The representation, as I just pointed out, on behalf of the taxpayers of the Province will be five appointed people, the representation for the people in the area, at this point, will be ten elected people. Surely, Sir, if that can be construed as taxation without representation then somebody must have read the bill very, very poorly or else they are deliberately twisting and turning the motives and the content of this bill just to serve some purpose other than the needs of the people in this area.

There is no intent at all to usurp the power of the councils that are now in position and place in this area. As was made abundantly clear, those councils that have sat down with the minister and his officials have taken the bill under study, looked at it carefully and many of them have shared the view of the minister and of others who have bothered to study the bill that there is no intent to take power away from any of the

MR. DOODY: elected councils. There is no more power to that effect in this particular bill than there is in the City of St. John's Act, the City of Corner Brook Act, the Local Government Act. And if hon. members want to look at and review these particular bills, to change them in some way or other, then that can certainly be done, if there is something wrong with these bills. But if there is something wrong with this bill then there is something wrong with the whole municipal system in the Province of Newfoundland and all the bills that govern them and perhaps they should all be looked at and all changed.

But to take this one in isolation and to accuse the minister and the government and everybody connected with it of deliberately trying to undermine and take over the powers of the selected bodies in this area is malicious, it is not so, it is incorrect, it is unnecessary and it does not serve the area or the people in the area. The purpose of this bill, as has been stated quite clearly, is to provide regional services on a regional basis governed by a regional council the majority of whom are elected at this time and hopefully in a year or two or three or four, whenever it falls into place, the entire regional council will be elected.

There are unincorporated areas, unincorporated areas in this particular part of the Province, Sir, quite a few unincorporated areas who have no opportunity and no hope to get any services at all under the present setup, under the present system or present lack of system. The only way they can hope to get a regional system is through a regional government. And if they avail of the services of that regional government they will pay a service fee. In this particular case, the first service that will be available is the water and sewerage system. If they

MR. DOODY: take advantage of the opportunity to hook on to that system, then they will pay a service fee for it.

The Metro Board no administers various areas, sections of this unincorporated area and they charge various fees for garbage collection and other such services. That same sort of system will be in effect under the regional government.

Those areas that are incorporated and have their own taxes, their own tax system and their own tax base will continue to collect their own taxes and the regional government will not interfere or add taxes. There will be no double taxation. This is another fallacy, another misuse of the privileges of speech, the opportunity of free speech to twist things into what they are not. This is not a double taxation bill, Sir. There is

Mr. Doody:

no concept of double taxation, no intent of double taxation. It is completely -

MR. MURPHY: Speak the truth.

MR. DINN: Montreal and Toronto is harassing you.

MR. DOODY: There is a great deal of difference between freedom and licence I think somebody once said.

MR. MURPHY: Legality and morality.

MR. DOODY: Maybe we should look at what the affects of the bill might be on some of the people who are concerned. Are the people in the unincorporated areas who will be serviced by this particular bill, by this particular regional council going to be a great deal worse off in terms of taxation than they were under the Metro Board? The answer is obviously, no. It has been appointed out earlier, and I think, it is a very important thing to remember that Metro Board, a much maligned Metro Board, the temporary vacation plan of Mr. O'Dea has operated so efficiently and so effectively as to serve the people of that area and to provide services at a fee, at a cost a great deal less than in the incorporated areas in the same section of the Province. I point particularly to the garbage collection rates, it cost about \$6 per capita to collect garbage in the Metro region as against about \$16 in St. John's. And that sort of efficiency is passed along through the St. John's Regional Council and I have no reason to believe that it will not since the same people Mr. O'Dea and his group will be involved, I see absolutely no reason why these same savings cannot be passed along to the Urban Region Council. And the same sort of efficiencies will be delivered to the people in this area.

Sir, I would not be at all surprised to the people in the City of St. John's, to the people in Mount Pearl, the people in other areas look very closely at this regional government operation in the next few years, and I should not at all surprised, Sir, if quite a few questions were asked of the efficiencies of the local governments and as they compare to the regional government. And

Mr. Doody: I think that when the City of St. John's gets an opportunity, as I hope it will, to change its taxation system that the regional government and the city and the towns involved will get closer and closer together. I do not know if that will happen that is entirely up to the people in the area. But what I am saying is that this regional government is necessary. It has to be put in place. The people who need services will have services. There will be municipal government for those people who have none. There will be services for those people who have none, and there will be fees, service fees from those people who take these services and who need the services.

Sir, I have absolutely no hesitation in supporting this bill. It is a good concept. It is a concept that everybody agrees with. The fact that some members opposite do not like the minister has very little to do with the content of the bill, and that certainly is not influencing me. I know that everybody here has admitted and said, somewhat reluctantly, that they favour the concept of regional government. And I have absolutely no hesitation in supporting it. And I am delighted to see it come before the House at long last and it should have been in here several years ago.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG) The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. H. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, it is hard to begin a speech on Bill 50 and to compress into forty-five minutes what has to be said on Bill 50 because I suppose there is never a bill presented the House of Assembly that was more sloppily drafted with less clarity of purpose, it is almost impossible to figure out just what is being gotten at in this bill. It is unclear. There is nothing specified. It is like signing a blank cheque to the minister. It is like the House saying to the minister, do something, whatever it is we do not know, but go ahead. It is a vote of trust and confidence, I suppose, because we do not know what we are getting ourselves into. Nobody knows that, because it is not said in the bill. And every time

DR. H. KITCHEN: we go to push it is not going to increase taxes, it is not going to do anything they say. But let us try to piece together some of the things that are in this bill.

Before doing so I want to say that this has to be looked at in the whole context of municipal government in this Province. And in the

DR. KITCHEN: city of St. John's. We have had a municipal government here now for ninety years. Ninety years where the people have been building up their services, their water services, their streets, building up the assets of the city through taxes and have done a fair job of it, paid for a lot of it. Other municipalities in the area have come later and have tried to do the same thing and have done the same thing and we have other areas which have persistently not wished to be incorporated.

The Province has not much of a history with respect to municipal government. We are not Nova Scotia. We are not Ontario. Where in Nova Scotia everybody is in a municipality of some sort and they are accustomed to taxes. This Province has feared the property tax. It is part of our structure of our whole fibre of being to fear property taxes and our way of life in this Province, our way of life where we have not had these full time jobs but where a person has had to try to get a few dollars where he could in a variety of ways keeping down the overhead, keeping down the taxes has been very, very important and we have traditionally and for a very good reason, been afraid of property taxes. We do not want property taxes in this Province. And the less property tax the better because it means in rural Newfoundland and we are talking about rural Newfoundland here as well as urban Newfoundland, in this bill, I think we are, although the boundaries are not specified, we are never quite sure what we are talking about here because the boundaries are not specified.

The property tax is something that you have to meet every year. Every year you have to come up with so much money for property tax and to a person without a job that poses hazards. You may lose your house if you cannot pay your property

DR. KITCHEN: tax. This is part of the innate fear that has gone down through generations and centuries of people living in this Province. It is the reason why we did not join Canada in 1867. It is the reason many, many people in this region, this area we are talking about, did not vote for Confederation, for responsible government, the fear of paying property taxes, and for very good reason. We do not want to pay property taxes. We do not want to lose our land and lose our houses because of the fear of paying for property tax. There is no tradition. And so we have to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, very, very careful in introducing any system of government which has innate in it, even though it is not specified, and the government has been very careful not to mention taxation in this at all, but the fear is there and the reality is there. Because we are not going to have any of those grand services that the former speaker was mentioning unless somebody is going to pay for them and the method of paying I guarantee you is going to be the property tax. And for anyone to say that it is not going to cost anybody anything is to talk nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: Now let me have another word about this question of -

MR. SIMMONS: They are good at deceiving the House.

DR. KITCHEN: - of this question of where did it come from? This whole thing was conceived in sin. Let us look at the Whelan Commission, the silly commission. I will say it is silly because the same chairman, he has brought in three reports about governing this Province. He brought in a report to the Board of Regents of Memorial University and what was his proposal? We need vice-presidents, another tier of government at the university level. And what did this do? It took the

DR. KITCHEN: administration of the univeristy clear of the students. It put in another level. It brought people away from what had to be done. It has effectively prevented that university from going ahead in the way they should have gone. And it is the same recommendation for another tier of government.

The same gentleman recommended to this government that they restructure the civil service, the same person. And so they restructured the civil service and they put in all sorts of commissions and so on but the effect is that the top decision makers in this government are removed from the people they serve. Every time you put in a level of government, whether it be in a university or in a Province, civil service, you are removing the ultimate decision makers one step further from the people who have to be served. And that is why this particular government is so hard hearted with people who are in trouble, social assistance people and so on. They do not even listen because the decision makers are not in

DR. KITCHEN: contact with the people or with their workers. The ministers themselves are not entirely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: And so we have the same person now a few years ago writing - My Lord! He must have been paid by the word! - 600 or 700 pages on municipal government and what he did in effect was - and how a person from New Brunswick can come in here and tell us what we have to do without really paying attention to our traditions in this Province, our fear of taxation and our desire to get on with it ourselves, is ridiculous.

So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is a commission which is not really a study of municipal government in this Province - it is a whole bunch of words that no one can really read and understand because the person who wrote them did not understand what he was really writing about. So that is what I mean by being conceived in sin. The whole idea that is coming up is bad. And then we appoint a commission and a regional group here - and I am not knocking the individuals here very much, but there are no regional people here really, I think. Who was on this report now? If I remember, it was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Henry, Morgan and Andrews.

DR. KITCHEN: Henry, Morgan and Andrews, right, three great people who understand how it is in the rural areas in the metro region, who know all about it.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what has happened here is that the government have been carried away with a series of recommendations that in many cases have very little relevance to the problems that we are facing. Now what are these problems? There are problems here and there are things about regional government. There is a whole mixture and a hodge-podge. Now what is needed in this area? I believe what is needed in this area is

DR. KITCHEN:

some co-ordinated planning.

There can be no doubt that there has to be some co-ordinated planning. Now whether the Metro Board can do that or not I do not know or whether the regional government can do that I do not know or whether they will do that I do not know.

One of the things that we have been talking about is that we are going to have some co-ordinated water - water authority. Well, why do we not set up a water authority for the region? And why do we not put it under the Public Utilities Board and let it be done that way? We do not need the trappings of an elephant to put a water authority in. We do not need that at all. What has happened is that we have gone hog wild on suggestions from other places. We have 500,000 or 600,000 people in this Province and we are bringing in a system of government which they use in Ontario basically. It is not necessary to have an elaborate system of government in a small province like this. There are certain functions that have to be done and have to be done well. One is planning. We have to stop this helter-skelter development in this area where a developer can go to a small municipal council and entice them to do various things with development and where we have to stop this flight from the city. The city of St. John's population is declining. People are leaving the city to go and get cheap land somewhere else and then they are going to expect the people who remain in the city to pay for them when they move somewhere else. Now this has got to stop.

Now what I want to get into mostly though, there are three main points that I would like to make and I will not have time to make them all. I wanted to have some say with respect to the control. A number of people on our side have mentioned the serious questions of control. This business of giving the Minister of Municipal Affairs a blank cheque to do as he wishes with this region, that is a very serious one. Perhaps I might get a chance to

DR. KITCHEN:

 speak on that one later on.

There are a number of points that I would like to make that have not been made yet on this. But what I want to do today is to get into the question of finances, because that is the crux of the whole matter. How much is it going to cost us? How much is it going to cost the citizen in St. John's? How much is it going to cost the citizen in an unincorporated area? How much is it going to cost the citizen in Mount Pearl? - because I guarantee you this, it is going to cost him a lot of money. And no matter what the minister has said so far and the other members opposite, this has got to cost money. Just let us look at the possibilities here why it will cost money. Section (3): "The purposes of this Act is to provide a framework for regional government in order to provide municipal services of a regional nature." And you cannot provide municipal services of a regional nature unless it is going to cost money. It is there. It is going to cost money, and if it costs money it is going to have to be paid for. Someone is going to have to pay for it, it is either the government, Ottawa, going in the hole to borrow it or else the citizens are going to have to pay for it.

DR. KITCHEN:

I looked at Section 8 ,and Section 8 says "The region is to be governed for the purposes of this act by the Northeast Avalon regional council which is to be a corporation " and operating that, these fifteen people with a paid chairman and all that sort of thing, that is going to cost a fair amount of money. They do not work for nothing, they are going to cost money and that money is going to have to be raised in taxes there is no question about that. It is no good to say that these people are going to work and they are going to work for nothing. It has already been announced that they are going to be full time paid people.

Then Section 12 talks about elections. You cannot run an election unless it costs money and the election procedure here is quite elaborate. It is going to cost money. It is going to cost money for the by-election and it is going to cost the people of that area money. How much is it going to cost? I do not know how much it is going to cost. They will not tell us anything about that. There is no budget table with this but there should be. We should know that the facts are about the projections for costs and then we can decide what we are going to do about it but there is nothing here. By-elections are going to cost money. Section 19 deals with appeals and someone who feels that he has not been elected properly and all this - that is going to cost us money. Everything in the act pretty well is going to cost money.

Section 26 - I just noted a few here, "every meeting is open to the public and is a privileged meeting." We are going to have to provide facilities for the public to go to the meeting. That is going to cost a few bucks too, a few chairs and a few tables, small stuff but it is going to cost money.

Section 28 - "The title of all property and assets which the board has invested in regional council. Regional council is charged with and assumes all the obligations and the liabilities to the Metro Board." It is going to cost money. This regional council is not going to operate on water it is going to operate on cash and that cash is going to come from the people in the area.

Section 29 - "All municipal plans,

DR. KITCHEN:

development schemes and so on are to remain in effect." Now vetting and approving and getting on with these plans is going to cost money to. Maybe it is not going to cost more than presently but it is going to cost money, it is going to cost money.

Section 30 - now here is the one "The powers may by order of the Lieutenant Governor prescribe powers in respect of the operation and construction of regional water systems." That is going to cost money, regional sewerage disposal systems, that is going to cost money, regional solid waste disposal sites. Reference has been made to the fact that we are going to have a new system of getting rid of our solid waste, that is going to cost cash. Improved services are going to cost cash. We are not saying that the services are not going to be improved but we are saying it is going to cost and let no one think that it is not going to cost.

The operation of regional public transportation systems is going to cost. We know that the bus system in this city presently cost money - to expand, to operate a regional public transportation is going to cost money, it is going to cost a lot of money and if the government are not prepared - they cannot say they are going to have it on the one hand and not going to have it on the other. The intent seems to me to have regional transportation and that is going to cost cash.

The other one regional planning - very necessary is going to cost money if it is going to be done properly and I submit that it is not being done properly because the people are not being involved very much in the planning, whatever the Chairman of Metro Board wants is the planning pretty well. It has to be planning and if people have to be represented it is going to cost money.

Fire protection. Reference has been made that we are going to do away with the voluntary fire department in the various areas and we are going to put in a full fledged fire system where everybody gets paid to run a fire department in the whole Northeast Avalon area. Fair enough it maybe good but let no one think that this is not going to cost a horrendous sum of money and any other facilities

DR. KITCHEN:

or services of a regional nature. Now we do not know what that is it is not specified but they are going to cost money and they are going to cost a great deal of money and for anyone to say that it is going to be by user, the user pays, it is not answering the question because I want to know how much is the user going to pay. I want to know how much the taxation is going to be.

Section 32 - "To acquire by agreement any of the properties in the municipality " some of that is going to cost money, this acquiring of the property as a municipality is going to cost money.

Section 33 -

DR. KITCHEN: the method of acquiring property, where things have to be done in a certain way, that method is going to cost money.

Section 35, where the regional council has all the powers of a council of a municipality where areas are unincorporated. That is going to cost money to do in unorganized areas, that is going to cost money.

Section 37, in addition to the powers set out the regional council may impose upon the residents of a designated serviced area taxes and the imposition of taxes. That is going to cost money, even imposing taxes and collecting them.

Water and sewerage systems, as we go down through this whole thing here all we can see is cash, cash, cash. It is going to cost money and horrendous sums of money.

The whole question of fire fighting is there. Sections 45 - 53, this is going to cost cash. It may be properly so but it is going to cost money.

55 - 56, parks, the acquisition of parks, the establishment of parks. This is going to cost money. The recreation in this area is not the best. There are a lot of improvements that have to be made and if the regional council is charged with bringing in recreation for this whole area then that is going to cost a fair amount of money. It is going to be taxation.

And so on it goes. We can go on. I am going to skip a lot of this now. But I think the main point has been made, that this whole bill has a very elaborate, very great money package attached to it which has not been specified by the minister, has not been specified by the government or by any of the speakers opposite and they should have been specified.

DR. KITCHEN:

The bureaucracy has been referred to by another speaker on this side. He mentioned the various people who are going to be hired and so on. There is no intention that this thing is to be self operating, as I read the bill. It is going to be a very expensive operation, with a very elaborate bureaucracy and this bureaucracy is going to cost money. It has to cost money unless it is to do anything.

So let nobody think and let nobody be deceived, let nobody in the region be deceived, this bill is going to cost money and a lot of money. And the question I would like to hear from the minister and from the government speakers, is how much is it going to cost. Surely there have been some studies. Surely you know you have done some projections as to the cost of implementing this bill, how much is it going to cost? How much? All I can say is it is going to cost a great deal. Looking at the bill I know it is going to cost millions and millions and millions of dollars, that is if they are going to do anything, and they say they will because the powers are there, and the more functions, the more personnel, the more elaborate the structure, the more expensive it is going to be.

I believe that the minister should table the budget for the first year of the operation of this bill. Surely he has got some figures. He should put it on the table. He should do it for the first five years so we have some projections as to what we are getting into here. Then we can decide whether that is what we want to buy. Does the House of Assembly want to buy this package? This is really what the minister is asking, which he is putting forward here. But we have not had the package. We do not know the cost of it and he has the obligation to put the cost of this bill before this House of Assembly. We will not buy a pig in a poke. We are not going to do that. He should table the budget. He should table the projections, the staff,

DR. KITCHEN: the cost of the water, the cost of the fire protection, the cost of the parks, the whole cost of what they plan to do should be here so that we know - he should come clean with us. We will not give him a blank cheque.

Now let me talk a bit about double taxation because there is double taxation in this bill. It is at least what I consider double taxation is there. The city of St. John's, the city itself, has a reasonable level of public services right now. The 90,000 people who live here have a reasonable level of public services. We have water. We have some parks. We have streets. We have sewer. The people in this town, the city, have been paying taxes for years and years and years and they have built up

Dr. Kitchen: an enormous amount of assets, network in the city. The city has been behaving responsibly for a number of years, it has built up its assets, and it has taxed its people, the people who are here pay taxes to maintain and to keep up these services. That is good.

Some people to avoid taxes have left the city and that is their right to leave the city and to settle in the neighbouring areas. Some people never lived in the city, they were always in the rural areas nearby for hundreds of years, and they had their own ways of looking after their water and their waste disposal, and it was not that expensive. And a lot of people have installed septic tanks, and they have installed other things, and they have been reasonably well satisfied. But when the flight from the city took place, when city folk left the city to avoid taxes, in some cases, and settled in these rural areas surrounding they prevented what the people who had there, they interfered with the services that were there by pollution. Now then these same people who fled now they want the same services as the city wants, as the city has developed. And the plan that has come from the government here, the plan is that the people in the city now are to help pay the taxes for the people who have fled into the surrounding area, the city folk who have left and now the people who stayed in the city paying taxes all the while are going to have to pick up the tab, help pick up the tab for the people who left. I do not think that is fair. That is double taxation. People who have been here have been paid. They should also have to pay for people who have been trying to dodge taxes. I do not think that is fair. I think that is unfair. And I believe that is the basis of what the City Council is saying to you. They do not think that is fair. Where we have to pay now for other people to have the services which we enjoy largely because of the tax structure in this city. It is being paid for by the citizens of the city and that is fair enough, but we should not pay for people who have been avoiding taxes. I am talking largely about people who have left the city, we are not rural folk who have rural occupations, but city folk who have left to avoid taxes.

Dr. Kitchen: I want to talk a bit about compensation too now, because there is double taxation. There is no doubt that the people of this city and other areas where they have been building up their municipal assets or their personal assets from the point of view of water and sewer and so on that they will have to pay more. I want to say a word now about compensation because the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) said that it is fair for people not to be compensated. I mention that the City of St. John's has built up assets with a net worth, there is a net worth of the City of St. John's has in Windsor Lake, in that whole water supply, the net worth. There is a net worth for us in the public transportation system that has been built up over the years. There is a net worth in Bowring Park, the park was given, but look at the investment that the city has put into these parks over the years, nurturing it, caring for it, bringing it along the city people have spent money on it.

Now then if this is to become a regional asset taken over it would appear to me that compensation of some kind should certainly be considered. There are many other things to be talked about as well. And it is very difficult when any amalgamation of this type takes place to be fair to people. When two school boards come together as they came together a few years ago when the integrated boards were set up. It was pretty hard to think about this question of compensation, one denomination had their school board paid off, the other did not, they come together. Who pays? It is a hard question to solve. I do not think it should be dismissed out of hand. I think it should be thought carefully through and rather than dismiss on principal.

Nobody likes to pay taxes. And what the member for St. John's East was saying was that it is the same people, we just take it from the City Council and give it to the region - it is just a different board administering for the same people but it is not the same people.

DR. KITCHEN: The regional council will serve a large area. The city council serves a smaller area. It is almost the same thing as if we took Labrador and gave it to Quebec and said, 'Okay, boys, you have it. The same people are living in Labrador as did before. We do not want any compensation.' It is the same thing as taking the assets of the city of St. John's and turning it over to a wider authority. It is exactly the same thing. And we should not put up with that, this question of the spurious arguments raised across the way. It is robbery. I think it is robbery.

I want to read a little bit now from the Henley Commission. We do that. Everybody reads a little bit from that - it is sort of a spiritual exercise. Page 265 shows in a table what the Province has contributed - what the Province contributes by way of revenue and what the locally raised revenue is for a number of municipalities in the area. For example in Holyrood in the year this was done 45 per cent of Holyrood's revenue - municipality of Holyrood - was raised locally and 55 per cent was put in by the Province. That is good. The Metro Board raised 12 per cent of their revenue and 88 per cent came from the Province - a very profitable organization; 67 per cent for Mount Pearl, local - 33 per cent provincial, and we go on; St. John's, 99 per cent local - 1 per cent provincial.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

DR. KITCHEN: Well, it does not include it for any of them as far as police protection is concerned because the police protection is not paid by the municipalities anyway.

I believe what we are doing here, we have a city which pays its own way, which has paid its own way, and now we are being asked to pay the way for everybody else and I think that is highway robbery.

DR. KITCHEN: Highway robbery - that is what it is, and the people of St. John's should buck this bill because the taxes in this city are going to rise. And they are going to rise because other people who have been fleeing the city to avoid taxes are going to continue to avoid taxes - like the hon. minister, people who do not live in the city. They do not want to live in the city. That is their right not to live in the city, but it is not their right to expect the people who live in the city to put their water and sewer in for them. That is not fair.

Now let me have a few words about the taxation, because one of the weaknesses in this bill is that the question of taxation has not been adequately dealt with. I believe that attached to this bill or a supplement to it or a companion bill there should be adequate dealings with the question of taxation. How much will our taxes go up within the city? How much will they go up outside the city? And they are going to go up. As services are provided they are going to go up. They have to go up. And it is just as well to face facts, taxes are going to go up. Let me read again from page 169. It says here that the per capita tax in Holyrood is \$9.41; the per capita tax in Petty Harbour is \$4.00; Pouch Cove, \$5.00. When this Metro Board comes in I can guarantee you that the per capita tax in Pouch Cove is going to be higher than \$5.15 a year.

MR. J. CARTER: It has nothing to do with it. That is not the situation today.

MR. STRACHAN: Okay, what cost?

DR. KITCHEN: The taxation rate in this area is going to rise and people who have not been paying taxes at any great level are going to have to be paying taxes both within the city and outside the city. The taxes are going to rise to pay for these. Now I am not arguing that they

DR. KITCHEN: should not rise or that the services should not be provided, but what the minister has got to do is level. How much are the taxes going to go up if these things which he wants to bring in are going to be brought in. We have to be fair about it. We have to know what we are buying and how much it is going to cost and perhaps we will not buy it if it costs too much. The people have to be told the truth whatever the truth is. There is going to be a gigantic increase in taxes, whether it is the services, the structure, everything is going to take more.

DR. KITCHEN:

I believe that this bill needs a taxation section. All references to taxes have been omitted virtually. There is a hodge podge of taxes in this region too various taxes are being levied. Perhaps the bill should address itself to that or that question should be discussed here. You cannot talk services and structure without talking costs and that cost section should be dealt with as well. The Henley report - half the Henley report talks about taxes half of it. This bill was based on the Henley report in part. There is hardly any mention of taxes in the bill at all even though this report - half of its half one hundred and forty-two pages dealing with the whole taxation structure and some reference should be made to that in the bill instead of not mentioning it. Let me read from the Whelan report the thing that this is based on really. Let me look at page 18 of the Whelan report - the Whelan report has a recommendation recommendation 72. After considerable investigation of all available fiscal options and in the light of Newfoundland's economic circumstances and so and so forth. We propose that imposition of real property taxation is being required by law in all developed municipalities. That is what the report that was given to this government recommended real property taxes would be the basis of the municipal taxation in this Province. That is what they recommended. Let me see what the Henley report says page 167 - I hope I have these references right - you can never be sure when you have a lot of them copied down.

AN HON. MEMBER:

DR. KITCHEN:

Yes, the Henley report talks about the existing tax structure. The present system of municipal taxation in the region represents an amalgamation of poorly co-ordinated diverse and inappropriate array of tax spaces. Not only does the method of revenue in fact vary from region to region municipality and so on but the statutory authority to tax varies. Clearly if the problems of taxation for the St. John's urban region are to be tackled from a regional viewpoint there must be at least some rationalization of the existing structure. This is what Henley has said and it makes sense - there has to be some rationalization of the structure of taxation. The commission has concluded that the present

DR. KITCHEN: hodge-podge of taxing sources is inappropriate as a means for future revenue generation within the region - reform is certainly required. This question of municipal tax reform which has been mentioned by the Whelan Commission is one of its strong points in my view not what it recommends but there has to be reform and also paid attention to by the Henley report has not been addressed in this bill. You cannot provide services in my view unless at the same time you tackle this question of tax reform, municipal tax reform because that is the question that is in everybody's mind is what is the tax going to be. How is it going to be taxed? And we have to face it. It is on us to face the problem of taxation. It is proper. It is proper to face it. Put it on the table, put it all out on the table we are not foolish. The people of Newfoundland are not foolish. If we need regional services - what is your plan for paying for these services? What is your plan? Let us test. There is only three sections. Only three sections in this act that deals with taxes at all. Let me just look at them for a minute; 34 (b) "Where an order is made under section 30 the regional council subjects the approval of the minister may levy user charges on the municipality for regional services provided to it by the regional council. That is one thing that is there. Then on Section 35 the regional council has all the powers of the council of a municipality under Local Government Act in those areas of the region and not under the jurisdiction of a municipality and that act applies to these areas. So that is a taxing power I think that is inherent in the Local Government Act of 1972 that the regional council has over the unincorporated areas. And then it goes on in section 37 and that is the only mention that is made. In addition to the powers set out in section 35 the regional council may impose upon the residents of a designated service area taxes and other charges in accordance with the Local Government Act and may vary such taxes and charges as between different designated service areas.

Now that is all I can find about taxation in this bill. The whole question of taxation is not handled in the bill. We are being

DR. KITCHEN:

asked to buy a pig in the poke
and we cannot do it.

The other point is this, what about the Province? What is the Province going to do? We are talking about property taxation and taxation. But what is the Province going to do by way of grant structure? The Whelan Report recommends changes in the grant structure? Page 242 of the Whelan Report. For these reasons we recommend the abolition of the entire system of provincial grants which has been developed over the years as a response to the very special needs of Newfoundland communities. And they go ahead and they recommend this. Instead they recommend a three part provincial support programme with the following components. First, a general municipal assistance grant, second, a municipal tax incentive grant, and third, a municipal capital projects grant. They say, "Do away with this hodge podge of special grants and so on and let us have a government policy with respect to grants of municipalities." Let us go on, "The recommended general municipal assistance grant," that is the first one. They have three elements in that, an annual per capita allocation scaled directly to the population size of each community, per capital allocation. Then they go on and say, "An annual per capita allocation varying from \$1 to \$5 and bearing a direct relationship with the level of social assistance payments per capita disbursed to municipalities. In other words, poorer areas get more grant. And third, "A final annual per capita allotment ranging from \$3 to \$4.50 and scaled directly to the local road mileage over which each municipality has responsibility."

So that is basically their general municipal assistance grant, three components, a general per capita component, another per capita component based on - imbursely with the ability of the people to and something having to do with

DR. KITCHEN: the road level.

Now that is the first grant. And then they go on and recommend a municipal tax incentive grant.

"The Province should next consider a second or a matching grant under which it would pay to each local authority an amount equivalent to the estimated yield of its real property tax a matching grant." That is the second thing they are after, a municipal tax incentive grant. The more you fellows come up with the more the Province will put in. The more the municipality raises, the more the Province will put in. That is the second general grant, a municipal capital projects grant which they are suggesting the municipality should basically make their case and the government buys whatever they want of it.

Now this is the Henley Commission did not do much other than to recommend what the Whelan Commission recommended. In fact what they did basically was to quote the Whelan Commission and they recommended that the recommendations of the Whelan Commission respecting the abolition of the existing provincial branch structure and the institution of a new programme of assistance based on general municipal assistance grants, municipal tax incentive grant and the municipal capital projects grant be adopted as the basis of provincial support to the individual municipalities in the St. John's urban region.

So the whole question of finances resolves itself in this, that the recommendations from the consultants that were set up on this regional government were these, that the question of taxes be looked into and that a more rationalized system of taxation be brought in and secondly that the government's grant structure, what they grant to municipalities should be looked at and make more rational as well. And that makes sense to me.

But now there is no mention in the bill of any revision of grants. They are long overdue. There is

DR. KITCHEN:

no mention in this bill of grants.

There is no companion bill. There is nothing about that. I believe that if these matters were tackled by the minister, by the government, that the whole question of taxation, how much is it going to cost, if these questions were answered then I believe that the fears that the people have in this area, and believe you me there are fears, the minister said he had - one of the speakers on the other side saying that they were not beating down the doors with complaints. No, but people raise it. I went down to the senior citizens place on Harvey Road yesterday and this thing was raised. I did not raise it. We just went down for a social evening to meet as many people as possible and see what the place was like. But people were raising it. "What about this tax? What is going on?" And it is on people's minds. This regional government is going to cost money. Let us be honest, it is going to cost money and the government cannot, they cannot

Dr. Kitchen: just say we are going to bring in something or other we do not quite know what it is yet, trust us, we are not going to hurt you, we are going to do well. They have all of the powers of the world here, they can do almost anything without being specified. And with no mention of how it is going to be paid. Who pays. No attempt to bring in any rationalization of the tax structure, of the grant structure. It makes no sense to me, Mr. Speaker, why this bill is being brought in at this time. It should be shelved, not forever, not forever, although I believe regional government as some people envisage, particularly Whelan and these envisage where every person in Newfoundland should be in a municipality like they are in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and pay property taxes. That is not acceptable to the people in this Province and neither should it be. Municipalities are brought in as necessary.

There are many things that have to be dealt with in municipal form in this Province. We have a lot of small municipalities which are not economically viable, and they can never be economically viable, in my view. I may be wrong but that is my view. And something has to be done about it whether they amalgamate, co-operate, but what we do not need is another tier of government, we have someone even more removed, and this is the chief fault that many people find with the Metro Board they are not responsible to the people. And how many complaints have I got about the arbitrary decision-making that goes on in that Metro Board. Arbitrary. And now we are going to have a regional government that is removed from the people, a second tier, in part, a second tier not entirely, a first tier for some people and a second level for other people which is going to make it very complicated and very difficult. And it is almost like giving the municipalities in this region over to the civil service to run. I believe that is really what is happening.

I would like perhaps some other time to address the questions of structure, and also on control. The whole question of control which we have been talking about. There are a number of points

Dr. Kitchen: yet to be made on that, and probably other speakers will make it. And the whole question about the proper structure have to be looked at as well.

But what I wanted to do today was to indicate that what bothers most people in their area, and what people are opposed to more than anything else is the uncertainty with respect to the tax, and the uncertainty with respect to the grants. And I believe that the minister and the other speakers opposite should address themselves in some detail providing us information projected cost and so on and let us know how much it is going to cost, and how pays what, how much our taxes are going to rise, how much the property tax is going to rise in this city or in any of the other areas, because believe you me they are going to rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, let me start first of all by making very clear that I support this bill and I congratulate the minister and his officials on the way they presented it, and the fact that he has brought this bill in here at all. And I was somewhat disappointed last year, in fact, that Bill 101 was withdrawn, however we did that or the minister did that by the following consultation with a lot of the members in the House, and I agree with his decision. I was disappointed as I said but at that time there were things in that bill that needed to be looked at and indeed they were looked at.

There has been a lot said about this bill in the past couple of weeks. Perhaps one of the most noticeable comments that has been made, made by many hon. gentlemen opposite is that there has been no consultation. Mr. Speaker, I take great exception to that remark. That is an insult to the people who have in one way or another contributed to the development of this bill, and this proposed regional government. And you have to go back a long ways, you have to

Mr. N. Windsor: back to the urban region study itself, a tremendous amount of work that was done on it, first of all by the consultants and by the people who attended the presentation of that study, and who

MR. N. WINDSOR: studied the contents, the reports submitted by the consultants, people who looked at it. The town of Mount Pearl, I can say without any hesitation, Sir, looked at that report in great detail and gentlemen say that the average person has no consultation. Well, Sir, that urban region study is the seed from which this proposal developed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It was the basis of it and the concept and it is a rationale. The justification for having a regional government is the need for regional services, and we will get into that. But just to give you an example of the consultation that was held with the people of Mount Pearl, Sir. The town council had a committee of which I was at that time the paid employee, an advisory person to the committee. We held some fourteen meetings with interested groups in the town of Mount Pearl and explained to them thoroughly the contents of the urban region study, the effect it would have on them, the concepts of regional government and what that would do to the average citizen of the town of Mount Pearl or of the region for that matter. Fourteen meetings, Sir, were held with interested groups. Every group that could be identified in the town was written and invited to come to the town hall. That was back in, I guess, 1973. So, Sir, there was the beginning of consultation. And then, Sir, the government from that urban region study commissioned the St. John's water study which was a study of the whole water system, the need for water services in the region, and eventually that became the Bay Bulls Big Pond water supply. And there was a sewerage disposal study which was a major study again of the need for sewerage disposal facilities in this area. And there was a solid waste disposal study which looked at

MR. N. WINDSOR: the needs and the possibilities and the ways of disposing of solid waste in the St. John's region.

Now all of these studies, Sir, took a tremendous amount of time. Officials and councils looked at them and studied them, debated them, talked about them, and certain actions have been taken on it.

And then we have the Bay Bulls Big Pond water supply. The minister fortunately recognized we had an emergency situation. We could not wait for this matter of regional government to sort itself out before we moved ahead to supply water to the Northeast Avalon urban region. We had a water shortage - people could not water lawns and so forth. You are all very familiar with that, of course. So the Province had to undertake to build a regional water supply, and it did. The Province should not be involved in providing water, should not be involved in operating a water system, but it would out of absolute necessity. And I congratulate the minister and his predecessor, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, for having the foresight to surge ahead with that and to do it in the face of great need. And it became obvious, Sir, that so many things were going - we had to talk about trunk sewers. Some of these have gone ahead. To date we have spent something like, or at least committed \$35 million to the water system and some \$15 million to the trunk sewer system in the region. These are regional facilities, at the moment still under the control of the Province, at least indirectly.

And so there was a technical advisory committee established, Sir. These things just do not happen by themselves. The technical advisory committee chaired by the City Engineer of the city of St. John's and with representatives from the town of Mount Pearl -

MR. N. WINDSOR: I, myself, Sir, have done it when I was employed with the town - from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation as representatives of the Newtown area, in the Newtown development, Conception Bay South, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the planning office of the department, and several other people, Sir, a technical advisory committee which has now held well over 100 meetings in the last four and one-half years, I think it has been operating, and these people have done a tremendous service to this area and I want to go on record as congratulating each and every one of them. And I say it was an honour for me to serve on it for the two years I did with those people. They are all tremendously competent people. They have done a tremendous job in pulling together regional facilities. But they are an ad hoc committee appointed by the minister, and I am glad he did do it because we would not be nearly as far progressed with the provision of regional services now if he had not done that. This committee has guided the development of these services to a very large degree and I am sure the minister will agree he depends on their technical advice very heavily for some of the

MR. N. WINDSOR: technical decisions that are made.

MR. MURPHY: Some of my people are on that too.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You have a representative on it as well, yes, Sir. It is a great committee. Well over 100 meetings they have had and that, Sir, is in consultation with technical people representing the people, who also happen to be residents, but they are the chief technical advisers to the various administrations or authorities in the region.

And so we had the commission of enquiry better known as the Henley report, the Henley enquiry which held meetings throughout the region. Every municipality made at least three representations because there were three sets of hearings on three various aspects. Each municipality had the opportunity to put in a brief or make a representation to that enquiry, as did any other registered group or any private individual. Anyone who wanted to address that committee, that enquiry had the opportunity to do so. Sir, that, I think, was pretty good consultation.

Then the committee made their reports. They presented their brief and said, 'Here are our findings, here are our recommendations. That was two years ago now and during that period of time the department put a series of press releases in the papers - one, I think, each week for a series of fourteen or fifteen, or more than that, twenty-one, I think, press releases - outlining the various aspects of what is proposed and what is about to happen and what the concepts are. primarily of servicing, local government, taxation, it covered everything. This is something that I have never seen before, the amount of consultation, with any proposed bill in this House of

MR. N. WINDSOR: Assembly. For anybody to say that there has not been consultation, that is nonsense.

So we have the Henley report now. We have these documents and this is the third and final report, third of the three, the most important one, I suppose, and again the minister made it very clear that he was available to discuss the contents of that report with any council and numerous councils discussed it with the minister. I discussed it with my council on numerous occasions, I held public meetings, held public meetings in the school in Mount Pearl and said, "We are going to discuss this, I am going to tell you what is in it and I will answer any questions you have. And, Sir, there is nobody in Mount Pearl saying they have not been consulted, I can assure you that. I can assure you that and I would challenge anybody to say they have not had the opportunity to discuss regional government, its concepts and regional services or anything that has gone on here.

But I would make this observation, Sir, that those who had been involved, particularly going way back, say, to the urban region study and all the way through, those who had been involved and sat in on these meetings - and I neglected to point out the set of meetings held by the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, three meetings, I think it was, Sir, called by the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities who felt perhaps, We have a role to play here. And I congratulate the then president of that Federation, Mr. Ron Fagan -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: - from the Burin Peninsula who did a tremendous job, I thought, somebody from outside who was totally impartial, had not really had any background, I would assume, in what had gone on, but he became president at that time and he called these meetings and it was very

MR. N. WINDSOR: obvious during those meetings, Sir, that that gentleman knew very well what he was talking about, he had a great grasp of the situation and the needs, Sir. He conducted those meetings very well and I would like to go on record as congratulating him on that. But there were three meetings, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: It is a pity he is not in the area.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Again, all the municipalities in the area and any committee who wanted to go in there was welcome. All the M.H.A's were invited and a great number of us took the opportunity to take part there and to make contributions.

MR. MURPHY: We gave up our Saturdays and that.

MR.N. WINDSOR: We gave us Saturdays; that is right. This is a valid point, this is a point that really I should have expanded on. Most of these meetings were not held during office hours by people who were paid to be there. You are talking about councillors who were non-paid, you are talking about other officials and members of the House of Assembly who gave up Saturdays and weekends to sit in on these meetings to make a contribution because they believed that what was going on was important, and so it was.

And so, to say that there has not been any consultation, Sir, is just utter nonsense. Just utter nonsense! Totally misleading. Again, I say that the people who took the time to take part in these discussions, they are not objecting, Sir, these are the people who are supporting this bill, supporting the bill. Most of the comments that I have heard, and I will get into a few of them, in objection to the bill have been comments made by people who, either, are totally misinformed or, really, are unaware of what is proposed in this proposal.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The Mayor of the town of Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, has come out in support of this bill. An hon. member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, suggested the other day when this was made known, and I think the minister referred to it in his speech, that, 'Oh well, of course the Mayor of Mount Pearl is supporting it, he is the only one with a P.C. slate that got elected in the election.'

Mr. N. Windsor: Oh well, of course, the Mayor of Mount Pearl is supporting it, he is the only one of the P.C. slick that got elected in the election. I mean what utter nonsense.

The hon. gentleman should get his facts straight, Mr. Speaker. He does not even know. If he is going to make false accusations let him at least be consistent because Mr. Hodder was not one of the ones that was named on my supported slate, which of course was nonsense, and I am not going to bother with arguing that for any length of time. I mean it is just too trivial to talk about. But he should at least get his facts straight, if he is going to accuse me of having a slate let him keep the names straight.

But anyway he says that he was the only one elected. Well that means, Sir, that the other six were not, they must be Liberal supporters I assume. They must be Liberal supporters and therefore I suppose they do not support the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is ongoing now, boy.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have a little letter here to the Town of Mount Pearl, it is addressed to the hon. minister with a copy to me, and I will not read all of it, I will read part of paragraph one, it says, "I am pleased at this time to inform you that a meeting of Council held on Monday, June 19, the Town adopted a motion of support for the concepts and principals behind the proposed Act. The whole Council, Sir, the six so-called non P.C. slate members, I suppose, support the bill." Sir, you know, I would just as soon get away from that point because there is no slate and there is no room in the Town Hall for provincial politics.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. N. WINDSOR: You know, that is just again a smear campaign, the typical type of reaction we are getting from hon. gentlemen opposite the opposition they have and the points they are trying to make are specious points because of lack of any valid points to make in opposition to this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Sir, we have had other municipalities now coming out down in Pouch Cove I understand and supported the bill. Any number of people.

So let me just move on, we talk about regional government and the justification for it. I am not going to spend an awful lot of time on it, I think everybody agrees that regional government is a valid, it is necessary, it is as inevitable as night and day that regional government must come to this area. The justification for it, Sir, is very ably presented in the Henley report, page 46, let me just read it very quickly, number (i), the need to provide appropriate mechanisms to co-ordinate and administer services such as water and sewer which exist on a regional basis and which cross municipal boundaries; (ii) the inability of the present system to cope with major servicing problems. And that is a very important point. The need to increase efficiency and economies of scale. Now imagine, the need to increase efficiencies.

MR. FLIGHT: You need to get yours hands on some more money

MR. N. WINDSOR: The need for a co-ordinated planning policy from a regional prospective with an appropriate agency to administer the policy. The need to co-ordinate financial contributions from senior levels of government that would be necessary to implement services in accordance with the municipal services plan. The need to provide a mechanism whereby regional financial resources are marshalled effectively and equitably to assist in the development of regional services. That can anybody argue with those points? These are made by the Henley Commission, Sir, not by me, not by anybody on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. N. WINDSOR: Pardon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: So, Sir, everything that was covered by those points made by the Commission, of course, is exactly what we are trying to do with the bill.

Now I made a reference a moment ago to meetings held by The Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. And they following those meetings, Sir, the final meeting it was agreed that a certain list of conclusions and recommendations be forwarded to the minister. Just let us review them, Sir, very quickly, I am not going to read them all, but I want to touch on them. Some of the recommendations of that group, the group of municipalities from this area, for one, that a municipal form of regional administration is now necessary.

MR. N. WINDSOR: for one that a municipal form of regional administration is now necessary. It is agreed we need Regional Government. Number two that in the beginning the regional municipal government in addition to its regional functions will be required to perform local municipal functions in those areas of the regions not locally incorporated. And just to stop for a moment on that that I agree with but I want to point out again as I have in previous speeches I have made in this hon. House that this is one thing that I am not entirely unhappy with what is being proposed now but I hope that it changes and I am sure it will but I would like to see this regional council, the Regional Government be responsible only for regional affairs. I do not like the fact that certain areas of this region will not be incorporated and therefore the regional council will have to act as a local administration in those areas. I recognize that this is the correct approach to take at the moment and totally necessary but I would hope that fairly soon we could move towards getting every square foot of this region incorporated and therefore under the control of a local government. Therefore your regional council would be purely regional and there could not be a confusion which I suspect may be part of the cause for some of the misconceptions that are presently prominent and that the regional council in the unincorporated areas acts essentially as a town council in those areas. Yet we are saying that in incorporated areas it acts as a regional council so it is a little confusing to the average person who is not perhaps totally familiar with every -

AN HON. MEMBER: How will that effect Newtown?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Newtown - they act as a local council in Newtown as Metro Board does now.

AN HON. MEMBER: I see.

MR. N. WINDSOR: A change essentially for Newtown. The people in Newtown are paying taxes and so forth and receiving services and so instead of paying it to Metro Board they will pay it to the regional council.

AN HON MEMBER: Just a change in the name.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Just a change in the name. The Chairman does not change. The only change is that instead of seven appointees

MR. N. WINDSOR: you will now have the opportunity to elect somebody to that council. That is not bad. I will go along with that.

Let us look at a couple more of the recommendations. In fact this recommendation two, it is recommended however that annexation or incorporation of new local areas proceed as quickly as possible. The minister has already done that with Portugal Cove and St. Phillips and St. Thomas as recommended by the Henley Report by the way. With an expectation for local incorporation throughout the whole of the region being accomplished over time, and that I support. Prospect for an expanded city of St. John's may thus be accomplished in a longer term as a result of a natural process of municipal boundary adjustments and amalgamations of local municipal units. In other words the federation is saying exactly what the minister said, we are not against the expanded city but let us not over complicate the issue at the moment, they are two separate questions. The establishment of Regional Government does not stop the enlargement, the expansion of the city of St. John's but it in fact provides enabling legislation for it. All it says is that at the moment, or what the minister is saying at the moment - we will not look at that question, let us get Regional Government in place, let us get these regional services operating and at the appropriate time then we can have a look at these other opportunities and possibilities.

MR. MURPHY: A lot of the spade work would then be done and St. John's would hardly have to do anything.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right. Now, number three. Functions assigned to the regional municipal government will be separate from but complimentary to local municipal functions and will include division maintenance of the regional plan, development and insuring conformity of local municipal plans with regional plans. What they are saying is that for unincorporated areas the regional council will administer the regional plan.

Land use planning, zoning and development control within the region but outside of local municipal boundaries. In other words again the regional council will act as a town council and

MR. N. WINDSOR: do all the normal functions as a town council in unincorporated areas which Metro Board is doing now, Sir.

Provision and maintenance of municipal type services is necessary within the region but outside of municipal boundaries. Again in unincorporated areas provide, where possible, garbage collection, provision of water and sewer in designated service areas and so forth. The same things that are being done now by Metro Board.

Control development and maintenance of water supplies including water catching areas, water reservoirs, water treatment and water supply mains up to a point of sale to each local municipality which is what the minister has already done, Sir. He has developed the Bay Bulls Big Pond regional water supply. It is now on stream and with that authority, the temporary water sewer board has been providing water to municipalities, selling water wholesale so to speak at the boundary of the municipality. I cannot object to that, Sir, not at all. Here what we will have when this is established hopefully, is that there will be an elected council or at least two thirds elected

MR. WINDSOR: to be an elected councillor, at least two thirds elected. At least the town of Mount Pearl will have the opportunity to vote to elect somebody to that regional council.

MR. FLIGHT: Will Petty Harbour?

MR. WINDSOR: Petty Harbour will too. Yes. Yes. They will have a chance. They will be based on a per capita, the same share. We will have an opportunity, Sir, to elect somebody to that board to speak on our behalf, and we will be buying water, which we have been doing, Sir, since 1959 when the town first installed a water and sewer system and since 1959 until last year when the regional supply went on stream the town of Mount Pearl bought water from the city of St. John's. We had no representation there. The gentlemen are talking about taxation without representation, Sir, I would sooner be buying water from a regional council made up of two thirds elected people, at least we had the opportunity to vote there. We did not with the city of St. John's. We had no choice.

MR. FLIGHT:

MR. WINDSOR: Yes. That is right.

The hon. gentlemen are talking about taxation without representation. Nonsense, Sir. The town of Mount Pearl, as I said, bought water from the city of St. John's for a long time under an agreement. We have had some conflicts. You have seen a lot in the press about arguments between the city and the town about the water bill. And it is just amazing.

Really what happened there, and I will just very quickly relate, in 1959 the system was installed. There was a ten year agreement which really was signed until 1961, it was valid until 1971. Yet the rate was not fixed by the city of St. John's for five years. The reason for that was because the

MR. WINDSOR: city was receiving an annual subsidy, an annual grant from the Province to cover the cost of the installation. When that ran out they finally discovered, "Well we had better send the bill to the town of Mount Pearl." And so we got into this great deficit, or debt, or amount owing for water supplied.

Then in '71 the town wrote the city, which the city should have been writing the town and asking the town to renegotiate their agreement, since it was in the city's interest. The ten years had expired, it was in the city's interest to try to get the rates adjusted. But, no, they did not so that went on and became another argument and eventually the city said, "Well we will send them a bill." It was totally in contravention of the agreement. "We will send them a bill. We charged them seventeen cents per thousand gallons before, we will charge them twenty-five now. The next invoice we will send out we will jack it up to twenty-five cents." No agreement. So the town says, "Well no, we are not going to pay that." And this went on for a while and some great figures of amounts owing were quoted in the press and other places. Finally we said, "Well that is enough of that. The agreement provides for when the two parties cannot agree on a rate to be charged that the Auditor General will be called in and asked to set a rate." And he was and the rate he set was seventeen cents per thousand gallons. Because the city had fulfilled their agreement.

This is the sort of thing you are dealing with, Mr. Speaker. The Town Council of Mount Pearl forced to deal with the City Council of Mount Pearl, over which they have control. The people of Mount Pearl had no say in their election.

MR. WINDSOR:

And the same is true for solid waste disposal. The town now is bringing its garbage to Robin Hood Bay and paying I think ten per cent of the cost of operating Robin Hood Bay. We have no choice. What choice do we have? The disposal site we had in Mount Pearl was closed down for Newtown and we had hoped when that was done that within a year or so there would be a regional facility. That has not taken place because as it has taken some time to find the proper form of regional government. And I think we have it here now.

I could go on but hon. gentlemen I am sure have copies of this. Interesting, in the setup of the recommendation of this Committee or of the federation for choosing a council. It says, "Appointment by the provincial government of a chairman and four members at large, a chairman plus two members at large to be persons particularly knowledgeable of municipal practice and politics within the region. Another two members at large to be senior provincial civil servants, particularly appointed to represent provincial interests. In other words the federation recommended there be five, a chairman and four persons appointed to this board by the Province. That was the first phase. That is a temporary thing until the election. They recommended also that there be a period, I think they recommended actually three or four months before the first election.

MR. N. WINDSOR: before the first election. Then they say Okay after the first election continuations of the Chairman and the four appointees. Then they recommend that there be elected four members representing the population of the City of St. John's and six members representing one of each sub-regional areas which is exactly what is purposed. No consultation.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

MR. N. WINDSOR: It has nothing to do with it. It is a different thing. You are talking a different thing altogether. There is a different thing in having an award system within a city and having regional su areas that contain two or three different municipalities. It is a different thing altogether. Totally different concept. It is amazing also, Sir, you are talking about the make up of the regional council in objecting to having provincial appointees. Let us see what the Henley Commission had to say, Sir, about that page 101 membership fifteen members to be composed as follows a Chairman and four members at large appointed by the provincial government, Imagine! Imagine!

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. N. WINDSOR: They said the same thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never heard of it -

MR. N. WINDSOR: And (b) here is where they differ slightly and I will give you the reason (b) they say six members from the enlarged city of St. John's and since the concept is not now to enlarge the City of St. John's and change from six to four and they said four elected from sub areas outside. Well because the city is not expanded the percentages of course have changed a little bit and it is now four from the city and six from outside based on per capita. The same thing, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) per capita.

MR. G. FLIGHT: How many?

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. G. FLIGHT: Within the City of St. John's?

MR. N. WINDSOR: And how many are outside?

AN HON. MEMBER: Less than 90,000.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Less than 90,000 outside. The hon. gentleman is a professor at the university, Sir, and he cannot even count. He cannot even count. The hon. gentleman does not know that within a fifty mile radius of the City of St. John's half of the population of this Province resides almost a quarter million people within fifty miles.

MR. FLIGHT: What about the other half?

DR. KITCHEN: Conception Harbour is it?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman let us have a look at what the hon. gentleman had to say.

DR. KITCHEN: Does it take in Bay Roberts. Fifty miles takes in Bay Roberts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Harbour Grace, Bellevue.

DR. KITCHEN: What about Bell Island?

MR. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman opposite, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman for St. John's South spoke a few moments ago -

MR. FLIGHT: Not St. John's South.

MR. WINDSOR: I am sorry - St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen). Blasphemous! The hon. gentleman for St. John's West, Mr. Chairman, talked a few moments ago and his main point was that regional government is going to cost - of course it is - so is my lunch I am going to have in a few moments. What is not going to cost? Everything costs money but is it going to cost more money? We have already agreed that regional government is a good thing. I do not think anybody disagrees with that. Okay? Regional government is a good thing because we can provide more efficient services, more economically. You think you are going to say it is going to cost more. Can you make up your mind? He says it is going to be a cost of elections. Well a moment ago he was objecting that we are going to be appointing one-third of them and only electing two-thirds. Now he is objecting to the cost of electing them. Can he make up his mind? Shall we appoint all fifteen? That will not cost us anything, Mr. Chairman, - save a few dollars that way. Is that what he is saying?

MR. G. FLIGHT: (inaudible) appeals.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Cost of appeals. He is complaining about the cost of appeals. Is he suggesting that people should not have the right to appeal? Cost of public meetings. Is he suggesting there be no public meetings? We can save the money that way. Costing assume liabilities and Metro Board what else are we going to do?

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. N. WINDSOR: Since we take over all the assets should we not take over the liabilities since we are going to operate the facilities that Metro Board now has. Should not the revenues from those operations pay for the liabilities as they are now? Well who should do it? Should we go to the people of the Province and say will you write this off? Cost of plans and development schemes should we not have plans and development schemes, Mr. Speaker? Should we forget those things? Should we let this area develop in a hodge-podge manner without any original plan the original that was adopted on August 6th., of 1977 should we throw that out.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. N. WINDSOR: The city does not have any planners, no, this is part of the problem, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now it is coming out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: The planners were chased out very quickly a few years ago, Mr. Speaker. Let us have a look at some of the other comments that were made.

MR. G. FLIGHT: We are paying enough now God knows to be doubled in five years -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Five government appointees let us deal with that as I appointed that the Henley inquiry and the federation of mayors and municipalities recommend.

Mr. N. Windsor: the appointment of five. It justifies it here, Sir, perhaps in better words than I could use, it says "To allay the fear on part of the outlining communities of domination by St. John's. The Commission feels at least in the initial years there should be sufficient input and participation on the part of the Provincial Government through the appointments of a number of representatives on the regional council. This would tend to neutralize not only the affect of the City of St. John's, but also any other point of conflict which would see the other communities in the region voting as a block against the City.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: The Commission also feels it essential particularly in the early years when a heavy involvement of both Provincial and Federal funds will be required in the form of cost sharing programmes needed to implement the policies of the municipal services plan that the Province should be well represented on a regional council. Indeed because of Provincial financial involvement in the regional permanent representation made be required." These are the words of the Henley Commission, the impartial inquiry, Sir. Justification for having Provincial appointees at least in the initial years. Then as we look around and see what has gone on and what essentially will be the regional council, in the first instance, Sir, we see that the Province with the assistance of the federal government has a \$35 million water supply system which will be turned over and a \$15 million trunk sewer system, and proposals for incinerations, Sir. And it is not bad. It says, "Will be", I think, the point that said, "A heavy involvement." That is pretty heavy, Sir. That is a heavy involvement. There is no question about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. N. WINDSOR: I am running out of time.

MR. MURPHY: The Council are -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Eighteen hundred dollars for what?
MR. MURPHY: Martin Meadows.
MR. N. WINDSOR: Martin Meadows.
MR. MURPHY: A softball diamond.
MR. N. WINDSOR: A softball diamond, and stuff.
MR. MURPHY: They are going to bring St. John's Centre within the city limits now.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Sir, I only have a couple of minutes left so - deal with the three main points, Sir, we can confuse this by saying Oh the arrogant minister and everything else, we can confuse the issues. We have a lot of these weak points. And I wish I had more time but, you know, it is amazing how time flies when you are having fun. What do we have ten minutes left, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Ten minutes.

Ramming the bill through, Sir, one of the big points, one of the key points. And I think I have covered that. Ramming it through, Sir. We had Bill 101 last year and we said let us defer it, let us have another look at Bill 101. And as I said in my opening statement I take exception to statements that there was no consultation, when I and my colleagues on this side of the House there have been fourteen meetings over the last year discussing this bill, that is only since Bill 101 was withdrawn. We had meetings before then as well on Bill 101. But since we decided that well we better take another look at it, we did very, very thoroughly, fourteen meetings I think were held over the past year. No consultation. Am I not representing the people I was elected to represent? Is someone suggesting that we as members are not talking with our people? Are listening to what they are saying? You cannot be serious. It is Friday morning and the hon. gentleman must be jesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: The power of the minister, Mr. Speaker, people are objecting to the power of the minister.

MR. MURPHY: Terrible! Terrible!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Where is the power? And the power of this bill. Let me do one good example, somebody objected to the right of employees in the regional council to enter private property, the right of expropriation and these things. You know, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition I think spoke at length, if I can find it here in my notes, what did he say about authority to enter private property - anyway he talked a great length on that. You see, I mean the hon. gentleman obviously has not had any experience with operating assist him, you know. Does he say that if somebody has problem with a sewer you cannot go in and try to repair that or if somebody is using a waterline improperly, letting water flow unnecessarily that you cannot go in and look at that? Is he saying that you cannot go in and read a water meter? Is that what he said?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: You know the hon. gentleman thinks that he can operate a municipality, any municipality, whether it be a local one or a regional one without the authority to do these things, you know, I mean it is not just realistic, Mr. Speaker. And it is a power that is very, very rarely used I would suggest. But if the authority did not have that power, there may be a case where someone calls and says, Look my neighbour is on vacation, his house -

MR. WINDSOR: but if the authority did not have that power there may be a case where somebody calls and say, "Look, my neighbour is on vacation, his house is barred up, I hear water running and I looked in through the basement window and see three feet of water, can you do something about that? Can you stop it?" Are you suggesting the authority then should not have the power to go in there without being charged with break and entry and trespassing and everything else. Of course they must, Mr. Speaker, be able to do these things to protect people and to protect the system that they have invested so heavily in.

And the power of expropriation, you know is there a municipal authority that does not have the power of expropriation in this Province? Of course not. And we must have it otherwise we could have a situation - I mean you could never have built, I think as the minister pointed out, could never have built Bay Bulls regional water supply system without the power of expropriation.

MR. DINN: That is what they wanted it for.

MR. WINDSOR: I could never have the Minister of Transportation spending \$800,000 widening Topsail Road this Summer without the power of expropriation, or many other roads, or any other water and sewer systems without the power of expropriation. Are gentlemen suggesting that if one person decides, "Well I do not want a sewer line going through my property and therefore that whole development up above me there, 400,000 units perhaps, cannot go ahead because I am not willing to sell it."

MR. FLIGHT: Without compensation from the -

MR. WINDSOR: That is not true. We are talking expropriation, not acquiring assets of another municipality.

MR. DINN: Read it.

MR. WINDSOR: Read the bill, you may understand it.

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman is an intelligent person, I am sure if he would take the time to read the bill he would see, there is a big difference in expropriation of property and acquiring assets of a municipality. What I am talking about now is expropriation of property.

The hon. gentleman from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) said, "Well the City of St. John's paid for its water and sewer system on its own." So it did. Nobody is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to take away the city's water and sewer system. Hon. gentlemen perhaps do not understand what is proposed here.

MR. DOODY:

- people of St. John's West.

MR. WINDSOR:

The people of St. John's West, yes. You know hon. gentlemen perhaps do not understand. We are not saying that every water line and every sewer line in the city of St. John's is going to become the property of regional government. Of course not, Mr. Speaker. The city of St. John's will still operate services within its own boundaries. Nothing has changed. None of their authority is changed. They have the opportunity to purchase services from the regional council, as does the town of Mount Pearl now. The town of Mount Pearl can now buy water from a regional council. We can buy sewage disposal facilities from the regional council. We can buy solid waste disposal facilities from the regional council. And hopefully other facilities will become available. At least now we will have the opportunity to elect that council and not be dealing with a city council which was elected by others.

We have got other objections, oh, we should have sent a copy of the bill to each councillor. You know, the minister did not send a copy of the bill to my council either, Mr. Speaker, but they got one, because I sent it to them. And somebody in a news release complained that they did not receive a copy of the bill until Wednesday, the 31st. of

MR. WINDSOR: May. The bill was tabled on the 30th. of May, Mr. Speaker, should we circulate it to people and in every case I think these were non-elected people really, perhaps community representatives, but not duly elected councillors, should we send them copies of the bill before we give it to hon. gentlemen in the House of Assembly? Is that what you are suggesting?

A speaker in the Opposition made reference to this the other day, some gentleman reported - or a letter to the editor I believe it was, that he had not received a copy of the bill until the 31st. It was tabled in the House on the 30th. That same gentleman in that newspaper suggested he had not had any consultation. But a month before I sat in his living room on a Sunday night, with the draft, with the minister's permission, with a copy of the draft bill in my hand to discuss it with him and to get their input and answered all their questions and said, "If you have any more representations to make, if you want other meetings let me know." No consultation, what a pile of nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

Never, I would suggest to you, has there been so much consultation

MR. N. WINDSOR: there been so much consultation. Never has so much work gone into developing any piece of legislation. And it has not been an easy thing to do because you had to look at the need for municipal services - what service is required, and you had to consider the best way to provide them, to finance them and who will administer them. So this has gone on now for some time. The minister, I would suggest, has done a tremendous job in pulling together the best thing he could get for the interim and the interim period. And I am not suggesting that everything in this bill is perfect. There are points that I would like to make, in fact. I may as well make them now.

There is a section here that says there should be an election two months following the municipal election.

AN HON. MEMBER: One month.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I am sorry, one month. We agreed, and I have had some second thoughts on that since our discussions. I agree with this now because I think we have to do it this way but I think we would have to look at it in future, and we have to look at it in a much larger light. We have to consider the municipal elections all around the Province, and one problem that is occurring, that is becoming evident, is that we have an election on the first Tuesday in November and before councillors have a chance to turn around the budget has already been submitted to the minister. I think it is December 1st it must be submitted to the minister so you are saying you are going to get three weeks to submit your budget in the new council. So obviously, perhaps, the outgoing council have already done most of the work or hopefully they have, and I would suggest that municipal elections perhaps should be put back to the first Tuesday in October to give you that much more time to get your budget

MR. N. WINDSOR: in shape for the beginning of the year.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. N. WINDSOR: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Whenever we have the -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Or in the Spring, or you know, maybe two months before. It would either have to be in the Spring or in October.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, it is a matter for discussion.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) discussion.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes. And I would suggest also that maybe one month between the municipal election and the regional election may not be enough either - two reasons, number one, somebody may run for office as a municipal councillor, may be elected even, and one month later he is into an election as a regional councillor because he does have the right to run for the regional council if he wants to, and secondly because the people of the district having to go the polls one month apart leads to somewhat confusion - Who are we electing this time? Who did we elect last month and who are we electing this time? - this sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to get into anything more detailed. Let me simply say that I support this bill. I support the minister on his stand. I am not at all apologizing for the position that I have taken on this. I think this is perhaps the greatest piece of legislation that has come in with regard to the St. John's area in a number of years, and I think it will be seen to be that over the next few years. I think it is a great step forward and I look forward to regional government being in place, to the various municipalities working with them, and I think this region has a great future. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First let me say that I do not pretend to be an authority on regional government in the Northeast Avalon. Certainly I have no direct stake, or the people I represent have no direct stake except for the fact that we found out this morning that they will be having to pay for it. But inasfar as what it will mean to them they will be helping to pay for it. So I would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to leave the debate on this bill to the people who have the most at stake and the people who have a feeling and the people who will be involved, the various St. John's members and the various members in my caucus who as I said have a direct interest.

However, there are parts of that bill that are objectionable, Mr. Speaker. To anyone who believes that people should have a say in their own rights there are parts of this bill that are repulsive and objectionable and that is what I am going to try to address myself to, the parts of the bill that I find objectionable.

Mr. Flight: And before I get into the Bill, I want to talk to the minister of a second to say to this minister as a result of his speech the other day, a few days ago, that minister seems to be under the illusion that he has had some impact, that he has made some contribution as Minister of Municipal Affairs to the Buchans area. He seems to be under the illusion that he has done something that would have improved the way of life of the people of Buchans. And he knows full well that he has done nothing. One of the reasons that the people of St. John's and Newfoundland is probably afraid of an appointed board. Maybe they are using the Buchans experience where a board was appointed to control the way of life of 2,500 people a year and a half ago. That board is still in place, a board appointed to run the affairs of a town of 2,500 people minimum is still in place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister rose here the other day, you talk about misleading the House, the minister rose the other day and said "Everybody in Buchans has got a home to live in now. Thanks to him." He had no more to do, Mr. Speaker, with the people of Buchans owning their homes, having brought their homes than I had to do with putting a man on the moon. And he knows it.

AN HON. MEMBER: One -

MR. FLIGHT: Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters formed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Price (Nfld.) and ASARCO, Mr. Speaker, put together a Co-tenancy Committee, they were not prepared to let the Department of Municipal Affairs have anything to do with selling the houses. They hired an ex-Mayor from Grand Falls Mr. Walter Tucker to deal with the people on their behalf. And that minister stands up and says, indicating that he had something to do with the people of Buchans buying and owning their homes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Now what has the Department of Municipal Affairs to this point in time since the town has been incorporated contributed to the Town of Buchans?

AN HON. MEMBER: A guilty -

MR. FLIGHT: A \$500 grant, an operating grant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Nothing at this stage, not one thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Recommendations were made as a result as a result of that study on how it was done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Embarrassment, 'Graham'.

MR. FLIGHT: The Buchans Task Force report - the only recommendation that have been followed out is the incorporation of the town, right? And the minister, not this minister, the previous minister refused to allow the people of Buchans to have a plebiscite, categorically and totally refused. The minister wrote me to recommend five names and I wrote him back and said, if you are not prepared to allow a plebiscite in that town for people to decide their own faith then I refuse to recommend people. And that minister, Sir, to this point in time have had no input at all, he has got a five man Board of Trustees who at this point in time, it might changed tomorrow, but for this past year and a half have had no influence at all in the Town of Buchans, and people are going around saying, We are incorporated but why are we incorporated? What has happened as a result of incorporation?

MR. NOLAN: "Graham", 'Graham' embarrassment him, ask him something to embarrassment him?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: That is good! That is good! The minister indicated to me, Mr. Speaker, that he said, I will go into Buchans and debate the member. Well if he did, I will tell you this, if he did -

AN HON. MEMBER: Windsor too.

MR. FLIGHT: - If he did he would be the first minister who went to Buchans. And I would welcome the chance to debate the minister in Buchans or anywhere else on the Buchans issue any time at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am going to Grand Falls next week.

MR. FLIGHT: We will go to Buchans then.

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

Perhaps I should point out to hon. members that in discussing the principle of this Bill clearly other incorporated areas do have some tenure -

MR. FLIGHT: No it has a lot of bearing -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): . But I would feel that this remarks in this regard should be brought into fairly clear relationship to the Bill under discussion.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would point out only, Sir, to Mr. Speaker that the minister, Sir, spent at least five or ten minutes on the Buchans situation in his two hour -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: -

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister wants to talk about Windsor. He made a great do of grabbing up this report because this is a report that the government are not going to shove under the table. This is a report we are not going to shove under the table. Well that hon. member's government instituted a Patterson report that cost the Province something like \$30,000 to \$40,000 four or five years ago, and the major recommendation was that regional government will be set up Windsor, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Just a minute now, let me deal with the minister. - will be set up. Now, Sir, I tell this House that there was not as much objection to regional government in that area as it is to Bill 50. So where was the great philosophy of regional government? What happened five years ago that they did not carry through? Now a minister who is now no longer minister, but five or six months ago made a statement in Grand Falls that he did not believe in the regional at this time, Windsor, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls are not ready for regional government. They are ready as the Northeast Avalon. There is not a community in that area that has not got a Town Council, has not got a water system, that has not got all of the services that will.

Mr. Flight: be required in the event if regional government came.
They are more ready.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this standing up on the great principle and say regional government that has got to come, that is what we believe in. They did not believe it in Central Newfoundland though.

MR. FLIGHT: Central Newfoundland though -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: - did not believe in Central .

Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, I will talk to the minister about regional government in Central Newfoundland or Windsor.

Now, Sir, there is a great fear in Newfoundland - not a great fear, but there is a feeling - I am not sure I subscribe to it, but there is a feeling that St. John's up to this point in time has been built and serviced and has all the great infrastructure that we see - very proud of our capital city, but it has been built off the backs of the people of Newfoundland by and large. Mr. Speaker, when we see the minister on Brophy's Half Hour start off Brophy's Half Hour with a stick pointing out how \$55 million is to be spent in the regional water supply and the trunk sewer -

AN HON. MEMBER: Totally untrue.

MR. FLIGHT: - I will guarantee the minister that lots of communities around Newfoundland both corporated and unincorporated wonders why they could not have got the same consideration - not \$55 million, \$25 million to put in an over the ground water system just to provide water to the houses. And there is some fear, Sir, that a case can be made that this regional government might just be the vehicle that will now service the Avalon off the backs of the rest of Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, there are lots of reasons. And there is no doubt, Sir, I do not care, I would be prepared to debate this with any lawyer in St. John's, there is no doubt that this is going to result in expropriation without remuneration.

Listen to Clause 33. Let me read that for the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor).

MR. FLIGHT: Clause 33, Section 3: "Where property is acquired under this Section or Section 32 no compensation is to be paid to the municipality and liabilities and obligations associated with the property will be assumed by the regional council." It does not say a water system, it could be a chunk of land that that particular municipality might be keeping for a playground, might be keeping for anything. They may want to use it as a negotiating point with the regional council. It is all gone. That is expropriation without compensation.

Mr. Speaker, it is also taxation without representation. Just look at the make up of the regional board - a fifteen man regional council of which four must come from the city of St. John's, five to be appointed by the minister, that is nine. That leaves six people to represent all the communities both corporated and unincorporated in the Northeast Avalon.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many people?

MR. FLIGHT: Sixty-five thousand people.

Now, let us use a case apart, Bay Bulls, Petty Harbour for argument sake. There is no way that communities such as these can have representation on that board.

I referred to the ward system here a few minutes ago. The reason the ward system has not been accepted in St. John's is that people know that if you get some representation, some ward of St. John's or any city that is represented by a strong individual, he is going to have one concern and that is the area that he represents, and if a decision has to be made as to where the next \$5 million of the regional council's money is going to be spent it is going to be made based on the arguments put forward by the members representing the various areas. And you get a situation like Petty Harbour

MR. FLIGHT: it is ten or twelve years down the road before their turn will come. And that is taxation without representation, Mr. Speaker. Who is going to represent the unincorporated areas on that board? Who is going to guarantee that the regional council will only have - let us assume their capital expenditures this year is \$5 million. Who decides where it will be spent? Do Petty Harbour and Bay Bulls think they are going to have as good a chance to get their share as some guy from the Goulds who sits on the board? No way, Mr. Speaker! This is total, absolute taxation without representation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) people will be elected to the board.

MR. FLIGHT: I am not assuming the people are going to be elected. I am saying it as it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a year and a half down the road.

MR. FLIGHT: And that is a year and a half down the road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why would the minister want to insist that he would appoint people to this regional board? Maybe it is because last Fall under that minister there were ten or twelve towns in Newfoundland who could not find people to run for council. There are at least ten or twelve municipalities in this Province where the minister could not find candidates to run and take on responsibilities of administering the towns. Is that the reason? Another year or two going the way we have gone in the municipal government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, the minister would have had his own way. He seems to be a great supporter of appointments. Another year or so he might have been able to appoint the whole fifteen because he might not have got anybody to run anyway.

Mr. Flight: For instance I have heard one hon. member of this House whose area is in the regional government suggesting that the regional government is the only way it is going to get a stadium. A stadium. An hon. member who represents an area in - the reason he is supporting and believes that regional government will be a good thing - he sees regional government as being the vehicle that will give him a stadium. He might be right too. But will Morton's Harbour get its water and sewer before he gets the stadium?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Now he might be right. Are all of the facilities of St. John's now going to be available to the Northeast Avalon? Is the Aquarena now going to be available on an equitable basis to the people of Pouch Cove and Logy Bay ?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Everybody in the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Everybody in the Province. Everybody in the Province. There is nothing in here to show what the city is prepared to give up, Mr. Speaker. No, Mr. Speaker, the people outside of the radius of St. John's got a lot to fear for this Bill, they have got a lot to fear. Ten years from now they are going to be wondering what is the advantage of their being under the regional government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member said they are going to get a stadium somewhere.

MR. FLIGHT: I am just pointing out the ridiculousness of this Bill. Are they going to provide police protection for all the people under the Northeast Avalon, under the Regional Bill? Are they going to expand the St. John's Constabulary? The member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) do not have to worry about regional government all he got to worry is bring Benton into Gander, and he did his best towards regional government last year when he tried to disband, take away the rights of the Town Council of Benton.

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

Mr. Flight: Disband the town, and then brought them off with water and sewer.

MR. MURPHY: They got \$18,500 -

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we have had on incorporation in this Province for the past two or three years. And maybe that is the reason, maybe the minister knew Bill 50 was coming, maybe the minister knew that if all these little unincorporated new towns in the Northeast Avalon were incorporated they may be in a better position to oppose them. The only people who have any any input into this bill are communities who are indeed incorporated because we have had somebody coming in to speak for them or get on radio. But the unincorporated areas who had no input at all, they have had no vehicle to have input and they are standing out and wondering, and they use a pawn, and they are the ones who got most to lose, and the ones that will lose the most. That message will be gotten through to them too, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: - back to the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right, back to the Province \$55 million over the past -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: That is right, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the concept regional government may be a good thing, the concept itself. But why you would bring in regional government refusing, totally refusing NIP. Look why does not the minister talk about NIP. You know, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows the only reason Windsor got NIP was because the federal government decided to put most of the funds in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Have you paid it yet? Is it paid? Is the minister going to pay it or is the Town of Windsor going to have a guaranteed loan?

AN HON. MEMBER: It was guaranteed.

MR. FLIGHT: It is going to be a government guaranteed loan?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is guaranteed.

MR. FLIGHT: A government guaranteed loan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, oh yes the hon. member knows as much about NIP as the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the concept of regional government in the whole Province. Maybe the minister when he gets the right to close this debate, I guess. Maybe he is going to explain to the House as to why it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: September.

MR. FLIGHT: September, yes. - why it is that regional government is suddenly so important for the Northeast Avalon and not important for Central Newfoundland, for argument sake, that was recommended five years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Pardon? What is the minister saying? You know, Mr. Speaker, that minister reminds me of the rooster that on awakening he thought the sun rose just to hear him crow. That is what that minister reminds me of, he sits over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: The most competent minister we have had -

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, yes, the most St. John's orientated minister we have had too.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes. St. John's.

MR. MURPHY: St. John's.

MR. FLIGHT: That is it, I have got to argue with the minister.

MR. FLIGHT: I knew I would get to the minister.

The minister says he is better than his predecessor? Better than the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. MURPHY: I said he is the best we have had.

MR. FLIGHT: He is the best you have had.

He is obviously kowtowing to the party line, you know St. John's gets everything. We will sock it into St. John's -

MR. MURPHY: They paid for it.

MR. FLIGHT: - and Mr. Speaker, the people in the Northeast Avalon, in those non-incorporated areas, St. John's is going to pay no bills for them. The Minister of T and C this morning was the first minister yet that indicated, "Where is the money coming from? Where is the money coming from? It is coming from," he says, "the government of Newfoundland, all capital expenditure expended under the regional government will be put up by the - ", so what is new? That is what has been happening all the time. What is new? All the minister has done is succeeded in putting another drain on the treasury by supporting this level of bureaucracy he has dreamed up under bill 50.

I will just confirm my notes a minute here now. I will go to the bill here. Now I want to hear the minister yes when he gets up.

MR. MURPHY: Are you going to talk about the bill at all?

MR. WHITE: He is talking about the principle of regional government.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting little - number 27 in this bill, "No councillor shall vote or speak on any matter before the regional council on or before any committee of the regional council where he has an interest in the matter distinct from any interest arising from his function as a councillor."

MR. FLIGHT: If that minister wanted to do the people of Newfoundland and all the community of Newfoundland a favour he would amend the Local Government Act, to read that. We talk about conflict of interest, members of the House of Assembly, the biggest conflict of interest probably in Canada today is the kind of conflict of interest that that minister allows to go on in town councils. Town after town after town have been denied development, denied malls, denied all sorts of facilities because some mayor or some councillor was afraid of their little empire being threatened and that has gone on with the knowledge of this minister. Why did that amendment come in?

AN HON. MEMBER: Name the mayors.

MR. FLIGHT: I will name the mayors. I will name the mayors. Do not worry. The minister knows it is true. I will name the towns.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead.

MR. FLIGHT: St. John's mayor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: The member does not know what he is talking about.

MR. FLIGHT: I will find another part of this bill. I indicated before I stood up, Mr. Speaker, that I was not an authority on this bill and one can only make a decent speech I think if he knows what he is talking about and I have appeared to run out but I intend to talk until one o'clock regardless. So I will find things in the bill I want to talk about.

MR. MURPHY: How did you enjoy the party last night?

MR. FLIGHT: Well I will tell you one thing about the party last night, if this regional government was in effect we would have another guest there, Mr. O'Dea is it? Is Mr. O'Dea really

MR. FLIGHT: going to be the president?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: Was he not invited last night?

Mr. Speaker, that is discrimination, I would go on record
as -

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us talk -
I will talk to the minister about the Buchans situation.

MR. MURPHY: We can call it one o'clock if you
just want to go on for that purpose.

MR. FLIGHT: No. No. This is very important.
Apart from misleading the House, maybe not deliberately, bluffing
all the people in Buchans, apart from doing that what is the
minister's intentions with regards to the Town of Buchans?
2,500 people incorporated under a board of trustees by appointment,
he is allowing a situation to exist where we have got two towns,
he refuses to make any moves that will make it possible for those
two towns to amalgamate. Every day the gap gets wider.

MR. DINN: A point of order.

MR. MURPHY: Why did you not accept the
boundaries -

MR. FLIGHT: It had better be a good point of order.

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

MR. DINN: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon.
gentleman does not know what we are discussing here. He had
admitted that he does not know what we are talking about, what
he is talking about in the bill. The fact of the matter is
the hon. gentleman also knows the procedure for setting up a town
council in Buchans if the people wish. It is a matter of
circulating a petition, sending it into the minister and the
minister will make a judgement on it.

MR. DINN: circulating a petition, sending it in to the minister and the minister would make a judgement on it through the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. He is being irrelevant to the debate and he is dragging in another red herring and if he wants the town of Buchans incorporated, if that is what he wants then he knows the procedure to have that done.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A submission by the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker on Bill 50 we are talking about the general principle of Regional Government. Most hon. members who have been speaking in this debate and referred to the general principle of Regional Government have not kept their debate to the Northeast Avalon region. They have talked generally about Regional Government all over Newfoundland and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this debate which is a very serious one and a very important one rather than raise a point of order as the hon. gentleman has just did in reference to the relevancy of the bill all he is doing is harassing the hon. member and stopping him from making some very important comments with respect to his district and with respect to Regional Government.

MR. SPEAKER: After sufficient consideration the principle of the bill deals with the establishment of an urban regional council in the Northeast Avalon references to similar urban or municipal organizations in other parts of the Province for purposes of comparison, of illustrating a point, of contrast certainly that would be in order. For an hon. gentleman to embark upon a speech specifically on municipally organization in Buchans or Herring Neck or somewhere would be to stretch that principle but an illustration for purposes of comparison would I think be in order.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that was obviously a very specious point of order. The minister is trying to kill my time because he knows I am making good points here.

Mr. Speaker, other speakers before me have made the point but the fact is, Sir, the Regional Government is going to result in too much government, people being regulated out of

MR. FLIGHT: their minds, higher taxes, no input at all and the majority of the people outside the city of St. John's and across to Mount Pearl itself, all the people in the smaller communities incorporated or unincorporated will be years and years and years down the road before they feel the effects, the good effects of Regional Government, it will mean nothing to them. There will be communities ten years from now that will not have gained by Regional Government because it does not matter how much money is available there is not enough money available to immediately service.

Another thing the minister and every member on that side is guilty of doing is creating false hopes in those people by saying with Regional Government in will come all this, it is the only way we will get the services, in will come the services. The people of Bay Bulls, Petty Harbour and the various other communities in this district believe now that as a result of the regional bill they will have services. But ten years from now and some of these communities will not and they will have been fooled again. This regional bill is meant to serve one group of people, the people in the metropolis with no concern or no consideration for the people outside who have not already got the water and sewerage systems that they need anyway. The minister knows that, the minister once stood up in this House and told the people of the unincorporated areas - get up and tell them when he believes that as a result of Regional Government they will get the services that have been talked about by the minister.

MR. WHITE: The seven year plan.

MR. FLIGHT: The seven year plan like the five year - this is a government of plans, Mr. Speaker, seven years this one. The hospital was five years and then extended to seven -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, in winding up this debate I just want to tell the minister that I would welcome - on the municipal services provided by this administration and his involvement in the administration - I would welcome to meet the minister in Windsor, in Buchans, in Badger, in any town in Newfoundland where I know what is

June 23, 1970

Tape No. 4822

AH-3

MR. FLIGHT: happening. So, Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate. No I do not adjourn the debate I have three minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should not, I just realized there are some other points that I have not talked about and it is very important, Mr. Speaker. I want the people of Northeast Avalon to know that somebody saw it their way, somebody has tried to protect them but not the people of St. John's, they do not need any protection

MR. FLIGHT: not even try to protect them - not the people of St. John's, they do not need any protection. They have the whole House of Assembly, City Council, this regional committee protecting them. Somebody raised it, but nobody has been standing up protecting the unincorporated people. You are taking advantage of them, that is what you are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: You are using them the way you have used most of rural Newfoundland over the past fifty, sixty, seventy or eighty years.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 2:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until Tuesday, June 27, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.