



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 71

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1974

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

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

NOTICE OF MOTION:

HON. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): A long title here. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act to Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Entered Into Between The Government And Pyramid Mobile Homes (1959) Limited With Respect To The Commencement And Carrying On Of A Business For Manufacture And Distribution Of Mobile Homes Within The Province, And To Make Statutory Provisions Respecting Matters Connected Therewith." The title is longer than the bill.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTS): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions all asked by the honourable member for Bonavista North, questions No. 2, 23, 25, 37, 41, 47, 48 and 49. I do not know what dates on the Order Paper but these are the numbers.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. So, I will polish him off first and get him out of the way.

Would the minister inform the House if he has received representation either in writing or in person from the Wabana Town Council for a request for financial assistance to maintain the essential services in the town?

MR. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had quite a long meeting with the town council of Wabana yesterday. My officials were there for a somewhat longer time after I had to leave. The situation of Wabana is a pretty serious one as far as their finances are concerned and the operations of the town.

What we agreed to yesterday - there is a report coming up with recommendations, I hope, on the whole situation over there including the water system and everything else. In the meantime I do not like

to use the word but literally what we are doing is we are baling out the town of Wabana with loans sufficient to meet their immediate commitments. Some of their bank loans are being pressed and other bills payable and so on. We are doing this but it is estimated that within two weeks we will have a proper picture of the situation at Wabana. Then we will be able to come to some conclusions as to how to deal with it.

MR. NEARY Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Could the minister inform the House if the members of the town council who are threatening to resign if they do not get fast action on this situation, if they will hang on for two weeks until they get the minister's report or his decision?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what they indicated yesterday. While I was there there was no talk of the council resigning. They did feel that they were in a desperate predicament but nobody said that they were going to resign. I left the meeting with the impression that they would hold on until they found out what we could do for them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House if the town council of Bonavista has notified the minister's department that four members of the town council have resigned because of a dispute between the four councillors and the mayor of the town?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, no. I am actually waiting to hear from the Town of Bonavista. The only thing I know is what I have heard on the radio and in the press. Normally when councillors resign, they send me a notice of their resignation. So far I have not received anything official from Bonavista. I presume that it may be somewhere in the mail but I have no knowledge of why they resigned or what the reasons are. I am waiting to hear from them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House if he has received a request from the Town of Mount Pearl for action on a request to pay the members of the town council of Mount Pearl?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had this request several times. In fact Mount Pearl is one of the few, in fact I think it is the only

town that has been pressing for payment of councillors. We have refused. It is a precedent which we are not prepared to set up at this time. I feel that we may have to look at this another year, compensation for councillors, but at the present time we are not prepared to do it because we cannot just do it for Mount Pearl. We would have to make it a general application if we did it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister inform the House if he notified the town council of the decision that he just announced here in the House or will this be the first indication they have of this? Is there a breakdown in communications between the minister and the town council?

MR. EARLE: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there is no breakdown. We are in frequent communication with the Town of Mount Pearl. In fact I think I see them more than any other council. This matter has been discussed a number of times with them. They are quite aware of our stand on it. I do not think they need to be informed any further.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the same minister inform the House what has happened to the 100 lots that I understand are in the second phase of the Virginia Waters Development down here - I think it is called Virginia Park. These lots were supposed to go on sale, in March I think it was. My understanding is that they have not gone on sale yet. Would the minister indicate to the House why these lots have not been placed on the market. What is causing the delay?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information at hand at the moment on that particular one but I think it has something to do with a question with the city council. I will get the information for the honourable member. There is some hold up. There have been some question lately of the ability of the City of St. John's to service all of these developments. I think there may be discussions with the council going on.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir: Would the minister also find out when it is expected to put these building lots up for sale?

When the minister gets the information, will he also find out the date that these building lots are going to be offered for sale?

MR. EARLE: Right.

MR. NEARY: I would like to switch over now, Sir, to the Minister of Tourism down here. I would like to ask the minister what he has against Mr. Ed Boyd of Quality Tours who has been trying to get an appointment with the minister for the last six months?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, maybe I could ask the minister if he has received a request from Mr. Boyd in the last six months for an appointment.

MR. T. DOYLE (MINISTER OF TOURISM): To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. NEARY: Well, is the minister aware that Mr. Boyd has made a public statement that he has been trying to get to see the minister for six months?

MR. DOYLE: No.

MR. NEARY: The minister is not aware he made a public statement? Well, I would suggest to the minister he read the morning newspaper.

Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations if he has yet received a brief from the Newfoundland Federation of Labour.

MR. J.G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS):

That is not the brief by the way from the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. Actually the thing originally was scheduled for Monday and the releases went out because of the difficulties involved. I am only there as an accompanist. The honourable the Minister of Justice will be receiving a brief from the Police Brotherhood Association, with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. I will also be present at the meeting.

The earlier reports in the news media suggested that it was this brief. However, subsequent reports in the last day or so suggested that it was the annual Federation of Labour brief, which it is not. It is merely another brief and I am glad to have the opportunity to clarify that. So, the annual federation brief - the

request has been made. I would anticipate sometime in the next month or two that the Federation of Labour will have the opportunity to present their annual brief.

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister for his answer, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation is responsible for day care centers or not. Would the minister indicate whether - is the Minister of Social Services coming in the House today? Not coming today?

Well, I will save that question for tomorrow, Sir.

I think I have another question for the Minister of Education. He is not going to be in his seat today so I will have to postpone that one until tomorrow. The Minister of Finance is not going to be in his seat either. Well, Sir, there are only fifty per cent, half the ministers in their seats. How can we ask questions and get answers and get information for the people of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we did not have a chance to question certain ministers in the estimates, I wonder if this question might be in order. I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries. Whether that minister can inform the House if his department plans any expenditures in Labrador during the forthcoming fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister wish to answer, I shall permit it but it seems as if it was a question that should have been asked on the estimates.

MR. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, they did not wish to do it that way, obviously. That is a pretty general question. I do not know if the honourable member might have something specific in mind.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling but I would like a point of clarification, whether or not we did have the opportunity to question the minister during the estimates debate. This is really the whole point.

MR. SPEAKER: Whether or not the opportunity literally arose to

ask questions on the Department of Fisheries in the estimates is perhaps not the point. There were seventy-five hours allocated and the budget estimates have been dealt with. So, it is really out of order to ask questions pertaining to the estimates as such.

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): If I may on that, Mr. Speaker. Just one moment, if I may.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not an appeal. The point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is this a debate now we are involved in?

MR. MARSHALL: All right, on the point of order. I will say what it is. That is that if anyone wish to ask me questions, the question period is open for all questions as far as the government is concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I did permit the honourable Minister of Fisheries to answer the question if he wanted to.

MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the honourable member asked if we are doing anything on Labrador this summer. He made some reference to the estimates as well. Now, the fact that the Fisheries estimates were not debated in the House, as everybody knows, is that the honourable gentlemen opposite decided to spend all the time allotted to them on three departments, Rural Development, Finance and Social Services I believe it was. It was not that we did not want to discuss our estimates. We are quite proud of them in fact. We have more money in fisheries this year than ever before in Newfoundland. Please goodness, by the time the season rolls around where we can do things in Labrador, we will be doing more down there than ever we have done before.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Today being Private Members' Day, we shall continue with motion (3) as it appears on today's Order Paper. I think the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing adjourned the debate last Private Members' Day.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, when the House closed last Wednesday I had

just started to say something about the motion by my friend, the honourable member for St. John's South, on the amendment to the Family Homes Expropriation Act, with particular reference to the concept of a home for a home.

This statement, broadly speaking, of a home for a home, has been thrown around rather loosely, I think, without much concept by most people as to what is really meant or what the intention is. It is something which nobody can argue against. It is really a motherhood resolution. I am sure that everybody feels that any person who is dispossessed of his home is entitled to another place in which to live of a standard which is satisfactory.

MR. NEARY: Is there a quorum in the House, Sir? Could we have a quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the clerk count the House please?

We have a quorum.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I hope the opposition will take it a bit easy this afternoon because if this is going to be the pattern, we may as well continue from here on calling quorums and probably we will not have anything to say. I can use up three minutes of the time, ad infinitum, but it does not do very much for the House.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: In any case, Mr. Speaker, as I started to say, the concept of a home for a home in my opinion has been oversimplified. Nobody can disagree with the arguments in principle that a person who loses his home should be compensated and replaced with a satisfactory home.

Now, the unfortunate thing which happened, as was pointed out last Wednesday, that under the urban development schemes which took place some years ago, because of our partnership or the government of that day partnership with the federal government on these schemes, they had to go along and contend with federal regulations on this subject. No way would the federal government participate in these schemes at that time, mainly the Shea Heights Development and the Mundy Pond, on that basis of a home for a home.



They agreed under their legislation that there should be what was in their opinion adequate compensation for the houses. They were also compelled under their legislation to find rental accommodation for those people who were dispossessed of their homes. Now, I think it is necessary for us to draw attention, in discussing this subject, to two particular different fields altogether in compensating people for their homes and the circumstances that bring them about. For instance, on the Shea Heights and to some extent in the Mundy Pond area and Corner Brook West, which were urban development schemes, these were literally schemes devised to clear out unsatisfactory housing, housing which in many cases was not fit for people to live in.

Actually under the federal legislation these houses could have been completely demolished, the people found rental accommodation and that was that. This is what could have been done. I think in all sanity and with some feeling towards the people concerned, the people who were involved with it at that time went further than that and tried to compensate those who were dispossessed to some degree.

Now, it is a moot point and a point which could be debated as to whether the compensation for these homes was adequate or not. Most of this happened some years ago and there were in all some eighty-four homes expropriated in that area. These varied in an assessed value from as low as being worth \$400 each up to a high of \$13,000. Now, we are talking perhaps seven, eight years ago or maybe longer; the value of homes had not accelerated to the point that they have today.

At that time this was appraised as the fair value of these homes. Literally when one gets down to a house which is appraised at only being worth a few hundred dollars, it is literally nothing much more than a tilt or one-room shack or something of that sort. There are still outstanding on the Shea Heights four cases only which have not been settled. The homes in these cases are valued by the assessors from \$605 to a high of \$2,960. They are poor types of homes, very inferior homes and under today's standard, not

worth very much at all.

In areas such as that, when one is literally going in and clearing out an area that needs to be demolished, one comes up against all sorts of peculiar circumstances. They find, for instance, such cases as they ran into of one old lady living alone, well over eighty years old, who simply refused to accept good rental accommodation. She wanted to stay in that one room. She was not capable nor healthy enough to look after a home if she had a proper home. Yet she insisted that that was her home and that is where she wanted to stay. There is no money in the world, no matter what that lady was given, that would compensate her for the disruption she felt she was undergoing.

Similarly there was another case of a person who - I am just quoting a few instances to show the sort of difficulties we are up against. There is another case where a person seemed to be quite satisfied to have her house assessed and paid for at the value which it was assessed for but it turned out

that she had a well so she wanted to be compensated for the loss of a well. So they offered to compensate her by hooking her up to the water line, so that she would have a steady supply of water. She agreed to this but she still wanted compensation for the well. The reason she wanted compensation for the well was that her neighbour next door had been hooked up to the water line and he did not have a well. So she felt she should be paid for the well she had because the fellow next door got compensation anyhow and he did not have a well.

So you came up against all this sort of arguments. Whether they are logical or not is a matter of question but in these cases to take the home for a home literally, on the surface, when you are dealing with circumstances of that kind you come up against tremendously knotty problems. For instance, if you expropriate a fellow's home who has been consistently lazy, has not put a bit of paint on the house for years, has lived in this shack and is quite satisfied, it may be valued at \$500.00 or \$600.00, you would take him out of that and you put him in perhaps what is a \$20,000 home, the fellow next door to him who is not quite as bad, his house is liveable and he decides that he is going to stay there, but he does not get a home. So how does he feel when he sees his buddy next door go off and move into a \$20,000 home and just because his house happens to be a fraction better and he is satisfied to be left there he gets nothing at all?

So it is not an easy subject, in fact, it is a very, very difficult one. The federal government recognize this and we most certainly recognize it. At the time we are caught right in the middle of it. Then on top of that public feeling runs high. I remember something about it, it is not too clear in my mind now but I know that there was suppose to be at the time a hundred low-rental apartments built up there for people who were really put out. They were suppose to get one hundred of these subsidized rental apartments on the Shea Heights. At the time, the late Father Shea, after whom the Heights are

now named, objected very strongly indeed to the idea of rental housing. He did not like it. He was deady opposed to it. The people of "The Brow", as it was called then, all got behind Father Shea and they said; 'No way are we going to accept rental housing', although it was of a standard much better than that in which they were living.

The result was that instead of one hundred low-rental houses being built forty-three were built. This went along for some years and now I find the demand from Shea Heights for rental housing is simply terrific. They are asking us when we are going to build the other fifty or sixty. They want them the day before yesterday. Everybody up there who have seen the experience of the people who moved into these rental houses is now saying, "What sort of fools were we? We would be much better off if we had accepted that."

On the surface it seems crazy because these low rental houses are costing today possibly as high as \$30,000 each, per unit. Looking back now, hindsight is always better than foresight. But if you look back and you paid those people who were expropriated for a matter of \$300.00, \$400.00, \$500.00 or \$600.00 had they been paid \$20,000 at the time, the government of the day would be better off because what they had to do was put probably \$30,000 into providing rental homes and from here on the cost of these rental homes obviously is going up and they will be costing more. So it is a naughty question every way you look at it.

Now the other question which is an entirely different one is in the case of highways or parks or other improvements around an area where people are dispossessed of their homes. They have a moderately good home in which they live and they are quite satisfied and because of public works of some sort (This is not slum clearance, this is just the fact of perhaps locating a road or a park or some other convenience.) they lose their home. Naturally they feel very, very bitter about it. They, I think in anybody's books, should be supplied with a home equal on every standard to the one that they were forced

out of.

I think probably all of us including the federal government authorities and ourselves, and the provincial government, have grown out of this terribly difficult experience we have had with Shea Heights and with Mundy Pond and with Corner Brook West, to realize something has to be done in cases where these difficult problems are to be faced. I think probably the prime example of that now, one of which this government are very proud, is that they have persuaded the federal government in the case of the Gros Morne Park to come in with this in giving these people really adequate compensation for their homes.

For instance, under the schedule which is being arranged - perhaps it would be interesting to the House if I read some of it. In the Gros Morne Park Agreement, under part (I), the relocation compensation, this is the type of thing that is going on now as compared to the Shea Heights: The compensation to be paid to an owner or a leasee or being located from a park community to a place outside of the boundaries of the proposed national park shall be calculated in accordance with the following principles: In the case of an owner, at his or her option, either (1) an amount equal to the appraised value of that owner's dwelling, land and any apartment, outbuildings or sheds; or (2) an amount equal to the cost of a building lot and the construction of a dwelling thereon as follows: (a) two bedroom house, if the owner have two children or less, (b) a three bedroom house, if the owner have three or four children, (c) four bedroom house, if the owner have five or seven children and (d) a five bedroom house if the owner have eight or more children.

"In the case of a leasee; a land grant, a forgivable mortgage and a mortgage bearing no interest, so that he can provide himself with a good home."

In addition to compensation mentions in Sections (1) and (2), the owner or leasee as the case may be shall be entitled to the following compensation where applicable: Compensation to

cover the cost of searching for a new house, the repayment of expenses incurred in removal of household and related effects or grant in lieu of these expenses, compensation for loss of income, incentive payments as deemed appropriate by Newfoundland to encourage persons to move to communities where they are better able to pursue their occupation, compensation for severance, payment for woodlots, payment for redundant assets. Now this is how this agreement with the Gros Morne Park goes.

It is a very enlightened agreement and a far better agreement, under which the urban renewal schemes could buy.

MR. NEARY: A good Liberal Government in Ottawa, Sir.

MR. EARLE: It happened to take the local Progressive Conservative Government to get such an agreement. In the Gros Morne Park negotiations this was a tough negotiation and this government have gotten these enlightened agreements from the federal government but it was done with considerable struggle. I do not think most people realize when they talk about the house for a house concept that under the Old Family Expropriation Act, if a residence were condemned as unfit for human habitation, even under that it was possible to throw a person out and demolish the house completely and give them no compensation whatever. The only thing that had to be provided was rental accommodation of a suitable standard, and in many, many cases the people would not accept rental accommodation.

I am just pointing out these facts, Mr. Speaker, to show some of the complications which are involved in this type of an operation. Fortunately, I think that the federal government are now seeing the light and there will be, so we are told, no more of these urban development schemes. The Shea Heights thing was a nightmare. We are still wrestling with the Corner Brook West one and the Mundy Pond one, and hopefully we will have this all cleaned up within a matter of a year.

But I suppose it comes down to this, that with the type of territory that is on the Shea Heights, on the Southside Hills and in Corner Brook West it would in the long run probably be far cheaper to take everybody off those sites completely and build for them new houses in another area. This is something that we have learned from experience, but it is too late to undo what has been done now. Therefore, I think, we can only learn from experience.

The fact is that these schemes are not quite completed as yet, they are rapidly coming to the conclusion. As I pointed out, Shea Heights has only four cases outstanding and these will be settled shortly. Corner Brook West has a few more.

But you can imagine the sort of shizzle you would get into now if you put this legislation into effect immediately and had to open up all the compensation and all of those schemes which go back over a number of years. How would the people who have settled and to this point apparently have been satisfied, feel if they found that the remaining few cases were given good homes at today's prices? If you took the remaining cases and took them out now you would probably have to house them at a cost of something over \$30,000 each, in a proper home. While a fellow in Corner Brook or Shea Heights or anywhere else, if he sees these last remnants of the scheme getting that type of a home, I think he is going to think twice about what he got when he accepted \$400.00 compensation for his house and got literally nothing but a rental apartment in which to live.

I feel myself, Mr. Speaker, that these schemes which are now concluded, which are now about to be concluded with the federal government, must be brought to conclusion and then we can revert back to the home for a home idea as expressed in the Family Expropriation Act as it originally was but perhaps with some improvements. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the whole expropriation legislation of the government needs revamping and redrafting. I am not satisfied with it, that it is completely fair in all of its concepts. I think that we will have to look at this legislation

and revamp the whole thing along modern lines.

Everybody has to admit that in the field of housing in particular, concepts of what were applied eight or ten years ago are no longer valid today. Certainly prices cannot be compared or the cost of doing this sort of thing. So I think we have to update our legislation and bring into it some more favourable aspects, if you would like to call it that, so that there need not be this continual dissatisfaction on the part of people who through one circumstance or another are forced to lose their homes.

I am going to recommend to my colleagues that it just has to be done, that we have a look at this legislation and see if we cannot update it properly.

Now the debate as it took place the other day developed into a full-scale debate on housing generally. With the permission of the House, although it is not strictly on the subject of this motion, I might enlarge a bit on that subject. Actually it was pretty fully covered in the debate on my estimates and in the comments which have been made so far on the budget speech, but basically -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister had ample opportunity, Sir, during the discussion on the estimates, to have a broad-ranging, wide-ranging discussion on housing and the minister did not do it, Sir. I would submit now, Sir, that he be not permitted to do it under the rules of this House. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House apply to this side as well as that side, that we be given the same privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: We hear this again and again, Mr. Speaker, the rules apply always equally to both sides. The fact of the matter is that when this was debated last Wednesday there was a certain amount of latitude given above and beyond the resolution itself with respect to the housing matter. If the honourable Member for Bell Island, I do not know whether he was in attendance or whether he was not, obviously he was not listening at the time the speaker on the opposite side, the Leader of the Opposition, used this latitude for the purpose of talking



about housing generally. The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is wandering no farther than debate has already taken now, I submit he is being very relevant.

The honourable member, I spoke and he spoke. He cannot resist himself. He has got to come out like a child and have the last word. Now get up -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as usual the minister could not take his seat without being nasty, getting the reputation of Mr. Nastiness in this House but, Sir, last week, if Your Honour should remember, the member who introduced this resolution, the Member for St. John's South, sort of wandered, was irrelevant to the resolution, and Your Honour allowed the same latitude to the Leader of the Opposition. It was by mutual agreement, if I remember, Sir. I only missed one sitting of this House so far and that was the night before last. It was done by mutual agreement, Sir. But now, since then, Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for housing had had ample opportunity to put forward his programme, and he did not take advantage of it, Sir, because he was gagged and muzzled the same as we were on this side of the House by the limit that was placed on the debate by the nasty Minister without Portfolio.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order: This is absolute rubbish, as the honourable Member for Bell Island knows. The debate last Wednesday, when they could use it to their own purposes, it was extremely free-swinging; everything in the field of housing was talked about. The opposition had ample opportunity to point out their views on housing. Now because it happens to be another private members' day and we have an opportunity to give our side of the story, they are attempting to cut off debate so that only one side of the picture comes across. I think in all essence, Mr. Speaker, it would be only fair if I were given the same opportunity.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER:(DUNPHY): Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order please!

The Chair does permit latitude, some latitude in debate. The points that the honourable Member for Bell Island was trying to make there, I cannot reverse the situation for the simple reason that I do not recall the preceding days that the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had spoken or what on. However, the principle of this resolution or the guts of it centers around a house for a house. Possibly to establish his point, he may have to go outside or slightly outside of the rules of relevancy to establish that point and the Chair would permit latitude in that direction. We shall see as we proceed. Thank you!

MR. EARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try and be as relevant as I can and certainly not repetitious. Surely the honourable Member for Bell Island now will have no doubts at all about running for Leadership. He has at least one supporter, which is one more than we thought he had.

MR. NEARY: He gets completely overcome. He gets carried away.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are all hoping "Steve".

MR. NEARY: However, perhaps by the time I am finished speaking he will have two, but the second one will not be myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of housing it is related to this home for a home concept, because if you are going to talk about a home for a home you have then to talk about housing in general and what type of housing and what programmes there are for housing and what the government can do or will try and do about housing, to give people a home for a home if that is the term in which you want to use it.

The whole question of housing today is literally a conundrum of the highest possible order. It is mainly due to several factors, which quite simply put is the very extremely high, outrageously high cost of housing to the average citizen. The question has been asked on all sides, right across Canada, North America and everywhere else,

why has the cost of housing accelerated and why is it going up at this rate and what if anything can governments do about it?

I pointed out the other day that the Liberal Government in Ottawa recently came down on this very subject, that they have not been able to cope with it. They are accused of not being able to cope with the housing problem. When the Government of Canada, with the multi-millions and billions of dollars behind them, cannot cope with the housing problem, I cannot see how a province such as this, which is one of the less affluent provinces of Canada, can cope fully with its housing problem. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that

does not mean to say that we are not trying to do our best to meet the needs of our people in housing. Now, the prime and first need in a housing programme is land on which to put a house. That is such a simple statement it goes without saying. There must be a very large programme of land assembly. To begin with, the price of land has accelerated out of all reason, first of all because there was not sufficient land available. It is the bounded duty of government to try to provide and cut down on this exorbitant cost of land by supplying an adequate number of building lots in strategic places so that at least there will be serviced land on which people can build their homes.

We had some success with this, not as much as I would like to see, but last year when we offered lots in the Mount Pearl-Newtown, on which we deliberately took off \$1,000 per lot to try to bring it down to a half reasonable figure, there were 200 lots put up for sale one week. There was a lineup waiting for them. After several weeks there were only approximately 160 lots sold. One of the local builders commented in the press -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. DUNPHY): If the honourable gentleman will permit, I must bring it to his attention that he has approximately one minute left to debate.

MR. EARLE: All right, Mr. Speaker, in one minute, the problems of housing are multifold but they are due to this; that everybody that is connected with housing from the fellow who sells the land to the fellow who builds to the chap who does the conveyances to the real estate agent who tries to sell it, does not appear to be interested in bringing the price of houses down.

It is like a story that appeared in the "Toronto Globe and Mail" a few days ago, where a lady brought a house for \$50,000. Originally that house sold for \$15,000. It was then resold for \$20,000 and resold for \$25,000 and resold for \$30,000 and eventually resold for \$50,000. When she went to a real estate agent to complain about it, he said, "Madam, that house is not for living in, that house is for selling." This is the whole story behind it today. It is greed, avarice and profiteering

on a large scale. I think that this is something all governments will have to take a very close look at.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I rise to support the resolution proposed by the honourable member for St. John's South. I did not discern from the minister's words as to whether the government is supporting it or not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The government is supporting the resolution.

MR. W. ROWE: Supporting the resolution? Very good! I am glad to hear that, Sir, because following along with what the minister had to say I must say I got the impression that he was against it or something, I do not know. He started bringing up peripheral problems. He started bringing up sort of one per cent cases, I thought to be arguments against the ninety-nine per cent normal situation. I am glad that he has set the matter straight now and that the government is going to support the resolution.

This will mean, hopefully, that debate on this matter can be shortened somewhat and we can get on with some of the other resolutions which are presently before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite are fond of saying that they had to clean up a mess left by the previous administration in a certain field, as a tactic to try to cover up their lack of action over the past two and a-half years. In this particular case, I would like to hear members opposite get up and say that this particular problem sought to be remedied by the honourable member who sponsored the resolution, that this particular case is a mess brought into being by certain members of the previous administration. The honourable Minister of Finance who is presently not in his seat today was the Minister of Municipal Affairs when this amendment to the act was brought into the House of Assembly.

The present Minister of Justice was Minister of Justice then and the present Minister of Municipal Affairs was either in finance or social services or one of those departments closely related to the problems that existed at the time. Now, Sir, therefore I am glad to see that the honourable minister has seen the wisdom of his ways. Nobody on this side of the House was in the cabinet of the day when

that act was brought in or that amendment was brought in to amend an excellent piece of legislation, namely that if a person were dispossessed of a home that person receives an equivalent home, not merely the assessed value of that house but an equivalent home for being dispossessed because of expropriation by the government.

Sir, I would have liked to have heard from the Minister of Finance on the matter to see how come it was that he had such a change of heart, along with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Unfortunately, we are not going to have that pleasure and privilege this afternoon.

Sir, the housing problem is a massive problem facing any government in Newfoundland. If we add little bits and pieces to that problem, the problem is going to become even more massive and get completely out of hand. I am not saying that the amendment which was brought in, which did away with the house for a house concept as far as urban renewal was concerned, has caused the housing shortage in this province. I am not saying that at all. All I am saying is that this type of thing, Sir, this type of a problem when you add this one to another small problem, to another small problem, all add up to the massive overall housing problem which we have in the province today.

This ministry, this government, I feel, Sir, has done very little about the overall housing problem although I am glad to see that they have reluctantly agreed to support this resolution. Last year or this year rather, within the last two or three months, statistics came out from Statistics Canada which showed that we were second-last in Canada in housing starts, that our starts were nine point three, just over nine per thousand compared to an average of over twelve per thousand right across Canada. No case can be made that this government is making an all-out effort to try to deal with the housing problem, not only the housing shortage but the fact that for the average family today it is virtually impossible for them to even dream about getting into a house, because of the inflationary spiral perhaps. Anyway, the cost of housing has gone up astronomically and is far beyond the reach of any normal wage earner in Newfoundland society today.

What I would like to say, Sir, is that there has been, I think, a misconception as to what the amendment to the house for a house legislation really did. As I understand it, there still exists under the law the right for citizens to obtain an equivalent house for a house or a house for a house as it is called generally, in all cases except cases of urban renewal. Unfortunately, many otherwise well-informed people in Newfoundland today have the idea, have the misconception that the house for a house concept was wiped out by the amendment to the act and that now whenever a home or land containing a home is expropriated by the government that all that that person, the original owner or the former owner, is entitled to is the assessed value or the appraised value of that home. In all cases of expropriation that seems to be the generally received notion current in the province today.

We have people where after two or three years of a freeze being put on their property and government officials going out and offering them some money, not really being too well informed on the situation, not really understanding that they are entitled to a house for a house, accepting far less for their home than they would otherwise accept if they knew the true situation.

Now, I have not looked at the acts for the last couple of years but my understanding is that the house for a house; the amendment which now provides that in certain cases people will be paid the appraised value or the assessed value for their home applies only to the urban renewal schemes, which usually are done in co-operation with the government of Canada. As I say, unfortunately this idea has crept along and spilled over into other aspects.

For example, I remember a case raised by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, of a man in Corner Brook who had his home expropriated from him, to accommodate I believe the arterial road in Corner Brook and who was offered by the government and received I believe an amount which would compensate him for the appraised value of his house but was not nearly enough to buy a house which would be equivalent to the home which he was required to vacate. I do not know why that happened. Perhaps under the DREE Agreement there was some

agreement with Ottawa equivalent or similar to the urban renewal idea.

In any event, even if there are no further urban renewal programmes and it likely that the Government of Canada is not going to enter into urban renewal programmes, at least as we saw them in the past. They are not going to do it in the future, they have new concepts. Even if we do not do that and even if the problem in a practical sense never arises again, I think it is necessary for the government to bring in the legislation to state clearly and unequivocally that in all cases a person who has been relieved of his home by expropriation is entitled to a home for that home, basically equivalent to the one which he was required to vacate and will not be merely compensated for it on an appraised value.

I think it is necessary that the people of Newfoundland realize and are told because of legislation going through this House, that as a matter of principle in all cases everybody is entitled to a home for a home so that the misconceptions and the misconstructions which have gone about since the amendment to the home for a home legislation was passed through this House, these misconceptions are laid to rest once and for all.

I do not intend to speak, Sir, very long at all on the resolution. It is an excellent one. The House asks the government to introduce legislation which would change the rules of compensation for expropriated private dwellings to embody the principle of replacement cost where applicable instead of fair market value. I think the honourable member for St. John's South is to be commended for bringing in the legislation. When I rose to speak, I was not clear as to whether the government were going to accept the resolution or not. I am glad to hear that they are now going to accept it. So, I can cut my remarks short. I do not have to get involved in too much oratory. I wish merely to go on the record as stating that we are in favor of that concept. The number of times in the future where it might get out of hand or the problems which were raised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I believe, Sir, those types of problems will only occupy one per cent of the attention of the public officials



involved because they do not arise too often where we have the type of invidious comparison which was made, for example, up on the Blackhead Road where one person might have a house which was habitable and therefore would not receive so much as a person merely because another person was marginally low or living in an uninhabitable house and therefore would receive \$25,000 or \$30,000 to get in a house which was habitable and which was more than equivalent to the house he originally owned.

That type of a problem, Sir, is a marginal situation. To hear the honourable minister rise in the House and say that these are the problems which exist, in a pessimistic fashion trying to throw cold water on the concept, a basically just concept of a house for a house, that type of an argument, Sir, does not hold any water at all. If the honourable minister should be afraid of this type of a problem, a marginal sort of situation or a problem like that, then he should realize, Sir, that this is why governments are in existence. If there were not types of problems to be solved by governments, there would be no need of governments. If this type of a problem did not arise, this marginal type of problem, there would be no need for courts, because it is always the difficult situation that occupies the time of government and occupies the time of the various courts in our province. This is exactly why they exist.

Most cases are clear and simple. Ninety-five per cent of the cases are clear and simple. I do not like to hear, as a member of this House, an honourable minister rising and giving out examples which, although very rare and very marginal in nature, throw cold water on a basically good principle such as espoused by the member for St. John's South. So, Sir, without any further ado, I say that we for our part will vote for this resolution. I am glad the government is going to support the resolution. I hope that the government find it possible to get an amendment to the act drafted quickly, perhaps during this session. If the House close on Friday or Monday or Tuesday coming, for a recess, and reopens sometime early in June, then perhaps we can have the first, second and third reading of such an amendment at that time.

I do not think it is difficult. All they have to do is copy the original legislation, get it before this House and I am sure that it would go through unanimously without a dissenting voice. I think it would go a long way to correcting individual injustices that have gone on in the past, say five or six years in this province, as a result of the unjust amendment which was brought before this House by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, now the Minister of Finance. We have pleasure, Sir, in supporting this resolution.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague, the member for White Bay South, has certainly put our position on this resolution very clearly. I do not think he left any doubt in the minds of members of the honourable House that we intend to support this resolution. I want to join with my colleague in congratulating the member for St. John's South for having the courage, Sir, to bring in this resolution.

The member probably realized when he put this resolution on the Order Paper, Sir, that this was a promise that was made by the Progressive Conservatives in the last provincial general election. As a matter of fact, it was one of the items that was read by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, in the Speech from the Throne preceding that election, Sir. It is a little over two and half years ago since that item appeared in the Speech from the Throne. The honourable member probably realized that it was in the Speech from the Throne.

The honourable member must have been very frustrated by the lack of action on the part of the administration, Sir, in this matter, as the honourable member has expressed his frustration and dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the administration on a good many more matters. Sometimes I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is a Liberal or a Tory. I think he is probably somewhere in between.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A Progressive Conservative for about twelve years.

MR. NEARY: A Progressive Conservative for about twelve years? Well, Sir, one would never say it sometimes. The way the member tries to straddle the fence sometimes, one would never know what he is, Sir, a Liberal or a Tory.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member is absolutely wrong and he knows it.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I do not know it. Mr. Speaker, nevertheless, Sir -

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

The honourable member is not being relevant to the resolution. I would ask that he so do.

MR. NEARY: An absolutely magnificent ruling, Sir, and I intend to abide by the rulings of Your Honour. I hope, Sir, that my one-man peanut gallery was just escorted out of the House, Sir, and not restrained for the evening. I hope that he will be sleeping in his own bed tonight. It is nice to know, Sir, that we have some supporters like that. They just love me, Mr. Speaker. They love me!

MR. W. ROWE: To think we worked so hard to get a chance to speak in here.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. In order to speak in this House one has to get elected, Sir, as my colleague pointed out to me.

Sir, when the minister was speaking in this debate he raised a couple of matters that were of some interest to me. He ended up on a note that sort of puzzled me. To hear a minister responsible for housing in the administration of this province come out and make a flat statement that one of the big problems involved in the high cost of housing in this province is profiteering on a large scale, greed and profiteering on a large scale -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather puzzled by that statement because the minister has it all in his own hands. When he was taking his seat he said, "This is something that government at all levels are going to have to deal with." Well, what I would like to know is what the minister is doing about it.

If the minister, Sir, can come into this House and admit that there is profiteering on a large scale in housing in this province, what is the minister doing about it? Sir, if a minister admit that and then does nothing about it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Now do not try and pawn it off on Ottawa; Ottawa is not the province. We have a Minister of Housing in this province and we have a provincial government. Do not try and pass the buck. Once the minister admits that, Sir, confesses; "Yes, I know that this is going on," then the minister either has to do something about it or resign.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, the other day we heard the Member for Port de Grave. We heard an expert on housing the other day, the Member for Port de Grave who seemed to know what he was talking about. Perhaps he would make a better Minister of Housing, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I think the member indicated that there was profiteering going on, excess profits. Sir, this is the sort of thing that we have been advocating on this side of the House for the last two and a-half years. We have been telling the administration, then today the minister admits it. "Profiteering" he said; "On a large scale." Well either the minister has to do something about that or get out of the job he is in. You just do not come in, Sir, and confess that there is a problem, admit it, then just wait for the problem to evaporate, to go away. What is the minister going to do about it?

The minister also talked, Sir, I think the first point he made when he rose this afternoon, he said, 'The number one problem in the high cost of housing is the need for low cost serviced land.' I do not think I am misquoting the minister, Sir. The minister made that statement? If he did I would like to ask him again what his administration

are doing about it.

I put a question to the minister today, during the oral question period, about one hundred building lots that were suppose to go on sale down here at Virginia Park, in March.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I know it is not cheap land, Sir. So what? Are these building lots going to be for the elite, only the rich and the wealthy can go down in Virginia Park? Why cannot a poor old truck driver or a poor old office worker or a poor old pipefitter, why cannot he go down there or a longshoreman and stick up a house? Is the area being protected for the elite? All you have to do is drive down there, and I think you can get the answer to that.

That is why I suggested to the minister the other day that in cases where persons do not have the money to purchase this land that it be leased to them unless they are going to turn it into an exclusive development, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Let us sav Bally Haly Place.

MR. NEARY: Yes, drop over to Bally Haly, for a cocktail whenever you feel like it. Unless the minister is going to make it an exclusive development?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I have nothing against cocktails and I do not go to Bally Haly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I have been invited many times. Many times I have been invited.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: How did the minister get in?

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not get in.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order please!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, one of the proposals, one of the positive, constructive suggestions that we have put forward from this side of the House in this session, time and time again, practically once a week, we make this suggestion to the minister: "Lease the land. Lease it to potential homeowners." How much is that land costing down there? \$10,000? \$15,000?

MR. W. N. ROWE: A lot would be way over \$10,000, I would say.

MR. NEARY: About \$12,000? \$15,000 a building lot?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fourteen thousand to sixteen thousand dollars.

MR. NEARY: Oh that is right. My colleague was down, yesterday I believe it was or the day before, looking over some land down there; anywhere from \$14,000 to \$16,000 for a building lot.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who owns the building lots?

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no not these.

MR. NEARY: Not these?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are around \$12,000 I think.

MR. NEARY: These are \$12,000, the ones the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have \$12,000.

Now remember, Mr. Speaker, remember this, that it is the government of this province, using the taxpayers money -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The money is coming, Sir, from the fishermen, the money is coming from the truck drivers and the office workers and the municipal employees. The taxpayers are giving this administration the money, Sir, to buy this land and to service this land. Yet when they put it up for sale, Mr. Speaker, you have to be wealthy, you have to be rich in order to get a building lot there. You have to be wealthy, you have to be a well-to-do lawyer or a businessman, the ordinary rank and file cannot get a crack at it because it is too expensive, it is beyond their reach.

What I would suggest to the minister responsible for housing is that they not make this an exclusive development, that they lease the land to people who want to build houses down there, give the ordinary rank and file a chance to get in Virginia Park or Virginia Waters. Lease the land to them and when they get their house paid for, that would cut down the price of the house by about, let me see, \$12,000 say on a \$35,000 home, what is that? \$23,000. Well say an ordinary person wanting to put up a home down there and could probably float a mortgage for \$22,000 or \$25,000 and lease the land for \$1.00 a year until the house is paid for and then, if he want to continue on with his payments and buy the land, that is up to him. He should be given that right. That should be a part of his contract. If he should not want to buy it, lease it to him for ninety-nine years.

The minister admitted that the first need is prime land. Well, Sir, what are the administration doing about it? Nothing as far as I can see. The minister said the problem is there but he did not tell us what the answer was. There is part of the answer. It may not be all of the answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as this home for a home principle is concerned, as far as I can see, Sir, there are two kinds of situations involved. First of all, there is the matter of expropriation. I think the minister was a little bit confused in his thinking when he was trying to compare the urban renewal project over on the Brow with say, for instance, the Gros Morne National Park or the clean-out downtown here. I think they are entirely different situations, Sir. In one situation, Mr. Speaker, society is trying to make up for neglect of the past. In the case of Mundy Pond, for instance, and in the case of the Blackhaad Road Urban Renewal Study, society was having pangs of conscience and felt because people were living in such substandard homes in these area with no water and sewerage and in some cases living under extreme circumstances that something had to be done about it, something had to be done to upgrade these two areas.

Now the government were faced, Sir, in the case of the Blackhead Road Urban Renewal Study, with cleaning the whole area out altogether or carrying out an urban renewal plan to upgrade the community and to upgrade the housing and the government choose to let the community remain intact and to spend a few million dollars to upgrade the community, and to provide new housing and upgrade the old substandard houses over on Shea Heights as it is now called.

Well, Sir, the minister may be right. Maybe the government of the day should have cleaned out the whole area. Maybe they should have, Sir. Maybe there is a lesson to be learned from the Blackhead Road Urban Renewal Study, I have no doubt but there is. Everything you do in this life, Sir, you can learn something from it, you can benefit from it. But, Sir, would these people living on Shea Heights, would they have gone along with it, even if you gave them a home for a home? Even if you moved them into St. John's, bought them nice new \$30,000? \$35,000? \$40,000 homes, would they have agreed to move? Would they? The member who represents that district up there, Shea Heights is in the member's district, would they agree to be moved out?

If there were a referendum held over there, would they agree to go? Would they have to be forced out? I am more inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that they would have to be forced out, and that would not be very democratic, would it?

As a matter of fact, Sir, in my opinion the whole question of expropriation, Sir, is undemocratic. It is undemocratic. It is a man-made thing. It is something invented in some legal mind to force people off their property. Sir, it is undemocratic. Expropriation is undemocratic. I suppose the main reason why it was instituted in the first place was to remove barriers to progress. People who were accused of obstructing progress, to get them out of the way. We saw that happen downtown here, Sir, right down now where City Hall is located. Some beautiful homes down there, Sir, were torn down. They could have been rehabilitated.



It is in this kind of situation, Mr. Speaker, where I think I would say that the person has more of a right for a home for a home than for instance the people who live on the Blackhead Road. They have a right to have their homes upgraded. They were not being forced out of their homes. It was an urban renewal project that was being carried out but the people downtown here, Sir, were being forced out of their homes. The people over in Gros Morne National Park, in certain communities, may be forced out of their homes and may be forced to give up their property.

Downtown here, Sir, the people who were forced out of their homes, in my opinion, were not adequately compensated. They were not. Some are still paying mortgages, committed probably for the next ten or fifteen or twenty years to paying mortgages. Now we see Trizec going down there and they are buying up the land on both sides of the road. They have an option, a three month option on either side of that street down there. They are buying everything in sight.

So, Sir, here is the result of expropriation of six or seven or eight years ago that was supposed to be cleaned out to benefit the city.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are Trizec paying market value?

MR. NEARY: Trizec are paying more than market value, Sir. They are certainly paying more than the individuals who were forced out down there. They are paying about two and three times more than the property is worth. They must have a commitment from the provincial government to take over at least fourteen stories of that huge skyscraper that they are going to put up down there, according to the way they are lashing the money out for property down there, on both sides of the road. We have not been able to get that information out of the Premier yet but we will get it one of these days. It will surface pretty soon, Sir.

But these people were entitled to a better deal, Mr. Speaker. They were forced out of their homes to make way for the like of Trizec to come in here and put up a skyscraper and milk the province for

everything it is worth. Do you mean to tell me that is democracy, Sir? Is it? Is that democratic? These people had every right to stay where they were. They were forced out of it by the city. Here you have this vacant piece of land down there ever since; it has been lying there for years. What should happen, Sir, is that the city should take the benefits that they get from Trizec and from the province and reimburse these people who were forced out of the centre of St. John's and forced to go out and commit themselves to heavy mortgages. They should be forced to do it. If they had any conscience at all, that is what they would do, Sir.

So I do not have to be sold on the idea of a house for a house, I can tell you that. It is not the first time it was raised in the legislature, Sir. The first time it was raised in this legislature I raised it, believe it or not. Go back and check Hansards. I raised it long before the Minister of Finance came in with the amendment to The Family Home Expropriation Act, to have it removed. I raised it. The Premier of the day thought it was a good idea to amend the Family Home Expropriation Act to put it in to give people a home for a home. We had it. We had it, Sir. The Minister of Finance brought in an amendment and took it out (My colleague covered that point this afternoon) because Ottawa would not agree to give the people up at Shea Heights a home for a home.

Well they did not have to give them a home for a home, but they were not being forced out, they could stay there. Some of the people wanted to leave. Not all that many wanted to live downtown. Most of the people wanted to stay up on the Hill because it is a beautiful piece of property up there, Sir. I heard rumours at the time that some of the well-to-do people in this province would be glad if they were forced off that Hill, so that they could get a prime piece of property, so they could go up and stick up their mansions up there, with the big bay windows looking out over the narrows. They would have her knocked. They would have her made if they could have gotten up there. They did everything in the book to try and persuade the government of the day to

get the people down off the Hill. They wanted to make it (what is that place in Montreal?)

AN HON. MEMBER: Mount Royal.

MR. NEARY: Mount Royal. They wanted to make it another Mount Royal, the well-to-do people in this city.

I remember somebody talking to the former Premier Smallwood and telling him "Look, you are making a mistake. Do not upgrade the homes up there. Force the people out of it. Get them down of the Hill so we can go up there and build our big mansions, put in our big plate glass windows, our corner windows, so we can bring our rich buddies up and look down at the peasants." That is what they wanted to do, Sir. That is why we hear the moaning and groaning from some honourable members of that side of the House. I thought I was going to cry when I was listening to the minister responsible for housing talking about the money that was spent upon the Brow. I thought he was going to have me in tears there for a while.

It is money well spent, Sir. Maybe we can learn something from it. I hope we do. But, Sir, it is the situation downtown that really concerns me and the situation out in Gros Morne National Park. That is the kind of situation that concerns me. Over in Mundy Pond the people will be all right if they are given low cost housing, if they are given subsidized rental housing, subsidized housing and given water and sewerage, sidewalk and a few paved roads which they are entitled to. They will be all right, Sir, they are not being forced out of there. Some may wish to leave, if they do, they should be given a home for a home. But the Minister of Finance told us that Ottawa would not permit this, so we had to amend The Family Home Expropriation Act, which they did. The Minister of Finance did it, Sir, much to my sorrow and grief, when I was sitting on that side of the House and I had to go along with it. How dare I stand up against the giant, the Minister of Finance who wanted to amend this act? "Tow the party line," I was told. Sometimes you wonder about the party system.

But anyway, Sir, it went through and there was nothing I could do about it. I have been suggesting that it be put back in, ever since.

The Minister of Finance unfortunately is not in his seat today, I would like to hear what the minister has to say about this. He was the one who took it out and now, Sir, the same situation applies at the present time. The Member for St. John's South who brought in this resolution knows full well that it is very unlikely that Ottawa is going to go along with this. It is very unlikely, so the province are going to have to go it on their own.

Where you have expropriation taking place, involving federal funds, Ottawa in all likelihood will say, "No. If you want to do it, you pay one hundred per cent of the cost." Well, Sir, the same situation applied a few years ago when the Minister of Finance had this act amended; the province could have paid the full shot but the Minister of Finance did not recommend that, Sir, he did not recommend it. Instead he took the route of having this removed from the act, and I think that was a mistake. That was one mistake that I would admit that the former administration made, on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance who is now sitting on that side of the House. No wonder he is not in his seat this afternoon, Sir. He probably does not want to vote on this resolution.

But it is a good resolution, Sir, and I do not care what motive the Member for St. John's South had for bringing it into the House, whether it is politically, whether he is trying to get a little mileage for himself, whether he intends to run for the Leadership of the Tory Party. He might make a good leader,

MR. NEARY: probably the only one on that honourable side of the House, Sir, who could lead that party. I heard rumours some time ago that the honourable member was going to run for the leadership of the Liberal Party. I hope he does, Sir. I hope he does. He would make a good candidate. I will not commit myself whether I would support him or not. But, Sir, I do not care what the member's motive was, I think it is a good resolution. It shows the member is thinking.

The member for St. John's South is also a practising lawyer and has probably had some experience in the heartaches and the heartbreaks of expropriation. He has probably seen it more than most of the members in this honourable House.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, if the government will only act on this resolution, Sir, I think it would be a good thing. The government are committed to it. It is one of the unkept promises. It is a hangover from the, I think it is the first provincial election, back in the Throne Speech in March 1972, a little over two years ago. It is over two years since the government made this promise and I will be anxious to see, Sir, if the government vote for the resolution as the minister responsible for housing indicated. I will be very anxious to see what action the government will take on this matter and how quickly they will take action on this, because I think it is a good resolution, Sir, and it is the kind of reform that I would like to see debated and passed in this honourable House.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to speak on this resolution before the House, brought in the House by the member for St. John's South, not only to make up my mind in this honourable House to support such a resolution because any common sense man of the day and the hour that we live in could think no other but do just that. But while listening to the honourable member for Bell Island I go along with a lot of points he has said and a lot of them I know that when he gets warmed up like I and a good many more that -

But nevertheless there are some good points derived from everything as far as that is concerned. While this resolution is to the floor

there is a lot to be understood and a lot to be learned as far as a house for a house and a piece of land for a piece of land. When we come to get into this category, we come across a person who has a two bedroom home and it is built on a rock wall, he has that house he lives in with a family of probably six or eight, he only has two bedrooms and when it is taken from him he wants a modern home built, forty-five or fifty feet, with a full size basement and everything, with about five or ten times the value of the one that he got clear of. I think somewhere along the line, if this come to pass, there should be provisions made to take care of that part of it.

I think while a man strives where he has a seven by nine or a thirty by fifty, he strives his lifetime and he got his lifetime earnings around him and he finds out that he comes to the place he has to take up residence and move, I think first that party should give concern as to where they feel like settling to and another thing, having homes to go into. Surely no common sense person on the government side, on the opposition side, would go against this because that is what has us all here in this honourable House and if we are in our communities to do anything for our fellow man who is after giving the members who are in this House the privilege to try to do something for them. Surely this should be our motive but by doing so, not to upset the apple cart with the other person.

The honourable member for Bell Island said one thing there that I paid great attention to, we have some people who if you give them a new home they will hardly live in it. They do not want it in that particular area. This is another case that you have. But I think that if you sit down before this happens and you come right in on the person and talk with him and through guidance and what not. I think that can be overcome.

Another thing, I am well in favour of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing who has spoken so broadly on these matters and I have to back him up. As far as that is concerned, it goes to show that this government, if it were not done in the former government, well it was not done. That should not be any blame to hold across this government,

because they are trying to do something about it. Surely the older we get the more we learn and if it were not that way, well probably we should all be staying younger.

But nevertheless there is something to be done about it and it is only by the help of the opposition and the government that the government themselves are going to do something about this. Surely, we are looking to that objective to do the best we can for our fellow man. Speaking of that and another too I am proud of, and I should not speak this way, as being a contractor and a builder myself, but also if I am, I realize that if I have to have a roof over my head then my next-door neighbour should have one too. Everything is gone to the extortion point and this is just what is happening.

Only a few days ago I picked up "The Evening Telegram" and I read about a fish-holding centre, a wooden structure with a concrete floor, thirty by forty-five. Lo and behold sure the contract was let for that for \$65,000 from the federal government. Now how can you expect any better from the ordinary contractor who has taken it on himself to make as much as he can? We have some conscientious people as far as that is concerned. We have others who do not give a toot. This is where it is to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WILSON: Right, and people have got the place because it is a government we will haul all out of, but the government is ourselves and we are the taxpayers. We are the taxpayers to ask to look out for this. Even so, it is shared. You talk about housing and what is going to happen, I myself have gone into a place that I do not see how it can be any cheaper, only what worse it is going to be. A house could be building last year, out in the outports, with labour, the labour cost \$2,500, and in this present year the labour is \$5,000.

Now that seems pretty hard to say but just look at it - \$3.50 an hour last year, union wages this year \$7.00. Is that not doubled? Is that not twice the \$2,500, which is \$5,000? But the greatest concern

of all, as to what has been spoken about here about housing, is land. You go in and walk on a piece of land, they want \$7,000 or \$8,000 for a building lot. This is ridiculous. As far as clearing off a building lot is concerned, what is it? If you pay \$20 an hour for a bulldozer, there is no trouble to clear away a space for two houses, without it is wonderful hard land, in one day, and all of this adds up to the cost. Another cost that no one had looked at at all is in municipal areas, where you turn around and send in and get ready to build a home, you get carpenters ready and waiting and probably wait six weeks to get an inspector to come and pass the sewerage disposal, where you are using septic tanks, before you get a permit.

Now it is just as well for us to face it, this is what we are up against. It was only this morning that I came from a municipality where there are about ten or a dozen homes. They are told that some of them are going to have to wait as high as six months.

Now, Sir, there is something wrong with our structure and our municipalities if we have people elected to municipalities who do not know where there is a place they can erect a sewerage system or not. This is all added up to the cost. I am very much concerned myself and to see this resolution put forward, you have to congratulate the member who brought it in because I see into that that we are going to have some people who are scratching their heads at the present time and wondering if they are going to be put on the path or what not and this will set their mind at ease. Some of these are probably people who are after bearing the burden and the heat of the day, after helping me to get where I am to, and they find out and figure, "Well, I am going to lose all that I got."

MR. WM. ROME: Right. The government may decide to put a highway through.

MR. WILSON: Right. I think this is a good resolution and I am out to support it regardless. I think myself, as the honourable member for Bell Island certainly does not know whether the Member for St. John's South is a Liberal or a Tory, well I have news for the honourable member for Bell Island. That is the kind of people we have over in the Progressive Conservative Government, they have an open mind.



MR. SIMMONS: They do not know what side they are on.

MR. WILSON: They know what side they are on but they have an open mind. They are not selfish, not trying to cut down someone who is trying to do something because he is a little higher educated than the other party is, to try to chop him off his feet, which is after being tried to be done with me here in this House of Assembly. The honourable member for Hermitage is one of them, one of the very guys in this honourable House, one of the very guys who just try to do that.

As far as I am concerned, my advice to you or any other member like you is, put the same time in fighting for your districts as what you are trying to cut down the other fellow and probably we will do a job.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, following behind the speakers we have already had on this resolution and particularly my colleague from White Bay South who I think expressed the views of this side very clearly. To my mind it is quite clear, a house for a house, and I believe that the honourable member for St. John's South in bringing forth this resolution put it quite clearly in the wording of it, because as I understand it, this resolution will deal with houses or private property, including private dwellings which have been and will be expropriated.

I assume that when property is expropriated, it is done so for a purpose by the government, either to put a highway through or for some future amenity for that community. So therefore I think the onus is on the government to satisfy the owner of that property by giving him a house for a house, just as outlined in the resolution, at replacement cost, not necessarily a \$35,000 home. If it costs \$35,000 to replace that home with today's costs, why then of course it will have to be \$35,000.

The expropriation, as I said earlier, is for the people of the province, done by the government of the people, so therefore the people through the government are responsible to reimburse the owner of that dwelling. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the motion.

I think it is a good one. I commend the member for St. John's South for bringing it before the House and as my colleague from Bell Island has said, I trust that it will fall on very wise and open ears of the government and that the bill will be brought before this House before too long. Thank you.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, representing a district and coming from a district that has experienced some of the most chronic housing problems in Newfoundland, that is the older section of St. John's, south of Empire Avenue, I have absolutely no hesitation in supporting this resolution which is really a truly Tory measure.

I remember when it was first brought in, I think as the honourable member for White Bay South has pointed out and certainly the honourable member for St. John's South noted at length the other day that prior to a situation which occurred down on New Gower Street, when the older part of St. John's was cleared out for the purpose of renewal of the area, it was under one of the federal programmes, at the time I believe through the City of St. John's but certainly with the impetus being given through the government, at that time a great deal of uncertainty and harm and mental anguish occurred to many of the residents as a result of the proposal to expropriate the homes and not recompense them fairly, because the only way in which they can be recompensed fairly is really a house for a house.

At that period of time, the then member for St. John's Centre, the present member for St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services, was instrumental in bringing an amendment to the act itself. It was a measure of the P.C. Party at the time in which all of us joined, including the honourable member for St. John's South who has been active in the P.C. Party for many, many years, and we brought in in effect that much needed reform. People in the New Gower Street area were treated in a much better way than they had been before and that particular amendment is still there because, as the member for White Bay South has indicated, we still have a house for a house, except in the

urban renewal areas.

The member for St. John's South, I suppose, has been most directly affected by the change that was brought about in the law by the previous administration, not because necessarily they wanted to, but because once again Ottawa was dictating from above the type of assistance that would be given.

As I understand it, the Shea Heights Area, on the Southside and in the honourable member for St. John's North's District, the Mundy Pond Area, that came under the urban renewal. I believe there is another one as well in the Corner Brook Area, in Humber East where in order to bring about these changes the federal government said, "We will not recompense in that manner," and unfortunately the act was changed, I believe to reflect this fact.

I think that the honourable member for St. John's South has one of the most chronic problems in the province with respect to this because of the fact that the people in the Shea Heights Area in particular, have not been treated in the same manner as really ought to have been done.

I think it is rather unfortunate that the federal government, and I think this is a real issue and I think one of the real issues at this time and I do not think that we really realize it in Newfoundland as much as perhaps they do in other provinces of Canada where confederation has been for a longer period of time, I think it is absolutely ridiculous the way in which the federal government is dictating to the provincial governments what can be done. If it should keep on going as it is going now we can trace this in the history of the Second World War, where it was necessary for the central power to assume much more power than the constitution of Canada originally envisaged, but if it keeps on going, what is going to happen is the provincial governments are going to end up as really in effect being municipal governments -

MR. WM. ROWE: Do not throw away your \$500,000 now.

MR. MARSHALL: Creatures of Ottawa, in effect what is going to happen is that we are doing and as we watch ourselves in the framework of

Confederation, we are going to have an exchange in merely colonial status from London with colonial status from Ottawa. I do not think, that that is acceptable to any honourable member in this House. I think that party lines aside, that if you look at what has happened in the history of Confederation, and both parties have been in, but I do think that the Liberal Government, the Liberal Party, intends to be much more centralized than the Progressive Conservatives.

But in any event, what is happening is really a centralization of power, a usurpation of power by the federal government and I do not think we have any more

vivid example of this than the problem that we are now faced with and which the honourable the Member for St. John's South has so admirably brought before us and which this government will be attempting of course to change.

The fact of the matter is that federal programmes are put down by Ottawa from time to time here, that we have no opportunity but to accept, if we are going to survive, that the concept of Confederation throughout Canada, in the past twenty-five years in particular, has been warped with the way that Confederation was set up. With provincial governments having power over such things as property and civil rights is the only way in which this country can operate because of the vast expense. I would hope that the provincial government can get the federal government to see the errors of its ways in this area. I am not suggesting that we have to wait on the federal government, because we have to act. We have to act in this matter to see that people are treated fairly as we took steps before to see that they were treated fairly.

Generally on housing policy, because this debate has been wide-ranging, the honourable Member for St. John's South I believe used words to the effect that he hoped that the housing policies brought down by Ottawa were not brought down cruelly because of regulations making it impossible for people to implement them. I have to say in my area of St. John's East that unfortunately such has been the case for a long period of time. You take the neighbourhood improvement programme which has already been referred to in this debate, where you require mountains of red tape to be cut, where you require agreements of large sectors of the city for the purpose of operating within neighbourhood improvement and it becomes absolutely and completely impractical of implementation in the older areas. You can utilize it in places on the Blackhead Road, where you already have an urban renewal area, the decision has been made. You can utilize it in the Mundy Pond Area, where composite decisions have been made, but in the smaller streets in St. John's, the older streets where the housing,

I will submit, one cannot say that it is more chronic than anywhere else but it is certainly very chronic, where you have houses in such a condition that they have been condemned by the fire department, no fire can be lit in them and nothing can be done. But in these areas the federal programmes, be it through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation with their huge mountains, as I say, of red tape, their procedures which are really impractical of implementation, be it in St. John's East or for that matter all throughout the island, everywhere.

Neighbourhood improvement programmes, where you are talking about bringing in the programmes that might work and undoubtedly will work in areas in Toronto, rundown areas in Toronto where they moved in and took over the whole properties and were in effect an urban renewal scheme. When you are talking about older residences and places such as Colonial Street, Bannerman Street, Power Street, in the city or where have you, and you are talking about people who are retired in their sixties and you say to them, that in order to implement this scheme we have to haul down your house and we have to do this, that and the other thing, and completely rebuild it, it is just really impractical no matter what good intent was originally envisaged when the act was brought in. I have no doubt that it can be implemented beneficially in many areas in Canada, certain areas in Newfoundland, but herein lies the danger, as I say, of these overall encompassing federal regulations and federal laws that do not lend themselves to adoption in specific areas.

I am glad the Minister of Municipal Affairs as he has indicated sees there must be a revamping of expropriation procedures. This province is doing all it can, by the way, with respect to housing. The honourable Member for White Bay South, I think said that this government are doing very little about housing. I do not think this is really fair. When you look at the situation with which we are faced under both our own fiscal situation and the exigencies of the housing situation itself, if he want to look at the budget he will see that there are

approximately \$7 millions of our dollars being poured in this year, which is really going to trigger off a programme here in Newfoundland of an expenditure in the vicinity of \$35 million. This is going to involve serviced land, land development, 1,500 subsidized housing units and what have you. So that in the newer area, when you are talking about the newer homes, I think we have really triggered off a meaningful programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: The biggest programme ever.

MR. MARSHALL: The biggest programme ever. So I cannot see,

I do not think that the honourable Member for White Bay South should be able to make this statement and have it unanswered.

But the fact which we are faced with, the Member for St. John's South, the Member for St. John's Centre and myself in St. John's East in particular, who represent that area, that is south of Empire Avenue, the older homes in the area, it is a depressing situation with which we are faced. This is one area that the honourable Member for St. John's South has been able to tackle quite adequately. It is very depressing for him to be representing people in this manner and to see that in one area of Newfoundland there is provision for compensation for a house for a house but because of the federal government happening to come in and the civil servants in Ottawa or what have you or because of the fact that we only have seven federal seats here and the bread basket of Southern Ontario controls about seventy and Quebec controls seventy more, because of this. Whereas our provincial policy - which was the same as the previous policy - the previous policy engendered, of course, (I add because one likes to be political) by the honourable member for St. John's Centre, but they accepted it and it was a policy throughout the island - a house for a house. Then because the federal government came down with their urban renewal scheme and what have you - which is not implemented here - as I say, it must be very depressing for the Member for St. John's South to find himself in that situation, as it is for all of use to find ourselves

who represent older areas with these programmes that are hailed by Ottawa as being the absolute answer and where we find they are utterly impractical of implementation.

So I certainly have, as I say in closing, no hesitation whatsoever in supporting, not only supporting but supporting enthusiastically this resolution brought in by the Member for St. John's South to make the Progressive Conservative or if you like the Tory Policy applicable throughout all of the areas of expropriation.

I just hope that in the months and the years to come, while we are in office, that we can persuade the federal government to give us the money to be able to tackle in a more meaningful way the province with respect to older housing in the city.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would certainly like to commend the Member for St. John's South for bringing in this motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well even on this side we would wish him well, in that it would certainly be an improvement, Mr. Speaker. We wish him well and could I vote for him I would certainly do so on that score.

I would like to commend him though, Mr. Speaker, for the courage which it took to bring in this motion. It is significant, of course, that it is a member on the government side of the House who has to bring in this particular resolution in order to get it on the floor of the House. Were this an item that were quite noble or quite new or unheard of before, you could understand it being brought in by a private member on whatever side.

But as it is, it is a measure that was promised, as we have heard already today, by the present Premier and a measure on which no action has been taken in the last couple of years. So in that particular context it must have taken real courage and the kind of courage that the Member for St. John's South is rapidly becoming known for, the courage which dictates independent action on his part on a number of occasions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.



MR. SIMMONS: I am delighted to sit in the same House with a fellow like the Member for St. John's South who has courage. On this particular point, he must be wondering to what extent I am being tongue in cheek. Let me assure him I am not at all. It is a real delight to be associated with him on this one because first of all I wholeheartedly endorse the resolution.

I am also delighted that I follow the Member for St. John's East rather than precede him on this point because had I risen before him, I would have made a prediction which would not have come true, apparently, although there is still time, the debate is not closed. Indeed I was going to predict that the Member for St. John's East would be true to form and would rise and move an amendment to this motion, an amendment which would take the guts out of the motion, which would destroy its effect. I am surprised that he did not do it. I do not know if he read all of his notes, Perhaps he forgot to do it and perhaps we will see him back up before the debate closes.

As we have come to know in this session of the House, Mr. Speaker, it is the style of that member and perhaps his assignment as the Government House Leader indeed to undermine, nullify the effect of almost any worthwhile motion, in one form or another - the method we saw him use most recently, in reference to the motion on election expenses, was to introduce some wording which would make the whole effect and which did make the whole effect of the resolution completely ridiculous.

I almost thought that he would come in today and give us his choice wording again and move that, instead of what we have here, a couple of words be added and instead of the motion saying "That the House ask government to introduce" that he would suggest "That government consider the introduction of." But I am delighted that he lost his note on that, Mr. Speaker, and that we do still have the unamended motion here, and as unamended it is certainly worth supporting. I am delighted to do so.

It is significant, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance is not here today. I cannot tell, I would not want to be unfair, I would let him speak for himself, I cannot tell whether it is out of sheer shame that he is not here. I think the record should show, since we have heard so much about the role of the Member for St. John's Centre on this matter and one would think that some how he was the Government House Leader in those days, when in fact he was a member of the opposition. If a man can impose his wisdom to the point that he persuades the majority of thirty-nine members in the House to follow his course of action, as we have been lead to believe, then I say that all the nonsense that we have been hearing about the one-man regime must be exactly that. It must be nonsense. If a man can sit on this side of the House and persuade the people on the other side - which by the way we cannot do - we cannot do, it seems - if he can persuade the other people that his ideas about housing are good ones, as we were told today, then I would say it was a pretty reasonable bunch he was dealing with indeed.

The fact of the matter is, of course, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from individuals interpretations of the events of those years, the fact of the matter is that the Liberal Administration of the day did introduce a Family Expropriation Act, one which provided for the very principle that is embodied in this motion.

The fact of the matter also is that the present Minister of Finance, some four or five years ago, was the actual sponsor of an amendment which destroyed the central principle of that Family Expropriation Act. That is why I say it is significant that he is not here today, mostly that he is not here today to answer on this particular point. There must be some embarrassment. The Member for St. John's South must have caused the Minister of Finance real embarrassment on this point by introducing the motion, and once again all the more to be commended for his courage in introducing it.

Mr. Speaker, since latitude has been given in this debate, I will try my luck at it. I would just like to say a word or two about the cost of housing and the cost of housing as it relates to the less urban parts of this province. One would think in listening to this debate that the only place that there are housing problems is in the City of St. John's and in Corner Brook. Actually the smaller communities in Newfoundland are very much finding the pinch.

The efforts of the federal government, we have heard the diversion of the Member for St. John's East on this point. Well rather than give you my version as such just let me say two or three things that the federal government are doing on this particular subject to ease the housing problems in all parts of Newfoundland, not only the larger urban areas.

In this year alone, Mr. Speaker, the federal government have allocated \$1 billion. One of the measures under that \$1 billion programme is the assisted homeownership programme known as "AHOP", the Assisted Homeownership Programme which allows people of lower incomes to avail of effective mortgage rates, as low as six per cent, at a time when the mortgage rates are essentially doubled that. That programme is equally applicable, indeed I would say even more applicable to rural areas than to urban areas but certainly available to people wherever they live in Newfoundland, provided their incomes are less than \$12,000 a year. That certainly covers a lot of people in all parts of Newfoundland.

One of the items, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government have addressed itself to in this matter is the matter of the high mortgage rates in home purchase, and how to attack that problem with the AHOP programme, the assisted homeownership programme for people with incomes of less than \$12,000. That is just one of several.

Another that we could mention is the residential rehabilitation assistance programme where persons can qualify for loans of up to \$5,000 for home repairs. Indeed, depending on their income, they can have that amount forgiven by the government so that while they borrow

up to \$5,000 they are required in some cases to pay back only half of that amount for up to \$2,500.

Another programme yet, in the federal government's programme this year, which we are able to avail of here in Newfoundland is the non-profit housing assistance programme - the effect of which would provide the low market rents to people on low incomes.

Another still is the rural housing, the native and rural housing programme being sponsored by the federal government, which over the next five years is intended to provide about 50,000 housing units in rural parts of Canada, including rural parts of Newfoundland.

Still generally on the subject of housing, the matter of land cost which is affecting very often the decision of a Newfoundlander to build or not to build, to acquire a home or not to: The skyrocketing cost of land in rural areas as well as urban is fast becoming a deterrent for people who would very much like to own their own homes.

In respect to land and its cost, the federal government are going to spend \$500 million over the next four or five years on a land assembly programme which will assist municipalities throughout the country to get land serviced and to make it available for housing projects. I just mention that, Mr. Speaker, because to listen to the Member for St. John's East one would think that all the federal government are doing is writing some regulation. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in this year alone the federal government have a \$1 billion housing programme going for the nation. We heard the Minister without Portfolio say that the provincial government are this year spending \$7 million. That is true according to the budget but that \$7 million of \$35 million, one should not forget where the other \$28 million is coming from.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we put this matter of housing and who is doing what into its proper perspective. If

the present provincial administration want to brag about what it is doing, let the members on the government side tell us in this House and let the minister stand up and tell us in this House what they are doing in relation to some of the big cost items that are affecting people especially in rural Newfoundland. We hear about the cost of land, we hear about the cost of building materials, we hear about how carpenters wages are going up and so on, all of which is very true, but it is significant that the people on the government side have said not a word about a couple of other matters, both of which are driving up the cost of housing.

What about the legal fees involved? What about the surveying cost involved? Visualize will you someone living in Harbour Breton or in Bay de Esprit or in Hermitage who wants to get a piece of land surveyed and compare him to the person who lives in the more urban parts of this province where the surveyor lives literally across the street from him - no travel cost involved. If the potential

home owner lives for instance in Gander, he pays \$125 a day surveying costs, all of which time the surveyor can spend doing the actual survey. If that potential home builder lives in Harbour Breton, he pays out the \$125 a day also while the fellow is travelling down to Harbour Breton and back from Harbour Breton and he pays for the cost of accommodation while that surveyor is there.

In that one example, Mr. Speaker, I think we can see that the fellow who lives in rural Newfoundland has the cards particularly stacked against him when it comes to home ownership. I could use a similar example with reference to the legal profession, to the legal fees involved. The fellow who lives in the rural community, removed from the urban areas, two or three large urban areas, the Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, St. John's areas, he does not have immediate access to lawyers and it in effect cost him more to obtain the legal services required. That is one point I wish to make with respect to legal services. Another is the overall problem of the share size of legal fees anyway when it comes to the matter of housing. What is the provincial government doing in these particular areas? Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing can tell us something about that subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes I have some suggestions for the Minister of Mines and Energy, the lawyer Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I asked that question because in the estimates we are on, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has already spoken in the debate.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh I see. No, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Placentia West is not aware, of course, there was, at the pleading of the Minister of Municipal Affairs there was given considerable latitude this afternoon on this subject. He wanted to do some things he could not do in the debate on the estimates, Mr. Speaker with our indulgence permitted him to do that and I am now responding to some of the things, as far-ranging as they were, some of the things which the minister raised.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I put a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, the minister is right, I put

a suggestion that perhaps if the minister has anything to say on the subject, there is no restriction here that he can only speak once,

I suggest that if he have something to say on the subject of high legal fees and survey costs and other related costs, if he have something to say on it, would he get up after - not as a question but as a suggestion to him. He is not at my beck and call but if he should like to stand up and make a second contribution to the debate, well by all means we shall be happy to hear from him.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Port de Grave is not in the Chamber right now. I sincerely hope he is listening to the debate and the discussion at this time, because I want to put him at ease. He seems awfully worried about a number of things. The fact of the matter is that despite all the nasty things he tried to say to me this afternoon, I have grown to like the fellow in the last few weeks. He is a very likable fellow. Indeed I have noticed in the last few weeks the member for Port de Grave has cleaned up his language considerably. The first two or three weeks we were here you had to plug your ears if you wanted to at all be above the kind of language that was floating around here and emanating from the mouth of the member for Port de Grave. But we have gotten away from that and he has reformed. He has cleaned up his language and even his nastiness is pleasant, at least from the standpoint of the words he uses to get it across.

I hope he is also listening for the next point. He should watch himself or if he should keep making speeches about housing, if he should keep telling us why he is against mobile homes and then keep telling us that by the way he is a contractor, a building contractor, you know I am afraid he is going to have the Minister for Rural Development on his back, because there is going to be such confusion if both of them get to be known by the same title, the same label. God knows one conflict of interest title is enough in this House and I would advise my friend, the member for Port de Grave, to get off that kick before he gets labelled and to address himself to the problems that come before this House without any particular concern for the health of his own business operation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that I support this particular motion wholeheartedly. I do not at all agree with the member for St. John's East that it is a particularly Tory measure, although I am not awfully interested in labels on this particular points. Perhaps he can elaborate on that one for us. I repeat that it was a good Liberal Government that brought in the initial bill. It was the present Tory Minister of Finance who destroyed its effect with his amendment and it is a liberated Tory who has introduced the motion at this particular time, a liberated Tory that we have a lot of hopes for and to whom we would give every encouragement, particularly these going after the leadership, as my friend -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: There he is. There he is. What was that?

MR. EVANS: You have not got a chance for the leadership.

MR. SIMMONS: I agree you have not got a chance for leader in that party over there. I agree with him, Mr. Speaker, completely. The wisdom of the member for Burgeo continues to amaze us and elude us at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I make two pleas. I make a plea that the member for St. John's East do not get up or arrange for one of his colleagues to amend this motion, to water it down. I make a plea that this motion be allowed to come to the vote in its present form. I make a plea that every member of the House will record his vote on this. I make a plea that the Minister of Finance would be in his seat when the vote is taken so we can see where he stands on it now. We know where he stood four or five years ago. We know where the Minister of Municipal Affairs stood four or five years ago. We are delighted to hear that he has changed his mind today, as he informed the House. We know where the Minister of Justice stood four or five years ago and we are hoping he has changed his mind. So I would make a particular plea that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance be in the Chamber when the vote is taken so we can see where they stand and I make a plea that every member vote on this and that every member vote for it.



I also take advantage of this opportunity to emphasize that we ought not to fall into the trap of thinking that the housing problem in Newfoundland is an urban problem. It is not. It is not only an urban problem. It is a problem that is affecting everybody in every part of Newfoundland who would want, who needs to build a house at this time.

In Harbour Breton, for instance, to get a serviced lot with a fifty foot frontage, at this particular time in Harbour Breton can cost between \$4,200 and \$4,500, the Town of Harbour Breton, with a population of no more than 3,000 people, \$4,500 for a fifty foot lot. That would have been unheard of even two, three, five years ago, in most part of this province.

I remember being in St. John's ten or twelve years ago and hearing a fellow tell me that he was going to pay \$6,000 for a building lot here in St. John's and I was at that time, ten years ago, completely appalled that a bit of land to put a house on should have to cost so much money. Now here we are, just eight or ten years later, with a community the size of Harbour Breton, an individual living in that community has to pay out more than \$4,000 before he starts at all. All he has then is the land. That does not include his related costs, his survey costs. The land obviously will be surveyed, but it does not include his other preliminary costs before he even actually begins to build a house.

I do then, Mr. Speaker, want to point out and want to make a plea to the members of this House to bear in mind, and particularly to the government to bear in mind that the housing problem in this province is a provincewide problem, it is one that is affecting everybody who would want to build a house.

I believe, as I have demonstrated with the information I have given the House a moment ago, I believe that the federal government has come to grips with this problem. With its native and rural housing programme, with its land assembly programme, with its assisted home-ownership programme, with these various programmes the federal government is addressing itself, is putting its money where its mouth is, is addressing itself to the housing problem

as it exists from one corner of this province to the other. I do hope that if this resolution pass , as I believe it shall, that the government shall take it seriously and shall immediately set about bringing in the kind of legislation which will not only provide a house for a house insofar as expropriated private dwellings are concerned but in the larger context shall begin addressing itself to the overall problem of housing as it is affecting people in every corner of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member speak now he closes the debate.

MR. WELLS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think before winding up my remarks on the principle of a house for a house and on matters of housing, I must refer to the remarks of the honourable member for Bell Island who has wished me so well and has issued me what I took to be an invitation of some sort to contest the leadership of the Liberal Party whenever they are having it this year. I have to assure him, so that he will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: No, there is no need. I think I should assure him now in fairness, so he or anybody else can make their plans, that I shall not be doing that.

MR. NEARY: I am disappointed.

MR. WELLS: Well there you are. But you see, Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe, and I did not know that we would get on to the subject of politics in a thing like housing, but I happen to believe that this party, the party of which I have been a member for a long time, is a party which has a great role to play, not only in Newfoundland but in Canada, and I believe that the best service one can do a party to which one belongs is not to be muzzled by it and not to be just a thing that sits there and takes orders from on high and swallows them and spits them out and regurgitates them in due course. I think that the service one can do -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Sometimes I amuse him, no doubt. But I think that that is the greatest service one can do a party. That is the service I hope I will be able to do, and others like me, in the party that I am a member of.

MR. WM. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: No one tries now. So the honourable gentleman will have a clear run for the leadership of the Liberal Party, an absolutely clear run. I will watch with interest and I will be sitting home with television on, and I must say I look forward with some interest to that evening.

Insofar as this party is concerned, my hope and expectation is that this party will continue to debate and introduce measures which will be good for the Province of Newfoundland and I hope, if the voters agree to keep me here to do it, that I will have some say and be able to make some contribution in the future toward the development and thought in this party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Who knows what is going to happen?

Now do not say that too loudly. You know there is no leadership convention over here. The leadership convention is over there. But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members who have spoken in support of this resolution. It is something that I think is worthwhile. I am glad to see also that the debate did not centre on the narrow business of the pure house for a house concept but dealt with housing in a rather broader way. There is no question about it and I think we are all aware that housing is one of the fundamental problems in Newfoundland, not only in the urban centres but in the rural areas.

I think there is one thing that behoves all of us as members of this House and as people in public life and that is to try and make these federal programmes come to Newfoundland, that is the only way I can put it. I read some of them last week; I do not propose to go through them again. I am thinking particularly of the neighbourhood improvement programme and the other programme, I forget the name of it, NIP, the one where you can borrow and be forgiven part of the principle that you borrow, neighbourhood improvement.

MR. EARLE: I wonder if the honourable member for St. John's South would tell the House why the programme known as NIP, Neighbourhood Improvement Programme, or the Home Ownership Programme rather, neither of these are

working as well as we would hope they would? Does he have any idea why they are not working?

MR. WELLS: This is something that I find very curious and it baffles me. When you read the federal programme you would get the impression that if you earned under \$11,000 a year you would be able to go and borrow the money to do something to fix up your home. Now what I cannot understand is why the various strings are attached to these programmes by the federal programme, and this is something which I cannot understand but it seems to permeate the whole field of federal-provincial relations, that the federal government comes up with programmes which on the face of them, like this, are excellent but when the ordinary person says, "Well all right I want to take advantage of that," he finds that there are so many "ifs" "ands" "buts" and strings, so many agreements have to be concluded between the provinces, the federal government and the municipal governments, that sometimes and very often I feel that the value of the programme are lost and the man cannot really get to it. If the federal government is going to make money available for people to borrow to fix up homes, why not in the name of God just do it?

MR. NEARY: Well they do but it is just the minister's department -

MR. WELLS: No! No! It is not as simple as that. Do you mean to say that the minister is going to stand in the way of people tomorrow who want to borrow that \$11,000? That is not so. That is not so. If the federal government really wanted to do this, without all these strings, they could go ahead and do it. But when you put all sorts of strings in, people get faint hearted after a while and they say, (Well what is the point.) "Why bother?"

So this is something that I think every member of this House ought to be concerned with. This is something that has to be pushed and it is something

that I think that every member of this House ought to be concerned with. This is something that has to be pushed. If there be anything we can do as members to assist the department, to assist arrangements to be made for these programmes to apply to Newfoundland, then I think it certainly should be our duty and something that we ought to find out about and push for as hard as we can.

Now, to come back again: My honourable friend from Bell Island spoke again and as usual he spoke articulately but he muddied the water. He muddied the water with respect (I have to go back over this, Mr. Speaker, briefly again, to put it right.) to the role of the present Minister of Finance when he was in the previous government. That government brought in not an amendment to the Expropriation Act but the legislation, the Family Homes Expropriation Act, which was a new act and enunciated, as far as I know, a new principle. It went into effect. One of the leaders in the argument for that act was the member for St. John's Center who is still that member.

The government of the day brought it into the House. It was passed. It became law and it worked very well. A lot of people who were uprooted from the center part of St. John's, down where City Hall now is, had the benefit of assistance under that act.

The government of the day, as I understand it, in 1966-1967, did not just for the sake of bloody-mindedness go and amend it to cut out the benefit to ordinary Newfoundlanders. I do not think that at all. I would not suggest it, not for a moment. I do not think any member of that government or any member of the House at the time did that. I think that they were faced with what my honourable friend calls the "Red Tape" from Ottawa. They looked at the situation. The present Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's West, happened to be Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time. They looked at it and they said, "Well, what else can we do if we want to go ahead with these urban renewal schemes, but amend it?"

Now, it is an interesting speculation. Maybe they should have stood firm at the time. Maybe they should have stood firm at the time and said, "No way will we amend it. This is our principle of expropriation here in Newfoundland. This is how we go about it and we are not going to

amend it." Maybe they should. How can I say, if I had been in the House at that time, what I would have done? I think time has shown that it is a good principle that was in that act and a principle that should be held to. So that the government of the day amended it, I think, wanting to do a good thing and wanting to get these urban renewal schemes going, but time has shown that there was a great deal of hardship and a great deal of grief arose out of that type of expropriation. Of course this is what this particular resolution is designed to change. As I say, I greatly appreciate what has been said by all members who have spoken in the debate, that they support this principle and wish to see it made law. I am quite confident from the remarks, particularly the remarks of the minister in his speech, that it will be done. As I say, I look forward to that.

So that, Mr. Speaker, having spoken at length during the last Private Members' Day on this matter, having outlined the principle behind the bill, the reasons for the amendment, having given the House some sort of insight, I hope, into the workings of the Expropriation Act itself, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unnecessary for me to go over the whole ground again. I would simply express my appreciation to the members of the House who have spoken in support of the resolution and ask that the question be put in due course and express, as I say, my hope and expectation that the motion will carry unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried unanimously.

We proceed with motion number (4) on today's Order Paper, moved by the honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am subject to correction of course. Perhaps the House Leader would like to speak on it. There is an order of a bill which was moved by my colleague, the member for Twillingate, concerning compensation because of the state of emergency. Now, I believe that takes precedence chronologically. I do not remember but I believe it takes precedence chronologically.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know in what period of time it came in, Mr. Speaker. I do not remember these things. I find my memory is failing in the past few weeks. I know with consent of the House - I am sure all

honourable members over here would be perfectly willing if they want to go on with the bill. I think that we can go ahead with the bill from the honourable member for Twillingate. Pardon.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we can dispose of it anyway. It was order (40). I do not know what number it is but it is the last one on the Order Paper.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Compensation Of Employees Act, 1971."

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely designed to take care of the state of emergency which existed in the City of St. John's as declared by the Mayor of St. John's for the day of March 12, from midnight March 11 until midnight March 12.

As we all recall, because of that state of emergency and because employees did not get to work, particularly the nursing staff of the various city hospitals, the Newfoundland Hospital Association, and the government at that time I believe choose to withhold their pay or remuneration for that day. In fact we are told that at least one wild-cat strike took place because of it, if not more than one.

So, this bill is merely an act to compel employers, I presume not only employers of hospital workers but all employers to compensate their employees for that particular day. I do not think there is anything further need be said about it, Mr. Speaker. I do suggest that an amendment be put to the House in the committee convened covering all municipalities in Newfoundland where a state of emergency was declared for that particular day.

Now, I do know of two, namely Grand Falls and St. Lawrence. I think there might have been one or two others, I am not positive. However, that amendment, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the House will be put in committee either by somebody on this side of the House, a colleague of mine, or from a member on the other side of the House.

So, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is quite simple. We all know what it means and therefore I ask that it now be put.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation in supporting this bill. This actually is a bill which is an amendment to a principal

bill that was passed about three years ago. With a certain amount of modesty, I have to say that it was the first bill certainly since the history of Confederation that was passed as a result of a motion by the opposition. I introduced it at the time. I almost fell over, as a matter of fact, when the then Premier - I was up earnestly explaining the import of it and the meaning of it and the then Premier of the time indicated that the government was going to support it. I do not know whether he had his eyes set on certain St. John's seats at the time. If he did, it was certainly in vain.

In any event, I think all members will agree that it was rather uncharacteristic at the time for the government to accept such measures. So, I was very surprised when the last bill was accepted. As I say, the last one was the first bill by an opposition, brought forth by an opposition, that became enacted into law since Confederation.

Now, this is the second one and I cannot think of a better person to propose it than the honourable the member for Twillingate who is to be congratulated on his foresight with respect to the matter.

The last time that it occurred is a matter of interest. A similar situation occurred as occurred this year. We had a horrendous snow storm and the deputy mayor of the City of St. John's declared a state of emergency and declared that no cars were allowed out on the streets, somewhat similar to this year. To my utter surprise, I think the motivating reason for bringing in the bill at the time was the dog-headedness of the Canadian National Railways here in St. John's - this was two or three years ago - in arrogantly, I thought, refusing to pay the workers. I mean if a responsible civic official, acting in good faith, turns around and says that it is a state of emergency, people are not allowed out on the streets. They could not bring their automobiles out. They lived four or five miles away from their place of work, and concerns such as Canadian National Railway had what I considered to be the unmitigated gall to turn around and tell their employees that they were not to be paid.

I think this is characteristic of the Canadian National Railway



and its operation in Newfoundland. As a result of the Canadian National Railways and as a result of the Liberal Government in Ottawa, I might say we are incidentally the first province in Canada to have lost a railway. Every other province in Canada when they joined Confederation got a railway, and we lost it. This Canadian National Railway, true to its arrogant manner, at the particular time refused to play -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member is not being relevant to this particular bill.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, on the loss of the railway, Mr. Speaker, I would concur. I shall not pursue that subject any more. I am talking about the bill and the Canadian National Railway and its utter arrogance.

Now, this year I do not think it has been so acute, I do not think there have been too many concerns that have refused to pay their workers who were not out on that particular day. There are always a few hardheaded employers around who will take advantage of a situation such as this.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: No, the government, not at all. The government has been consistent all the way through. The government announced its policy. The government was instrumental at the period of time in seeing that all the workers of which it had even a direct control or an indirect control received payment ultimately.

There may be a certain amount of employers. I was not aware that St. Lawrence and Grand Falls and a few other places declared similar states of emergency. The government will certainly have no objection whatsoever to amending the bill in committee for this purpose.

So, as I say, while the problem is not so acute at this period of time as it was a few years ago, this bill is an amendment to that bill of a few years ago and certainly the government will support it. I would like to congratulate the honourable member for Twillingate for bringing it forth.

One of the things that the bill does - by the way, I think that this should be known by any employee who has been adversely affected by a failure of an employer to pay wages, that it evokes the provisions in one of the Labour Relations Acts; I do not know which one, but one of them under the responsibility of the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, whereby they can make a complaint. I think it is somewhat similar to the Minimum Wage Act, whereby an employee can make a complaint if an employer had not paid him after this becomes law. The department will have no hesitation whatsoever and in fact is empowered and directed to take up the cudgel for that employee, with the employer for the purpose of obtaining compensation. So, I think that that fact should be known. It is not in the amendment but it is still a part of the bill, because the amendment becomes part of the principal bill.

So, as I say again, the government has no hesitation in supporting a bill which originally initiated with the government itself, and I would like to again congratulate the member for Twillingate on his foresight and energy and direction in bringing this before the House. MR. W. ROWE: The House Leader is enough to bring one to his feet.

I rise primarily, Sir, to commend Your Honour on Your Honour's brilliant ruling there a minute ago when he ruled that the honourable Government House Leader was irrelevant. He certainly is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt about that in anybody's mind.

Sir, I join the Minister without Portfolio in commending my colleague for bringing this before the House. The honourable House Leader commended him for his foresight. Well, he had foresight but he also had memory. He remembered that it was the House Leader himself who was the trail blazer in this regard, pioneer legislator. He brought this into the House. I do not know if it had ever been brought into the House before. I do not know what used to happen when states of emergency were declared in earlier days, whether employers - some would pay and some would not pay and all this sort of this went on.

So, the honourable the House Leader, when he was in the opposition, was acting in the best traditions of sort of independant legislators

seeing a fault, seeing a defect in society and coming in to cure that defect. If only his public zeal at that time spilled over into the time that he took the reins of government, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Industrial Development would agree, in those days, those balmy, halcyon days, there is no doubt about it. I used to sit over there, as my honourable colleague says, barely inside the bar of the House and sit over and admire the then member for St. John's East, as he then was, sitting on the opposition side of the House with his public zeal, his public spirit, the great traditions of being an independant legislator who had grown up throughout the centuries over in England and in Newfoundland and Canada, to see him following along.

We were delighted, Sir. I must say he should be commended for bringing that legislation in at that time because at that time, besides being sort of a matter of foresight in concept, the whole concept being something to grapple with and bring into the House, the honourable member did a marvelous job as well, I think probably with the help of the law clerk of that time, in drafting up what is a pretty complicated piece of legislation. I do not think it was the law clerk, it was the clerk of the House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Harry Cummings, yes, who is the present Registrar of the Supreme Court was the law clerk. He brought in an excellent piece of legislation. So excellent indeed, Sir, that in order to make that legislation apply to further similar instances, we do not need to bring in a new bill, a new allover piece of legislation, we merely need to ask the House to amend the definition of a state of emergency. Then we can just name the period and the time and the place and the thing will fall right in line.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The drafting is almost as good a drafting as is needed on the House rules.

MR. W. ROWE: No, no. That is an example, Sir, of what I earlier referred to, where since the honourable minister got in the government, he has lapsed and very sadly. Unfortunately he did not carry over with him into power and responsibility the same sort of zeal, draftsmanship

and other things that spurred him on to bring the original bill before the House.

Now, Sir, as my colleague from Twillingate has mentioned, we should like to, when the committee sits, move an amendment to the bill presently before the House, with the consent, of course, of the majority of the House. Undoubtedly they do not have any objection to it because at that time, not on the same day exactly but in the same period of time there were one or two other states of emergency called or declared by various municipalities. One was Grand Falls, I believe. One was St. Lawrence. I do not know what happened in Corner Brook. They suffered one or two onslaughts of the weather around the same period of time.

Now, I do not recall myself, Sir, where exactly the communities or municipalities were but perhaps - I have already spoken to the law clerk about it - between now and the time that we sit in committee an amendment can be drafted, a general amendment to incorporate these communities. I cannot think of the words while I am on my feet here but it might have something to do with such other communities -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, because we do not have the same zeal as had the honourable member when he was in opposition. We have more money and we have more talent but we are lacking in zeal at this point in a long drawn session, Sir, where at every opportunity to make some utterance we have been gagged and stifled and debate has been cut off by the House Leader. Our spirit is nearly broken, not quite but nearly broken by the honourable the House Leader.

Perhaps a general amendment applying to all municipalities in which a state of emergency was declared and the times could be put in as well. That information could be readily gotten I would imagine from the Department of Transportation or the Department of Municipal Affairs. Probably a phone call could get us that information and then we can have the general amendment and put it through. It would not only apply to St. John's because

even in those days the honourable the House Leader was a bit parochial, a little bit of balliwick politician. He did not see fit to extend this to all of Newfoundland. Perhaps there were no states of emergency called throughout all of Newfoundland or any other communities in Newfoundland but it applied only to St. John's at that time, perhaps because that was the only place that had declared a state of emergency.

So without any further verbage on the matter, I have great delight, Sir, and we all on this side obviously have great delight in supporting this bill, a bill which appears to be passing in a few minutes with the unanimous consent of the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member who speaks now closes the debate.

MR. H.W.C. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, from the two speakers we have had, I can gather that we wonder what happened in years gone by because the initial bill was brought before the House in 1971. As the Minister without Portfolio says, this is merely an amendment to that and subsequent amendments will be coming I presume as we do get states of emergency declared, not only in the City of St. John's but in any municipality throughout the Province in future.

I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps in the days gone by when we had storms, labour relations were different. Today they are very cold. Contracts are being entered into and they are very rigid. So perhaps it has a tendency to make the employer very hard-hearted perhaps but like the merchant of Venice to want the pound of flesh. Thank God that has not come our way; I do not believe. I know in my case I have told employees not to come when it is stormy. Never would I even consider withholding pay from them for that.

As I say, the labour relations are different today from what

they were years ago. Perhaps this is the reason, Mr. Speaker. I am also wondering too whether this legislation will cause the mayors of municipalities in future to think twice before they declare a state of emergency for fear that they will have strikes on their hands in hospitals and strikes in industry.

Be that as it may, I think it is the duty of the government to protect the employees who fall within the category of those who might be refused remuneration because of a storm and because of a state of emergency.

I feel that it should not be necessary, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that it should not be necessary but in this day and age we find that it is necessary. It has been proven that way because some employers did actually withhold remuneration to the employees for that particular day, March 12.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House will vote for this motion and that the amendment will become a reality very quickly.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Compensation Of Employees Act, 1971," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps we might call it six o'clock. I mean I do not want to embarrass the honourable member for Bell Island. I realize, I do not think he feels like talking on this motion at the present time. If he wish to for seven or eight minutes he may but we can call it six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: I need a spell, Sir. I am absolutely exhausted. I am worn out.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now call it six of the clock and I leave the Chair until three of the clock, tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 1974.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 15, 1974.

6278

## QUESTIONS

2.—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

For each month of the calendar year 1973, what was the value of production by Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation at their operations at Pleasantville, St. John's?

January	-	\$ 228,536.61
February	-	234,213.88
March	-	291,864.91
April	-	252,931.80
May	-	256,795.30
June	-	339,414.46
July	-	263,500.74
August	-	323,748.25
September	-	409,439.97
October	-	319,019.09
November	-	299,758.75
December	-	381,203.35



23—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

During the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date what is the amount of funds which has been expended for each Community Pasture showing for each community in the vicinity of which it is located?

1973 - EXPENSES - PROVINCIAL PASTURES

PASTURE	MAINTENANCE	DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL
Cochrane Pond	\$ 26,427.32	\$ 4,546.65	\$ 30,973.97
Shoe Cove (St. John's E.)	5,977.52	25,926.13	31,903.65
Foxtrap	24,968.47	460.29	25,428.76
Brigus	14,299.14	205.14	14,504.28
Salmon Cove	11,405.01	1,301.03	12,706.04
Country Road	26,908.02	128.28	27,036.30
Colinét	16,775.05	3,834.74	20,609.79
Riverhead	8,624.11	2,435.07	11,059.18
Gaskiers	7,114.63	32,330.04	39,444.67
St. Shotts	8,229.13	16,600.42	24,829.55
Peter's River	4,333.79	5,036.11	9,369.90
Ferryland	11,865.09	28,061.66	39,926.75
St. Brides	4,795.44	19,890.34	24,685.78
Winterland	13,941.42	4,697.19	18,638.61
Point Crewe	5,253.08	15,901.58	21,154.66
Lamaline	5,204.62	36,899.25	42,103.87
Port Rexton	5,186.76	50.42	5,237.18
Spencer Bridge	17,963.18	2,264.68	20,227.86
Comfort Cove	11,500.00	3,208.93	14,708.93
Wooddale	10,772.64	14,281.97	25,054.61
Mic Mac	10,326.44	1,745.56	12,072.00
Cormack	18,928.91	14,492.93	33,421.84
Robinsons	8,750.05	6,492.55	15,242.60
Searston	6,013.12	15,446.98	21,460.10
West Bay	8,827.45	615.21	9,442.66
Long Point	4,277.01	45.98	4,322.99
Long Harbour (new)	3,223.81	16,651.71	19,875.52
George's Brook (new)	2,401.36	34,598.01	36,999.37
Holyrood		274.90	274.90
O'Regan's		28,546.40	28,546.40
Swansea		101,116.03	101,116.03
Port Albert		24,981.86	24,981.86
Bay de Verde		962.15	962.15
Bonavista		2,962.15	2,962.15
Northern Peninsula		962.15	962.15



25—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the total amount of money which was received during calendar year 1973 or was receivable as at December 31, 1973 by Government or by any Agency, Board, Commission, Corporation or

Service thereof in respect of the loan of any farm equipment from any farm equipment bank during calendar year 1973?

The total amount of funds received during the fiscal year 1973-74 for Farm Equipment Rental was nil.

(37)—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

For each calendar year for which there are records kept, what are the numbers of dozens of eggs

- (a) that were sold in the Province of Newfoundland
- (b) that were produced and sold in the Province of Newfoundland
- (c) that were produced outside the Province of Newfoundland but sold within the Province of Newfoundland?

STATISTICS CANADA

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>
a.	9,172,595	8,672,025	8,425,050	7,239,690
b.	9,050,000	8,640,000	8,325,000	6,690,000
c.	122,595	32,025	100,050	549,690

④—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

During the calendar year 1973 and for each item of farm equipment by location of farm equipment bank, what is the number of lending-days during which said item of farm equipment was loaned by the farm equipment bank to persons or firms employed in the agricultural industry in the Province?

The number of lending days was nil.

① MR. THOMAS (Bonaville North) To ask the Honorable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) During the calendar year 1973 at what locations were farm equipment banks established?
- (2) For each location where a farm equipment bank was established during the calendar year 1973, what was the number, type, make and model year of each item of farm equipment that was provided the said farm equipment bank, showing also for each such piece of equipment the purchase price or depreciated value of it at the time it was acquired by the said farm equipment bank?

Farm Equipment Banks were not established during 1973-74.

47—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

By electoral district, what is the value of all amounts expended by Government during the current fiscal year and as of a current date for Crop Production — Blueberry Development and which were charged to vote 1209-03-02?

The following value of all amounts expended by Government for 1973-74, as of March 29, 1974, under subhead 1209-03-02 are broken down according to three blueberry development areas.

The present system of accounting does not break down costs as to electoral districts.

AREAS

Avalon	\$ 95,286.00
Bonavista North	4,916.00
Bonavista Peninsula	<u>4,246.00</u>
TOTAL	\$104,448.00

Please note that blueberry access road construction (equipment hire) does not come out of the above subhead. 1210-07-02 is for blueberry access roads.

④8 MR THOMAS (Bonaville North) -To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What steps did the Government take during calendar years 1972 and 1973 to bring into being a resource loan bank for the benefit of persons and firms employed in agricultural industries?

No steps were taken by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture to bring into being a resource loan bank.



49—MR. THOMS (Bonavista North)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) Since April 1, 1973 and as of a current date what is
  - (a) the total number of, and
  - (b) the total value of the principal amounts sought in applications for loans received by the Farm Development Loan Board?
- (2) During the same period, what is
  - (a) the total number of, and
  - (b) the total value of the principal amounts approved in respect of applications for loans granted by the Farm Development Loan Board?
- (3) During the same period, what is
  - (a) the total number of, and
  - (b) the total value of the principal amounts sought in respect of applications for loans deferred or rejected by the Farm Development Loan Board?

1 (a)	235	
(b)	\$1,372,935.00	
2 (a)	167	
(b)	\$742,995.00	(Dispersed 463,051.00)
3 (a)	68	
(b)	\$629,940.00	(Deferred or rejected)