



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a distinct pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today ten Grade VIII, IX, X and XI students from Our Lady of Labrador School in West St. Modeste with their teacher in charge, Sister M.A. Driscoll, and from Holy Heart of Mary Regional High School here in St. John's ten Grade X, and XI students with their teacher, Miss Sharon Griffin.

On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the Chamber and trust that your visit is most informative and interesting. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before we come to presenting petitions and in the absence of both the Premier and the Minister of Justice perhaps I could be allowed to make a motion or to second it according to the practice of the House because death has taken another of the men who served Newfoundland so well, in the person of the former Registrar of the Supreme Court, Mr. Roy Mercer, Q.C.

Mr. Mercer had been ill for some considerable time and indeed, I believe it was ill health which forced him to retire two or three years ago from the position of Registrar of the Supreme Court. I understand he died earlier today.

Although, I, of course, never practiced at the bar, I knew Mr. Mercer extremely well, both as a young chap growing up in St. John's when his family and mine were friends and also as a young lawyer, I had occasion from time to time to ask his advice and found him always to be the soul of gentlemanlyness and courtesy and well-grounded in both the practice and the theory of the law. I would think all of the members of the Bar found him like that. He practiced for a number

of years in private practise and then became Registrar of the Court, seven or eight or nine years ago. I do not have the precise date but in that position he served well and only retired two or three years past when ill health forced him to do so.

The family tradition is being carried on. His son David is Director (I believe that is the correct title) of the Priorities and Planning Secretariat - one of the key officials of the Government of this Province, a very dedicated and a very knowledgeable Newfoundlander.

So, I do not know if it is appropriate for me to move a motion of sympathy to the family of Mr. Mercer. He is survived by his wife, by David, by a son James and by a daughter, Lois. If it is not the right thing for me to move it, could I second it an perhaps, or the House Leader or someone speaking for the Government could speak as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I do not think we really need any formal motion because we certainly all wish to be associated with the motion of sympathy. I think the House all speaks as one, I am quite sure they do, on the passing on of Mr. Mercer. I was not myself aware of the fact until the Leader of the Opposition mentioned it, that he had passed away today. Mr. Mercer is well-known to many people in the St. John's area and particularly to those, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, who have had occasion to practise in the courts or members of the Law Society. He was Registrar of the Supreme Court for many years. He practised law in the city of St. John's for quite a number of years; has been ailing for some time, He earned and merited the respect of everybody who had the privilege to be connected with him or come into contact with him.

One of his sons - he has a family of two boys and a girl; one of them, David, Mr. David Mercer, is executive Director of the Planning and Priorities Committee, a most valued employee of the public service in this Province. I think you can say unanimously that this House joined would wish to express to the family of the late Roy Mercer. its sincere

sypathy in their grief.

PETITIONS:

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

MR. F. ROWE (St. Barbe North): I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 840 residents of the communities between Barr'd Harbour and St. Barbe in the southern part of the district of St. Barbe North. Sir, the prayer of the petition reads: "The undersigned residents of the area from Barr'd Harbour to St. Barbe support the following proposal of the Action Committee, a nonpolitical group working to improve local conditions. Since our electrical service is poor, with many outages; many homes and businesses suffer from it.

"This past weekend," Sir, and this petition was drafted up about a month or a month and a half ago, "this past weekend electricity was off from 11:15 A.M. Friday to 11:00 A.M. Saturday. Many person's water and sewerage systems froze and broke. No people should live under these conditions any more. Because the generators are in Flowers Cove, the power line comes around the bay, therefore salt water sprays the lines and causes outages continually. With a larger generator at Plum Point, the line would not come around the bay and many problems would be solved. Therefore, we propose that a generator be placed permanently in the Plum Point area to service Barr'd Harbour to St. Barbe."

Now, Sir, if I could just for a moment paint the picture. The Flowers Cove generating station serves from Eddies Cove East in the North right down to Barr'd Harbour in the South. Now, for all intents and purposes, you can look at that area as two

that is from Adey's Cove down to St. Barbe. The Flower's Cove power station or the diesel generating station is just north of St. Barbe, in that northern section. The trouble is in the St. Barbe Basin Area. They get the salting problem in the spring and in the fall and they get the lines being blown down in the winter and quite often they are inaccessible because of snow and this sort of thing. Consequently, practically all communities south of St. Barbe are without electricity quite frequently.

Now, Sir, therefore, if we could take the district, take these two sections and leave the generating station in Flower's Cove to serve from St. Barbe to Adey's Cove in the north and put an additional generating station in Plum Point to serve from St. Barbe down to Bard Harbour in the south, this would alleviate and solve this problem that we have.

I talked with hundreds of people in the district, I have gone from door to door in the district about three times since the last election, I have been talking with officials of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission on a number of occasions in the district, the linesmen and the foremen and what have you and I have also had meetings with the officials here in St. John's of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission. I have suggested that the line should be taken back into the woods around the St. Barbe Bay Basin Area where there is not so much exposure to the sea or to the wind, or the rebuilding of the line with heavier conductors, a twenty-five K V line with clamp-type insulators or the putting of this additional diesel generating station in St. Barbe. I think personally that that is the better or the best solution to the particular problem that exists.

Just a few weeks ago I did meet with certain high-ranking officials of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission and, Sir, if I can be granted leave to do so, I would like to read the reply that I got from these officials at the power commission as a result of my meeting and a request to put this diesel generating plant in

Plum Point.

"Further to our meeting of last week at which time we discussed operating problems being experienced down in the Flower's Cove distributing system this winter, I want to bring you up to date as I promised on the measures being taken to improve the situation there. Since our meeting we have been in contact with our supervisor for the area, Mr. John Fuller, (a good man, Sir, and a new man this year)" and he agrees with us that a comprehensive study is desirable to determine the condition of the system.

"It is to be expected that such a study will reveal existing defects and very likely indicate modification which when affected would improve the reliability of the system. Immediate steps are being taken to improve reliability by reducing the extent or length of line outage by the installation of reclosures. These are automatic switching devices which operate to isolate a faulty section of line and maintain service to the remainder of the distribution system, thereby keeping the number of customers without service during outages to a minimum. Some of the recent outages have been caused by salt deposits on the distribution line insulators.

"A programme is being initiated to protect the insulation by application of a compound. This work will commence as soon as possible." (Then there are a few more paragraphs, Sir.)

"Regarding your request for additional generation in the St. Barbe Area, we wish to advise that we are unable to accede for a number of reasons which, when considered, it is felt you will acknowledge as being sound. Firstly; the funds are not available in the current programme or in the proposed 1974 - 1975 programme to undertake such installations. Secondly; our policy is to integrate isolated systems where possible and consequently dividing the Flower's Cove generation distribution facility into two systems would be a backward step. Thirdly; and most important of all we recognize the problem as being one associated with distribution lines and this is where the problem must be investigated and solved."

Now, Sir, in spite of what this letter says, I do not feel

nor do I acknowledge this letter or the explanation therein as being sound. This letter says exactly what the people of St. Barbe North and I have been saying for the last two years. We know what the problem is and the obvious solution to the problem is the complete rebuilding of the electrical line in that district or split the present line and put an electrical generating station in the Plum Point Area.

Until such time, Sir, as a new line is built, possibly

with electricity flowing across the Straits of Belle Isle from Labrador.

Sir, until a new line is built, it is imperative that this generating station be established in the Plum Point Area, Sir, because businesses are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars; people's waterlines are freezing; the fluctuations in the voltages are causing the burning out of electrical appliances, Sir; people are sleeping in their cars overnight in order to keep warm. It is an absolutely atrocious situation in the district. Sir, I would sincerely ask that the minister take this under his consideration with the greatest of sympathy. I will be only too happy to meet with the Minister of Mines and Energy, under whose jurisdiction the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission falls, and chat it out, Sir. I think that this work should begin as soon as weather permits in the spring.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from 118 residents in the Community of Sweet Bay in my district. The prayer of the petition is a very simple one. They are asking that the road through the Community of Sweet Bay be paved this year. The road through the community was upgraded and reconstructed last year by this government so I sincerely hope that this year, when an asphalt plant is set up on the southside of Bonavista Bay, that funds will be forthcoming to pave the road within the community

Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly in the policy that when funds are not available to pave the main roads leading to the communities, that the road within the community itself, where the people are residing, that that section of road be paved rather than go into the expenditure of paving the main road leading to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the petition because most of the people of Sweet Bay are employed. There is a fish plant in the neighbouring Town of Charleston and people are travelling back and forth each day in the summertime. There is a seasonal operation there at Charleston. The people are travelling back and forth. It is a very viable community. People who are not working in the fish plant are fishing. It is a very basic economic base to the Community of Sweet Bay. I sincerely hope that this year the funds will be forthcoming for this small project.

I move that this petition be placed on the table of the House of Assembly and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition that was presented by the Member for Bonavista South on behalf of 118 residents of Sweet Bay. We too feel that the Minister of Finance should see fit to put sufficient funds in the budget of his colleague the Minister of Transportation and Communications to see that this particular job is done and the wishes of the people of Sweet Bay are met and not to exclude putting some in his budget for Labrador as well.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Newfoundland which shall, effective from this minute, become the Workmen's Compensation Board of Newfoundland and Labrador, I hope. I have ten copies for the press and others for the members of the House.

HON. T. V. HICKEY (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following regulations: The Highway Traffic Bus Amend No. 2 Regulations, 1973; Highway Traffic Fees Amendment Regulations, 1973; Highway Traffic Snow-Clearing Regulations, 1973; Highway Traffic Snow-Clearing Regulations, Grand Falls Area, 1973; Snow-Clearing Regulations, St. John's, 1973; Snow-Clearing Regulations, St. Anthony, 1973;

Corner Brook, 1973; Highway Traffic Vehicle Amendment Regulations, 1973; Highway Traffic Bus Taxi And Commercial Motor Vehicle Insurance Regulations, 1973; Highway Traffic Snow Clearing Regulations for St. John's for 1974, for Grand Falls for 1974, for Corner Brook for 1974, for St. Anthony for 1974; Highway Traffic Snow Clearing Regulations for 1974; Licensing Equipment Amendment Regulations for 1973; Highway Traffic Bus Amendment Regulations for 1973; Vehicle Requirement for Mobile Homes and Recreation Vehicles; Highway Traffic Licensing Equipment Amendment Regulations for 1973; Highway Traffic Fee Amendment Regulations, Number (2) for 1973.

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to table a report from the M.D.D. of my department. Now, this is a report of the activities of that division for 1973. This is not a statutory requirement to file the report. It possibly therefore should have been the subject of a ministerial statement but with leave of the honourable members, I would like to file the report at this time. It is the first in what is hoped to be an annual report from this division. This is a method used elsewhere in Canada for communicating the progress and major results of exploration programmes, etc, and in this current report there is a lot of very interesting information that I am sure the honourable members will be interested in.

We have notes, reports here, such as notes on the geology of the Great Bend and Pipestone Pond, ultramafic bodies, notes on the geology of the King George IV Lake areas, southwest, central Newfoundland, economic geology of west Newfoundland, gravel resource inventory; geological mapping of the Burin, Bonavista Belt and so on, Mr. Speaker. All of that will make very interesting reading for the honourable members I am sure.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to address a question to the honourable the

Minister of Education. Is the minister prepared to retain the present student teacher ratio for the high schools until the formula recommended by the study committee is implemented in the fall of 1976?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, the essential difference between the old system of allocation and the new one is that the old one was an allocation to schools whereas the new one is an allocation to school districts or boards. Under the old system there were many disparities requiring ad hoc decisions and the lack of flexibility. There was considerable criticism and much of it justified under the old system because of this lack of flexibility.

I do not think that it would be wise or serve a useful purpose to implement a new programme for primary and elementary classes and leave the old programme in effect for the next two academic years in the high schools. The allocation under the new programme is not to schools but to school boards. The way of making up the number is obviously by counting or estimating the number of pupils in the schools within the district. I feel that the new system announced a couple of weeks ago, which is completely in accord with the recommendation of that

committee, except to be implemented over a three year academic year period instead of two year academic period. I think that that will give a consistent approach and a flexibility which would not be served by a continuation of the old system and I think that it would be quite confusing to have two different teacher allocation programmes in operation in the same district depending upon the grade, especially since there is acceptance of the philosophy that allocation should be on a school board or school district level rather than individually school by school.

MR. F. ROWE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, does the minister realize that according to the president of the N.T.A. that the new announced formula on teacher allocation will result in a reduction of the staff in the high schools, at the high school level, and you will have an increase in the staff of primary and elementary schools and this will probably result, since it deals with school districts, in teachers being taken out of the primary and elementary section and moved into the high school section. Consequently, you will be back in the same boat as you were in the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to answer that question properly, I think I should point out or repeat that under the new teacher allocation programme there will for the academic year 1974-1975, be an additional 300 teachers available to schools across the province, at an approximate cost of \$1.4 million. In the second year of implementation 1975-1976 there will be an additional 200, at a cost of an additional \$1.9 million, that making for the two years a total of 500 additional teachers, That is what somebody called mathematical trickery but you add up 300 and you add up 200, you get 500, at a cost of \$3.3 million, and that in the final year, which is the academic year 1976-1977, you have again 364 and then, with mathematical wizardry, you add that to 500 and it comes to approximately 864 and that at a cost of \$3.6 million, and adding that to the \$3.3 million is \$6.9 million.

So 300 next year, a further 200 the year after and a further 364 in the final year. That is the total, approximate obviously because it depends on enrollment. But they are the approximate numbers available for the next three academic years under the new allocation programme. I think it is necessary to restate that there is no requirement whatsoever under the new teacher allocation programme for a reduction of teachers in high schools, the allocations within school districts. The criticism, quite justified, for a number of years had been the rigidity or lack of flexibility within let us say an organic system, and there is no requirement that any high school need lose students. The allocation of teachers within the school district is the responsibility of the school. There is no requirement by government or from these regulations there is no requirement that any high school loses teachers.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I was giving the minister the opportunity to restate his teacher allocation programme because he certainly has not answered my original question. Sir, do I put this supplementary question to the minister? Is the president of the N.T.A. and the N.T.A. itself right or wrong when they say that there will in fact be a reduction of the number of teachers, relatively speaking at the high school level this coming year as a result of the teacher allocation formula? Is the answer right or wrong?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not regard it as my function to say that the president of any organization is right or wrong, all I can state are the facts and the facts are that there is no requirement resulting from the teacher allocation programme. There is no requirement from

that new programme that any high school will or need lose teachers. The allocation of those additional 300 next year and in the aggregate 500 the year after and in the aggregate 864 the third year, the allocation is based on a district basis and is done by the school board.

MR. F. B. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it that the minister has received a letter from the President of the N.T.A. Is that correct? So am I correct in assuming that the answer to the request of the N.T.A. is no?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, while I can no longer communicate in English, I will certainly be pleased if the honourable gentleman wish to offer his services as translator but I think most occasions at least I managed to get together a subject and a predicate. It is usually understandable. Perhaps people do not agree with it but that is obviously their privilege but I think that I can communicate. I think what I said was quite clear and that is; according to the new teacher allocation programme which again will bring in 300 next year, the second year a total of 500 and the third year the whole aggregate 864, there is no requirement under that teacher allocation programme that any high school will lose teachers.

The allocation will be done in those numbers by the school board.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I will give up, Mr. Speaker, again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, our persistence on this side of the honourable House has finally paid off. Now would the Minister of Tourism, Sir, confirm or deny that Horizons Communications is under contract with his department to the tune of the scandalous amount of \$100,000?

MR. SPEAKER: That question has been asked in various forms in the last week or two weeks. I have direct the honourable Member for Bell Island several times to put the question on the Order Paper and it has not yet appeared here. I suggest that he do the same thing with this one, at least put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling but in today's "Telegram" there is an article on this matter.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to this matter and it is not subject to debate. If the honourable member want an answer, Your Honour has told him to place the question on the Order Paper. If he wish to appeal Your Honour's ruling he can, but he is not permitted under the rules to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure all honourable members are aware of the procedures that could be followed if a member is not satisfied with a ruling made by this Chair.

MR. NEARY: that will be the day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Tourism could inform the House if public tenders or if proposals were invited from firms or individuals in Newfoundland to do the public relations work for the Silver Anniversary Committee this year?

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Tourism could tell us if the controversial George McLean Firm has a contract with the government to do another film?

MR. SPEAKER: Order Paper.

The honourable the Member for Labrador South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister tongue-tied? The honourable Tongue-Tied Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the government's policy that there should be prior consultation with tenants before rental increases are announced, I wonder if the minister responsible for housing could inform the House if there were prior consultation with the tenants that live in the Pleasantville Apartments and Churchill Square Apartments before the rental increases were announced?

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

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, while the St. John's Housing Corporation comes directly under

me as far as reporting is concerned, the operations of that division or crown corporation are contained in their own Act and they have the powers to act. I think the question should rightly be directed to the Chairman of that corporation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what nonsense! The minister is responsible for that corporation. Would the minister tell us then, Mr. Speaker, what the average monthly increase is going to be in the rental of these apartments?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the honourable gentleman could read. Apparently he got his source of information from somewhere. The same source also quoted the amount of the increase which is approximately \$20. per month.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question: Is the minister stating that the increase is not five per cent but it is twenty dollars a month? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, it seems difficult to get through some heads but -

MR. ROBERTS: That is what we find.

MR. EARLE: It is very, very difficult indeed. If I can enlighten the honourable member further, I can say that the Chairman of the St. John's Housing Corporation came to me a month ago and explained to me that because of the increased cost of fuel, of which I am sure every householder is aware, that it would be necessary to put up the rents of the apartments referred to.

He stated to me at that time that it was the intention of the corporation, he did not have to report to me, but he just out of courtesy advised me that it was the intention of the corporation to advance the rents twenty dollars per month, and I understand that is what he has done.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a supplementary question? Is there any consideration given to waiving this increase in the case of pensioners, retired clergymen or widows or these sort of people? Is there any consideration given to not imposing the drastic increases on these people?

MR. EARLE: To come back to my original statement, Mr. Speaker, ask the Chairman of the St. John's Housing Corporation -

MR. NEARY: A do nothing minister. He does not know what is going on in his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North:

MR. PAUL S. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism: Could the minister inform the House when we can expect some announcement as to the licensing and the areas pertaining to moose and caribou for this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Tourism:

HON. T.M. DOYLE: Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker. I would, at the outside, within two weeks hopefully, sometime next week but at the outside

within two weeks from today the total policy for the year will be announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question which I would like to direct to the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications: In view of the approaching crisis in air transport between the southern section of my district and the Island of Newfoundland, I wonder if the minister can tell us what if anything came out of the meeting between officials from Newfoundland Labrador Air Transport and Treasury Board a day or two ago?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give my honourable friend an answer in terms of the decision, as such, yet. We met with Mr. Manion and Mr. Patey from both airlines and the Director of Transportation, Mr. O'Brien and myself. Mr. O'Brien has taken the facts and the figures and the explanations as offered by both gentlemen and from there we go back to Treasury Board and hope to sort the matter out and hopefully arrive at a decision. I hope that would not be more than the middle of next week.

MR. SPEAKER: I note we have in the gallery at the back, I think, some members of the Liaison Committee of the Mayors and Municipalities Federation and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who just arrived. I would like to welcome these gentlemen to the galleries today and trust that your visit is most interesting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply: I think the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing adjourned the debate last day.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, when I started my address last evening I only had a very brief time in my opening remarks to make two comments which were to the effect that the members of this government were putting in a tremendous amount of time, far more than the previous government, in trying to straighten out the affairs of this province and in trying to plan for its future.

Having had experience, as I said, with both governments I can speak with some authority on this because I know just how hard and how long my present colleagues are working.

My second remark last evening before I stopped was to the effect that the address which had just been given by the honourable Member for Labrador North consisted mainly of hot air. Now I do not like saying that sort of thing to honourable members of the House. It is not my practice to try to insult them but I was probably overcome by the tremendous volume

and strength of his remarks and, therefore, I think that to some degree I should take it back because in his remarks there was an essence of good common sense with his reference particularly to the plight of the Labrador fishermen and to the predicament of the wood harvesting operations in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that a lot of the rest of it was purely dramatics and might well be classed under the heading of "hot air." In these two particular fields his remarks were extremely pertinent and I should like to compliment him on them.

Mr. Speaker, if I may dwell on Labrador for a few moments in reply to his speech: This, of course, has to do with just what this government are attempting to accomplish. The wood harvesting operations in Labrador, when they were set up by the former administration, were a singular nightmare to the whole Labrador Linerboard operation which has since cost this province tens upon tens of millions of dollars. As an example: When I went to Labrador to have my first look at that operation in the woods, there were down there sitting on the sides of the roads huge contraptions, I suppose you could call them machines, and there were two of these in place which cost approximately \$2 million each and consisted of miles and miles of wires, pipes, gears and gadgets, which were something incredible, something out of the future. These were supposed to be tree harvesting equipment, costing as I said about approximately \$2 million each. Fortunately for this government, there were only two of them down there. Mr. Speaker, there were sixteen more on order. Sixteen more of these machines at \$2 million each, if my arithmetic is correct, is \$32 million. Thank goodness this government came in when it did. We were able to cancel that contract and get out of it. That in one blow, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know what this government are doing or what this government have done, that one simple operation saved this province \$32 million.

Now the whole story of the Labrador Linerboard effort is fraught with similar extravagances and it is only by the grace of God that this government came into power in time to stop that whole operation

completely swamping the Province of Newfoundland. That is just one illustration of it. The Hon. Member for Labrador North made good points but, of course, what he carefully avoided saying - I notice that all speakers on Labrador usually omit this very obvious fact to anybody that goes to Labrador - is that the coastline is very sparsely populated. The settlements are widespread. They are in conditions climatic and otherwise which are very, very extreme and difficult to overcome. The cost of servicing that coast per person of population would be astronomical. To bring the people of Labrador up to the services which they should have, it would run into tens of millions of dollars.

MR. NEARY: It is being paid for by the Government of Canada. What is the honourable minister whining about?

MR. EARLE: I am very happy to come back to that. The Hon. Member for Bell Island always gives me a very good clue. When I run short of something to say, he brings in just the right remark to allow me to go on. He says why not do it, it is the problem of the Federal Government of Canada. I have to go back a little bit in history on this because the Hon. Member for Labrador North referred to the Labrador fishery. I had something to do with fish at one time. As a matter of fact the firm with which I was associated used to send thirty-two sailing vessels to the Coast of Labrador - one firm alone.

MR. NEARY: Fish merchants.

MR. EARLE: Yes, the benighted and old merchant princes, the fish merchants that screwed the country, the ones that the "Hon. Red Flag Waver" over there said were the downfall of our province. These people gave employment to hundreds of people and conducted quite a large industry on that Coast of Labrador. When I was young

I was aware of all of that which was going on at that time. I came up through the depression years. The honourable member for St. John's North was a little younger than I was. Of course, I knew exactly what people were going through. I knew what we all went through at that time.

I started work on the magnificent sum of five dollars a week and I was overpaid, much overpaid at that time. However, that is all past history. This must be getting to them, Mr. Speaker, because the interjections are really worthwhile.

Anyhow, to come back to the state of the fishery on the Labrador Coast. When I was associated with that great industry, I used to go to Labrador as a representative of the fishing industry and talk to the Federal Government. We went there on numerous occasions, numerous delegations. I was the Director of the Fisheries Council of Canada and very closely, I think, associated with all aspects of the fisheries. The one thing that used to strike me in going to Ottawa and in dealing with such men as those who were alive in those days, the honourable C. D. Howe was very prominent in it. Jimmy Sinclair, the father-in-law of the present Prime Minister's wife, was very active in it. His Deputy Minister at that time, Stewart Bates, a Scotsman who later became Chairman of the CMHC, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; to be followed by the late George Clarke, who was also a very fine Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

I had numerous meetings with these men in company with my friends in the industry and the one thing which came home to us was the complete disinterest of the Federal Government in the Newfoundland Fisheries. The whole thing stunk, from their standpoint. They did not think there was any future. They never went to any length of things to disguise that and even worse than the Newfoundland Island Fishery was the Labrador Fishery. I heard it said in public meetings in Ottawa at that time that the sooner that industry was abolished the better for the Province.

This was the attitude towards the Labrador Fisheries. What was the result of that attitude down through the years of Confederation? The result was, Mr. Speaker, that where the Federal Government should have been living up to its responsibility to provide marine services for the fishermen, wharves, piers, breakwaters and all other necessary facilities for fishermen - On the Labrador Coast they are non-existent almost - they were not built because, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government felt there was no future in the Labrador Fisheries, and that is the sad story about it.

Now, you cannot hang the blame for that on the Provincial Government. The blame for that lies fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government.

To come back to the type of settlement my honourable friend from Labrador North has to deal with, I admit I am no expert on Labrador. I have only been down there five or six times and I have seen some of the settlements, unfortunately, not the ones on the shorelines of my honourable friend from Labrador South. I would like to see these sometime. I have been down as far as Nain, Makkovik and these areas down there but I have not seen the southern shore of Labrador. I look forward to seeing it sometime.

But I have found, by comparison, having seen these settlements at first glance, and I say this without any great experience or any great knowledge, I admit frankly that I have seen on the South Coast of Newfoundland, in settlements which have been inhabited for two hundred years, conditions just as primitive as they are on the Labrador Coast and settlements lacking in the same services; that is on the Island Province of Newfoundland.

You can go, even today, into such places as Francois, McCallum, Rencontre East and as you are flying up to these settlements, look down at some of the ones that have been evacuated, such as Muddy Hole, Pushthrough, Sagona Island and Point Rosie, people lived in these settlements for generations under conditions which are just as bad and sometimes worse, I believe, than existed on the Labrador Coast.

So, his problems, the problems which the honourable gentleman mentioned have not just been related to the Labrador Coast only. The only difference is that these areas are somewhat more remote, somewhat more expensive to get at and somewhat more difficult to service properly. I do not think there could be any government, whether it be Liberal, Conservative or NDP, that in the time since Confederation that we have had and with the money at our disposal, as surely they know for twenty-three years it was thrown around very liberally indeed, that could have literally

upgraded these people to the standards which they deserve. This applies to many places in Newfoundland also.

MR M. MARTIN It is germane to the issue that we clarify this point at this time. Because those communities on the Labrador Coast are so isolated, with so many strikes against it, climatically and otherwise, is the honourable member suggesting that perhaps we should do the same on the Labrador Coast as we have done on the South Coast of Newfoundland and evacuate those communities?

MR. EARLE: No, Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government is that if people wish to remain under these conditions, as and when finances will permit, we will try to get the services to them. I will go on to prove that in a little time. I know it will be of interest to the honourable member for Labrador South. To keep referring to the villages and towns of Labrador, Northwest River, Happy Valley, Goose Bay, Labrador City, Wabush and these other towns and settlements - in many of these places they have facilities and amenities equal or in some cases even better than apply to the Island of Newfoundland and some of the larger towns. Nobody can deny that.

Now, I know that people living in remote areas and under severe winter conditions and so on, feel that they are not getting their share of the good things of this life. In these places the companies involved have certainly gone all out to try to provide all of the amenities which anybody would expect to receive today in any civilized area.

Now, the honourable gentleman from Labrador North sort of pooh-pooched the idea of the Snowden Commission and anything of that sort or made fun of it rather and said, "We are going down there to look at people whose eyes are slanted this way or that way" - and all this sort of thing. I would say to the honourable gentleman that any commission's report - I do not care what it is on - will contain a certain amount of garbage. Now, that is a strong statement but it will

because it seems to me that when intellectuals get at a job quite contrary to anything that we ordinary individuals can understand, there is a certain amount of verbage contained in their reports and a certain amount of research which to the ordinary individual seems to be utter nonsense. It probably is to some extent. These reports are filled up with a lot of stuff at times but the fact that this government is interested enough in the people of Labrador to try to find out just what makes them tick, is not a reflection on this government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: It is not just a reflection on this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member to my right of course knows that the member who has the floor has the right to be heard in silence and I ask him to observe that.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It does show our sincere interest in the people of Labrador and that we are actually trying to find out what has to be done for them, what can be done and the sensible way to approach it.

I refer to another very short, very concise but very useful report that we have already had on a certain section of Labrador and that is the Harnett Kane Report on Goose Bay amalgamation. This has allowed us and permitted us to go ahead and helped us in the amalgamation of Goose Bay, Happy Valley which I think will be a very useful exercise. In fact, I am pleased to know that the honourable member for Labrador North feels that it will be productive. I say that is one step we have taken which will turn out to be a very good thing for the people of that area. Mine you, Mr. Speaker, I know now that this is going to cost the provincial government millions of dollars because to put right that situation down there and to have it operating as a sensible, well run, good serviced community is going to take years and it is going to take an awful, awful lot of money.

We have taken the bit between our teeth. We have taken the first step and we are going to go on with it. Now, I will not talk

too much longer about my honourable friend but as I said yesterday -
I did say that his speech was mainly hot air and I wanted to take
him to task on some of this stuff because at least

it can be said that he is the spokesman for his district in Labrador. He comes into this House and talks about the same sort of thing you see in the press and so on. What on earth are the government doing about not getting on with the Lower Churchill? Why do they not give it to BRINCO? Why do they not get on with the job? Why do people not get work?" And all this sort of thing that shows the shallowest kind of thinking. If the honourable Member for Labrador North would use his head at all, he would be conveying to the people of his district the reason for this.

I state, Mr. Speaker, that it took approximately twelve years to get the Upper Churchill going. Well it took ten to twelve years, I am not sure of the exact number of years, I was there most of the time. In view of the negotiations and what went on, it took approximately that time to get the thing going from start to finish.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: However, whether they were Liberal or they were NDP or whatever they were it took them ten or twelve years to get the thing going.

AN HON. MEMBER: It would take the Liberal Government to give it away though.

MR. EARLE: And what was the result?

MR. PECKFORD: It would only take a day to give it away.

MR. EARLE: What were the results when they did get the Lower Churchill going? The Minister of Finance has revealed the figures, that the deal will cost Newfoundland \$185 million I believe.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: One hundred and eighty-five million dollars! Yet you have the member for the district, who is suppose to be representing the interest of his people, urging us to get on with the job and do it post haste without proper consideration or proper examination in two years or less, regardless of what it would eventually cost the people of Labrador.

"The foundation is laid." But there is a complete new ball game - That is utter rubbish. You are operating today under entirely different

financial conditions in the world, entirely different conditions of the cost of materials and everything else. There is a big job ahead but this government will get the Lower Churchill going. It will be done in such a way that it will react much more to the benefit of the people of Labrador.

MR. NEARY: The river will be dried up.

MR. EARLE: The honourable the Member for Bell Island says that the river will be dried up. I only hope that he is dried up by the time it happens.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will be.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I referred to the Happy Valley/Goose Bay amalgamation. There is no need to say anything further on that except that the question of housing for Labrador was raised. I should like to point out to the honourable member that last year the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation called tenders twice for forty-eight low-income housing units for the Town of Goose Bay, Labrador. Could we get tenders? He did not tender, nobody else tendered. We could not build the houses. What more can we do than to offer to build and ask for tenders and not get them built. I hope this year we will be successful in getting not forty-eight but perhaps one hundred and forty-eight, if we can get the people to build them. Labrador is not the easiest place to get people to build homes.

MR. NEARY: Too late in the year when they called tenders. -----

MR. EARLE: We would be glad to award a tender if the person would state that they would go at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: On the question of housing, anyhow in Labrador there is developing a very, very serious situation in Labrador City and Wabush. The demand for houses in the next five years down there is going to be tremendous. It is estimated that at least 1,000 units are going to be required in that area. I know what I am talking about because unlike the previous government we have gone down and looked into it and made some enquiries as to how we can get at this job and what we

need to do down there. This is what we are planning and trying to get at.

This is not just something that you can do over night. You are talking possibly of construction of 1,000 houses down in that area. Now to begin with you cannot put houses on the lakes or the ponds, you have to have land, so you have to assemble land in the area. Land assembly, strangely enough, in Labrador City and Wabush is quite a problem. The Iron Ore Company in Labrador City is not being tremendously co-operative because their land is sitting right on top of the iron mines. They are not too anxious to let any of it go for housing development. They have room down there now for I think it is 250 serviced lots in Labrador City but we cannot get it. We may have to put some pressure on.

We are told that in Labrador City

we have to go eight miles down the road to get land to build houses.

Now we are going to resist that. I do not think it is going to be terribly convenient for the people of Labrador City and Wabush to go eight miles down the road for their homes. This is why I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we must look into these things properly, understand what we are doing and try to do the job that will best suit the people.

If we are criticized for delays in not getting on with the job, the reason in Labrador as elsewhere is that we are trying to do a proper job which will cost the Newfoundland people the least possible money.

For the moment, Mr. Speaker, this whole debate is in the resolution which condemns the failures of this government and what we have not done. I would just like to refer for a moment to my own District of Fortune Bay because this is a small example of the comparison of what this government has done as compared with the previous government. Now I was member for Fortune Bay in the Liberal Government and I knew how hard it was to get things done in Fortune Bay and on the south coast. I struggled and fought for every inch of road that we got down there. I did not succeed too much because you know why, the answer was that everybody on the south coast always voted Liberal anyhow, there was no need to pay much attention to those people, they were going to vote Liberal anyhow, therefore there was not a great deal of Liberal money spent in that area.

Since I joined the P.C. Party and been a member of the P.C. Government for the past two years.

MR. NEARY: Traitor.

MR. EARLE: If the honourable member who puts in the word traitor had only had the courage to do what he really believed in, he would be over here too. However, he did not have the courage.

MR. NEARY: We will be over there the next time.

MR. EARLE: He did not have the courage, that is all there is about it. He blows a lot, he talks a lot but he has no real courage, it is all hot air, there is no courage. After all, Mr. Speaker, I only followed

the pattern, Mr. Speaker, of such well known people as Winston Churchill and others. There is nothing like boasting a little bit. You might compare yourself with Winston Churchill, so this is good stuff. However, these interruptions by my honourable friend for Bell Island rather put my mind off the track.

MR. NEARY: I am going to leave now.

MR. EARLE: Good! Great! At least I am going to be able to speak without interruptions, Thank you!

Coming back to Fortune Bay District; I have not made an accurate financial calculation but I would say that on road work alone in Fortune Bay District, in the past two years since this government came into power, that we have spent more money in two years than was spent in any five years under the Liberal Government. For instance in Bay L'Argent there is a terribly dangerous hill, we spent \$500,000 to get around that; we since spent another \$500,000 to extend that road.

We have several good medical clinics down there which we did not have before. The people in Terrenceville for instance had been promised a medical clinic and they were saying they even collected money for it and when they saw that the Liberal Government was not going to give it to them, they gave the money back to the people and when I went out in the election, in October of 1971, I used this, I said, you did not get your clinic but you will get it if I am re-elected. Unfortunately, or I suppose some people might think fortunately, in that election I was defeated in Terrenceville, not by a medical clinic but by a television antenna. That is a rather interesting story by the way because the Liberals at the time knew that a television antenna was really the most - one of the things which the people wanted most so that they could get good television reception in Terrenceville. They were smart enough politicians to catch onto it so they went, although it is a federal responsibility or a municipal responsibility, they went ahead and started building television antennas. So they built a television antenna and everybody voted for it. They did not vote for Val Earle

they voted for the television antenna.

However, when I got in this government I was curious to know where the money came from for the television antenna because I knew there was nothing in government votes for television antennas and I was wondering where it came from, so I had it looked into and it happened to come under the Department of Municipal Affairs, no at that time, I am sorry, it came under the Department of Community and Social Development. You know, that television antenna in Terrenceville was paid for out of a vote to dig artesian wells. How on earth could you take money from an artesian well and build a television antenna?

MR. MORGAN: It was going up instead of down.

MR. EARLE: However, that is the sort of thing we will talk about in expenditures on elections which will come at a later date. I am delighted that I got rid of all but the three sensible members on the other side.

Now in Fortune Bay District we have got a new clinic at Terrenceville and an excellent little one there; the people are delighted. We have a recreation centre in Garnish which will be finished, hopefully, this year, if we can get some more grants for them. The roads in these

towns and villages have been fixed up considerably and there will be another programme to continue this. On the west side of the bay, in Belleoram, there is a little fish plant started over there. We had to struggle for years to get this but we are gradually getting it off the ground and tenders have been called for it.

The school system is upgrading down there and there is a tender called for a new high school at Jack Fountain which is near Bay L'Argent. This will serve the people of that whole area. I am not bluffing when I say that the money that this government have spent and permitted others to spend in the area is at least four to five times what was spent under the Liberals. Then we are accused of doing nothing.

My district is only a pattern of what is taking place in so many other districts in Newfoundland. Incidentally, he has gone out but I should have at the opening of my remarks welcomed the new member for Hermitage. I do so quite sincerely. I think he is on the wrong side, because he is a fairly brilliant fellow. I welcome him to the House of Assembly and I know that he will make quite a contribution to it. I welcome him particularly because his district is next to mine and we share mutual problems. I think perhaps the people of Hermitage District have one more problem than I have, they have the honourable member for their member; but that cannot be helped.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: That remains to be seen. Time will tell. However, in Hermitage District we did, and we were accused of playing politics of the worse sort, honour the commitments of the previous P.C. Member during the Hermitage election.

The honourable former member before that, who was a Liberal, who I am delighted to see in the spectators' gallery, he struggled for years and years and years as a Liberal and a very faithful Liberal to get things done in Hermitage District. What

did he get? He got less than I got in Fortune Bay District. Just another example of the way that coast was treated under the former Liberal Government.

The Liberals today are of the same ilk and kin and the same thing will happen. However, perhaps the honourable member for Hermitage now may be able to at least get credit for changing all of that, because this government is not vindictive. This government is going to treat the people of Newfoundland fairly.

There are things going forward in Hermitage District this year which were not completed last year and I hope he gets some credit for it. It is also hoped that he can persuade his new found friends up there in the Conne River Area to not stop this park which we are trying to give the people in that area. I think it will be a great recreational facility for them. If he do not want it or if his people in Hermitage do not want it, I should be delighted to move it another twenty or twenty-five miles down into my district. Our people would welcome it and there would be no protests nor no anything else. This to my mind is an absolute shame and it is a lot of nonsense. Frankly, I would like to see that park go ahead and provide the people with the facility.

I will not stay much longer on that part of the country. I have a lot more to say but I would just like to point out that in Harbour Breton, where they suffered a most unfortunate landslide and disaster, where people lost their lives last year, this government rushed to the assistance of these people, got them into new homes and provided them with the best shelter we could under the circumstances, cleaned up the mess and got the thing tidied up. There are still a few odd jobs to done down there and again, as I said, we have a member on the other side as member for that district, but this is going to be done. We have authorized to finish off that job and to clean up the Harbour Breton disaster and see that

the people are properly looked after. This is going to be done.

I am sorry that I frightened away my honourable member for Bell Island because I just wanted to spend a few moments referring to his remarks. I think the other day that even the Speaker may have been inclined to think that I had fallen asleep. Mr. Speaker, I would never, never insult this House by falling asleep in it but it is very difficult. The remarks of the honourable member for Bell Island were so monotonous and so repetitious that one has to close one's eyes and try to close one's ears so that one does not take in all this old garbage that is going on year after year after year. His tactics and his way of addressing this House go back into the ancient rounds of history. The tactic he uses, it goes back to the times of the Romans. "The Plebeians versus the Patricians." Anybody who went to school knows what that was all about. "The higher class versus the lower class." Come on a little further in history; "The Lords versus the commoners." Come on in history to the American situation; "Wall Street versus the Bowery." Now we come on to the local scene and you get the professional worker against the ordinary man. Then lastly he started to pick on the university; these intellectual élite are going to be our downfall.

This sort of tactic was used by the previous leader of the Liberal Party for probably twenty-three years. What did it do? What did it accomplish? All it did was create class mistrust, class hatred and accomplished absolutely nothing. It is as old as the dawn of history. It is the oldest political tactic known to man and it is the most unsavoury. All it does is try to turn one section of people against another.

If we are to accomplish anything in Newfoundland, in this province of ours, it is a case of all classes of people, wherever they are placed in their status of life, to work together. The less of this stirred up strife that we can have and the less of ill-feeling the better for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I would hope that the honourable gentleman would get off that tactic. He has the intelligence to get off it and if he would only say something constructive this side of the House would feel a little bit happier toward him. It is amusing, not harmless buffoonery but it is buffoonery. We are not paid, we are not being paid by the public of Newfoundland to come into this House and act as clowns. We have come into this House at the will of the people, hopefully, to try to discuss something intelligently and in an intelligent way, so that we can convince the people that they were not wrong in putting us here and that we are worth the pay cheques that we get.

Mr. honourable friend on the other side, I find him sometimes amusing and sometimes annoying but what I really do find annoying is the intellectual people on the other side who use all the tricks of the trade. They are clever, they are extremely clever to block procedure by their great knowledge of parliamentary affairs and to be completely void of progressive thoughts. Where they have the intellect and ability really to contribute to the arguments of this House, all they do is oppose. It is the job of an opposition to oppose

but it is the job of an opposition to oppose with constructive ideas and not destructive ideas.

This brings me to one very sore point with me at the present time. It is one of the more dastardly, disgraceful political tricks that I have seen in the twelve years which I have been in the House of Assembly. Now, this was brought on, perpetrated by the honourable member for White Bay South on the other side. I refer to the letter which he sent to every council in Newfoundland, literally saying - I am just abbreviating the words - but, "the government has announced it has \$100 million to spend. So, come and get it, boys!" Now, if that letter had been written by say the honourable member for Bonavista North or even by the newest member from Hermitage, I would have shrugged it off and said, "Well, they have not the knowledge of what goes on, so, you can excuse them for that sort of tactic." But this gentleman, who worked for years with the Department of Community and Social Development as its minister, worked closely with DREE and knows what the complications of working with DREE were and how we had to cross every 't' and dot every 'i' and try to get every individual contract straightened out. For him to come across with this sort of inane statement to councils, trying to play on their simplicity, it is an insult to councils. Trying to play on their simplicity, that they would believe that all they had to do was come in here because we said that under a general agreement - this was stressed - that under a general agreement the Federal Government hopes to make \$100 million available to this province but subject to certain criteria.

The Federal Government put in this criteria. They say that settlements that want water and sewerage and so on have to be able to qualify under their criteria. Their criteria is that you are able to create employment in these places, that you have a growing community, that you can see a thrust forward and that it is worth putting this money in so that a community can grow. What in the name of Sam Hill is the sense of writing to some little village down somewhere which

has at the present time no great prospect of any great industry or advance, and saying, "Come on, boys! You can take advantage of this \$100 million." If we sent that off to Ottawa, they would laugh in our faces.

These villages and these places will be helped and helped on water and sewer systems and everything else in the way of public services, under what money this provincial government can find to spend on them. Very few of them will qualify under the restrictions laid down under the DREE agreement. They are being very, very stern in their requirements under this agreement and they do not seem to be inclined to help us out in the servicing of communities and bringing people up to standards where they should be.

Well, fortunately not all councils believe this. The larger councils who have had direct dealings with DREE, they know that that is not the way it works. They have said to me that we sympathize with you. Furthermore it is doubly dastardly because it puts good councils and good men in a really bad spot. You have councillors serving without pay and under lots of criticism, good serious men who are trying to do an honest job, and this sort of letter goes out, becomes known to everybody in the community and the pressure is on those councillors. "Why can we not have a water and sewer system? Why can we not have our roads paved? Why can we not do this? You are the fellows to blame, we elected you. Go into St. John's and see the minister. Get it! Get it! Get it! They know, because they have the experience in working on these DREE agreements, that they cannot get it and they are the goat for the stupid kind of letter that a member of the opposition writes to their people.

If this is politics, heaven forbid that I am part of them! This is not politics. This is downright dastardly, disgraceful treatment of our Newfoundland people.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to compound the evil, I understand that in spite of all that has been said in this House to point this

out that another letter has gone out to all councils from the same source which even makes the situation that much worse. In heavens name! will they ever learn to play fairly or are they just in this House for the sake of raw politics? We can all play politics but we will play them fairly, not this kind of a way.

Now, the resolution asked, what has this government done? I think they are trying to give the impression to the public that we are just sitting behind our desks day after day looking at plans and reports and so on and not doing a confounded thing. Well, any sort of planning that is worth-while takes time. It takes deep search and deep study and proper research. This government for the past two years has been working through various task forces. To explain what a task force is: It is a group of provincial officials working with federal officials on a particular provincial problem. We have a combination of the federal officials of the highest order and the provincial officials of the highest standing working on the problems of Newfoundland. These people have been working for months and months to come up with task force reports on every aspect of life and activity in the Province of Newfoundland. They have come up with jolly good reports, excellent reports which contain a lot of useful information and a lot of useful advise as to what has to be done for Newfoundland.

Some of them are not quite finished yet and some of them have not reached the final stage of presentation but we had the evidence of one the other day on the forestry report. In spite of all the criticism of the forestry report, that is the most progressive report on the forest industries of Newfoundland. In fact, it is the only real one that has ever been brought into the House of Assembly for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland. That report will revolutionize the forest industry of Newfoundland, and will give us sustaining and lasting industry in the province, something which we could not count on before now. That means, Mr. Speaker, the

livelihood of thousands upon thousands of present people and people yet unborn.

Yet that report is decried as being something less than useful. For goodness sake, when are we going to get some sense and look at our industries and what has to be done with them in a proper light!

Some evidence of the sort of things that the task forces are doing is also being done pertaining to education. This has by no means come out yet but just straws in the wind if you would like to call them that. The honourable minister made his announcement a few days ago about the student teacher ratio which is a progressive step. You can criticize it all you like. You can get reports from the N.T.A or anything else and you can go on criticizing. Anybody can criticize anything. The facts of the matter are that in the next three years it will produce, what is it, another 625 teachers and about \$6 million additional expenditure on education. What is do nothing about that? What is there in that item alone that is not progress? This is just one straw in the wind

in education. There will be many, many others to follow resulting from the Task Force Report on that particular aspect of our lives.

Tourist services have been strengthened and enlarged to try to cope with what we hope will be a massive influx of tourists. Perhaps, under the energy crisis, we may find that the tourist industry will suffer some setbacks but I do not think it will. I think that the people from North America who can no longer get enough gas to drive around in their cars and so on, many of them will come here for a holiday. In fact it might well be that the energy crisis would be a great benefit to the tourist industry in Newfoundland. I do not know, I am not too cognizant of the tourist industry but I think it may react in our favour.

The current expenditure on fisheries is away above anything it has been in the past - millions of dollars. It will be even more millions of dollars. You cannot spend millions of dollars on an industry on the fisheries without doing something. We are not going to pour it out in the harbour or throw it overboard, we are going to try to do something with it. That is activity in the fisheries.

My colleague, the Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources has a good mineral development plan. That is as a result of his task force studies. He will be coming up with mineral plans, mineral development in a sensibly, orderly manner. That will mean more jobs, more industry and more activity for the province.

Mr. Speaker, labour legislation is improving under our guidance. The minimum wage has been spoken of before but it has gone up from \$1.10 to \$1.80 and it is going up to \$2.20 and \$2.50. Is that not doing anything? Is that just sitting back and letting things stay as they are? Is this an inactive government that is not doing anything? That means actual cash in the pockets of a lot of people who need it and that is the sort of thing which this government are doing.

Now there is the tax off fuel oil, off the present high cost of fuel oil. That in itself is a nice little help to people. It is not as much as we would like to do but it is a help. That is a progressive step. Even down to a little thing like spreading the labour on highroads' work, I refer to my own district: Last year the size of the work gangs was doubled on most of the units that do highroads' work. This cut out a lot of overtime but it gave a lot of extra labour to a lot of additional people. In many of these places, many of the people who work on the highroads or many that would like to work on the highroads are very, very happy to be able to get a job. Last year many more of them did get jobs.

Mr. Speaker, to get a bit more personal: Perhaps my department, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, may be subject to some criticism from the opposition: So, what do I do to earn my pay cheque? I suppose I come in fairly late in the mornings and read the paper, sit down, chat with a few people, answer a few phone calls and reports, do nothing else and go home and get my lunch. That is generally, I suppose, the impression that would like to be conveyed.

The Department of Municipal Affairs, as the former minister, my colleague on my right, well knows, he was nearly driven into a state of a breakdown in this House, I think because of the problems that are represented and brought to that department by all the communities, all the incorporated communities all over the island. There is not a week goes by or not a day of those weeks that I do not have one or two or three delegations coming in from all over the country seeking water and sewer, road paving, this, that and the other thing. You name it, they want it. They come from all parts of the country. Okay, that is part of the job! I have no objection to it. I think I am able to inform the people really what they can or cannot expect. What have we done in the department apart from seeing a lot of people and talking to a lot of people and getting down

to things? Really, what are the bread and butter issues that needed to be done in the department and how are they progressing?

Well, Mr. Speaker, to begin with there is a huge study going forward here now and it has reached a further stage than a study actually. It is going to have public hearings starting very shortly on the whole St. John's Urban Area. People who live comfortably in St. John's - after all this is where about one-third of the population is, in this immediate urban area. When I speak of the urban area, I just do not speak of the City of St. John's, I mean out to Holyrood, down to Witless Bay, Bay Bulls, on up to Torbay, Pouch Cove, Portugal Cove, all of these areas. All these areas are included in the study. The future lives of these people, their amenities and their comforts depend to a great extent on what we do with that St. John's Urban Study. I have an excellent commission, under Mr. Alec Henley, now about to commence hearings on this. I would urge on the public, all of those who are interested in the conditions of where they live in this area to try to attend some of these hearings and to try to bring up good ideas. We want to listen to the people. We want to get the advice of the people as to what is the best thing to do in this area. There are some tremendous problems facing us in the St. John's Area and right out as far as Holyrood and down the Southern Shore and all that area.

Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I do not think many people realized until I made an announcement a couple of months ago that if we did not do something immediately about a new source of water supply for the City of St. John's, by the end of 1975 there would be a water shortage in this area. Now nobody misses the water until the well runs dry. If we permitted the water of St. John's to run dry or to become short, then there would be some real hollers. What do we do about it? We do not sit back and do nothing as our friends in the opposition say. We have this very

deliberate and very voluminous report on the whole situation in this area. It is an excellent report by Proctor and Redfern and others. It tells us what needs to be done. We start to implement it. We immediately get the pre-engineering study done on the actual main route of the water supply from Bay Bulls Big Pond into St. John's. That is a tremendous main and a tremendous new source of supply. It will have pumping stations and everything else that is involved, not only to carry the water into St. John's but to be able to supply water to all of the Southern Shore of Conception Bay and to all these other places I have named in the area, many of which are now crying for water and sewer facilities. The study of that alone is costing this government this year, at the present time, \$620,000. The first stage of implementing that study will be \$19 million. It will cost \$19 million. Here is one of the projects which we hope to be able to sell to DREE. We are hoping and depending on DREE that they will be able to find that \$19 million for us.

Mr. Speaker, now you cannot have water without having sewerage. Now what is the sewerage situation around St. John's and in this immediate area? Ask anybody who lives on the South Shore of Conception Bay what the sewerage situation is out there. Their wells are becoming polluted. They are living in daily fear that the next day their well water will not be fit to drink.

All of them that live in that area out there have worries and real worries and they wondering what this Government is doing about it.

The sewerage disposal study is just about ready. I checked this afternoon. This will be coming in very shortly and that again is a massive project. St. John's has been pumping raw sewerage into the harbour for generations. It has to stop. This whole mess from here and all around the immediate area has to be cleaned up. What do you clean it up with? You do not go out with shovels and brooms and everything, you spend money and you spend a tremendous amount of money. Where the water things cost \$19 million, I venture to bet that the sewerage disposal system will cost another \$19 million in the early stages.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: ... DREE pays ... (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Okay, but this is fine! DREE will pay for it, the great Liberal Government will pay for it but who has to do the studies and who has to present it in a such a way that DREE will pay for it? The former Liberal Government did not do it. They sat on their (I will not use the term. It is unparliamentary), they sat where they sit and waited for things to happen. Things are happening all right and they are happening very fast and if we do not do something about it and get on with this job as we are doing now, we will be the ones, I suppose, that will hold the blame, but this goes back a long time before we took office.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You had better hurry up (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Okay, let us get on to land speculating! I thank the honourable gentleman. He is so good at giving me ideas. He is such an excellent person at giving me ideas. I love this, land speculation. I ask anybody within hearing distance of what I am saying, that when the snow is off the ground, when weather conditions clean up, to take the trouble to get into their car and go out and look at what is called Mount Pearl, Newtown, and ask somebody out there, somebody in the Newfoundland

and Labrador Housing Corporation, what is going on, what is planned to be done, what all this happening out there, what that means? We have at present two hundred building lots to offer for sale out there. We will have, hopefully, another thousand in the coming year of building lots. We will have a commercial centre ready for people to set up shops, schools, churches, what have you. There is a really massive development going out in that area and when you talk about land speculators around this area of St. John's leading out as far as Topsail, they are getting as high as \$10,000 for a building lot, and some, I believe, are going even to \$12,000. So, the government is not doing anything about it, eh? The Government developed that section out there, this new town and its first action when it put these first two hundred lots on the market was to deliberately cut the cost of a lot by \$1,000. There are lots for multiple housing out there as low as \$3,300 a lot and there are lots out there for the more expensive houses up to \$8,800 a lot.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Because, as one builder in St. John's said, and this I think is a great revelation, when that announcement was made a local builder said that at last there seems to be sufficient land for building available around St. John's. Now who did that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Foolishness.

MR. EARLE: Okay, foolishness. There are other private developers. We are not like the honourable red member over there who is trying to dispose of private industry and kick them all out. There are private developers out there at the same time who have been quite successful in developing building lots but they are not underselling the Government, the Government is underselling them. The Government is trying to bring down the price of land.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about Chester Dawe who is crucifying the people who want to buy his building lots?

MR. EARLE: I have no more control over Chester Dawe than the honourable member has. He is a private industry and so far, thank heavens -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member from Bell Island persists on interrupting and then has the usual apology but that type of thing will not be tolerated to any great extent. I ask the honourable member to refrain from his habitual interruptions.

MR. NEARY: My honourable apology.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, do not interrupt him too much, he gives me ideas. I find a section to go on with. However -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How can he do that when he does not know himself?

MR. EARLE: Well, he does not have ideas but he has the seed of an idea so I can develop it, you see.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Anyhow, come on! What have we done around this area? We are practically getting to the stage that we are rapidly cleaning up the former mess of Shea Heights up there. There is quite a bit to be done yet but we are progressing rapidly in the cleaning up of the Shea Heights area up there. Recently the people have obtained ownership of their land. There is not a day goes by that I do not sign two or three conveyances and we are gradually getting this situation up there cleaned up. That was another ghastly mess that was created by the former Government. It was full of intrigue. If the story were ever properly told about what happened in Shea Heights and how that was constructed and so on, it would be a best seller. It really would be a dramatic best seller. But anyhow -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: He was the Minister of Municipal Affairs you might say and he did have the courage, strange enough, to leave that government. The last three years of that Government were the worst.

However, Mundy Pond, the Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Scheme is going ahead this year. Fortunately, we have been able to take advantage of the new neighbourhood improvement programme and it will give us funds to complete Mundy Pond and the Shea Heights and the Corner Brook West

Urban Renewal Scheme. Now, immediately you mention these three larger centres, the smaller places in Newfoundland say, "What about us?" Rightly so and under these somewhat grandiose schemes that the Federal Government have announced, rather complicated schemes actually, people do not understand what has to be done to avail of them. It is another tactic in politics where a government makes an announcement and everybody gets the impression that all they have to do is run and get the money, but this is not so.

Under this Neighbourhood Improvement Scheme, our Government, in conjunction with the town councils, has to designate areas that can get into this scheme and the reason that Mundy Pond, Shea Heights and Corner Brook West were designated as the first step in this scheme was that these schemes have no more money left from the previous commitments to finish them and the Federal Government said that we will not put any more money into finishing these particular schemes. We could not leave them as they were. They had been started by the previous government and they had been left in a mess, so we had to tidy them up. Therefore, we said, "All right, we will accept the first installment, if you would like to call it that, from LIP to complete these areas at least. These are areas which badly needed attention and we will do it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: At the same time, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they were only going to give us a limited amount of money, just enough to do that. We fought hard. We got the thing up from \$2.3 million to \$4 million which will allow us, it is not much, it is true, but it will give us another million dollars to spend in other areas:

Now, then, my problem is going to be a really tough one. It is to know where we should spend that extra million dollars this year because everybody wants it. I could spend \$25 million or \$30 million without the slightest trouble at all. I do not know where I am going to be able to put a million dollars because here again every council in the Province wants its share of it.

March 1, 1974.

Tape 546

RH - 5

It is just as well to say so in this House, Sir, there is not a share for everyone. It is not possible. The money is not there.

I referred to the Corner Brook Urban

Renewal Scheme. I do not know how many members of the House are familiar with that but that urban development scheme on the west side of Corner Brook was built in very, very difficult terrain up the side of a hill where you could not get an oil truck or anything else. There have been a lot of complaints out there because the roads were reshaped and all the rest of it, and some of the people were down here and some where up there, and all this sort of thing. We are gradually getting that straightened out. It is going to be a much more desirable area. As a matter of fact, the value of the property has skyrocketed there because the people see that eventually that will be a very, very nice area to live and we are tidying it all up and getting it in shape. That hopefully, with the money we have available, will be finished this year.

I refer briefly to the amalgamation of Harmon and Stephenville, these rapidly growing towns on the West Coast. I announced yesterday that the election of a new council will take place on the 28th. of May. It has been a long and painful story because feelings ran rather high out there on this particular issue. I had to go out and see various groups a number of times but fortunately we were able to get everybody to see the sense of the thing. It is a matter of simply strength and growth where if they would get together it will be a much better town.

Now we have convinced them that is to their own advantage, they are going ahead with the amalgamation with Stephenville and Harmon. That I predict will be a very fast-growing town and a very creditable town to Newfoundland before many years. The Arts and Culture Centre is out there and there are numerous clubs. The government have turned over some very desirable former American premises to people like the Kinsmen, the Legionaries and they are putting in excellent facilities over there. Stephenville is going to be a very nice and a very desirable town.

AN HON. MEMBER: ... Mr. Smallwood.

MR. EARLE: I was out there to Stephenville with Mr. Smallwood, do not tell me about that.

One big problem, of course, in building houses is to try and look ahead in the future and to provide the necessary serviced land for these developments. Land has become exorbitantly expensive. There has been far too much speculation on land because it is all based on the demand. The government are trying to accumulate land to take care of this situation in the coming years. For instance, we anticipate, we are told by the best authorities that in the St. John's Area the population during the next twenty years will grow by 65,000 people.

Well we are planning and we are working and we have accumulated quite a lot of land and we will accumulate more so that 65,000 people can be accommodated on decent building lots. Anyone with their eyes open at all has only to go around in the environs of St. John's and see what the St. John's Housing Corporation have done and what the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation have done, to know that we are busy accumulating this land and getting ready and trying to keep up with the projection of expansion of population in this area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk count the House please? Twelve. Would the Clerk count again, I think some more members should come in. There is a quorum.

MR. EARLE: It was a little breather for me, unfortunately it could not cure my cold, I am a bit hoarse but it did give me a little rest.

I was on the subject of housing and land assembly. On the subject of housing, it has been generally felt by the public I think and there has been a lot of adverse criticism that we are not doing much about housing. It is rather interesting when you look at the actual figures. I will just run through the last few years, most of which actually were Liberal Government years. In 1966 there were 2,144 housing starts in Newfoundland; in 1967 there were 2,700 ; in 1968, 2,900; anyhow it comes on up until

1972-1973, we did 3,901 houses in 1972 and 4,400 houses in 1973. That is a total of housing starts in the last two years of just over 8,300 houses. Newfoundland is going ahead, in the St. John's Area the total went from 1966 from 1,023 houses up to last year 1,700 houses.

How did we get on with accumulating land for houses? Well this just does not apply to St. John's because we are accumulating land all over the province. We have 3,152 acres of land under our control now. Land presently being acquired is 465 acres, which is a total of 3,600 acres at the present time. We plan to acquire another 2,400 acres in this coming year.

I better stop here, Mr. Speaker, because if I am not careful

I will be divulging my whole housing scheme for the coming year which is rather a good one and I do not want to steal my own thunder by announcing it prematurely.

I think it was the honourable member for Bonavista North who got into the question of outport water and sewer systems. His district, so he said, had I think ten incorporated communities or at least ten water and sewer systems installed which I think he gave the Liberals credit for and he said there were fifteen others which needed to be done in that area.

Well from the number of petitions that are brought into this House from time to time requesting water and sewer systems, you would think that nobody had ever spoken to my department or to me about the need for water and sewer systems. We have them in all the time. I think it is one of the things which are most on people's minds, to get a good, modern water and sewer system or in some cases even a supply of drinkable water. So we are very familiar with what is needed around the country.

In fact the usual technique is for a delegation to come in to see me and the first thing they produce is certificates from the Department of Health saying that the water in their community has to be boiled, it is not fit to drink. "Well now Mr. Earle," they use their own words generally, "in this day and age have we got to put up with this?" This is happening all over, in many, many places in Newfoundland.

But to come back to Bonavista North for a time where the honourable gentleman made quite a noise about it: There has been spent in his particular district on water and sewer systems, which compares more than favourably with most districts in Newfoundland, a total of \$5,616,000 and we have requests in at the present time for additions to these systems, extensions to these systems -

MR. NEARY: Over what period is that now?

MR. EARLE: This is over the past twelve years.

MR. NEARY: The Liberal days.

MR. EARLE: Not all of them, some of them were and some of them were not.

MR. EARLE: We have requests at the present time for extensions which will total another \$331,000. No, I am sorry, that is not correct. We have requests for extensions which will cost \$2,535,000. At the present time all these water and sewer systems in his district, not all of which were put in economically or sensibly or in places where people had any hope of being able to contribute towards the payment of them, in some cases the water rate was as low as \$2 per month.

This government every year pays out in subsidy to that particular district \$331,000 in subsidy. If we could meet the request which we have at present from that particular district we would need another \$300,000 a year in subsidy. That is a total of \$631,000 to meet subsidy only on water systems in that district. Now that is on the present ones which want extension but on top of that, I cannot find the fifteen communities which the honourable member says want water and sewerage. There are five of them, five of them from which we have had requests and these five alone, some of which are very small, would cost \$3,040,000 to install. That is just a ballpark estimate because today the way prices are going up, that \$3 million could very well be \$4 million before the system was built.

This would mean an additional subsidy on these systems every year for the next forty years of another \$265,000. So what is it? Forty districts in Newfoundland. There is a total there, if we could do what was necessary in that district on top of what has already been done, of an annual subsidy of about \$1 million. It is costing the province \$1 million for the next forty years, \$40 million, just to keep that going, in one district alone.

Now this will give people who talk glibly about water and sewer systems some idea of the extent of the problem which we face. I estimate that in order to give the people of Newfoundland the water and sewer systems which they should have and which we would like to give them, it would cost us between \$250 million and \$300 million and

I would not hazard to guess what the subsidy on that would be over the period of forty years, but that is what it would cost, \$250 million to \$300 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as much as any government, Liberal P.C. or N.D.P. or what it is, would like to do on that one public service alone, there is no hope in this world that we can spend that kind of money. The Newfoundland budget could not stand it, on top of which, unfortunately, and I say this, unfortunately, that in many of these places that are asking for water and sewer system, they have no real base of taxation to help pay for them. There are no industries in the place. There is no real basis for taxation at all so it will have to be by the government more or less an outright gift to be paid for out of government funds over a period of years.

Well perhaps the Liberal Government did not look at that and they were prepared to do it. But we have to have some financial sanity in this province if we are going to try to survive. The fact is if many of these systems that are now installed and very poorly installed and very poorly engineered and very extravagantly installed had been properly done, we might be able to put in a lot more systems out of the money that would have been saved.

What we are trying to do now, Mr. Speaker, is to give some sensible approach to the need of water and sewer systems in the various communities based on the number of factors. First of all the size of the community, the number of people there, the conditions in the community, the community's hope and ability to be able to contribute something towards paying for them.

In other words, try to work out some sensible criteria on which if a delegation comes in to me to say, "Mr. Earle, we want a water and sewer system. We are going to sit in your office until we get it."

I should be able to say to these people; "Look, on this list are the needs to meet the payments for water systems and what we can do for you," that you are not first on the list you are not second on the list that you are probably in the third group. because of the size of your community and the actual needs.

This is not just saying that you are going to turn people down. While we are doing this we are also looking into the means and methods of installing and developing cheaper water and sewer systems. There is not much point in going into a small village, that has been done unfortunately, putting in a full scale water and sewer system with fire hydrants and everything else when the people do not have a hope in the world of ever being able to pay for it. I think where people need water, good drinking water and they need an adequate sewer system, that we can give them something will meet their needs for a lot less than we have been doing in the past.

This is where the studies are going on at present to try to do something of this sort so that we can spread the dollars further, and that we can do more systems. We do not want any more Hawkes Bays or some of these other places that have run into terrific problems this year. We want to have properly designed and properly costed water and sewer systems.

As a matter of fact, down on the Northwest Coast, and this will apply to Labrador also, we have a report and we are presently doing examinations on means and methods of putting in systems which will not be subject to deep frost penetrations. A lot of these systems which were installed in the past are of virtually no use in the winter because they freeze up. We are trying to develop systems that we can put in Labrador and elsewhere that will be able to carry the water and carry off the sewage at all times. It is just part of our effort, Mr. Speaker.

Then, of course, we are a do-nothing government. We are

not planning anything, we are not doing anything, we are just sitting down, not even using our heads at all. We have no brains so, I suppose, we cannot hope to cope with any of this sort of stuff.

Unfortunately I do not like to dwell on the past because I was a part of it. We did not use our heads as much as we should. We learned that from experience and I hope that this government will benefit from that experience. I hope that we will be able to devise ways and means whereby the people's money and after all it is the people's money, will be spent more economically and be put to better use.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to interrupt the honourable minister to advise him that he has five minutes left.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was about to finish anyhow.

As I have dwelt on my own department for a long time, I think that there is a lot more that needs to be said but I cannot say it this afternoon. Just to show that we are not sitting on our haunches and doing nothing particularly in Municipal Affairs and Housing I will have more to say on housing later on.

In this whole province in which we live there is more to life than just water and sewer systems. There is education and health of course which are top priority items. The people's health is of a prime consideration. Their education, if they are to get anywhere in life, is also a top essential. The education budget is skyrocketing beyond all realization.

On top of that, I think as the Scripture says; "People do not live by bread alone." They certainly do not live by water and sewer systems alone. They live with a certain amount of recreation, fun, entertainment and enjoy their lives where they are. This government are getting badly criticized for what they plan to do in that field. The percentage of our budget which will be spent on trying to bring some of the lighter things and some of the more - the nicer things, if you like to call them that, to the

people so that they can enjoy them, it will be a very small percentage of the total budget indeed but there is a percentage there for it. There has to be a way of life in Newfoundland if we are to live in this province so that we cannot only strive to enjoy the ordinary amenities such as water and sewerage but that we can also enjoy our social lives, our recreation and our fun. Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage:

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say what an honour it is to stand in this honourable House and to represent some of the people of rural Newfoundland and in particular the people of the District of Hermitage.

I would like to thank the several honourable gentlemen who have spoken before me and who have extended to me their warm words of welcome, some of them at times a little barbed but that is par for the course as I am learning fairly quickly here. I find myself not completely among strangers, of course. As I look in other parts of the House I see, although not at the present time, a very good friend of mine over the years in the person of the member for Green Bay. Although we happen to be waving different political banners right now, if I know him to the degree I think I do, I believe we share many concerns in common with people about rural Newfoundland.

I am delighted also to be in the company of the present Minister of Justice. He and I shared a battlefield at one time and I am sure we have different versions of the result of that battle. There are others I could mention, Mr. Speaker, certainly you yourself, Sir, and the other members who like I come from the rather honourable profession of education. It is good to be among company like that. It is good to note that the education profession is becoming increasingly well represented in this honourable House, a departure from the past. It is good to note also that rural Newfoundland is much better represented than it has been on

past occasions. When I say rural Newfoundland I am cognizant of the fact that we have always had men from districts all over the province but very often they were not men who were themselves resident in rural Newfoundland by and large. That is part of the twenty-fifty anniversary celebrations, I believe starting prematurely.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nothing in it, but see, I broke your glass.

MR. SIMMONS: Time will take care of that I am sure. So, this is worth noting and encouraging to note, Mr. Speaker, that both education and rural Newfoundland are so well represented here. I delight in being a part of each and both.

I would like to say also that I am delighted to be here as a Liberal, not as any kind of hyphenated Liberal, not a Smallwood-Liberal, not a reform-Liberal or the various other kinds we have had over the years. Those who know me will be sure to relate my involvement to the period of 1969 and since, when men like the present Minister of Finance, the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, the present Minister of Justice among others stood up for something in which we believed. Each manifested our belief in several ways and in different actions. As a resulting part of that activity at that time, I find myself standing here as a Liberal without hyphens.

In the first speech I would like very much to address myself at some length to the needs of the district but because of course we are addressing ourselves to the amendment at the moment, I shall refrain in large measure from doing so and shall reserve those comments for some time subsequent when I come to participate in the address on the main motion. I will of course in the course of my remarks today be making reference to the district but I give notice that I will be spending some more time and elaborating in some detail when I speak later in the debate.

It is a delight to follow the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have rarely seen a man so concerned with the member for Bell Island.

I have rarely seen a man who could do such a complete flip, could justify eight years of one type of activity, two years of another type of activity in his words, feel proud about both and yet condemn the first date. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if ever there were a modern soul going evangelistically and full speed backwards, this is he.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Full speed backwards. He does some things full speed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, reflecting upon the Minister of Municipal Affairs' annoyed concern in the last hour or so for what the member for Bell Island was allegedly doing to him, I am sure he will not stoop to copy although he is off to a bad start. He did express concern for the way the member for Labrador North was representing his district. Mr. Speaker, let me say, thank God the Minister of Municipal Affairs is concerned about some district. Every time I went on open line during the election in connection with the Hermitage by-election, half my callers from Fortune Bay asked me if I had seen the member for Fortune Bay. So, let us not hear this nonsense about how they have been represented. I will tell you subsequently how they have been represented, Mr. Speaker. I have some proof in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, to the amendment itself, first of all, I am pleased to support it. Perhaps pleased is not exactly the word because it is not a very pleasant thing to have to do to indict a group of reasonable Newfoundlanders for having failed. I find that despite the lack of pleasure I have to do it, in all sincerity. Whatever the outcome of the amendment is, let me say that personally I regret the failure of this administration to introduce adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly increasing cost of living. Let me say that I regret the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high numbers

of our people who are unemployed. Let me say that I regret the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of the province. Mr. Speaker, I believe the operative word, the key word in the amendment is "Adequate". It occurs three times in the amendment, "Adequate".

A number of speakers on behalf of the government side of the House have addressed themselves to all that has been done. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be one who is going to stand here and say that nothing has been done. If you put any group of people together however devoid of ideas, they will come up with - the law of accidents, the law of coincidence says that they will come up with some good things. Having in mind that the men who sit on the opposite side of the House are by and large reasonable Newfoundlanders with a reasonable degree of concern for their province, it is no surprise that they have managed over a two year period to do some things which ought to be of benefit to the people of Newfoundland. I wish at least one of them would have addressed himself to the operative word in this amendment, the word adequate.

The motion does not say that the government has done nothing. The amendment does not say that. It addresses itself to the inadequacy of what has been done with respect to the cost of living, with respect to unemployment, with respect to public services throughout the province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is the issue. That is the issue. How adequate, how effective have the measures, of which the Minister of Finance has told us and other speaker, how effective how adequate have these programmes been?

Earlier this week the Minister of Finance stood in his place and took credit quite wrongly for a number of things that the government has virtually little or no control over.

Would you believe he even took credit for fish landings. If that were the period when the QE-II were sailing from New York to Newfoundland with the honourable minister on board, I would conjecture to say that had the fish known that he were on board, there would be a lot more fish landings than in other periods of our history, if by landing they would get further from him. By and large, that aside, I suggest he can take little credit for fish landings. I suggest he and his government can take little credit for the increased logging production over the last couple of years.

Sir, the amazing thing for me and I can stand here, I can sit here as very much a greenhorn, very much a layman and look on and I can enjoy the amazement, I can see that somehow there is something that I have missed, that somehow the day after the election, day one that the Minister of Municipal Affairs keeps talking about, that suddenly everything began to happen.

Mr. Speaker, are the people on the government side that naive, will they not concede that perhaps it was they, too that perhaps some things had gone on, of benefit to Newfoundland, before. The Minister of Finance takes credit for logging production, mind you, and fish landings, mind you, and schools. A notable production call the "Progressive Conservative Times" which appeared at least four or five times during the Hermitage by-election listed the schools that "your Progressive Conservative Government have built." He listed them, where they were, Hermitage High School and a number of others. Anybody who knows anything at all about education in this country knows that the government have no say whatsoever. The Member for St. John's North had occasion to be barbed about that problem yesterday.

The government have no say whatsoever where schools are built in this province and yet there was a list, about a half a page, a list of schools that had been built within the Hermitage District in the last two or three years. Of course they had been built there. Why take credit for something for which no credit is due. What is the point? Is it to deceive the people? What can be the motive?

Then the paragraph about schools went on to say, the final paragraph said: "In 1974 your Progressive Conservative Government will build new schools at Gaultois and McCallum." So Gaultois and McCallum are each going to have two schools because the integrated board are going to build one and the government are going to build another one.

Then, of course, there is this complete nonsense of housing starts. The Minister of Municipal Affairs talked about what is being done in Newtown, the Mount Pearl Area. I am glad he mentioned it. I wish he would give credit where credit was due. He knows as every honourable member of this House knows that that project was started by the previous Liberal Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Then, of course, if that were not enough, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the other day, actually took credit for the St. Alban's Medical Clinic, actually mentioned in his speech. I wonder how far back do they have to dig for programmes when they go back to an item that was on their contract before this administration took office and openly attempt to take credit for it. I thought that they had learned their lesson in Hermitage on that one. I thought the Minister of Finance had already advised them that they had done a bad thing in Hermitage, that they had run the election all the wrong way. There is one right thing they did down there, Mr. Speaker, and that is they decided not to have him down there. I wish they had. The gall, the deceit of suggesting that somehow credit can be taken by this administration for housing starts, for the St. Alban's Clinic, for new schools, for fish landings, for logging production and the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of the cost of living: Let us first of all stop begging the question of who is responsible. All of us know that the federal government have a very sizable responsibility

in this matter. Let us suppose that the federal government's responsibility is seventy per cent, eighty per cent, ninety per cent. There is still another ten. But suppose the federal government is ninety per cent responsible and let us address ourselves to the other ten. These were not in the Federal House of Commons and we cannot address ourselves to the ninety, if it is ninety. Let us talk about the other ten. Let us not hear any more about what the provincial administration have not done that the federal government should have done. Let us hope that the federal government will do it if it has not been done. Let us talk about what the provincial government should do and have not done. Let us hear the government members address themselves to that subject. If it is ten per cent of total responsibility, twenty per cent, let us talk about that part. What about the ten per cent?

There are a number of areas we could go into here in this respect, the matter of housing once again. Unfortunately, at the moment, we have a Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing who appears not to understand the problem. He said and he was quoted widely in the papers a couple of weeks ago that there was no need for warranties when it came to house building. There was no need for protection for the consumer here. There was no need for any device to see to it that house owners got their houses at the least possible cost. There was no need for that kind of thing. Is that the voice of a government who are doing what it can to keep down, to restrain the cost of living? What have this government done in terms of keeping down residential land costs? Tell us about that one. Do not tell us about Elizabeth Street in Corner Brook because that land assembly project was done by the previous Liberal Administration. Do not tell us about Milltown, honourable members have heard my comment on that one. That was done by the previous Liberal Administration. Do not tell us about Blackhead Road because the same comment applies. Tell us about some of the new land assembly projects. Where are they? Which ones have been started by this administration in an effort to help

the homeowner, to keep down the cost for the house buyer? Are we going to talk about the cost of living as it relates to gasoline taxes? We have at this moment the highest gasoline tax in Canada, albeit, levied by the former Liberal Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me an opportunity to address myself to something else that has been nagging at me since I have sat in this House and that is the ridiculous suggestion that somehow you have to pretend that everything that went on in the past was right if you were

Liberal and if you were a P.C. that everything that went on in the past was wrong.

Now I happen to have more respect for the intelligence of the honourable members opposite than that. I happen to know and feel that a lot of things that went on in the past were wrong, but this is always cited as the precedent for why we should do something and why we should not do something. Now if a government is going to be a government in 1974 let it address itself to the issues of 1974 not the precedents of 1949 or 1970 or 1971. Perhaps all things taken into account, I do not know, I was not in the government or the cabinet or in the House, perhaps all things taken into account the twenty-five cents levied for gasoline tax was the most ridiculous thing ever done. I do not know. Perhaps it was the most sane thing ever done. Perhaps it was the only thing done at that particularly time. Perhaps; the Minister of Municipal Affairs now was the Minister of Finance at the time it was done.

I am not concerned about those matters. I am concerned that in 1974 were the cost of living is creating more panic among our people than ever before that in 1974 we ought to take a new look, to heck with what was done or why it was done or who did it! Let us ask ourselves in 1974, all things been equal, is it possible now to ease the burden on the average consumer to perhaps cut back a bit on the gasoline tax? If that is the road we should go, let us at least look at it.

We could talk about electrical rates as they affect the cost of living at the moment. We could refer to the Hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy and his world-shaking announcement about saving the diesel electricity consumers all that money. For a fellow who took so long on television and in this House to explain that programme, I wonder why he did not tell the essential point in the programme. I wonder why he did not tell the people sitting out there in those small communities who use diesel electricity why their grand total saving after all the noise he kicked up and the big announcement he had made, the time of this

House he consumed to do it, the time he spent on television to do it, I wonder why he did not tell the people of Newfoundland, the consumers of diesel electricity that their total possible savings were \$1.13 a month.

AN HON. MEMBER: A shame!

MR. SIMMONS: Are these the world-shaking programmes that they are telling us about that are doing much to keep down the cost of living? One dollar and thirteen cents, that is what that announcement amounted to, \$1.13, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE, W.N. That is the greatest amount possible.

MR. SIMMONS: That is the greatest amount possible. That is the difference. If you would let me just explain for a moment, Mr. Speaker, it only applies up to the use of 500 kilowatts per hour, per month.

Now before this subsidy was announced by the minister or took affect, the user of hydroelectricity, if he were using 500 kilowatts, he was paying \$11.87. The user of diesel electricity if he were using 500 kilowatts is paying \$13.00. As a result of the announcement by the minister, as you recall, Mr. Speaker, both types pay the same amount, to the man who is on diesel who was paying \$13.00 will now pay, like his counterpart on hydro \$11.87, a saving of \$1.13. That is what all that wind amounted to, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of programme we are hearing about, the \$1.13 programmes.

Yes, well of course the other hazard of this announcement a part from the fact that it is misleading in its own right, is that it has misleading implications, because the person down in the smaller communities who is using diesel electricity does not understand the full implication of what the minister announced. He would say, "Haw! Haw! well I can plug in the extra toaster and I can go a little easier on the use of electricity. I do not have to restrain myself as much." Of course, as the minister pointed out, after 500 kilowatts there is no saving. The average householder is using what? Six hundred kilowatts I am told. So the average user was already using more than 500 kilowatts. So the most he could benefit, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, is \$1.13.

We could talk, Mr. Speaker, in terms of cost of living, about food costs themselves. Again, I am familiar with all the arguments about federal responsibility here. I am not concerned in this House about federal responsibility, I am concerned with what provincial initiatives can be taken by this administration to keep down the cost of living.

They are talking about positive suggestions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Provincial Affairs, I think that is the appropriate department, should look into the disparity of prices which exist often within the same community. I am presently doing a survey of food prices in the District of Hermitage. I just have one information sheet that came in today and within one community in my district there is a difference of twenty-five cents a pound on a pound of salt beef, within the same community, two stores that are literally across the road from each other, twenty-five cents difference. If you compare those prices with prices for Central Newfoundland you will find that they are generally higher.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is an avenue for the government if it want to manifest its concern about the cost of living, to launch a study into this matter of disparity of prices between communities. What causes them, if there is any flagrant abuse of, the present panic about the cost of living, what the problem really is, Mr. Speaker, and take the required initiatives within the scope of the provincial government.

The problem has been, as we talked about the cost of living, that there have been too many people saying

not I," to stop and hear the real intent of what our concern is on this side of the House. Our concern is for the cost of living, Our concern is for the unemployment rate. Our concern is for the public services throughout the province.

Coming, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of unemployment, it is an oft-repeated fact now that the 36,000 people in this province who are unemployed constitutes the highest number ever in the history of this province, the highest number ever. I was delighted that it was the Premier who took credit for that. It was appropriate that he be the one to take credit for it on opening day of this House. That is exactly how it should be, Mr. Speaker, and how impressive would his decision be if it were not for the massive infusion of federal funds in the projects like LIP and LEAP and others.

AN HON. MEMBER: On the job training.

MR. SIMMONS: On the job training and so many others. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am with him 105 per cent. I want him to take credit for those figures. I want it to be known across this province that the man who should be identified with the highest unemployment figures in our history is the present Premier.

MR. NEARY: --- 20,000, according to their propoganda.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, despite the appalling high unemployment figures, the fact remains that there are businesses in this province, there are industries in this province which are prospering, businesses which are prospering despite the botching of this administration. I could refer, and my honourable friend the member for Green Bay is aware of the farm trainee programme in the Green Bay Area, undertaken and sponsored jointly by the Green Bay Economic Development Association of which it was my privilege to be president for four and a half years, jointly by that association and the federal government, the federal Department of Manpower.

There are fifteen jobs there today through absolutely no initiative. Mr. Speaker, this is not an inditement, this is a statement of fact, through no initiative on the part of the provincial administration, fifteen jobs. That could be repeated many times, that story, around this province. If that is the case, why this hypocritical stance of taking credit for everything? The only thing the Minister of Finance had to mention the other day in his credit bow was sunshine, and I wondered when he would come to it. Everything else but sunshine he took credit for.

We are all reasonable people, let us level with ourselves. If there is a job like the one I mentioned, the farm trainee programme or others which the government can take no direct credit for, let these reasonable people allow that possibility. In the case of the programme I refer to, I defy anybody to contradict me on this, there was no initiative by the provincial government on the matter. I am not suggesting there should have been. It was a matter between a development association and the federal government anyway. I am not suggesting there should have been but I am saying since there was not, let us at least call a spade a spade in the interest of basic honesty.

Then I come to all the pratings about the linerboard mill, the Come By Chance Refinery, jobs which indeed have been created in time since December 1971 but which are there despite the madest ravings of many of the honourable members opposite. There would be no Come By Chance if the present Minister of Finance had his way two or three years ago. There would be none, not a better or worse deal, there would be no deal if he had his way.

So if we are going to start giving credit lines, let us at least give them where they are due and I am sure that the present government even in that kind of fair play situation, the present government can show that it has done some things in two years. But somehow as we saw in the Hermitage by-election and if I had a copy of

the P.C. Times, one in particular, I forget which number, but one of the four I happened to take and there were seven areas of jurisdiction, seven areas of accomplishment, I should say, for which the paper took credit on behalf of the P.C.'s and which you know, it is not a matter of opinion, not a matter of which colour you are, whether Liberal or P.C. or what, it has nothing to do with that but just because of the law of the land. There is no way that the P.C.'s could take credit for those seven activities, and I invite honourable members opposite who have not seen that document to have a look at it and see what I am talking about. I referred just now to one of the items, the schools for which it said: "Your P.C. Government did this for the school in Hermitage and the extension here and school here," and so on and so forth - just down right lies, no truth, no basis for truth, no possibility of wrong interpretation or a different bias depending on where you stood, lies absolute lies. Why this? Why the need? Just tell us what has been done in two years. I am satisfied to rap my desk at the appropriate moment. I am satisfied to give applause where applause is due. But for Lord's sake tell us about the two years! I have sat here with bated breath wanting to hear, I have not heard that much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to another area which relates to the government's claims or efforts in employment, the government's announced efforts to develop rural Newfoundland and that is itself the Rural Development Programme about which I have had some things to say outside this House, about which other members on this side of the House have had some things to say.

I intend for the next few minutes to tell you the basis of my comments, tell you why I was able to say what I said and feel confident that I was saying something that was not at all panicky or misleading. Mr. Speaker, before I do that, just let me say that I do so

as a person who is very concerned about rural Newfoundland, as a person who has had some involvement in rural Newfoundland. I refer to the Green Bay Economic Development Association. That was a formal involvement but otherwise I have lived there in rural Newfoundland for all of my adult life since I have been seventeen, during the past sixteen or seventeen years. You just do not live that long in a rural context without becoming a part of it.

When I heard of the Government's proposals concerning rural Newfoundland, I was delighted. Indeed, I led a delegation of a number of mayors from Green Bay, from Triton and South Brook and Robert's Arm and Springdale and a couple of other gentlemen, a delegation of seven or eight of us to meet the Premier and six of his ministers, some of whom are opposite here today. We meet with the Premier and the ministers between the two elections, somewhere just after the Government assumed office. I think it was early February of 1972.

It was here that I heard some announcements, suggestions publicly, but it was there that I really heard for the first time about what the Premier and his colleagues had in mind and I told them then and I later said publicly on T.V., the same day in reporting on the meeting with the Premier, I expressed my delight both privately to him and publicly at the concept that he had outlined for rural Newfoundland. It was a good concept. The purpose of the Rural Development Legislation is admirable. The purpose of the Rural Development Authority is stated in the legislation. It is just what the doctor ordered.

The act in setting out the authority says in part - the authority shall receive, consider and report upon applications by persons engaged in or about to become engaged in small industries and enterprises in rural areas or in the home for financial or other assistance by way of loan, for financial assistance for small industries in rural areas. Of course, there can be no dispute about that because a number of government members opposite have referred to it. As recently as Monday of this week, the Minister of Finance, in coming to the defence of the Rural Development Authority - I do not know why they always feel, Mr. Speaker, they have to come to defence of something. I do not know

why they cannot listen and see what the criticism is first, what the appraisal is first and then see if something needs to be done.

This assumption that all we do is perfect and all you do is imperfect, I do not know why we insist on operating on that basis. Nobody has come to me, Mr. Speaker, from the Government side of the House, either privately or in this House, and said, "What did you have in mind? What did you mean?"

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, the other day in defending the authority, and if it is doing such a good job as it has been claimed, why defend it, why the need to defend it? Why does it not speak for itself? He said two things, Mr. Speaker, that I shall have occasion to refer back to. One, he said: "The Rural Development Authority is a direct contradiction to that, to the Resettlement Programme." Secondly, he said: "The Rural Development Authority is to lend money to people who want to establish some industry, small as it may be, in rural areas, not in St. John's, Corner Brook or in Grand Falls but in rural areas."

Mr. Speaker, not knowing it, the Minister of Finance was alluding to part of my concern about the Rural Development Programme and now, as I said publicly, it has gotten off the tracks. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that it is badly, it is abysmally off the tracks. It is off the tracks to the point where it is violating the existing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the figures which were supplied by the Department of Rural Development up to January 15 of this year. Now, I know that it is an ongoing thing, so there have been loans since then but I had to have some cutoff point. So, Mr. Speaker, I took it as of January 15. I have done an analysis of the Rural Development loans for that period up to January 15. Total loans for that period were \$3,535,429.55, just over \$3.5 million, \$3,535,000.00. Now, if you were to listen to the legislation, obviously, you do not spend any of that money in St. John's, Certainly, that is hardly a rural community about to be resettled. You do not spend any of that money in Corner Brook or in Grand Falls. Indeed, I called the Statistics Canada to see what would be the definition of rural as it applied to Newfoundland and they told me that the definition for rural was any community of less than one

thousand. Well, I said that that is a little, it is cutting it pretty fine.

So, perhaps we should look at it in terms of larger communities. So, I analyzed the figures in terms of communities either over four thousand or under four thousand to see where the money had been spent because we are told by the Minister of Finance, by the Minister of Rural Development, by the legislation that the money is to be spent not in Grand Falls, not in Corner Brook and not in Stephenville, not in St. John's but in rural Newfoundland. I took the cutoff point of four thousand, you can argue it to be five, I have the figures for five too if you want them, but I took the cutoff of four thousand.

Mr. Speaker, the figures that I am going to talk to you about in a minute are for expenditures, allocations of Rural Development loans in communities of more than four thousand populations. Now, what kind of communities are we talking about? Well, we are not talking about Harbour Breton in my district or Milltown or the Head of Bay d'Espoir at St. Alban's because these communities have lesser population. We are not talking about Gambo or Glovertown or Clarendville or Placentia or Burin or Grand Bank. These communities all have populations under four thousand. I am not even talking about Fortune or Springdale or Baie Verte or St. Anthony or Bay Roberts or Harbour Grace or Wesleyville or Lewisporte, none of these communities. These, Mr. Speaker, are all excluded because they all have populations of less than four thousand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a dozen communities in this Province including Labrador City, Wabush area, Happy Valley, Goose Bay, Stephenville, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Winsor,

Gander, St. John's, Bell Island, those dozen or so areas of population. I was shocked and surprised to find that of the three and one half million dollars one half million, \$531,000 or fifteen per cent, nearly one dollar in every six of the money allocated for R.D.A. loans is being spent, not in rural Newfoundland at all.

Mr. Speaker, I claim that is a direct violation of the legislation. I think something ought to be done about it. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that we do not need an infusion of money for job creation in St. John's, Corner Brook and Labrador City. I am not saying that. I am saying let us call a spade a spade. I am saying if we are claiming to be developing rural Newfoundland let us tell them how much money we are spending in rural Newfoundland not what we are spending in St. John's, Corner Brook and so on.

I repeat; one dollar in every six, just about fifteen per cent of the R.D.A. loans have not gone to rural Newfoundland at all they have gone to St. John's, Corner Brook, Stephenville and those areas.

MR. F.B. ROWE: How much did the honourable member say?

MR. SIMMONS: Fifteen per cent.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Shocking! Shocking!

MR. SIMMONS: Over half a million bucks gone to those areas.

MR. ROBERTS: To the rural areas of St. John's and Corner Brook.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. Mr. Speaker, in eleven of the districts, in eleven of the forty-two districts in this province more than half the money that was allocated for that particular district was not allocated in the rural part of the district at all but was allocated to the urban part of the district, that part of the district which had communities of four thousand in population or more. An example; in Grand Falls, \$159,000 spent or allocated in R.D.A. loans, \$159,000. \$99,000 of that allocated in Grand Falls and Windsor. Hardly rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker,

hardly rural Newfoundland.

MR. F.B. ROWE: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: \$100,000 went in those two communities. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, for the record, I am not against the infusion of money in those communities, those urban communities for the creation of additional jobs. I am against a deception which says that we this government; "We," as the Minister of Finance said and I quoted him earlier; "We have a programme that is the opposite, the contradiction of resettlement." Was Grand Falls ever in danger of resettlement? Or Corner Brook perhaps? Or Stephenville perhaps? I repeat; in eleven of the districts, Carbonear, Grand Falls, Humber East and West, Placentia West and the six St. John's seats over half the money was spent in the urban parts of the districts. I could, of course, get partisan, Mr. Speaker, and draw your attention to the fact that all of these are districts represented by P.C. Members.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the figures I have just given one can only conclude, one can only conclude that the development of rural Newfoundland could not have been the chief concern in allocating those funds to Carbonear and Grand Falls and Humber East and West and Placentia West, St. John's North and South and East and West and Center and East Extern.

Mr. Speaker, if that were all you could partly write it off to some coincidence but listen to this. I also, being the partisan that I am, actually analyzed the loans allocated in terms of whether they went to P.C. Districts or Liberal Districts.

MR. ROBERTS: They all went evenly.

MR. SIMMONS: I have always told the honourable member that he had too much faith in the honourable crowd opposite. Anyway, the grants, the loans, grants they are called, that on the information, I think they are all loans, the loans in

districts represented by Progressive Conservative members totalled, (Remember your grand total for the point under review, the period under review was 3.5 million.) the loans in Progressive Conservative districts amount to \$2,893,000. The loans in Liberal districts amount to \$451,000. The loans in the New Democratic Party district, Labrador South, amount to \$63,000. I will give you some average figures shortly.

The loans in Hermitage district - I did not single it out because it is my district but because most of the period under review it had no sitting member so you could not really fairly classify it as Liberal or Progressive Conservative so I pulled that one out separately. Interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that with no member at all Hermitage district got \$127,000.

Mr. Speaker, the average amount of loans in Progressive Conservative districts, \$93,336. The average amount in Liberal districts, \$56,000. Almost two to one.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You do not mean they favoured the Tory districts?

MR. SIMMONS: All I mean, Mr. Speaker, is what the figures have shown me. I leave it to the honourable members present to draw their conclusions. \$93,000 per district in Progressive Conservative districts, \$56,000 in Liberal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another fact that we should take into account. All of the urban districts are represented by Progressive Conservative members, the six St. John's seats, the Labrador West seat, the two Humber seats, the Grand Falls seat, the Gander seat. There are eleven districts that we really should take out of the figurings altogether. Taking into account that the sitting members for the Progressive Conservative are in truth all the urban members in this province, it really makes you wonder what is really going on here.

Mr. Speaker, in one Progressive Conservative district - since, Mr. Speaker, you are the sitting member for Lewisporte and I would not want to cast any aspersions on you, Sir, I will not mention that it is the district of Lewisporte had a total of \$372,000

in loans compared to \$450,000 for all the Liberal districts, \$370,000 in one Progressive Conservative district versus \$450,000 in all the Liberal.

Now, I point out to you of course that the Liberal districts are by and large the rural districts of this province except Bell Island if you like. Even allowing for the exception of Bell Island, take Hermitage, take Labrador North even because of Happy Valley and Goose Bay, exclude that one if you like but take St. Barbe North and White Bay North and White Bay South and Bonavista North and Twillingate and Fogo and you have the more rural parts of this province, the places where the infusion of money ought to be taking place, Mr. Speaker, and is not.

Mr. Speaker. I believe the figures that I have presented on the R.D.A. at least lead one as my honourable colleague the Leader of the Opposition has suggested the Bill Saunders case does, leads one to some irresistible conclusions. By the way, while I allude to the Bill Saunders case, let me say that I was not in this House at the time. I was a very interested bystander. As a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what went on. I would like to know what went on. I too call on the government to

accede to the request which was articulated by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and have this investigation and settle the matter once and for all.

To the matter of the R.D.A. and the figures I presented, Mr. Speaker, there are certainly some fairly irresistible conclusions that one could come to. Before I do, I just want to make a reference to the loans that were meted out in the district of Hermitage. I thank the R.D.A. publicly for them. I would not want to be misconstrued as having said that there was too much money spent there. I just want to point to the conditions under which the money was allocated and the time period during which it was allocated. I would like to ask a question to which I know the answer but other honourable members can think about it.

Is it true that in July and August of 1973, two or three or four months before the election of November, 1973, is it true that in July, 1973 a senior R.D.A. official then stationed at Gander, since moved to another department, had his vacation postponed the day before he was due to leave and instructed to go to Bay D'Espoir area and quote, "Lend all the money you can."

Mr. Speaker, it probably is not an accident that of the money allocated in the Hermitage, the \$127,000, \$112,000 wound up in St. Alban's, Milltown, Head of the Bay, Morrisville. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the word loan several times. I am not sure that they are loans of course. The Premier quoted in Montreal in February of last year, said at that time, "We have spent \$2 million to date to create 1,500 jobs" - this is in R.D.A. - "and will be lucky to get even half of that back." Now, Mr. Speaker, again let us call a spade a spade. If this is a free for all, let us tell it. There are a lot of people of integrity around this province who will not come and get those loans because they are told they are loans and there are enough conscientious left in this country that they will not undertake financial

commitments if they cannot meet them.

Now, if it is free for all, if it is money that has not got to be paid back, let us let the word go out to one and all. If it is a free for all, let us have everybody in on it. The Premier is saying, "We will be lucky to get even half of that back."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Anyone who intends to pay it back, would have by now.

MR. SIMMONS: Exactly.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, some of them, Mr. Speaker, of course have left the country. So, I am sure they will be among the half who they will not get it back from.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned there were some fairly irresistible conclusions that one can come to on the basis of those figures. I am going to tell you what my conclusions are, not could be but are. One, the Rural Development Authority is not serving its stated purpose under legislation, an admirable purpose that it is, it is not serving that purpose, Mr. Speaker. Number two, the Rural Development Authority legislation is being blatantly violated by this administration. Three, Rural Development funds are being improperly spent within the spirit of the legislation. Number four, a potentially good programme is being given the shaft for political reasons. Number five, the government's claims, public claims of

R.D.A. are misleading and false. (6) The allocations in urban areas clearly indicate that the development of rural Newfoundland is not the government's chief consideration in this programme. (7) The disproportionate allocation of the funds in P.C. Districts is evidence of political hanky-panky.

MR. W.N. ROWE: NO!

MR. ROBERTS: Pay off! Shame!

MR. NEARY: Resign!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe my comments, my information on R.D.A. up to this point is sufficient to warrant a full-scale explanation by government of these strange goings on. Sufficient to warrant a fully fledged and independent enquiry into this matter.

MR. NEARY: I thought Bell Island was the only place that happened.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I could have given you a little more evidence about where the loans have been distributed around the province. That makes an interesting game when you keep in mind the Minister of Finance saying: "It is the contradiction, it is the opposite of resettlement." Particularly when I hear today the Minister of Municipal Affairs tell us what has been done in Fortune Bay in the last two years compared to what was done before.

I took the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland because it is the area where there has been so much resettlement in the past few years. I took that area (I did not take all the areas because I did not have time) from Cape Ray just west of Port Aux Basques down to Grand Bank. The whole Southwest Coast. Mr. Speaker, keep in mind, of course, that I mentioned to you already that some communities in Hermitage got some money around July and August last year. St. Alban's Milltown, Head of the Bay, Morrisville. In addition to these, the Community of Harbour Breton also got a couple of loans. Five of the communities are in Hermitage District.

Mr. Speaker, do you believe that along that whole coast- where do the loans go for the coast that they are not going to resettle anymore? They are going to do something to preserve all those

communities. Now remember, Grand Falls is not down there which got some money nor Stephenville, nor Labrador City but there are some places down there. Did Port aux Basques get any money? Not one red cent. How about Margaree and Fox Roost or Isle au Mort? Not a cent. Burnt Islands, Rose Blanche or LaPoile? Not one red copper. Ramea, Grey River of Francois or McCallum? Not a copper. Conne River? Not a cent. Furby's Cove, Gaultois, Hermitage, Sandyville, Seal Cove, Pass Island? Not one red cent. Wreck Cove (We are now into a familiar area since I am sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs reads about it in the voter's lists) not a cent. Most Ambose, not one copper. Coombs Cove, Boxey, English Harbour West, not one cent. St. Jacques -

MR. EARLE: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SIMMONS: No, Order Paper is the answer we have been getting.

MR. EARLE: Afraid of a question.

MR. SIMMONS: St. Jacques, Belleoram, Pool's Cove, Rencontre. Not one cent in any of those communities. Nothing in English Harbour East nor Grand Le Pierre nor Harbour Mille nor Bay L'Argent nor Little Bay East, St. Bernard's, Jacques Fontaine, Garnish, Frenchman's Cove, Grand Beach not one red cent in any of these. Anybody who knows the geography of the Southwest Coast must ask, where do they spend the money down there? I had to ask the same question and I will tell you where. They spent it in five communities in Hermitage about two or three months before the election and up until several weeks before the election.

MR. ROBERTS: Did they spend any there since the election?

MR. SIMMONS: I have not been able to establish that yet.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The honourable member is not going to be able to.

MR. SIMMONS: They spent in a couple of communities in Fortune Bay - do not forget of course, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been telling what he has been doing for Fortune Bay -

Do not forget that I told you earlier that the average expenditure in the P.C. District, the P.C. District was \$93,000. So what do you think they spent in Fortune Bay? \$8,000, in two communities.

MR. NEARY: A real fighter is he not, a real ball of fire that minister.

MR. SIMMONS: One of the communities was St. Jack's and among the communities was Terrenceville. The only two communities and possibly Red Cove, I am not sure whether it was Red Cove or not, with a possible additional Community of Red Cove, St. Jack's and Terrenceville the only two in that district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: He said he was not sure.

MR. SIMMONS: Well perhaps that is why - it is on your list. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the minister again is giving me ideas too, of course. It is on the list but there is nobody there that is why I am wondering, perhaps they are doing the old headstone bit now. That is exactly the point. Perhaps they are doing the headstone bit, they do not care if there is anybody there or not, they are going to see that, that community is not resettled.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I will say they are.

Mr. Speaker, let us come to that historic district represented by the capable Member for Burgeo. How many communities in that district do you think got money? Well if you listened to the list of course you missed Burgeo. Burgeo is the only community, as it happens the largest community in that district, certainly not the most rural community in the district. The only community of the whole works in that district that got money. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, Burgeo in Burgeo LaPoile, St. Jack's and Terrenceville in Fortune Bay, Harbour Breton, St. Alban's, Milltown, Head of the Bay, Morrisville in Hermitage, eight communities from Cape Ray to Grand Bank along that great coast that they are going to do so much for, along that coast they are going to save from resettlement. Cape

Ray to Grand Bank along that great coast that they are going to do so much for, along that coast they are going to save from resettlement.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the half million dollars that have been pumped into communities of over 4,000 people or more had been spent in the Margarees and the Fox Roost and the LaPoiles and the Rameas and the Conne Rivers and the Furby's Coves and the Seal Coves and so on then the administration could with a straight face and with honesty claim credit for doing something for that coast.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us not hear anything more of all that have been done for that coast. Let us all not hear anything more about how this government are the champion against resettlement when anything that is happening in that area, be it resettlement or the opposite of it, as the Minister of Finance talks about it, it is completely by accident insofar as this administration are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the government to explain the strange goings on in RDA. I call upon them to launch a full-fledged enquiry into the matter, in the interest of the proper expenditure of funds and in the interest of the people of rural Newfoundland. I call upon them if they intend to continue with this programme, for God sake to do so within the legislation! Let us not flagrantly violate the legislation. I call upon them to stop playing politics with this potentially good programme.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I call upon them to revise the legislation, revise the legislation. I have not said yet where my suspicions lie in terms of where the problem lies in this programme. I do know as everybody knows that three of the six member board which decides the application are politicians, full-time politicians, they are cabinet ministers, men who everyday have learned to react to and respond to political motivations. It would not be surprising if their decisions are politically awaited - three of them.

Of course, we all know that the fourth was the defeated candidate in the District of Hermitage, that leaves two about whom I cannot comment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well good loser, almost a good a loser as the Minister of Finance was down at the Stadium that day in 1969. It reminded me of those days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good sport.

MR. SIMMONS: Two of a kind.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Grateful news.

MR. SIMMONS: My honourable friend the Minister of Justice will remember the candour and the mature way in which the Minister of Finance took that defeat. Anybody who watched television that night was surely inspired by the display of the Hon. the Minister of Finance following that day when he lost the Leadership Convention.

AN HON. MEMBER: His activities....

MR. SIMMONS: I could not help but hark back that day when I heard my opponent in the election after his defeat conceded so gracefully. Mr. Speaker, four of the six members of that authority the defeated candidate in the District of Hermitage and three cabinet members have reason, it is in their bones to act politically, to make the decisions on political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that I call upon the government to revise this legislation, to introduce revised legislation, to provide for the establishment of a crown corporation or some other body which would be independent of the pressures of political, provide for the change in the make up of the board. I have nothing against the personalities involved but I have something against the structure which allows at least four politicians, a majority of the board to make decisions which allegedly are not suppose to be political decisions.

Mr. Speaker, being near 6:00 P.M. I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the honourable Member for Hermitage has adjourned the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 4 at 3:00 P.M.