



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 2

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PETITIONS:

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 741 residents in sixteen communities in St. Barbe North. Sir, the prayer of the petition is asking for the removal of a blind hill which is directly in front of the St. Augustine's High School in Plum Point. Sir, this school has an enrollment of 253 students and runs parallel to the main road and the students often cross this road during recess and lunch hour and many students walk along this road to and from school. There have been several near accidents as the cars come over the hill at very high speeds. At the present time, Sir, there is a school zone sign by the side of the road but the drivers cannot see the school because of the blind hill and the sign is quite often ignored.

Sir, representation has been made to the Department of Highways officials in St. Barbe and at St. Anthony by the school board, I understand, and some teachers. The school board has been informed by the officials of the Department of Transportation and Communications that the school was not meant to be built in that particular location. Well, Sir, that does not solve the problem. I would like to see the Minister of Transportation and Communications support this petition and give this request top priority so that the removal of this blind hill can take place come early spring when the weather conditions permit.

Sir, I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. THOMAS V. HICKEY (Minister of Transportation and Communications):

Would the honourable gentleman give me the name of the person who -

MR. ROWE: I beg your pardon.

MR. HICKEY: The highway official who gave that -

MR. ROWE: I can find it out. I will have to contact the person who sent in the petition.

MR. H. W. C. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to present a petition from the voters of the Town of Durrell, which is on Twillingate Island. The prayer of the petition is for the government to install a water and sewerage system in the Town of Durrell. Those of this honourable House who have visited the area can appreciate that the Town of Durrell is the most important part, I would say, of Twillingate Island. They are the producers, the fishermen of the Twillingate Island Area. They certainly deserve a water and sewerage system.

This area, Mr. Speaker, is the area where I was born, where I grew up. I know it quite well. I have to admit that it is going to be a costly project but I think it is a necessary project. I think it is something that has to be done very soon because until it is completed, I do not think the roads can be paved and that, of course, is a dire necessity; the roads in Durrell as well as the roads in Twillingate.

I would present this petition, Sir, in all humility and I trust that it will reach the ears of the minister responsible and the entire cabinet. I would have this placed on the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act, 1973 and in particular, section 15 thereof, I table the report of the Newfoundland Electoral Boundaries Commission. This report has already been circulated to all honourable members and to the press. To complete the records of this honourable House, I table the report of the royal commission to enquire into the amount of social assistance received by Frederick Thompson and Ruth Thompson of Bauline Line, St. John's and the report of the royal commission on illegal work stoppages. All these reports have already been made public.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I table a report that was quite recently received by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, the report of the royal commission on matters pertaining to the relationships of the Workmen's Compensation Board with the employees. If honourable members will recall, it is the report of Magistrate Hugh O'Neil. This report will be distributed to honourable members and to the press within a few moments.

Whilst I am on my feet, for the edification of honourable members, Mr. Speaker, there are three other royal commissions that have been sitting for some time. I have inquired as to when we can expect to receive their reports: the royal commission on the present structure of local government throughout the province, under the chairmanship of Professor Hugh Whelan and who anticipates that the report will be completed by May 1, 1974; the judicial enquiry on the supply of housing and building materials on Bell Island; and the disposal of the former Dosco assets, by Mr. Justice Arthur S. Mifflin

It is anticipated by Mr. Justice Mifflin that his report will be ready for presentation within two months. The report of the royal commission on the economic and sociological conditions of life in Labrador under the chairmanship of Mr. Donald Snowden, it is anticipated that this report will be completed by the end of February.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE, Minister of Finance: Your Honour, I ask leave to table, as required under section 51 paragraph (3) of The Financial Administration Act, guaranteed loans paid in part or in whole since the last sitting of the House, some copies for the opposition and the press. These are the usual hardy perennials we have been familiar with since the early days of the last administration, with one or two new ones.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other reports? The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. C. W. DOODY, Minister of Industrial Development: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of The Development Areas Lands Act, 1964, I have to table this information: The Development Area of Bay Bulls Order of 1973; the Development Area of Bay Bulls Regulations of 1973; the Development Area of Gros Morne Park Enclaves Regulations of 1973; and the Development Areas of Gros Morne Park Enclaves Order of 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other reports?

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. JOHN A. CARTER: I beg leave to present the following motion:

WHEREAS the financing of election campaigns and political parties is a matter of vital public concern and whereas members of this honourable House have from time to time publicly advocated legislation to govern and control these matters and whereas the Parliament of Canada has recently passed Federal Legislation with the support of the major political parties thus therefore be it

resolved that this House request the government to introduce legislation to govern and control; (a) the public financing of election expenses and (b) the private financing of election expenses and other expenses of political parties with suitable controls involving (1) disclosure of contributions, (2) the limiting of amounts allowed to be spent by candidates and by political parties.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall accept the resolution under advisement and rule on it later.

The honourable member for St. John's South.

MR. ROBERT WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that whereas the Province of Newfoundland provide for the expropriation of private property including the expropriation of private dwellings and whereas the present rules of compensation allow for payment of fair market value for such expropriated private dwellings and whereas in such expropriations this rule of compensation causes hardship in many cases and whereas in such cases there is need for compensation based on the principle of a house for a house, thus therefore be it resolved that this House ask the government to introduce legislation which would change the rules of compensation for expropriated private dwellings to embody the principle of replacement costs where applicable instead of fair market value.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall accept that under advisement and rule on it later.

HON. A. J. MURPHY, Minister of Social Assistance: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on tomorrow I will ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act," and a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Adoption of Children Act, 1972."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Repeal A Gift Tax Act, 1972," and a bill, "An Act to Repeal the Succession Duty Act, 1972."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN, Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Pensions Of The Chairman Of The Board Of Public Utilities," and a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Change Of Name Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo.

MR. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before we get into the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. the Minister of Fisheries. Can he tell the House when the fishermen along the Northeast Coast who suffered storm damage last June will be compensated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. H. A. COLLINS (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the question which the honourable member raises is a very important one. A great number of claims have already been honoured. The officials in the department are trying to bring it up-to-date. We hope to have it up-to-date in a month's time.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, is it correct that the fishermen who suffered damage in the same storm along the Southern Shore and Placentia Bay have been reinstated or compensated?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is an on-going programme. Just about daily during the past four, five or six months, federal officials as well as the provincial officials have been gathering information. As I have said it will all be taken care of in a month's time.

AN HON. MEMBER: When did the honourable member say?

MR. COLLINS: About one month.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Could the minister inform this House when the Report of the Forestry Task Force is going to be publicized?

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTS): Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate the report will be ready for distribution to the public on or about the last of February.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Is it a fact that the government or the minister's department has committed \$3 million to the



St. John's City Council for the financing of the 1977 Canada Summer Games, if their bid is successful?

HON. T. M. DOYLE (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr.

Speaker, it is a fact that the Government of the Province have committed to support the Canada Summer Games 1977 should the City of St. John's be awarded the bid.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Well, Sir, in view of the fact that St. John's represents approximately one-fifth of the province's population -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): When one is asking questions one does not make speeches. The honourable member can ask a question but that does not allow him to debate it.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Well I will continue on with the question. Is the minister prepared to provide an equal share to the rest of the province, fourth-fifths of the province, which comes to approximately \$12 million for recreational purposes?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that should the City of St. John's be fortunated enough to be awarded the 1977 Canada Summer Games that not only the citizens of St. John's be the beneficiaries of any facilities that will be built therein for the games but because of there use by students attending the University, the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades, some two-thirds of which at any given time come from all over the province, because of various quarter-finals and semi-finals from all over the province in the various sports which will lead up to the games and other provincials events thereafter it is felt that the province generally will benefit from the awarding of the games to the City of St. John's, as the Capital City of the Province.

I should point out right here, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad of the opportunity afforded me by the honourable member that the money committed should the city be fortunated in getting the games will in no way effect the recreation or any other budget of this government.

MR. ROWE, F. B. It is \$3 million?

MR. DOYLE: That is correct.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I would expect, Sir, the same latitude as the minister because the minister did not ask the question. I asked the minister if he would be prepared to argue in Cabinet for the equivalent amount for outside of St. John's, which comes to \$12 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The honourable member for St. Barbe North is making a speech and he is not asking a question. I have to rule him out of order.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the Premier stated publicly on television that the likelihood of DREE school construction this year is slim.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Would the minister inform the House as to whether or not his department has submitted counter proposals to the Government of Canada for such badly needed construction?

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable gentleman is referring to a statement to the effect that the inclusion of additional schools under a new DREE agreement, this does not effect amendments to the agreement and schools which have already been agreed upon. The substance of the Premier's remark was to the effect that in any new agreement the chance for inclusion of schools would be slim or whatever the wording was. I want to make the point that we are speaking about additional schools not schools already agreed for. With that point, obviously the Premier was expressing what many of us feel and that is that funds which in future would be available in this area would in our opinion be spent with much more profit, not in additional, non-agreed upon, non-negotiated and additional DREE day schools, but in these broad areas of vocational, technical and fisheries education in these brought areas.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker a supplementary question. Have any specific and counter proposals been made to the Government of Canada for such vocational and fisheries colleges and what have they in the list that the minister just gave.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it would be proper for me to comment upon negotiations between one government and another until they are finalized.

MR SPEAKER: Order please!

MR OTTENHEIMER: If the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North wish to answer the question, I suppose he could have a crack at it when he is going to serve education, but I think I stated the position clearly and succinctly.

MR F.B. ROWE: Well I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the answer is no.

Sir, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Premier. In view of the fact that Dr Parson's report confirms conclusively that the financial

factor is the greatest reason for students not attending the university, does the Premier not think that his time for study is over and that he should make a definite commitment to the students of this province so they can plan for the coming semester?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I have ruled the honourable member's questions out of order. He is asking a question and getting into a speech at the same time.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, now I ask the question is the Hon. Premier prepared to make a definite commitment in order that students planning to attend university in the next semester and September semester can make plans for such attendance?

HON. FRANK D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the report of Professor Parsons is not completed, it is an interim report. When the report is completed, this government will read it with interest and whatever we do will be based on the premise that it is not the government's intention to make it more difficult for people to attend university, but upon examination of the report we will be taking a position that is necessary to insure that everyone who wants to and everybody who qualifies will have the opportunity to attend university.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, does the report not state that 87.8 per cent - Mr. Speaker, what is all the noise about on the other side? You have no way of identifying whether it is a question or not because of the subhuman noises from the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I request that if the honourable member for St. Barbe North is going to ask a question that he get on with it.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to.

MR. M. WOODWARD: (Labrador North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. the Premier. Can the Premier inform the House if construction will start this coming summer upon development of the hydro project on the lower Churchill.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this side of the House and the other side of the House, I am sure I express all our sentiments when I

say I hope it will.

MR. JOHN A. CARTER (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct to the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, but in his absence I will have to direct the question to the Premier: The tenants of the Valleyview Apartments have recently been notified of a very large increase in rent and I would like to ask the Premier if he has given any consideration to holding public hearings on this matter?

MR. MOORES: I would think that is noticed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEPHEN NEARY (Bell Island): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health. Would the minister inform the House if there are any new cases of diphtheria on the Burin Peninsula or if there are any cases reported in other parts of the Province?

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, there are no new cases reported during the week end, since the last cases were reported on Thursday. We have however had two more positive swabs come in this morning, which indicates that

these are two individuals who are growing the germ but who are not sick. They have not been confirmed but they are called sub-clinical so there were two more positive swabs of people who are not ill but who may be carriers. They are being treated with toxide and with the necessary antibiotics.

The second part of the question: there are two cases which are under surveillance from Labrador which have been possibly but have not been confirmed as complications which may have resulted from an earlier attack of this disease.

MR. S.A.NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the Department of Health to carry out an immunization programme province-wide in the foreseeable future?

DR. A.T.ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention to. I should mention here that if people who have children who have been getting their shots had been attending the clinics held in all parts of the province, that well over seven percent of all our people are considered to be completely immunized now. As and when any situation dictates we will put the whole resources of the department into any area.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. Would the minister inform the House what steps his department have taken to restore the principle of paying social assistance based on the number of dependents in families?

HON. A.J.MURPHY: (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, we are doing that now, I believe, unless we changed since I left the office this afternoon. I think the point here is that the honourable member feels that it should be more profitable to go on welfare than it is to work. Our philosophy is this; that a family on welfare should not receive more monies than someone working. We have pegged our rates at two plus seven in the case of a couple plus seven, children, at \$320 a month, because when we go above that it would be more profitable to stay home and watch T.V. in the afternoons than it would be to go out to work.

I think this is a philosophy that we will stand for. I do not know if the honourable member for Bell Island would want to make a case of it politically, that we should pay more to people on welfare than those who are working get. In addition, of course, in conjunction with every other province and with the federal government the family allowance is a part of the income supplement and they will receive one hundred and forty dollars. I may also add, many of these, a great majority are getting their rent paid, one hundred and forty dollars or one hundred and fifty dollars a month; they get free drugs and free transportation.

We feel quite honestly and we are only referring to the taxpayers in this case whom I think are the ones who pay the bill, that what we are doing is right. Anyone who should want to make a case any time can get up and challenge it and we will be only too happy to stand behind them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the Premier whether or not that university report states that eighty-seven percent of the students gave as their reason for not attending university a financial reason and that thirty-seven percent stated that it was the government's financial aid policy to the students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order! Order!

MR. F.B. ROWE: What is wrong? Everybody is pretty touchy today, Sir.

HON. F.D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the interim report that the honourable member is referring to I have not read in detail. I do not know if the Minister of Education can confirm it or not. I just have not seen it to that degree.

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Actually I received the report Friday afternoon. I left St. John's for meetings in Clarenville over the weekend and I have been in Gander until this morning. I have read it, read through it, read it quickly. I have not given it - before I want to say "Yes" verbatim, this sentence is in or

not, I would want to read it much more carefully.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order no. 1, Address in Reply. The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a most unusual and difficult position today. Originally it was the intention of the Leader of the Opposition to lead off the Throne Speech Debate on this side of the House. Unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition has the flu, he could not attend the sitting of the House today and at the last minute he asked me if I would pinch-hit for him



which I am glad to do. It does not necessarily mean, Mr. Speaker, that coming events cast their shadows before them.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I was extremely pleased over the weekend to learn that the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations had returned to the province and that it is only a matter of a short time when the minister will be able to resume his seat in this honourable House. I think I express the pleasure of all the members on this side of the honourable House, Sir, when I say that we look forward to seeing the minister back in his seat in the near future.

Now, Sir, traditionally each speaker in the Throne Speech Debate offers his congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. I must say, Sir, that I do so today without too much enthusiasm because as a Newfoundlander, Sir, and as one of the senior honourable members of this honourable House, I must say that opening day, in my opinion, was very, very disappointing indeed. It is usually agreed, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the House that the decorum, the procedure on opening day would be followed to the letter. There would be no political speeches as such, no partisan political speeches. I am afraid the honourable member for Bonavista South, who is notorious anyway, Sir, for getting carried away, certainly got a little bit carried away on opening day and certainly lowered, in my opinion, the dignity of the opening of this House when the Lieutenant Governor makes his annual visit to open the House.

So, the only thing that I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I suppose I congratulate the member for being given the opportunity to make the speech. Unfortunately he did not take advantage of the opportunity or maybe he did take advantage but I think he went a little too far.

I think the honourable member for Harbour Grace, Sir, did a little better although we found it very difficult to follow what the honourable member was saying. We did appreciate his wit and I would like to extend my congratulations to him for being chosen by the leader of his party to second the motion on the Address in Reply.

Now, Sir, I think that takes care of the formalities and I think I can get on with a few comments on the Gracious Speech from the Throne. It may take me fifteen or twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, to say what I have to say but in case the honourable member for Bonavista South does not know, this is the time to make a partisan, political speech.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, in the most Gracious Speech from the Throne there are a number of great, silent wastelands. Resounding silences, Mr. Speaker, on matters upon which the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador are most anxious to have clear-cut, forthright statements. No vague promises, Mr. Speaker, or lofty expressions of self-esteem by the present administration can distract attention from these most serious, gaping omissions. Why do we have no more than vague talk, Mr. Speaker, in the Gracious Throne Speech about the creation of 35,000 or so jobs over the past months when all of us know that our province, Mr. Speaker, leads all Canada in its unemployment rate. This despite the fact, Sir, that millions of dollars have been contributed to our economy through federal manpower training, LIP projects, opportunity for youths projects and other programmes.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, of what our unemployment rate would be if Ottawa had not been there to help. Even a child knows, Sir, it would be double or triple what it is at the present time.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the present administration heaps praise upon itself for its wonderful work of job creation. Well, Sir, the only thing that I can say about that is that apart from the appointments to the upper echelons of the public service and apart from the appointment of a whole platoon of highly paid flunkies to non-civil service posts, exactly what kind of permanent economically, justifiable jobs, Mr. Speaker, have this administration created? I would ask them in all sincerity that they table in this honourable House details of those thirty-five thousand plus jobs the administration is so glibly claiming to have created.

Mr. Speaker, why does not this most gracious Speech from the Throne give detailed outlines of its plans for creating employment for the masses of the jobless in the months ahead? Is it, Sir, that they have no plans other than to cut social assistance allowances for the employable unemployed? Has the minister made a new discovery in the field of motivation? It seems, Mr. Speaker, a bit like motivating honesty by executing thieves, as Voltaire I think it was put it a century ago. If the honourable Minister of Social Assistance is going to cut welfare to interest the jobless in working, he and his colleagues should be able to guarantee the jobs, practical jobs, jobs that are within the geographical and skills reach of our unemployed.

Why is the honourable Speech from the Throne completely silent on this matter of job creation? I ask the honourable speakers on the other side to tell us. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it is because the administration have no plans for such job creation and is completely incapable. Sir, of coping with the twenty to thirty percent of our people who are forced to live at or below any recognized poverty level. Nor, Mr. Speaker, was there a solid word of comfort in the Throne Speech for the thousands of families throughout Newfoundland and Labrador who

are forced to live in substandard shacks or be filed away in dreadful slum boarding houses. Why do the government members not stop passing on the other side of the street? Why not stop passing the buck to Ottawa or blaming world conditions or blaming it on our own provincial poverty?

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to financing industrial development or buying linerboard mills or run-down fish plants or executive jets or silver anniversary celebrations, or as the honourable Minister of Tourism just told us, hosting Canada's Canada Games, we can find the money for this or we can use our credit. Why cannot we, Mr. Speaker, use our credit to set up massive land banks immediately in the areas of this province where the housing need is the greatest? Why cannot we further use our provincial credit,

Sir, to install services, infrastructure in these land banks? If we did what Ontario's home plan, Sir, home-ownership-made-easy plan, is doing, if we did what Ontario is doing, we could through the establishment of land banks of serviced land do what Ontario did, cut home ownerships and costs by half or more than half.

I say to the honourable members on the government side of the House and all other members in this honourable House, immaterial of what side of the House they sit, that we as legislators, Sir, we as elected representatives of the people of this province should cut away the legislative cobwebs here in the House and permit our citizens to rent or lease the land on which they build their homes so that only the homes themselves are mortgaged, Sir. They would be mortgaged at interest rates subsidized by federal provincial co-operation and only a rental on the land, Mr. Speaker, be charged until the building itself is paid for or payments on it well under the owner's control.

Why, Mr. Speaker, did we not hear in the most Gracious Speech from the Throne plans to employ and encourage modern mass production methods in home building here with subdivisions set up in terms of hundreds and thousands of homes being built instead of the present wasteful practice, building four or five, eight or perhaps ten homes at once, as we heard the other day on radio?

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable and Gracious Speech from the Throne is silent on this vitally important matter of housing for our people? Is it, Mr. Speaker, because the administration has no plans for such, is completely incapable of coping with the need and the opportunity or is it that, Mr. Speaker, it just does not care about the two in every five of our families in this province who are forced to live in hovels that would be condemned by the Department of Health officials, Sir, if they just had some alternative roof for their occupants?

Silent too, Mr. Speaker, is the most Gracious Speech on any real plans for improving our traditional Newfoundland industry of the fishery except to set up conditions whereby the wealthy will get wealthier and the poor get poorer in spite of the world-wide need for protein food and the amazing level of prices, Sir, for our product and the

tremendous success of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation in marketing their share of that product. Why do we hear nothing, Mr. Speaker, more than the building of half a hundred modern, automated trawlers as our contribution to the fishery? Not a word, Sir, not a single word for the inshore fishermen already hard hit by the trawler operations and the trawler invasion around our shores.

Honourable members of the House know, Mr. Speaker, that over sixty per cent of Japan's protein intake comes from the sea and nearly a third of her sea food from the inshore fishery. Her's, Sir, Japan's, is an inshore fishery fostered and encouraged by a farsighted government with highly advanced fish culture technology aimed at constantly replenishing a resource that is numbered among the nation's most important. Why then, Mr. Speaker? It is very difficult for us to understand why the most Gracious Speech from the Throne is completely silent on the inshore fishery, the traditional occupation of so many of our people, the occupation, Mr. Speaker, upon which the honourable the Premier and his family built their family fortune before deserting it.

Is it, Mr. Speaker, that the administration is completely sterile when it comes to the inshore fishery? Mr. Speaker, one would get the impression that the smell of fish nauseates members on the other side of the House and that the present administration, Sir, is too busy in its preoccupation with jettisoning about this energy and protein hungry world and they just do not seem to care.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and I merely mention this as a footnote only - we hear in the most Gracious Speech that we are going to have a debate in this session - the Minister of Justice tabled the report today - we are going to have a debate, Sir, on the matter of redistribution of electoral seats, upon the report of the royal commission that was tabled in the House this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that this commission was handicapped from the start for the administration said to that commission, Sir, "Draw us up a redistribution based on fifty-one seats and about 10,000 souls to a district." Why was not the royal commission told to find out how many districts we

February 4, 1974

Tape 31

IB-3

should have in a little province of half a million people? Sir, what is the proportion of elected representatives to population in other provinces? What is the cost of government in other provinces in relation to the gross provincial product? Especially, Mr. Speaker, what do the people, the taxpayers, the electorate, Sir,

what do they want? Would they sooner have twenty-six electoral districts and a lower tax rate with few ministers of the Crown and their mandarins flitting around the world on expense accounts, paid out of the taxpayers hard earned dollars? Was the reason for specifying fifty-one electoral seats, Mr. Speaker, an effort to justify the mushrooming, if you would allow me to use that term, Mr. Speaker, of cabinet ranks, by a government which when it was in opposition talked about running the province, Sir, with a cabinet of twelve or fourteen? Was it for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the most gracious speech is silent upon this matter of consulting our citizens about the number of electoral districts or is it just that the present administration just does not care what the wishes and wants and the true needs of our Newfoundland people are, Sir?

Mr. Speaker, one interesting item in the Speech from the Throne is a vague reference to a new forest policy, although, Sir, there are no specifics as to what the government intend to do. We have not seen the legislation and we probably will not see the legislation for some time. We nevertheless on this side of the House think it is a good move. Mr. Speaker, why would we not think it is a good move? Why would we not think it is good policy when it was a brain child of the former Liberal Administration?

What we have before us, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what we have before us and honourable members of this honourable House should not have to be reminded, especially the Minister of Finance who was a member of the former Liberal Administration and the Minister of Justice who was a member of the Smallwood Administration and the Minister of Public Works and Municipal Affairs who was a member of the former Liberal Administration, Sir, they do not have to be reminded that what we have in front of us, Mr. Speaker, is a modified form of a policy outlined in this honourable House by former Premier Smallwood, in 1969.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.



MR. NEARY: Surely, Mr. Speaker, surely we all remember Premier Smallwood standing over there in the southwest corner of this honourable House with all kinds of papers, blackboards and maps outlining the future policy of his administration on management of our forests.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member will never forget because I am going to give the honourable member honourable mention here, Sir. Only a week ago, it was only a week ago, Mr. Speaker, that I read Mr. Smallwood's speech in Hansard, in the verbatim report of this honourable House. It is there for any honourable member to go and take a look at.

I read Mr. Smallwood's speech introducing this resolution that the House adopt these new measures but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition at the time, who happens to be the present Minister of Social Services, and his colleagues were not ready to debate the issue. The honourable member is nodding his head, he remembers it. The honourable member remembers it.

MR. MURPHY: I will never forget it.

MR. NEARY: We were not ready to debate the issue, Sir, and like so many other important items it was left on the Order Paper for future consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is one of the items that we had to leave behind as unfinished business. That is why we all look forward, Sir, to the tabling of this legislation. The tedious detail, Sir, and all the difficult groundwork was already completed when the Tories took office. All they had to do, Mr. Speaker, was to follow our plans. It is surprising to me, Sir, that it took them so long to do so. Just another example, Mr. Speaker, of the government continuing to follow in the footsteps of their old whipping boy the former Liberal Administration.

Mr. Speaker, another item of interest in the gracious Throne Speech. The vague reference again, no specifics, vague reference to the development of the Lower Churchill Falls. Well, Sir, before I deal with the development of the Lower Churchill I am going to have a few words about the development of the Upper Churchill.

Sir, this question of the development of the Upper Churchill has arisen in recent days as to whether or not Newfoundland is getting a fair and just amount of revenue from the development of the Upper Churchill? Mr. Speaker, hindsight is not foresight. If this project, Sir were being negotiated today with the present energy crisis, of course, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland would be in a stronger bargaining position. Why would we not be? Even a child knows this, Sir. Sir, and I should not have to remind honourable members of this House that when the terms and conditions of the development of the Upper Churchill were being negotiated there was no talk of an energy crisis. The situation in the Province of Quebec and on the national scene were not as stable as they are today.

One could say at the time, Mr. Speaker, why go ahead with the project at all? Why not just let the water continue to run as the Minister of Finance has said about the Lower Churchill so often. Why not let the water run into the sea, as it had done for thousands of years? Well, Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is reflect back on the economic conditions of the province at the time when to take this position Sir, eight, ten years ago would have been utter madness, when you take into account the social and economic conditions that our people were forced to live under in this province at that time and the high rate of unemployment that was plaguing this province.

I have no doubt at all, Sir, that when we are returned to office we will be able to find many examples of agreements and contracts and deals that are being made by the present Tory Administration that would be a better deal if they had only waited. Sir, I can give you a couple of examples right now. I do not have to wait until we get back in office, Sir, to show you how hindsight is not foresight. The Minister of Industrial Development came galloping into this House, Sir, as quickly as he could after they were elected to office, with

the proposals, "Shut down the steel mills down at the Octagon."  
"Shut it down. It was not a paying proposition."

Sir, within months, within months after the administration took that fatal decision the cost of steel skyrocketed.

MR. BARRY: The cost of scrap skyrocketed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there was an embargo placed on steel in Canada. The steel was kept home for domestic use and the honourable Minister knows that, so scrap would be more plentiful in Canada than it ever was.

MR. BARRY: More expensive than ever.

MR. NEARY: Bunkum, Mr. Speaker, bunkum. The honourable Minister should also know that within weeks after his administration took the decision to close down that steel mill, the Government of Canada brought in a proposal whereby they would pay 75 per cent of the freight rates of material manufactured in the Atlantic Provinces going outside of the Atlantic Region.

MR. BARRY: But that would not apply to the steel mill.

MR. NEARY: Two of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, two of the major reasons given by my honourable friend, whom I have the greatest deal of respect for. We both came from the same roots, Sir. But, Sir, I have no respect for his judgement in this case and this is the crowd that are telling us, "You could have gotten a better deal on the Upper Churchill." Well, Sir, I say they could have gotten a better deal in Burgeo and they certainly could have done better with the closing of the steel mill.

I could go on and on, Sir, but the question that arises here, Sir, the question that is foremost in everybody's mind.- should we at that time have let our natural resources lie dormant or should we have developed them? Even if those of us who are sitting in the House today, who sat with the former Liberal Administration, including our lily-white, simon-pure Minister of Justice - there is an honourable member, Sir, who has it coming to him. He has created a very dangerous precedent in this province, a very dangerous precedent and I guarantee the honourable Minister, when the administration

changes that he will regret what he is doing. The honourable member knows what I am talking about.

But, Sir, he has not got the intestinal fortitude to stand in this honourable House and say, "I was a member of the administration that was responsible for developing the Upper Churchill." When we hear the criticism of his leader, the honourable the Premier, and the Minister of Finance, who incidentally was also a member of that administration, now looking back, it is easy now to say we should have gotten a better deal. They did not say so at the time. Sir, I have researched Hansard and I have not heard one word of objection from the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance.

So the question arises, Sir, should we have developed the Upper Churchill even if we were alert and smart enough to know that there may be changes coming in the world? We did not have a crystal ball. We did not have John Monolesko, Sir. We did not have that great Planning and Priorities they have down here on the sixth floor. Sir, what appears good at the moment may be better a few years from now or it may be hopeless a few years from now, Sir, because of the rapid changes that are taking place in the world. You would not know, Mr. Speaker, but we had control on this side of the House over the changes that are taking place in the world today at such a rapid pace.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable Minister of Finance has just come back to his seat, just escaped the little bit of criticism, Sir, he just escaped it.

MR. CROSBIE: Would he mind repeating it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will repeat it.

MR. WM. ROWE: Gladly.

MR. NEARY: I will gladly repeat it. First I would like for the honourable minister to admit, if he has the intestinal fortitude to do so, that he was a Cabinet Minister in the Smallwood Administration when the development of the Upper Churchill took place. I was not a minister

in that government, Mr. Speaker, at that time. Not at all.

Not at all; the minister says?

MR. CROSBIE: It was all agreed on.

MR. NEARY: It was all agreed on. It was all agreed on. Since when did the minister become a softee? He has got the reputation of being a bully boy. We found another example of that yesterday on television. They are going to bring rules into the House, change the rules of the House now, Mr. Speaker, whether the opposition likes it or not. There is arrogance for you, Sir, and contempt. Arrogance and contempt for this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: I propose to suggest to the House for the House's consideration.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I did not see the honourable member.

MR. WM. ROWE: I had him on for five minutes.

MR. NEARY: I did not see it and I heard, Sir, I heard the honourable member's voice being quoted on radio, leaving the impression that the rules of this House were going to be changed to stymy debate, to curtail debate, to screw the opposition down in the ground. Even if the opposition liked it or not -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is incorrect.

MR. NEARY: That is not incorrect.

MR. WM. ROWE: Correct. It is right.

MR. NEARY: It is absolutely right, Sir. It is the worst example of contempt and arrogance, Sir, that I have ever seen.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order please! The honourable members to my left, the member for Bell Island, has the right to be heard in silence and honourable members to my right also keep that in mind.

MR. CROSBIE: A question?

MR. NEARY: Of course I will permit my honourable buddy a question.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, my question is this; if the honourable gentleman did not see the programme, how can he comment on it, in all fairness?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, any time the honourable member opens his mouth in this province he is quoted very widely and, Sir, he got a fair amount of coverage on that statement that he made on Issues and Answers on Sunday afternoon. I heard the minister's voice taped on radio.

Scandalous, Sir, scandalous, scandalous, I never in my life saw such an example of arrogance. The honourable minister thumbing his nose at the House, looking down his nose at the poor old peasants in this honourable House. I am not surprised, Sir, because the honourable minister is becoming notorious for that.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the development of the Upper Churchill; the terms, Sir, under which Churchill Falls was developed were the best and the honourable minister knows this, were the best that Newfoundland could get, and this was only after seventeen years, Mr. Speaker, of hard bargaining. It is a miracle, Sir, that the Churchill Falls development was born at all. There was no way, Mr. Speaker, the project could have taken place by agreement with the Province of Quebec and it would have been insane at the time, Mr. Speaker, if we, as elected representatives of the people, did not proceed to negotiate a settlement with the Province of Quebec to get this gigantic project going.

Sir, the political situation in Quebec at that moment was unbelievable, not as stable as it is at the present time. It was an explosive situation. Even, Mr. Speaker, if we had gone to the Government of Canada and said, "Look, this project is in the national interest." This seems to be the theme that the Tories are on at the present time. Let us say that the Government of Canada agreed and forced Quebec to let the transmission line go across their province, the situation was so explosive, Sir, that one bomb could have wiped out the transmission line.

It is easy, Sir, for the Premier and the other spokesmen on the opposite side of the House to condemn this deal. The pioneering, Mr. Speaker, has now been done as in the case of Come By Chance. I might add, Mr. Speaker, and this is a very significant point, I might add that the development of the Lower Churchill would not be possible at all if it were not for the Upper Churchill providing the water through

diverting rivers, streams and dykes that enlarging the volume of water essential to make the second stage of the development practical and feasible.

Mr. Speaker, that is worth repeating. The Premier when he goes down in front of the Rotarians bellyaching about such a lousy deal that we have on the Upper Churchill - should I remind him? Surely, there are members on his own side of the House that could tell him that the development of the Lower Churchill would not be practical nor feasible if it were not for the development of the Upper Churchill. The huge reservoirs that were built in the Upper Churchill, the diverting of the rivers and streams, Sir, put the volume of water in the river that makes it possible to develop the Lower Churchill. Does not the honourable Premier know that? Did I make it up? Ask the engineers, ask BRINCO, ask anybody who can think for themselves and not go off and make such foolish statements about Newfoundland getting a lousy deal. It was the best deal we could get at the time.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits from the Upper Churchill are a matter of public record. I believe, Sir, because of the misleading statements made by the Premier in his so-called State of the Province Address to Rotary, that, repeating those terms again, the benefits from the Churchill would be of benefit to the honourable members of the House.

Now, Sir, what is Newfoundland going to get out of the Churchill development in cash revenue? The value of the return from the Upper Churchill will average between \$15 million and \$16 million a year. Yes, Sir! Yes! Yes! These figures are authentic, Mr. Speaker, and I dare the Minister of Finance, as smart and as clever as he thinks he is, to contradict them. These figures, Sir, have come right from the horse's mouth. The Minister of Finance should get out his pencil and paper if he is going to advise the Premier to go down before Rotary and make a fool of himself. Before he does this, give him the true facts



and figures. The value of the return, Sir, in actual cash, is \$15 million to \$16 million a year. During the forty-year contract with Hydro-Quebec, Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, will receive over \$600 million from the Upper Churchill. BRINCO, Mr. Speaker, relieves the government completely of the burden of providing buildings or maintaining roads, hospitals, police services, the fire department and the airport. The Lower Churchill, as I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, which cannot be disassociated from the Upper Churchill, will add substantially to the government's revenue. Why will it add to the government's revenue, Sir, when it is developed? It is because of the development of the Upper Churchill. That bears repeating, Sir, because it seems that it is very difficult for the Premier and his ministers to grasp precisely what happened in the development of Churchill Falls.

Mr. Speaker, this province receives a royalty of fifty cents per horsepower for the electricity sold. Eight per cent of the profits of the company taken off the top, Mr. Speaker, before taxes, which is the equivalent of eleven per cent after taxes. Half of the taxes the company will pay to the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, has agreed (I will tell you that this was a gigantic fight, quite a struggle as the Minister of Finance knows) to pass back to the Newfoundland Government all but five per cent of their take each year and Newfoundland has agreed, as one of the inducements to get the project started - to return each year approximately one-half of this payment to the company from which it came in the first place. Mr. Speaker, according to my calculations, about thirty-six per cent of the company's income will go to the Newfoundland Treasury.

Twenty-one thousand Newfoundlanders, Sir, have found work on this project and received about \$121 million in wages. Because of this development, Mr. Speaker, thousands of Newfoundlanders will get jobs from the construction of the Lower Churchill over a period of four or five or six years. It will mean hundreds of millions of additional badly needed dollars for our Provincial Treasury, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to divert here for a minute to say this: The old whipping boy, the former Liberal Administration, Sir, has been the topic of criticism since this crowd took office two years ago. The people of this province, Sir, are completely fed up. They are tired of hearing ministers, the example being set by the Premier, attacking the former Liberal Administration. They want to know, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province want to know what it is that this honourable crowd are going to do themselves. My God, how often do I hear people say; I wish they would stop talking about you fellows. They say the same to us, I wish you would stop criticizing the government and come up with some positive ideas. The people are just dying for this crowd to come up with an original idea. They have not done it yet, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, my answer to these people and to this honourable House is this: The party and the government that built all the schools in this province; the party and the government that built all the hospitals in this province; the party and the government that built the Trans Canada Highway in this province; the party and the government that built all the fish plants around this province, in the rural parts of this province; the party and the government that built the university; the party and the government that built the technical college and the vocational training schools; the party and the government that built thousands, thousands and thousands of miles of road to take our people out of isolation; the party that brought in the social assistance programme; the party that brought in medicare in this province; the party and the government that took so many people out of isolation and provided them with electricity; the party that developed Bay d' Espoir; the party that developed the Upper Churchill; the party that intended to build the Trans-Labrador Highway; the party that was going to develop the Lower Churchill - Sir, what I am getting to, does it not make sense that this is the party, Sir, that is going to develop the Lower Churchill and not that

honourable do-nothing crowd on the opposite side of the House?  
Does it not make sense, Mr. Speaker, that the party that did  
all these wonderful things in the happy days, is that not the  
party, Mr. Speaker, that is going to develop the Lower Churchill?

Mr. Speaker, my case rests, as my honourable lawyer friends  
would say. The people of this province will judge, Sir, what  
party, what government will develop the Lower Churchill and what  
party and what government will build the Trans-Labrador Highway.  
We heard a lot of fuss and a lot of fanfare the other day, Sir.

and the Minister of Transportation and Communications had his picture taken with the minister responsible for highways in the Province of Quebec. What a farce! All they did, Sir, was to sit down and agree to agree to go and ask Ottawa to finance the highway. That is precisely what happened, Mr. Speaker. That is right! That is right! That is what they did, Sir, they agreed to agree to go to Ottawa whom they have criticized so much over the last couple of years. You can hardly turn on the radio or turn on the television but you will see the Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice throwing the darts at Ottawa, sticking the needle in whenever they can, squirting their poison around. I would say; "God help Newfoundland but for Ottawa!"

This is the crowd, Mr. Speaker, this is the crowd that told us in two provincial general elections that they were not going to go to Ottawa asking for handouts. They were not going to do this, but now, Sir, they can hardly open their chops...

AN HON. MEMBER: We are asking for our rights.

MR. NEARY: Asking for their rights? When we asked for our rights over here, Mr. Speaker, we were criticized for it. It was handouts then, it was a form of welfare.

AN HON. MEMBER: You went on your knees begging.

MR. NEARY: We did not go on our knees begging to anybody. All they have done, Mr. Speaker, is to agree to agree. To go up and ask Mr. Jamieson and Mr. Trudeau and the Government of Canada to finance this Trans Labrador Highway. Anybody can do that, Sir. The Youth Parliament down here the other day could have done that.

AN HON. MEMBER: With the honourable member guiding them along the way.

MR. NEARY: Let us hear something specific about this road, Sir. I can only say that this party that I have the honour to represent on this side of the House, that has done so much for this province, believe me, Sir, and I say this in all honesty, that the party that has built up this province over the past twenty odd years will be the party, Mr. Speaker, and mark my words, will be the party to

develop the Lower Churchill and to build the Trans-Labrador Highway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to my friend the honourable Minister of Social Services for a moment and talk about his brave new world of welfare which was introduced with so much fanfare and paid advertising on radio, television and through the newspapers and direct mail. This brave new world of welfare has backfired on the administration.

In the past week, Mr. Speaker, especially since the cheques came out the end of the month, our office has been literally flooded with documented complaints from recipients who have either had their allowances cut or discontinued altogether. Today, before I came into the House I picked up a few letters from my desk just as examples. I am not going to read the letters, Mr. Speaker, but I am prepared to table the letters if necessary. I certainly think that I am entitled to let this House know how some of these people feel about this great, new, brave world of social assistance that was supposed to cure all the social and economic ills of our unfortunate Newfoundland people who are sick and unemployed through no fault of their own.

A gentleman down in Terranceville says; "I am writing concerning what the Progressive Conservative Government have done to us since they took office. I am an old age pensioner and since our bit of money rose they have cut grub cards from us, cut transportation from us, they have cut everything that the Liberal Government used to give us. I am getting the old age pension for myself and I have to buy everything out of it. I have to pay for my drugs all the time, thirty dollars to thirty-five dollars a month, I have to pay for oil ninety dollars a month and I have to pay for transportation when I go to see a doctor. I am not getting that much money. God knows how much we pay for food. I do not have anything left out of my cheques to buy food. I have to pay my transportation to a doctor because I have to go see a special doctor."

Listen to this from English Harbour West: "I am writing

concerning the new social assistance. I do not understand it at all. At least the other social assistance you could make ninety dollars a month and now if you make it you have to give half to the government. Why am I writing? I work one night a week and I make about forty dollars a month. I told the welfare officer that I was working and I had a letter from him and he said that they were taking twenty dollars off my welfare cheque. I was making forty dollars a month. I do not understand that. My husband has been on social assistance for ten years because he is not able to work so I thought I would try to make a few dollars to help out.

"I have four kids going to school. Anyone knows that it takes a lot to keep kids. I only make forty dollars a month and they are going to take half of it. I do not think that should be. I would understand if it were"(it is hard to read this) It winds up by saying;"please let me know what you think of it." The whole world knows what I think of it.

Lord's Cove: "The welfare officer from Grand Bank was here to visit me and he told me that I would be receiving eighty dollars monthly." Eighty dollars monthly! The new brave world of welfare. "And my"(something)"would have to be seventy dollars." (They were going to deduct seventy dollars.) "I would have nothing only ten dollars for myself and I would not even be able to buy a pair of boots for me to wear. I am not able to work. I was a sanatorium patient and when I came out I went out to visit my son and they even cut off my cheques completely for three months because I went off to visit my son. Now I have ten dollars." Ten dollars, Mr. Speaker, a poor old lady down in Lord's Cove, Placentia Bay. with ten dollars and the Premier has the gall and the audacity to get out on television saying: "Oh what a programme this is!" What a programme! Here is a poor old lady here forced to live on ten dollars a month and I can tell the honourable Premier a better one than that.

There is a lady down in Campbellton, Sir, with no arms, no legs, middle aged, receiving ninety-eight dollars a month. The

department did not even see fit to increase her allowance. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? I will tell the honourable House why. I could mention the lady's name in this House because I have her approval to do so but I am not going to. I have visited her home in Campbellton. The reason the Minister of Social Services, Sir, and his officials will not grant her her full entitlement is because she has a boarder in the house. A gentleman, a gentleman, Sir, who is looking after her, who has to lift her out of her wheel chair and sit her on a toilet. He is called a boarder. He gets seventy or eighty dollars a month so he is classed as a boarder and her assistance is cut accordingly. If he gets seventy dollars a month her assistance is cut by thirty-five or forty dollars. Is that right? Is it right? No, Sir, it is not right.

This honourable crowd of millionaires who do not understand the feelings of ordinary people anyway, should be ashamed of themselves. They should all be trotted down to Campbellton, a little community down there in Lewisporte, they should be trotted down there and marched into that house to take a look for themselves. It would make them sick to their stomachs and, Sir, they might have a little more humanitarian feeling in their blood when they came back to this honourable House. This is the programme that was going to solve all the problems.

"I am writing you about the family allowance going up. The family allowance is going to be deducted from my cheque." which is perfectly true, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Lies! Lies! Lies!

MR. NEARY: Lies, Mr. Speaker? Let me deal with that,

Sir, for about two weeks or more we witnessed the most unusual sight in this province that we have ever seen in our lives, I suppose since the advent of television, Sir. We saw the Minister of Social Services and the Premier and one of the minister's officials on a paid political telecast out trying to sell this new social welfare programme so-called to the people of this province.

Well, Sir, one of the points that the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Minister played up in their attempt to fast talk our people into accepting the programme - one of the things that they tried to convince the people, Sir, that they did, was that this was done with the approval hand-in-glove, the minister said, with the Government of Canada. Well, Sir, I became very suspicious of this. I could not, Sir, imagine the Government of Canada going along with a programme that discriminated against larger families, as this programme does.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wired the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Sir. I wired him -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, Franky Baby paid for it. I wired the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wired the Honourable Mr. Lalonde, Minister of National Health and Welfare, and I asked him if this were true. Well, Sir, what a shock, you can imagine the shock I got when I got this wire back dated, Ottawa, December 7. Re Telegram of December 3. "Since the department" (referring to Mr. Lalonde's department) "has not yet received a formal submission from the province I am unable to comment upon the programme." Mr. Lalonde and his officials knew nothing about it.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lalonde was good enough, so very embarrassed over this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So very embarrassed over this gross example of political duplicity, the worst example they have ever seen in this province, Sir, Mr. Lalonde wrote me a letter and I am not going to read the letter, Sir,



but he merely reiterated what he had already said that he had not received the programme. He did not know a thing about it.

MR. MURPHY: He has it now.

MR. NEARY: Well he may have it now.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Abbott is not the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister was kind enough to write me. He told me in this letter, Sir, I can table it if the honourable members want me to, that it was not the intention of the Government of Canada to have the increases in the family allowances tangled up with provincial social assistance rates and linked to provincial social assistance rates, in any way, shape or form.

So, Mr. Speaker, the whole scheme looks to me to be much ado about very little. At one end of the scale, Sir, the one where most help is needed it is obvious that the only help large families will get will be from Ottawa in the form of the new increased family allowances.

MR. MURPHY: Hear, hear! God Bless Uncle Ottawa!

MR. NEARY: Right. Good Liberal Government up in Ottawa. The misleading statements, Mr. Speaker, made by the Honourable the Premier and the minister that every individual -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: At no time did we mislead the public and I am -

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister of Social Services rising on a point of order?

MR. MURPHY: I am rising to something.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The honourable member for Bell Island does have a right to be heard in silence unless there is a point of order raised.

MR. MURPHY: I would like to rise to a point of order now, to an accusation that the Premier and myself endeavoured to mislead the public of this province. Is that an accusation?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is unparliamentary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I may, the only thing that is out of order, if my reading of Beauchesne is correct, is an allegation by a member of the House that another member attempted to mislead this honourable House. The fact that the Premier may or may not have misled the public is a matter of opinion by honourable members.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: The allegation that has been made is an allegation that the Hon. the Premier and the Hon. the Minister of Social Assistance attempted to mislead the public in the carrying out of their duties as Premier and Minister of Social Assistance of this province and as such is very much out of order. The honourable the member for Bell Island should be invited to retract.

MR. SPEAKER: It is well known that honourable members tend to get carried away in the heat of debate. I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island did not intend to say that the Hon. the Premier and the minister misled the honourable House and the public. I would caution him to be perhaps, if he could be, a little more careful in his choosing of his words in the future.

MR. NEARY: Your interpretation is absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker, I did not accuse the Hon. the Premier or the minister of misleading the House. Sir, misleading the public or the appearance of misleading the public is a different matter. Anyway, Sir, I am satisfied -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order.

MR. NEARY: I am quite satisfied to abide by Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Hon. Minister of Finance:

MR. CROSBIE: It is all right, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, at one end of the scale - I woke the Hon. the Minister of Finance up anyway; he has been asleep for a long time. Anyway, Sir, the statements that were made by the Hon. the Premier and the minister, that every individual will be motivated to work by being

allowed to keep fifty per cent of their earnings up to \$200 a month is so much malarkey, Sir, because the individual with a large family cannot do any better on social assistance even when the minimum wage does go up to \$2.00 an hour. Now we discover, Mr. Speaker, that the much boasted about motivating people to work turns out not to be motivating at all but the big stick.

The honourable the minister is attempting to turn the welfare officers into storm troopers. Former long-term recipients, Sir, or their spouses now have to earn \$180 to get a \$90 allowable income. Under the old set up -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They were allowed \$90, Sir. Short-term recipients, Mr. Speaker, have to earn \$120 to get the \$60 former entitlement.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a work incentive.

MR. NEARY: It is a work incentive my eyeball! The most startling aspect of the so-called new programme is the way, Mr. Speaker, in which it discriminates against large families. The new plan, Sir, definitely discriminates in provincial social assistance rates against larger families, it is causing hardships, Mr. Speaker, and seriously handicapping backgrounds and equality of opportunity for children in families of six or more.

MR. MURPHY: That is bunk.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will find out in the next election how much bunk it is.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Income Tax Department bases its exemption on so much per dependent in the family. Manpower allowances and training allowances are calculated according to the number of dependents in the family, veterans allowances the same way, again based on the number of dependents and Canada Pension Plan benefits the same way, Sir. The guaranteed annual income concept, Mr. Speaker, was definitely worked out on the number of persons in the family. Mr. Speaker, according to our own Tory Government this principle is wrong, everybody is out of step except the Minister of Social Services. Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, has now developed a principle of its own, not only a first for Canada, Sir,

but I have no doubt this is a first for mankind. Sir, the professors of logic around the world will be watching this new formula I am sure with wild anticipation and bated breath. For the first time, Sir, in our history and I suppose in the history of mankind, assistance is not based on the number of persons in the family.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very dangerous precedent and one that must not be permitted to stand on the record of this province, Sir. What it boils down to, Mr. Speaker, a family of five people,

two adults and three children will receive an average of forty-nine dollars while a family of seven, two adults and five children will only receive forty dollars per person per month and this situation gets even worse with larger families. The larger the family, Mr. Speaker, the amount per individual in that family gets less and less. The real truth is, Sir, that instead of most families getting substantial increases as we are led to believe, the increase in most cases is very minimal and once you reach a family of two adults and seven children, Sir, there is a minus or a decrease in the allowance.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the programme that was to solve the social and economic ills of our people. With all the months, Sir, that went into preparing this scheme, it would either seem that somebody was badly lacking in basic arithmetic or set out deliberately, Mr. Speaker - no, I better not say that, that would be unparliamentary. I was going to say set out to deceive, Sir, but that is not permissible so I withdraw it in public. All in all, Mr. Speaker, it was a poor effort and one which neither social assistance recipients nor taxpayers can be very proud of. If you take a close look at the figures it can be very easily seen that the so-called new programme is based largely on shuffling money from Ottawa from one pocket to the other, from benefits for the poor, large families to somewhat increased benefits for single and small families.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it was never intended by Ottawa that provincial welfare departments should use their allowances to save a few dollars for provincial treasuries and it is obvious that our own narrow-minded government is proven to be penny-wise and pound-foolish in term of the whole intent of the social welfare programme instituted by the Liberal Government of this province during the happy days preceding January 18, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will make a commitment here and now, Sir. We will make a commitment to our unfortunate brothers and sisters in this province that when we move back on the other side of this honourable House, Sir, that a new scale of provincial

welfare rates will be set, completely independent of the benefits paid through family allowances by Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this province has no ombudsman makes it necessary for people like Mr. Harrington and other organizations like Citizens Rights and Consumer Affairs, Social Action Committees and others to defend the rights of the unfortunate of our province against bureaucracy and parties and individuals with facetious leanings and thinking who are primarily interested in looking after the needs of themselves and their officials, Sir, rather than looking after the needs of our people. Mr. Speaker, if I were the Minister of Social Services I would pay an awful lot of heed, Sir, to what these people are saying. I would pay an awful lot of attention, Sir, to every detail of what these people are saying instead of heaping personal insults upon these people. The minister who occupies this position, Mr. Speaker, was appointed to look after the needs of about one-fifth of the population of this province who are drawing - one out of five, Sir, citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador - drawing social assistance. If he is not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to do this then the only way to correct the situation is the one mentioned recently in a brief - a new Minister of Social Assistance should be appointed with some real idea of the nature of his job.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

MR. SPEAKER: Twenty minutes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are only two more topics I want to deal with. I want to make a reference to my own district but before I do, Sir, I cannot help but commenting on the energy policy of this honourable crowd across the House.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago when the matter of who owned the offshore resources came up members will remember that the late Mr. Pearson was Prime Minister of Canada. At that time many of provinces were of the opinion that a political settlement, rather than refer the matter to the courts, was the only way to resolve this problem. Mr. Pearson at a federal/provincial conference informed the premiers of the ten provinces that he was unable to accede to

their request for a political settlement but assured the first ministers that if the courts ruled in favour of the federal government that Ottawa would negotiate very reasonable and generous terms with the provinces. Surely, Mr. Speaker, everyone remembers that. It will be recalled also, Mr. Speaker, that a short time later British Columbia challenged the matter in the courts. Maybe not an identical situation that we have in Newfoundland but it can be related, Sir.

British Columbia challenged the matter in the courts and after engaging very high-class legal talent were told by the courts that they had no rights. Since that decision, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Atlantic Provinces were reluctant to submit the matter to the courts and upon the advice, Sir, of the highest legal authorities in the land join together to try to make the best arrangement possible with the Government of Canada.

Last spring there was an indication, when the Premier spoke at the annual meeting of APEC, in Halifax, that this was Newfoundland's position and we were all going to join together, the Atlantic Provinces, to negotiate a satisfactory settlement to this province. The next thing we know, Mr. Speaker, certain ministers are making statements directly opposite to what the Premier told the APEC members in Halifax and as the weeks and months pass the contradictions became more numerous until ultimately we saw three out of the four Atlantic Provinces sticking together and Newfoundland going it alone, just what Premier Moores said would not happen under any circumstances. Even the Tory Government, Sir, in New Brunswick, saw the wisdom of the Atlantic Provinces sticking together, but it appears now that everyone is out of step except Newfoundland. Our young valedictorian, Sir, who heads up the Department of Mines and Energy, has spent the last few months making schoolboy statements that you would expect to hear in a school debating class.

It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the province has no energy policy and we are on a disaster course if the present administration continue to follow their hit and miss attitude towards a matter that has suddenly emerged, Sir, the most important issue in the history of

the world. It is hard to tell whether Premier Moores, at the recent energy conference, was clowning, Sir, on national television or just downright confused. Somehow or other, Sir, the honourable Premier got the purpose of the conference mixed up with ownership of offshore rights. Mr. Speaker, surely the Premier must have known that this is not why the conference was called. It was called to deal with a very grave problem of providing relief to the eastern provinces faced with soaring oil prices. In lining up with Alberta and Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, somehow or other the Premier and the delegation from Newfoundland were trying to leave the impression with the rest of Canada that we down here were a major supplier or could become a major supplier of oil. Mr. Speaker, somebody in that delegation must have realized that even if there is a commercially exploitable strike on the Grand Banks, it would take eight to ten years before it becomes commercially productive.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we saw the Premier on national television gambling. First of all, Sir, he was gambling that oil or gas would be discovered off Newfoundland and secondly, gambling that Newfoundland would win its case in the courts. The tragic part of this, Sir, is that the Premier is gambling,



we are gambling the future of this province and the people of this province and it is not using good, common sense or good sound advice. The truth of the matter is, Sir, that our government went to Ottawa completely uninformed, unprepared and inconsistent in its approach to offshore rights and the energy problem as a whole and perhaps before this session ends, Sir, we may be able to show the Premier and his colleagues the error of their ways. Perhaps our spokesman on this side of the House during the Throne Speech Debate will be able to demonstrate to the people of this province that we on this side of the House have a clear, unmistakable, positive approach to this matter when my party is called upon to form the government of this province. Let us hope in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, that that honourable crowd over there, the Premier and his colleagues, will have enough sense not to do any more damage than they have already done and when they are not prepared, Sir, to make up well-planned, intelligent approach to this whole new energy situation, then they should keep their mouths shut.

Mr. Speaker, Ottawa is still shaking its head at the position taken by the Newfoundland delegation at the conference and the fact Mr. Speaker, that Canada will have a one price policy for oil and prices in the Atlantic Provinces will be subsidized is not because of the Tories here Mr. Speaker, but in spite of that.

Mr. Speaker, I think I still have twelve or thirteen minutes left, so I would like to spend the remainder of my time dealing with my own district of Bell Island and to give the House some idea, Mr. Speaker, of what is happening over there since the closing of the DOSCO Mines in 1959, starting in 1959, and the final pullout in 1966. Despite Mr. Speaker, the profits of doom and gloom, who predicted Bell Island would become a ghost town, we are very much alive today, Sir, and it would seem that the population is gradually increasing, believe it or not and is now up once again to around, approximately 6,700 souls.

Since 1972, Mr. Speaker, since 1972, does that ring a bell, that year? 1972, since January 18th, 1972, no positive projects or programmes have been started on Bell Island and consequently, Mr. Speaker, unemployment is about the highest per capita for any single community in Newfoundland and Labrador. Not one inch of road has been paved since 1971, not a foot of water and sewer line have been laid or any other public work project begun since the Operation Restart Programme in 1971.

At this very moment, Mr. Speaker, over fifty per cent of my constituents, of the people of Bell Island, are without adequate drinking water because of frozen pipes that are either not deep enough in the ground or worn out because of age. In the past two years, Sir, under a LIP grant, some new lines and replacement of old water pipes was completed. But Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount needs to be done and it would be cruel, Sir, indeed, for this government who talked so much about conditions on Bell Island, when they were over here in opposition before they become the government, if they discriminated, Sir, against the community that has suffered so much over the past ten or twelve years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, and I call upon the Hon. Premier to tell us, I would like to know just what the government's attitude is towards Bell Island. Their lack of interest in the problems of the community and the absence of positive steps to try and rehabilitate Bell Island, Sir, would certainly indicate to me, and one of the recommendations in the report of the Royal Commission on Regional Government, that no more public funds be spent on public services on Bell Island, has been adopted by this administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, now we know, now it is all coming out. Now we know who it is that wants to make a ghost town out of Bell Island, this trying to force the population to relocate. I call upon the government to state their position, Sir.

Is it the policy of the government to curtail and cut back

services in a community and force complete transplant of the people of Bell Island. Well, Sir, it would certainly seem that way. But I can assure, I can assure my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House there, that this will never happen, at least not in our time. The government would be very naive and foolish indeed, Mr. Speaker, if they think by ignoring the problems of Bell Island that people will forget about them and they will just go away.

A few months ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy called public tenders to seal off the two remaining mine openings on the Island, numbers four and six slopes. There was a great outcry of protest, Sir, from the community and the minister was eventually forced to back away. Obviously, waiting for the objections to die down and then proceed with his plans to seal off these openings forever. The announcement of a federal-provincial agreement to bring in a competent firm, Sir, to research and recommend on the potential of the Bell Island mines for the storage of crude oil, certainly brought a wave of optimism to the residents of Bell Island and very much justified, Mr. Speaker, the campaign that I headed up to prevent the mines department from sealing off number four slope and in this connection, Sir, I want to set the record straight.

The Minister of Mines and Energy is trying to leave the impression in this province that his government has taken the initiative. Sir, it is not true, it is not true. Mr. Speaker, let me inform this honourable House that one hundred per cent of the cost of this study is being paid by the Government of Canada, initiated by the Government of Canada, Sir. Why would they pay one hundred per cent if they did not take the initiative? Mr. Speaker, they could not get agreement. They could not get agreement from this province, Sir, to pay. They could not get an agreement to pay a share of the cost of this study and I might find out Sir, that this is merely a preliminary study. No decisions

have been taken, but if the minister had his way, the mines would have been barred up and no study could have been carried out, not would it possible, Mr. Speaker, to create a tourist attraction by using a section of the mine, similar to what has been done in the Cape Breton coal mine. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, public tenders have been called for the operation of the Bell Island-Portugal Cove ferry service.

There is a tremendous interest in this matter, Mr. Speaker, as one of the provisions of the tender calls for replacement of the obsolete "Kipawo" as soon as the successful tender can obtain a ferry suitable for the Tickle, which can replace the big ferry, "John Guy" during her annual refit and supplement the service during peak periods, especially, Sir, in the summer months and on week-ends.

This is the first time that, Mr. Speaker, tenders have been called for the operation of this service and there is hope, Mr. Speaker, that the improvement which we have been fighting for, for ten years, will become a reality. The Federal Government, Sir, obviously, is prepared to do its part to provide a satisfactory service on this three mile run which is life or death for the people of Bell Island. But what about our own provincial government Sir? What happened Mr. Speaker? What happened to the promise? I am coming to that. Waste of \$10,000. They may as well have given us the nutbeam and let him go out and throw another binge. What happened, Mr. Speaker, to the promise made to the people of Bell Island? What happened to the promise made to the people of Bell Island in two provincial general elections Sir, by none other than the Hon. the Premier himself, to make this service a part of our provincial highway system?

Is this another one of over the 200 promises of this regime, Mr. Speaker, that have been broken? Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the Minister of Transportation and Communications, in another one of his usual goofs, spent \$10,000 of the taxpayers' money on a foolish notion that extra trips at odd hours of the day, Sir, the most peculiar times that you could have picked in your life, when everybody was home sleeping, when nobody was travelling or eating, that these trips of the ferry were needed at the most ridiculous times of the day. No reason was given for this faux pas and neither were we told why the extra trips were discontinued. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the minister, when he participates in the debate in this House, would oblige us during this session of the House with a few facts on the results on this experiment. For instance, Sir, the people of Bell Island would like to know how many passengers and vehicles use these trips. What yardstick was used to measure its success or its failure. As a result of this venture, Sir, can we look forward to provincial participation in the ferry service in the future?

Mr. Speaker, Bell Island in my opinion has great potential as a fishing and farming community. There is no reason, Sir, why Bell Island could not become a fresh vegetable garden for St. John's. There is no reason that I can see, Mr. Speaker, why Bell Island could not be a large producer of beef and dairy cattle, sheep raising, hog breeding, eggs, poultry and so on. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the vacant land on Bell Island cannot be used to alleviate that desperate shortage of low-cost land in and around the greater St. John's Area for home building. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why Bell Island could not become a beautiful tourist attraction. I see no reason, Sir, why small or medium industry would not succeed on Bell Island. The great weakness, Sir, in our agricultural programme in this province is that there is nothing for beginners. There is no beginners' programme. That is why we cannot make Bell Island a major agricultural producer. We can talk about the potential of Bell Island forever, Sir, the same way as we talked about the potential of our deep-water ports and our hydro potential and our natural resources.

If we sit back, Mr. Speaker, and do nothing and expect things to happen automatically by themselves, then, Sir, it becomes a hopeless situation and the people are the ones who suffer because of this lack of initiative and imagination.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I will be anxious to find out from the government if they have written Bell Island off as suggested in the report of the study of regional government, thus forcing the whole population to move. Is the root of their neglect politically motivated as in so many instances over the past two years?

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I must, before going on with my own remarks, make a comment on the honourable member's speech. It was a very articulate speech and, of course, it is well-known that he is one of the more articulate members on the other side of the House. Another factor I think which should be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is that I think we have witnessed not the birth but the maturity of an actor of considerable proportions. One will note that the honourable member speaks fluency -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, point of order. What debate is the honourable member speaking on, what motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WELLS: That is a spurious point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not recall, but it occurs to me now - if I may speak to my point of order - that any motion was ever put to any member to speak in this House. As far as I can ascertain the Hon. member for Bell Island was speaking with the leave of the House on some matter or other.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Opposition House Leader is referring to the report which should have been tabled earlier.

MR. ROWE: Sir, I do not know if it were supposed to be tabled or not. The simple matter is that there is no motion before this House for any member to debate to, for or against .

MR. WELLS: I do not know what the Hon. member for White Bay South is talking about. He is like a ruffled grouse, Mr. Speaker, something has upset him.

MR. WELLS: Perhaps we better find out what has upset him, Mr. Speaker. I was complimenting the Hon. member for Bell Island and doing it genuinely. I have a great regard for the member.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with the honourable member's remarks.

MR. WELLS: Oh!

MR. ROWE: The fact of the matter is that there is no motion before this House, Mr. Speaker. Ordinarily what happens is that the chairman of the committee, who has been appointed by Your Honour to draft an Address in Reply, comes in and tables in this House his report which says that the Hon. Lieutenant Governor is to be thanked for his gracious address to this House and a motion is then on, the motion put by him, that this report be accepted by the honourable House. That has not been done. There is no Address in Reply at this particular moment and there is no provision for the honourable member to speak.

MR. WELLS: If I may, Mr. Speaker, what has my honourable colleagues on the other side of the House been speaking -

MR. ROWE: They were speaking with the leave of the House as far as I can see. Nobody raised any objection. In the honourable member's case, I am raising an objection.

MR. WELLS: I see.

MR. ROWE: That is the House Leader's fault, not ours.

MR. WELLS: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members of the Opposition wanted to object to the procedure, the time to have done it was when the honourable member on their own side began to speak and not wait an hour and one-half later to object.

MR. ROWE: There was no motion before the House.

MR. WELLS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the honourable Opposition House Leader should have raised this point at the earliest opportunity and I do not think that he did that. While it is true, and that is tradition I think, the mover of the motion submits the report and then it is tabled. I think the first person to rise or the tradition is that the opposition speak first

on the Address in Reply and then usually a government member. I will notice the Hon. member for St. John's South.

MR. ROWE: It is not a matter of when I brought the matter up. As a matter of fact, it only came to my attention about five minutes ago. I thought that this was the opportunity now to regularize it. It is not a matter of when I brought it up or bringing it up at the first opportunity. The simple fact is that there was no motion before the Chamber. Unless there is a motion before the Chamber, members cannot speak unless they are rising on points of order or points of privilege. I mean the Hon. Minister of Finance knows that. Why does not the chairman of the committee, appointed by Your Honour, bring in his motion so we can debate the thing regularly and in accordance with the procedure? Sir, that is the only point I am making. I am not trying to embarrass the honourable member. I am merely bringing to the attention of the House that there is no motion before the House. Nobody has moved anything before this House and therefore there is no provision for a debate before the House. It is not a question as to when you bring it up or not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the honourable gentleman has a good point or not. It sounds like it might have some logic to it. There was a committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply and we are now debating the motion that the committee be appointed.

MR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: If we are not, then we better get to debating something.

MR. WELLS: If this position obtains - I do not recall in the previous years any particular formality before the speech. If this has to be resolved, let it be resolved. This seems to be a serious matter. Perhaps then what we might do is if the honourable Opposition House Leader would give leave, perhaps I may speak with the leave of the House and we will



come to this knotty procedural point at the next sitting and then if the Hon. member for Bell Island is perhaps allowed to speak another ninety minutes in the Throne Speech Debate, maybe I will speak another ninety minutes in the Throne Speech Debate. I am sorry but I do not want to precipitate any impasse by speaking. Perhaps, as I say, if there is any problem, let it be by leave.

MR. CROSBIE: The difficulty is that the letter in question is not signed by all of them.

I believe that the procedure is that a letter is supposed to be tabled from the members of the committee. This letter is not signed by all the members of the committee and I therefore suggest that, so we do not lose this time in which we are hearing so much valuable debate, that we proceed as though it is tabled and when we get it signed by the last member we will table it. Is there any objection to that?

MR. WM. ROWE: None whatsoever, Sir, as long as it is done with the full understanding that the honourable member for Bell Island was speaking by leave of the House and that he will now, when the motion is put, he will have the opportunity to speak to that motion.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not care. We will listen to him all day long if you want us to.

MR. SPEAKER: As the honourable Minister of Finance has said, two members of this committee have signed the letter and the other gentleman has not signed it as yet. Does the honourable member for St. John's South have leave to speak? Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. WELLS: Of course it is understood, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member for Bell Island exercise his privilege to speak a further ninety minutes, I may be given five minutes ten minutes. I take it I have leave then. Perhaps that letter should be filed as a minority report and then that would solve the problem.

Anyway, what was I doing? Yes, I was complimenting the honourable member for Bell Island, which I propose to continue to do because I say I think he has really displayed today that he has great status as an actor. His humorous blue eyes flash and his gestures, his voice, it is absolutely marvelous, Mr. Speaker, and I think we in the House are indebted to him for this kind of speech. There is only one regret I have and that is that we might lose him, he may yet, you know, especially with the

gestures which are beautiful, he may yet fill the void left by the death of the late Bruce Lee and go into these marital arts pictures. I am sure he would leave a memorable mark. Quite apart from all that, I did enjoy his speech.

I may say though, Mr. Speaker, that there is one thing really wrong with it: Everything that is done by this government is far from being wrong and I think perhaps the points that he was making suffered by reason of the fact that his criticism was somewhat unbalanced. Every effort it seems that this government has made has been wrong, and that is not so.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island dealt first with matters of general application and then dealt with matters pertaining to his own district. I propose to do the matter in reverse. I propose to speak about some matters particularly pertaining to St. John's South and then to deal more with matters of general application.

I know it is somewhat boring to members of this honourable House to hear people talk about their districts but it is a very necessary thing because we as members have two functions, as I see it and I understand it. One is the function of representing a district and in trying to do whatever can be done for that district and in trying to represent that district as well as it is possible to do so and the other role is to address ourselves to matters of importance to all citizens.

Now I want, in dealing with St. John's South and matters pertaining to St. John's South, to speak particularly about roads. I will in some respects be critical. Certainly road work which I had hoped and wished up to now to have been done in St. John's South has not been done. Let me say at the very outset, I do not know if he is here or not. I have nonetheless found the Minister of Transportation and Communications to be most helpful and everything that he has been able to do in his power with the amount of funds that has been available at the given time he has done.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have to point out to this House that there are some very real needs existing in St. John's South for road work and this may surprise a lot of people. I suppose it would particularly surprise people in some of the more far-off areas of the province who feel that their needs, in respect of roads, are greater than anybody else's and God knows they are great all over this province.

I for one believe firmly in a principle that this province cannot stop road work. It cannot slack off on road work. If necessary we must borrow as much money as is necessary, as it is necessary to borrow in order to bring the roads of this province up to a proper standard. We have long since passed the stage where roads are luxuries. Roads now are necessities and not only roads are necessities but roads with decent paved surfaces are an absolute necessity and we cannot stop with dirt roads and we must not stop with dirt roads.

I want to refer to the Community of Maddox Cove which is part of the council area of Petty Harbour. The road is paved down through Petty Harbour, on both sides of the Harbour. The road that leads to Maddox Cove, Mr. Speaker, is approximately a mile in length, maybe not quite a mile in length. It is not paved. It goes along a rocky and very picturesque cliff edge. I think to upgrade it would cost a great deal of money but I believe with minimal upgrading it could be paved and should be paved.

There is one area out there in Maddox Cove, I think the residents call Heartbreak Ridge, where there is a very steep hill and oil trucks, food vans and private cars, trucks, whatever have you, when there is snow on the ground cannot get up over it. The inconvenience and the cost and the nuisance to the people of Maddox Cove is incredible.

Petty Harbour, the roads are paved. There is a council in Petty Harbour which is doing its best with the limited amount of money to keep the whole thing going, but the

situation is far from satisfactory.

We come to the Goulds and Kilbride and here I have to make a very strong statement in respect to paving on certain roads. I am thinking particularly now of the Old Bay Bulls Road, the section, in Kilbride, of the Old Bay Bulls Road, unpaved is one mile in length. Last spring I made inquiries as to whether or not it could be paved and it was hoped that there would be money available to do this and I was given figures from the Department of Highways that the cost of paving that one mile would be \$100,000. That road does not have to be brought up to standard, it is ready to be paved.

You know that road has people living all along its length. It is only a mile but in spring it is a quagmire and in summer it is a dust bowl and I am not at all happy that that road has not been paved, not at all happy, and I expect and I am asking the government now, asking them as clearly and directly as I know how to say the words, to pave that road in this coming financial year.

There is also the question, Mr. Speaker, of the road to Cape Spear, the road which leads beyond Blackhead Road, out through the Community of Blackhead and on to Cape Spear, which is a very scenic and historic part of Newfoundland and which has a federal park. That road is an utter disgrace and when one drives out over it, one is likely to lose tail pipe, muffler and all the rest and when a snow storm comes, when weather that makes the road soft comes, both the Highways Department and anybody connected with it, members, ministers, everybody gets a flood of phone calls from people who have to struggle through that road leaving half their cars sometimes, although that is an exaggeration, but leaving many running parts of their cars on the road.

This is vitally important. It is true that the Community of Blackhead has only probably thirty, no less than twenty-five families, but nonetheless the importance of Cape Spear cannot be overlooked. So that on the road question the priorities as I see

them, Mr. Speaker, are that the road to Blackhead, the Community of Blackhead particularly, be done something with, the upgrading be continued and the government commit itself to paving, likewise the road to Maddox Cove and likewise roads, such as the Old Bay Bulls Road in Kilbride is the chief example to be paved this year.

Now as I say I am asking the government very clearly to make a commitment on these matters. I expect that a commitment will be given. There has been no road work worth anything done. When I say worth anything perhaps that is not a proper choice of phrase, there has been no significant road work done in the past two years in the District of St. John's South. There has been the arterial road, yes, and that is a road over which I and the government had some difference of opinion but the decision has been made and there is nothing I can do about it and I presume that road will go ahead. That is all right. Insofar as roads which the people of St. John's South, particularly Kilbride, Goulds, Petty Harbour and Blackhead, use in their every day lives, there has been little or nothing done. I have been told that very straight and clear by the people of that district and I am here today representing them and I am telling the government very straightly and very clearly that something has to be done.

I am asking for a commitment in respect of this. I do not want to have, between now and the Budget debate when I will speak again, to drive around some districts adjacent to St. John's and contiguous to St. John's South and measure off the

pavement that has been done in the past two years. I do not want to have to do that but if I have to I shall. As I say, I am speaking very frankly and very clearly and I am asking for that commitment for St. John's, South which has waited a considerable time. In fact the people on these roads have waited ever since the roads themselves have been put there.

There is another matter concerning the District of St. John's South which is of vital importance and that is the matter of water and sewerage. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, last year the first phase, the so-called first phase of the Kilbride water and sewerage project was finished. When the water system and the sewerage system began to be operative, charges were levied on the people of Kilbride. There was a considerable outcry, a considerable fuss and representations were made to the government and in due course the government in the last session brought before the House of Assembly and had passed an act which lengthened the time in which people could pay. In this case they are paying through the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, for water and sewerage services. That was done and I must say it is a credit to the government for bringing this before the House and having it passed. A new schedule of rates was introduced last fall which was acceptable to the people and they have started to pay them and there were no problems. As I say, that was a matter which was solved and solved I think by quick action on the part of the government and to the satisfaction of the people, not only of Kilbride, because of course, when the legislation was amended it applied to the whole Province of Newfoundland and people all over this province will benefit.

However, Mr. Speaker, there remains the problem of the second and third phases of the water system in Kilbride. Kilbride is now so densely populated, in fact most areas of Kilbride are now beginning to be as densely populated, almost, as any street in St. John's. I think there is a history in other communities in Newfoundland where when an area becomes densely populated, to a certain point it is impossible for that community to survive without extreme danger to

health unless there is water and sewerage. The Kilbride Area comes under the jurisdiction of the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, and that Board has requested of the government, requested the authority which had to be granted by the Department of Municipal Affairs, authority to borrow the necessary money to put water and sewerage in the second and third phases.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am asking of the government a commitment that it will give that authority to the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, authority to borrow the necessary money, using the same formula as was used in the first phase so that the second and third phases can be completed, because it is absolutely vital, absolutely essential that the water and sewerage be put into the rest of Kilbride. Kilbride is no longer a little community on the outskirts of St. John's. Kilbride is growing as fast as the Northeast Land Assembly Area when it got going. It is growing perhaps faster, I think, than any other part of Newfoundland with the possible exception of some areas maybe around Corner Brook with which I am not so familiar or perhaps some areas of Conception Bay, in the District of Harbour Main. It is something, Mr. Speaker, that is a top priority. When I say this I am not forgetting that there are many communities all around Newfoundland that have very great need for water and sewerage. It is another area where, whether we like it or not, I feel that water and sewerage along with roads, and it is hard to say which is more important but these are areas in which we are going to have to borrow as much money as it is necessary to borrow or allow to be borrowed in order that these things can be done. We cannot and we will never move into the twentieth century with outdoor privies, cesspools and all the rest of it. This is something that has to be tackled. So again, Mr. Speaker, I say that I am asking for a commitment, particularly in respect to Kilbride and the water and sewerage.

The Goulds also, and here we come to a more general problem,



a thing which affects so many communities in Newfoundland. I do not have the answer but certainly, I can define, I think with some clarity, the problem. The Town of Goulds is out there and there are many, many towns in Newfoundland in exactly the same position which have wide powers under the Local Government Act, wide responsibilities to provide services and yet no tax-base worth speaking of, no possible way of getting the revenue except by borrowing, to do the necessary public work such as water and sewerage. They have to get the assistance of the provincial government in order to borrow and when they do borrow the tax-base does not provide the revenue for them to pay for these services over a period of years. I pity mayors and councillors all over Newfoundland who are in this situation and who see the desperate and crying need of their communities for these services particularly water and sewerage and yet cannot find the wherewithall to do anything about it.

I must make reference also to the role of the federal government in some respects in this matter, Mr. Speaker. Last year, I remember there was a list, if not tabled in the House certainly given to members, showing the projects which DREE was prepared to undertake in the various communities. I recall seeing with pleasure that DREE was going to provide, I think it was \$25,000 for a town hall in the Goulds. That is all very well but the point is that that \$25,000, Mr. Speaker, is still sitting in the bank or wherever it is sitting. It has not been used and it cannot be used because the Town of Goulds has not the money to put with it in order to build a town hall. In fact, my understanding is that when they cast about looking for land on which to put a town hall and possibly ancillary facilities such as a fire hall or something like that, it was found that land alone could not be bought, a sufficient size piece of land, for less than something like \$12,000 or \$12,500 and that would take half the money in one crack. What you can build for \$12,500 today is nothing. In St. John's and this immediate area an ordinary three bedroom bungalow costs \$40,000

or \$45,000.

When you see the thing in perspective, a DREE grant of something like \$25,000 to put up a town hall is just no help at all. In fact, it is unfortunately an embarrassment to council because it has the money there but does not have the financial resources to go on and build. Somewhere in this House, and this seems to me the only place it can be solved, Mr. Speaker, if it can be solved, somehow a definite approach is going to have to be evolved in this House to the problem of assisting municipalities to provide the necessary monies.

It is all very well to ask people to wait. I suppose any government of Newfoundland and all over the years people have been asked to wait a certain length of time. That is fair enough. I remember seeing a television programme within the last two or three weeks on inflation and I think the title of the programme was: "We Want It All And We Want It Now." That is all very fine but people of Newfoundland are no different from anybody else. We want it all if we can get it, I suppose and we want it as soon as we can get it. We cannot have everything that we do want but there are some things that are so vital to public health, the provision of water and sewerage particularly, that we cannot wait, we must have it now. If it means borrowing and I do not want to upset anybody by suggesting that we go out and borrow huge amounts, but if huge amounts are necessary then we have to borrow them. We cannot shrink from it we have to do it and get it over with.

These are the essential and worse problems in the District of St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, and I have them off my chest. I am asking clearly, straightforwardly, the government for commitments in the next month or two in respect of some of these things so that the work can be commenced and brought along in the coming construction season. As I say, I will continue to seek this commitment and I hope to have it. If I do not have it, not only will I be very upset but the

people of St. John's South, will be very upset. These are deserving cases and these people have waited in the past two years and have been very patient, now something has to be done in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Agriculture brought in a policy which pleased me as the member for St. John's South, which is one of the larger agricultural areas in the province, and this was that agricultural land should be frozen and not used for anything except agricultural purposes. That is stating a rather complex policy in very simple fashion and I think I should elaborate. The position, I think, in which we find ourselves and I would be interested to hear other members talk about other parts of Newfoundland in this wise, but the position as explained to me by farmers in St. John's South, is this;

Everybody recognizes that we have to produce or we ought to produce as much as possible of our food stuffs. Nobody would argue or complain at that proposition and yet it has to be faced, Mr. Speaker, that agricultural work, farming, in other words, in Newfoundland is not a particularly paying proposition. So, you get a great many farmers in the Goulds, Kilbride area who are thinking of going out of the farming business because they cannot make a decent, good, substantial living. They cannot attract their sons to work with them and they cannot attract farm labour because they are not able to pay wages which are available in other sectors of the economy.

So, here you have a curious situation, Mr. Speaker, where valuable agricultural land is lying fallow and where farmers who are trying to make a go of it are unable to make a go of it because of the price structure and the various factors, cost factors involved in farming. So, it has been the practice in the past, I suppose in the past ten years maybe longer but particularly this is accelerated in the last two or three years, for farmers to sell off their lands and of course, the obvious buyers are the developers. Consequently, you get a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the land on the outskirts of St. John's - and this I know - in the Goulds and Kilbride, has been bid up in recent months to something of the order of \$7,000 an acre with developers buying or making arrangements to buy for the purposes of housing developments. It is all very well.

Then you come to this question of an agricultural freeze or a freeze on agricultural land. Let us look for a moment at what you do to that individual farmer. He has had a hard go at farming. He cannot make a go at it. At best it is a marginal income that he gets from it. So here on the one hand he can pay Mr. B or Mr. A, the developer, or can receive from Mr. A or Mr. B, the developer, \$7,000 per acre and on the other hand here is the government very properly and hopefully telling him; "Look, you should stay in the production of food. We are going to need it. We are trying to build up Newfoundland's agriculture." God knows that that is what we should be doing and what this government is trying to do. You can

see the difficulty because if he can sell his land for \$7,000 an acre, how bitter and how upset must that man feel because he is sitting there on a marginal farm or perhaps he does not want to farm at all and if he sells that land for agricultural purposes who will pay him more than \$500 per acre or \$1,000 per acre? Nobody. You go to any farmer and there are a few farmers in the St. John's South area who are trying to expand particularly in the area of dairy farming but they cannot pay \$7,000 an acre for pasture or anybody in root crops cannot pay \$7,000 an acre for pasture. So, therefore he cannot buy any of that land because the developers are looking and they can pay \$7,000 an acre because they simply pass it on to the people who buy the lots and the homes.

So, there is a terrible difficulty and anomaly here, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the government implement the freeze. I think it is necessary to hold some of this agricultural land. I would however say to the government that it should be a little more selective than it is at this time because what we have now are lines drawn on the map which take in large areas some of which although they may be predominantly agricultural are not entirely agricultural. So, you have the situation that with the line drawn you take in the farm all right, and that is fine but you also may take in bog, scrub land, land that by no stretch of the imagination could be ever used for agriculture. I think that the minister and his department having done the right thing in the first case, should now put men to work, qualified people, weeding out of this area the land which is not suitable for agriculture and not suitable for agricultural development so that it can be released onto the general market for housing or whatever other purpose that it can be used for.

Now, this still and again comes back to the fundamental question of what we do in this country or this province with agricultural land. Do we allow it to be swallowed up by developers or are we, as a people, prepared to pay the price (and this would mean, I feel, the establishment of a land bank) prepared as taxpayers and as people to pay the price so that the farmer is not faced with the situation of his land being frozen and worth next to nothing

but at least has a choice, in fact, he would not have a choice he would be able to sell it to the land bank for something like the price that he could get on the open market. Now this perhaps to some ears is a terrible concept that we are going to go out and save agricultural land at the price of \$7,000 an acre. Maybe that is what we will have to do if we want it. We have to sit down and think in this country about what is important to us and what is not. Agricultural land at the moment cannot sell for anything like that figure but we have to consider how important agricultural land is going to be sometime in the future and that future may not be too far off because the world is more and more burdened. It is finding it more and more burdensome the task of feeding its people. Some day we are going to be glad of every half acre of agricultural land in Newfoundland and everywhere else in Canada. Some day and I think the most of us who are here in this room today will be around to see the time when people will have small gardens again not only in areas like St. John's but even in the larger cities in North America.

We have been wasteful of our resources. We have allowed all over North America the bulldozers to advance and chew up agricultural land. Now it is going to be costly to keep agricultural land in production. It is going to be costly to keep it for agriculture. We have to make that kind of decision in Newfoundland and if it is costly to us as taxpayers then I think we have to accept that and if it means paying a farmer who wants to sell his land and get out of agriculture, if it means buying that land for a land bank to have it available and if it means paying \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 an acre I do not think we can shrink from that because to shrink from it would be to victimize the individual if we are only prepared to pay \$500 or \$1,000 an acre or the other side is to victimize the individual or let it go to the developer, willy-nilly.

I think there is ever so much land and in fact we all know it, thousands of acres, thousands of square miles of land in Newfoundland which is suitable for residential development or business commercial development but which is not suitable for agriculture. So I think we should preserve our agricultural land and be prepared to pay for it.

Now before leaving matters concerning the District of St. John's South itself I have to refer to Shea Heights which used to be known as the "Blackhead Road." Shea Heights is an area that has caused, Mr. Speaker, a certain amount of controversy. I think there have been a lot of elected officials and appointed officials who have had moments of grief over Blackhead Road, later named Shea Heights. I think this is one case though where a project was started by the previous government for which I give them credit. It was a bold project. It was an expensive project but nonetheless it brought to the community which is now Shea Heights it brought a decent standard there or at least the makings of a decent standard. It gave them something to work on which please God in the future with the help of this government which took over something which they can be proud of and make into a real community.

I think, although I have heard it said that that project was so expensive and so difficult that it frightened the federal government out of such urban renewal projects, I do not mind that. It does not worry me if the federal government get frightened about something. I am glad that that project was initiated on Blackhead Road. I think everybody connected with it learned something from it. I think that the way to go about a project is probably for those who are operating the bulldozers, mainly the construction companies, perhaps even the government departments to be a little more careful of people's feelings because on Blackhead Road a lot of people did not know what was happening until the bulldozers rumbled into their backyards, knocking down fences and clotheslines. This actually happened. Blasts were set off of dynamite which rattled and broke windows and shook houses on their foundations, all sorts of things went wrong. God knows who is to blame for that. How can one ascribe that sort of blame? One cannot.

The idea of the project was good. It has been carried on and it is very nearly completed. I am glad myself to have had a hand in the recommendation for the Blackhead Road Review Board which is now the Shea Heights Review Board which has been in operation for just over a year and which has bucked up as it were and it had a representative of Shea Heights

a representative of government and an outside person on it. It did a lot of good work mopping up the troubled spots, getting rid of the big rocks that might roll down and in fact did roll down,



rolled down on a couple of children; ironing the bugs out of the thing, trying to get people compensated for their land so that gradually, Mr. Speaker, this project is nearing an end. It is a worth-while project which has given and allowed the people of Shea Heights to get some sort of new community identity and very strong feeling that they are a community and they have something to work for and that they can achieve results. I must say that I am very pleased to have represented this district at the time when this project neared completion and fruition and I am pleased that it was done and I am quite prepared to give full marks to everybody connected with it because it is a worth-while thing. We have to tackle these difficult problems and we have to give people a sense of belonging to a community and a sense of being prepared to do something about it.

Now, in Shea Heights perhaps it is not out of the woods yet. The problem remains and we will face the people of Shea Heights and face this government which has to agree or disagree one way or another on the problem of whether Shea Heights will become an independent municipality or whether it will be part of the City of St. John's or whether it will continue to be governed by the St. John's Metropolitan Board. There are various choices facing both government and the Community of Shea Heights but one thing we can be certain of is that there will be the strongest kind of representation from the citizens of Shea Heights on that point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I presented a resolution to this House on matters of housing or at least to the effect. One part of the housing, what I consider to be the housing crisis in this province and it is a crisis, is not so much a question of a crisis of housing. Like all of these things very often it is a crisis in so far as money is concerned. It is not a governmental crisis. It is a crisis in that the ordinary working man now cannot really afford to buy a new home. That is what we are down to.

Now, on the question of the matter that I raised here in my resolution, the particular matter about expropriating homes, I will

not deal with that and perhaps it would not be sensible for me to deal with that today. Hopefully there will be a debate on that point. We have to recognize and I am glad to say that this government has announced its intention and its recognition of housing as a major piece of importance in this province today. I have heard from members on the other side of the House in their public statements that they also recognize housing as being vitally important. Perhaps this could be an area and an issue which would see a degree of unanimity in this House because we owe it to the people who put us here to try to do something to help people come out of this problem.

I have talked to people all over Newfoundland, in different parts of Newfoundland, about this matter. One thing that it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it has become, with the prices of houses and land today, more difficult, for the ordinary young man, working man in Newfoundland to get a house, even I believe than it was ten or twelve years ago, perhaps even than it was forty or fifty years ago, long before Confederation when people did a great deal themselves. It is a rare person who is working now in this community or any community in Newfoundland who can stop and build his own house. It is hard enough to live, God knows, when one is working full-time without taking a winter off or a summer off in order to build a house even if you possess the skill to do it. This is something that we could do in the past in Newfoundland but it is out of tune with modern industrial life and it is something that cannot be done. Yet the wages which are paid - I am not talking about the minimum wage, I am talking about the wage that a tradesman makes, I am talking about the man making \$10,000 a year - I do not see, quite frankly, how he can support and bring up a family here in St. John's or in Clarenville or in Gander or Grand Falls or Corner Brook or St. George's. I do not see how he can do it and lay aside sufficient money to make a down payment on a house which costs \$40,000, \$42,000, \$43,000, \$45,000, and that is a minimal sort of house here today in St.

John's. I do not see how he can do it. In fact he cannot do it. He cannot do it and pay ten or ten and three-quarter per cent on mortgages. He cannot do it and therefore I think we are going to have to attack

this problem of housing. There is another area which is extremely important and it was dealt with to some extent, the federal policy of neighborhood improvement grants.

Now it seems to me that is one of the best and most significant advances that have ever been made but it requires the province to designate areas within the province so that the neighborhood improvement grants can apply. This is simply that where a person makes application for a loan, you have to be earning less than a certain amount of money, but the vast majority of Newfoundlanders would certainly be within these guidelines and you make application and depending on the amount of money you are earning, you can be forgiven a certain part of the loan and it is for fixing up, things like putting in water and sewerage or plumbing, any kind of necessary and worthwhile repairs of homes, perhaps older homes that need this sort of thing.

I heartily applaud and I am delighted to see a programme like that being brought in and I would urge the government of this province not only to designate as it has Shea Heights in my own district and Mundy Pond in the District of St. John's North, and one of the areas of Watson's Road in Corner Brook, not only to designate these but immediately to designate other areas, in fact perhaps most areas of this province for this kind of programme.

I do not know if the federal government have the funds available to supply these home improvement loans or grants to all the communities in Newfoundland or to all the individuals, I should say, who would seek to borrow. I do not know but if they have not I would say let us call their bluff. Let us designate so many areas, practically every area of Newfoundland, because the designation could be justified on grounds of good hard logic and cold fact. You take people around Newfoundland and you look at homes and what I have said with regard to people building new homes also applies to people who

have older homes, who are not able now, with the price of materials and the price and cost of just living, they are not able to turn to and fix up their homes. I would ask the government to designate immediately areas, in consultation with officials and in consultation with the federal government, but if the federal government balks to designate them anyway and lay them all squarely with them to come up with the money which they have said, not the money which they have said but to come up with the money to implement the plan which they have put forth, called the Neighborhood Improvement System of Loans and Grants. This it seems to me could be one of the most worthwhile things to be introduced in Newfoundland in recent years.

Sometimes I have a scepticism about plans which involve or seek to involve governments combining, and corporations and all sorts of things, and people and civil servants and consultants, God knows who. This is a plan which, as I see it, could be and is to be administered by Central Mortgage and Housing or perhaps some other body in which the individual makes the application. At least that is how I would like to see it work. The individual makes the application, he gets his loan, he does his work, getting the best value from the dollar, and then if he is entitled to be forgiven any part of it, by all means let him be forgiven under the plan.

I think this plan and other areas of housing are areas in which this government and this House are going to have to try to work carefully and quickly and well because we have an extreme problem I feel here in Newfoundland, a problem of fixing up older homes and the problem of the young married couple not being able, quite frankly, in ever so many cases, to even think in terms of owning a new home or an old home or any kind of home in this province.

To change direction, if you like, in these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with some matters pertaining to

the Newfoundland Constabulary, that from time to time the Newfoundland Constabulary blows up in the press, there is discussion, some saying it should be expanded, some saying it should not. One of the newly elected councillors, a man who has some very good ideas, recently elected here in St. John's, suggested that the Newfoundland Constabulary should cease to be a provincial force but in fact, as I understood his remarks, should become a city force and that in due course it could police the whole area of St. John's, Mount Pearl, the new town and adjacent areas.

I have some familiarity with the workings of the administration of justice in this province, Mr. Speaker, and some familiarity with the Newfoundland Constabulary and I would urge on

government now not to let that force, the Newfoundland Constabulary, go out of provincial control. That is a provincial force. It has always, as far as I know, been a provincial force and before Confederation it had provincial-wide responsibilities and duties. I think it is unfortunate, after the coming of Confederation, that this force was restricted entirely to the City of St. John's. I can see why it was restricted. It was a case of the federal government paying for the R.C.M.P., under the rental contracts. It appeared and I am sure that the balance sheet of the day showed that it was probably cheaper to have the R.C.M.P. police the rest of the Province of Newfoundland and confine the provincial police force, the Newfoundland Constabulary, to the City of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived when we ought to take another look at that, when we ought to recognize this force as a provincial force and when we ought to start - I remember a year or two years ago, when we had a debate, I think on the estimates of the Department of Justice, if I am not mistaken, in this House, when this was discussed. At the time I suggested to the Minister of Justice that the constabulary ought to be tried out in some other centres of Newfoundland, on a trial basis, i.e., that it should be brought - the first place I would do it, quite honestly, is Labrador City. I would expand the constabulary and take over the policing of Labrador City to start with. I would then think and negotiate in terms of Corner Brook, then perhaps Grand Falls, the various larger centres of the province.

Now the reason I suggested this is that there is a difference in the price which is paid by the federal government or the amount which is collected by the federal government for using the R. C. M. P., a difference between urban areas and rural areas. I do not think we could afford to have the Newfoundland Constabulary police the rural areas of this province because the R. C. M. P., in that sense, I believe is somewhat of a bargain. The price goes up when you move into the urban areas. The cost of policing Corner Brook (I do not have the figures. In

due course, perhaps the Minister of Justice will provide them, perhaps in the budget debate or when his estimates are going through, but it is high I think with the rates of pay of the R. C. M. P. and the cost of their equipment, the point has come, not only on a balance sheet basis but on the basis of what is good for the Province of Newfoundland, that we should think in terms of putting our provincial police force into these centres and to enlarge the police force. They are more fitted and more used to municipal policing than are the R. C. M.P. It is true that in Western Canada the R. C. M. P. do a great deal of municipal police work. I still feel that a force such as our own Newfoundland Constabulary could be used to good advantage in these centres. I would like to see them do it and I would like to see a system arrived at whereby the province pays part of the cost of having the Newfoundland Constabulary in a town and the town itself pay something toward the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I think this could be started and could include St. John's as well. I think that there are a lot of towns all over Newfoundland from time to time who have wondered aloud and understandably: "Why is it that the province pays the whole cost of the Newfoundland Constabulary in St. John's and the whole cost, i.e., or most of the cost of the fire department?" I think that this has to change sometime. It may not be popular in certain areas of St. John's or with certain people in St. John's. I think a start has to be made somewhere and that the people of St. John's start paying directly for a part of the cost of their policing and likewise that Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Labrador City and all the major towns in due course do the same thing and that there should be a rental agreement or call it what you will, whereby the constabulary could provide that service partly at the expense of the province and partly at the expense of the municipality. That is something, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to see come. We have talked about it in this House and it has been talked of, both inside and outside this House, for a number of



years but it something which I feel should come. If it cost the province a little more money then okay. I think the benefits which would accrue to us in being able to train and put a certain number of young Newfoundlanders into this sort of work would more than outweigh the extra cost which it may cost the province over and above what we pay in a fairly high rental in urban areas to the R. C. M. P. The R. C. M. P. I then feel could continue to police rural areas

and continue, of course, obviously to do the federal work which they have always done since we became a part of Canada and no doubt will always continue to do in this province.

Now dealing with matters involving the administration of justice leads me also to the Steele Report on the magistracy. I do not intend to say a great deal on that, Mr. Speaker. I think it was a good report, a very comprehensive report and I certainly feel and I feel sure that the government will take somethings out of that report, maybe not all of it. Maybe not all of all at once but at the same time I feel the government ought to take some significant things out of that report, particularly along the lines of the provincial court and giving to the magistracy the respect which I think it deserves.

A lot of persons perhaps in this House are not too familiar with the operation of the Magistrates Court. I think it is worth saying that these courts now insofar as criminal matters are concerned must deal with ninety-eight per cent I am sure of the matters involving, criminal matters that is, which come before the courts of this province. The jurisdiction of the magistrates in criminal cases is always increasing. This is done of course not by the province but by the federal government.

So more and more you have the magistrates courts becoming important. I think this should be recognized. It should be recognized in terms of salary and it should be recognized also in terms of the facilities which magistrates must be accorded in order to do their work properly.

Now I think the Steele Report says, and the minister will correct me if I am wrong, that the name should be changed from "magistrates" to "provincial court judges." Is that not the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Yes, I think that was the suggestion. My own view I must say is that the term and the title of magistrate is a very old and honourable title in our system. I would by all means give them the facilities, give them the tools to work with, give them the recognition, give everything that is necessary but I think it is a very old and a very

proud title in Newfoundland and in England for that matter, the title of magistrate. I would like to see that remain.

I understand also and I am pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, that the government proposed to introduce the necessary legislation to set up a court of appeal. My understanding is, with the possible exception of Prince Edward Island, that we are the only province that does not have a court of appeal. I think we need one and I think it is a very awkward situation that develops in our courts, certainly it did all of the time before we got a fourth judge, when a man would have to sit on his own appeal as it were. A judge would have to sit on a case, in which he decided further down the line, when it came up to the court of appeal.

Now with four judges this has not been so bad but if you get a judge travelling on circuit, a judge sick, anything disturbs the normal routine of the court, you can find difficulties in constituting a court of appeal. I think it is time that this was done. I am glad to see it proposed in the Throne Speech. I look forward to seeing the legislation. Not only do I look forward to seeing the legislation but I will look forward to seeing it passed by this House and brought into force immediately so that the court of appeal can be constituted and start doing its work. I think it is time that this was done. As I say, I can only say that I am delighted to see that it is going to be done in this session.

On matters involving the administration of justice too, you know, I have to turn again to highways and the matter of licencing of drivers. This was only brought to my attention very recently in a case which occurred in court, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that this business of eyesight and driving is one of the things that we would all say if asked and say very quickly; yes a driver ought to have good sight before being allowed to drive a motor car. I think the form, when one fills it out to get a licence, says something like, "Is your sight all right?" I suppose you say yes or no as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, people whose sight is deteriorating often are not aware of it themselves, sometimes even though they are aware of it they still want to drive cars. Maybe I can understand this to some extent but it is absolutely wrong, it is absolutely dangerous and it should not be. I was involved very recently in a case in our courts when a man who was declared to be technically blind was still driving a car under a valid drivers licence in 1973 and hit and killed a young girl. He did not even see her. He could not see her. This is an absolute fact. It brought home to me with very great force the need for a test of eyesight, there maybe might be tests of other things needed also before drivers are licenced but it seems to me that just the loss of that one life is significant enough to bring us to our senses and for us to institute, without delay, here in this House, the necessary change in the regulations or the necessary change in legislation, whatever is required, to change that, to make it absolutely mandatory that a person has good sight and produce something to that effect, if necessary, before getting a driver's license. Because we cannot have people on the roads who are not able to see. In fact

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You mean continuing good vision?

MR WELLS: Yes continuing because the case in which I was involved was dreadful and sad and bitter and tragic, when a pedestrian was walking in the proper place for pedestrains and the car struck her and killed her, and she did not have a chance, and the man genuinely, who did this, was not under the influence of alcohol nor driving recklessly nor anything like that. He just could not see. He was blind - blind. Yet he was a licensed driver. That is something which in conscience, MR. Speaker, we cannot allow to continue.

Now before dealing with other matters, MR. Speaker, I note that it is very near six o'clock and I would move at this time that the debate now adjourn, my impromptu remarks. I shall get to more serious matters in the next ninety minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we have the motion to adjourn, I gather that the honourable member from Bonavista South is ready to entertain us with the controversial letter and he must have unanimous consent. Is it agreed that he be permitted to table this report? Agreed.

MR. MORGAN: I am pleased to table the report of the select committee of the Assembly appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the most gracious Speech from the Throne.

Motion, that the House at its rising stand adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, February 5, 1974, at 3:00 p.m., carried.