



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 66

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations:

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

Mr. Speaker, you recall last year during the restructuring of government that there was a suggestion in there that the Apprenticeship Board be done away with unless there were representations made from the management and labour in the province. We certainly did receive representations from them. On the basis of this we decided to continue with the concept of the Apprenticeship Board. However, we gave it some thought and we thought that the legislation and the concept of the board was probably not in keeping with the needs of manpower in the province today. So, as a result we have come up with the following ministerial statement:

"I am today announcing the appointment of a Manpower Training and Certification Board. The members of the new Board are Mr. K.F. Duggan, President, College of Trades and Technology, as the chairman; Mr. Horace Pye, Manager, Industrial Relations, Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation, representing employers; Mr. John Fury, general contractor, representing employers; Mr. Ralph Chippett, Corner Brook, representing employees; and Mr. Jack Scott, Grand Falls, representing employees; Mr. Gilbert Pike, assistant deputy minister, vocational education, representing the Department of Education; Mr. William J. May, assistant deputy minister manpower, representing the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations; Mr. George Marshall, alternate member, representing employers; Mr. Esau Thoms, alternate member, representing employees; Mr. Aubrey Rose, the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, who will be the secretary of the board.

This new board will be responsible for carrying out the duties assigned to the Apprenticeship Board under the Apprenticeship

Act and advising the government on new legislation to replace that act. The government feels that the time has arrived to introduce new concepts to train and certify the labour force. Training is still largely confined to the skilled trades and apprenticeship plans and are primarily based on time served and will not permit certification until certain time periods are served.

If Newfoundland is to create a qualified labour force of sufficient numbers to meet the needs of our changing economy, we must begin to develop trends toward modular training and certification in areas of specialization, not only for the traditional apprenticeship trades but also for other occupations.

The new Manpower Training and Certification Board will be given the responsibility of advising the government on these new concepts which will have a much broader application making training and certification services available to a much greater portion of our labour force with an increasing de-emphasis on time served requirements.

I have some copies for the press and copies for the opposition to table.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what the minister has more or less implied there in his ministerial statement is that this board will be more of an advisory board in the beginning rather than a certification board. They are going to take the place of the Apprenticeship Board and advise the government on new legislation. Well, I do not see too much wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, except that the board seems to be a little top heavy. How many members? Nine member on the board? Plus a secretary?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Seven members plus alternate members and a secretary.

MR. NEARY: The board may be a little bit top heavy. That is the only thing, Mr. Chairman. I think the best committee in the world is a committee of three people, one dead, one with one foot in the grave and the other one inactive. I think that is the only way we will get anything done.

Nevertheless, I presume the minister has to balance

out the number of employer representatives and the number of representatives of labour on the board. I beg your pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We tried that for twenty-three years.

MR. NEARY: Tried it for twenty-three years and it did not work. Well, at least we got some action in this province. We got something done. That is more than we can say is happening right now.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister could tell me if there is still an agreement between the province and the Government of Canada on apprenticeship training. The Government of Canada financed largely I think the apprenticeship programme in Newfoundland. Is that agreement still in effect? Will it continue under this? It will continue under this? What do they call it? Manpower Training and Certification Board. Well, we will just have to wait and see, Mr. Speaker, how it works out. It may be a good thing.

PETITIONS:

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by sixty-five adult members of the population of La Poile in my district of Burgeo, La Poile. The prayer of this petition is that a dentist make periodic trips to La Poile so that the dental health of the people and the children in the schools may be safeguarded.

MR. NEARY: The member would be the first customer.

MR. EVANS: Well, I do not know. Probably the honourable member might be to if he got too close.

Regardless of that fact, a bit of supposed repartee injected by the member from Bell Island, this is a very serious situation. Of course it should have been done years ago, about twenty-three years before we took office even. Unfortunately it was not.

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

MR. EVANS: So, I certainly support this petition. As I say, the service is long overdue. It is never too late to do good. I hope that this petition will be passed over to the Minister of Health.

I am sure that it will be given every consideration by the great man we have today as Minister of Health.

MR. F. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before the great man who is Minister of Health gets up and tells us what he is going to do about this, let me add a word of support to it. The member of Burgeo and La Poile took quite a bite at the petition but I think he missed the point of it entirely.

The point of the petition is that it should have been completely unnecessary because the current administration promised two years ago in the Throne Speech, the famous one day session, that they would bring in a system of mobile dental clinics. Well, Sir, I do not know if we will get to the health estimates in this session because of the gag rule, the guillotine rule. Of course, no more had been done to bring in those dental clinics than has been done on so many of the other things promised in the health field.

I hope the people of La Poile are given the opportunity to see a dentist when they need one. I notice with some interest that the member stressed that this petition was signed by adults. That is right and proper but of course the children's health programme introduced by the Liberal Government, extended by the Liberal Government, provides free dental care to children up to the age of eleven, their twelfth birthday. That is even more important, Sir. If we cannot afford to make dental services available to all of the population, we should make them available first to the children. We all agree on that.

So, I would hope that when the dentist goes to La Poile he would pay special attention to the needs of the children, the children getting their second teeth, losing their first teeth, because these are the ones which they carry through life.

Now, I do hope the prayer is granted. I say to the member now, Sir, that it can be granted if the minister wish to do it. We saw an example of that last fall when there were some festivities under way in the sovereign District of Hermitage, immediately to the

east of the constituency which the member now adorns, the Constituency of Burgeo and La Poile.

The Communities of Francois and McCallum, communities with which the honourable member is doubtless intimately familiar, received I am told the attentions of a dentist at that time. I am sure, Sir, that that sudden attention by a dentist had nothing to do with the election that was then under way. I am sure it was part of a carefully planned long-range health programme and it was part of the mobile dental clinics.

I hope, Sir, that we will see a dentist made available to the people of La Poile on a regular basis. I hope that it will begin immediately and I would urge the minister when he stands to assure us that this will be so. They did it in Permitsee during an election. There is no reason that they cannot do it in Burgeo and La Poile now. The people of La Poile deserve it, Sir, and I hope they get it.

HON. DR. A.T. POPE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague from Burgeo-La Poile. I am the first one to admit that there is a great paucity or dearth of dental services within the province. I am the first one to admit that not as much has been done as should have been done. I would say also that we have made certain gains in improvements in health facilities in the province. I am happy to announce that aporovement for a dental programme is on our immediate list.

I would have to say further that irrespective of the statements of the honourable Leader of the Opposition with regard to mobile clinics, I did make an announcement some two or three months ago that through the generosity of the Lions Club of Weston who provided the CNIB mobile unit two years ago, three years ago and as a part of the Silver Anniversary Celebrations of the Department of Health, we are equipping a mobile dental clinic. The hold up at the moment is that the General Motors Corporation have cited it would be six months before they can get to build the special chassis or unit that is required to put the

dental clinic on top.

So, as far as that is concerned it is on the road. The funds are provided. The order has been made and that will represent I think a fair degree of improvement.

As far as a travelling dentist for the La Poile area is concerned, there are many areas in the country and in the province where a travelling dentist is necessary. I hope that upon being able to recruit a few dentists that we will be able to serve some of the under-serviced areas of which La Poile is an example.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting the petition and assuring them that I will do what I can to see that the prayer of the petition is carried out.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

HON. W.W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bill, a bill, 'An Act Respecting Certain Building Supplies.'

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act.'

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister of Industrial Development is on his way back to his seat. Sir, I understand, Sir, that the minister is scheduled to be in Ottawa today. Would the minister care to indicate to the House if the meeting with Prime Minister Trudeau is off or is it going ahead? What is the meeting all about? Is it about the Lower Churchill? The offshore mineral rights? Does the minister care to make a statement to the House?

HON. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, this is the oral question period and not the time for ministerial statements.

MR. NEARY: I thought the honourable minister was jettisoning his way to Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: We were planning to do so. Unfortunately there is a

thick fog out there now. As soon as we find someone who can intercede for us -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOODY: He does not want an answer, Sir, only wants to give me a bad time. It is foggy. We were on the way.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to tell the House what the meeting -

MR. DOODY: I tried to but the honourable member interrupted me.

MR. NEARY: No, go ahead.

MR. DOODY: No, no. I am finished. I will not be jostled and joked with.

MR. NEARY: I wish the minister would get off the ground.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There goes the minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether the transmission line from the Lower Churchill and the Trans Labrador Highway are two separate and distinct projects? As far as Ottawa are concerned, is it either/or. Is it either the Trans Labrador Highway or the transmission line? Would the minister indicate to the House just what the situation is on that?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, even to somebody with a background in the grocery business like myself, it is reasonably clear that a transmission line and a highway are two separate and distinct projects. That probably takes care of the first part of the question.

The other part is that Ottawa has indicated that it would be difficult for them to find money to finance all these projects on behalf of the province, both of these projects. However, since they are to a large extent complementary the Goose Bay, Churchill, Esker road runs pretty well parallel to the transmission line in the Labrador section, one certainly would not preclude the other in terms of effectiveness and in terms of progress. I think they can both work consecutively and together with each other.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting piece of information. Would the minister then tell us what the province is going to go for? The Trans Labrador Highway or the transmission line? As far as financing from Ottawa is concerned, which one is the province

going to go for?

MR. DOODY: The province is going for both, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did not the minister just indicate to the House that Ottawa will not finance both? They will only finance one project?

MR. DOODY: Sir, I said that Ottawa has indicated that it would be difficult for them to finance both. The honourable member from Labrador North told us that a little while ago. He said that Mr. Rompkey had so informed him. We have not had a formal indication of that, so we are going for both.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if - does my colleague want to ask a question? If Ottawa says no, that they are only going to finance one project, then which one will the province go for? Will it be the road or the transmission line? Surely the minister must know the answer to that by now.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, if the minister knew the answer to that, he certainly would not inform the member from Bell Island.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. The Minister of Industrial Development just stated that Mr. Rompkey did inform me. I did not state in this House, Sir, that Mr. Rompkey informed me if they would finance both those projects or if they would only finance one. I said that Ottawa had informed me. I would like for the minister to withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry I mentioned Mr. Rompkey's name, Sir. I did not realize the federal election was so close. I withdraw it and if I have offended the honourable member or Mr. Rompkey, I apologize humbly.

MR. WOODWARD: Good.

MS. MARTIN: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the same minister, the honourable Minister of Industrial Development. On the same line, could the honourable gentleman inform the House whether or not it is the government's intention that actual on-site work will begin on the Lower Churchill project this year or if it is only going to be preliminary planning?

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker. Our indication and our plans are that on-site work will be done this year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROBERTS: A question, if I may, for the Minister of Health. I wonder if he has as yet met with the delegation of doctors from the Placentia area, the Placentia Cottage Hospital medical staff?

DR. RONT: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not met and I have not had any official request to meet.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary question. The minister said an official request. Has he had an unofficial request? Because I am told some of the doctors in the area, perhaps all, have met with a public group which obviously is the source of my information which said that they intend to see the minister and serve on him what amounts to an ultimatum.

DR. POWE: No, Mr. Speaker, they have not yet said officially or unofficially to me that they want to meet me. I have had no information.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a question to the Minister of Fisheries. I wonder if the minister can inform the House if his department has any plans to put a floating service depot into Labrador this year to supply the fishermen? What type of particular craft this will be and the location that the particular service depot will serve and what fishermen it will serve on the Labrador Coast?

MR. P. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, we are formulating some plans for the provision of a mobile servicing unit for Labrador. I would hope to be in a position within the next few days to make a statement to the House concerning that.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the House if his department has taken any action on reserving the rights of local salmon fishermen having exclusive rights to the traditional grounds that they have fished, something along the lines that the federal government have taken as far as the char fishery is concerned? Has his department worked

in that direction?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member well knows, the question which he poses should be posed to the federal minister who has jurisdiction of course in that particular field.

We have discussed that particular problem on several occasions with the minister, most recently when he was in the province meeting with fishermen. It is a continuing process. The minister is interested. Of course, when I say the minister, I am talking about the federal minister. He is interested in getting the views of the people in that area as he is in getting the views of people in different areas of the province to find out what they want done. Supposedly, they will make a decision after he has done that.

MR. SPEAKER: As it is Private Members' Day we shall proceed with Motion 10 on today's Order Paper. I am not sure who adjourned the debate last day on the amendment. The member from Labrador North adjourned the debate on the amendment last day.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker. I have very little to add to the member for St. John's East's motion. I think that this particular motion has been beaten around the House long enough. It seems as if the strength has gone out of the thing, so I do not have anything else to add to that particular motion.

MR. ROBERTS: What amendment are we on now?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Witch-hunt.

MR. WOODWARD: "Witch-hunt Willie's" motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anybody else wish to speak to this amendment, so that I might put it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say on the amendment is that we shall vote against it. I think it was brought in as a delaying tactic. It further waters down an already weak resolution. It is going to be unpleasant. That is the wrong word. We shall vote for the motion, the main motion simply because it is the lesser of two evils. It is better than no motion at all. I do wish it had been stronger. We tried to make it stronger but the government majority, after a three or four week filibuster, voted that down. Well, so be it!

This amendment introduced

now by the gentleman from St. John's East, the Government House Leader, does nothing to strengthen the resolution. In fact, Sir, it does and is designed to weaken the resolution, to water it down further, to give it even less point than it had when originally moved by the Member for St. John's North. We shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I find it most significant that the government House Leader has brought in this amendment, not only in the amendment itself but in its sponsor. The amendment itself weakens the motion. It would replace the words, "the government shall introduce." The exact words used by the gentleman from St. John's North are: "This House request the government to introduce legislation" This shall replace those words with some other words so it will read that the government consider the introduction of legislation. That weakens the amendment, it waters it down even further. Indeed it is so thin, the gruel is so thin now as to be almost nonexistent.

I think, Sir, the fact that this was moved by the House Leader for the government side shows that the government have no intention of making any significant progress in this field. They say that they will do something before the next election. I hope they will. They have had two and one half years in office now. This is the third full session in which they have had the control of the House. The leadership of the House resting upon their shoulders. They have brought in no legislation. They have made no move. They have not asked the committee to look into it. They have not sought expert advice. They have not sought public opinion. All they do now when the gentleman from St. John's North raises the question - it is well that he raises it, when he brings it up for discussion, the government are frightfully embarrassed. They are embarrassed to have this matter come up and to have their own delinquencies exposed. They try now to water it down.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment. I think it is a bad amendment. The motion itself as unamended will be better than no motion and therefore, I shall vote for that. I only

wish, Sir, that the government had some of the courage of their convictions, would put some action where their talk is and would bring in legislation to deal with this matter of campaign expenses. It is the greatest potential source of abuse that we have faced in the democratic process. In too many cases the potential becomes real. I do not propose to go over the ground that has been so well ploughed and so well trodden by the members of the House over the past seven, eight or nine weeks. All I will say is that I urge every gentleman to vote against the amendment because a vote against the amendment, Sir, is a vote in favour of action, of meaningful action in this field. Equally I would urge all to vote in favour of the motion because although it is certainly not the motion which I would have liked to have seen, Mr. Speaker, it is infinitely to be preferred to no expression of opinion by the House.

I can understand them playing their petty little party games. The gentleman from St. John's East has been an expert at that. He seems to think that it is his role, his role in life and in debate. to play these petty little games. Let him indulge himself. It is his privilege. If it be his pleasure, so be it! I do hope that the government, having played their little games, will act meaningfully. I can assure them that my colleagues and I shall support this legislation, if it be real legislation, if it be worthwhile legislation, if it should deal with the facts. If it should be just like the conflict of interest legislation the government brought in, we shall oppose it. The conflict of interest legislation as we have now seen in a year or so of experience really, Sir, is not worth much more than the paper it is written on. It has been exposed. The gentleman from Trinity South has driven one of the loopholes through it. There are I am sure others that can be driven through. Honourable gentlemen opposite, I have no doubt, from time to time will have that brought to their attention. The Minister of Finance showed what can be done within the letter of the conflict of interest legislation and against the spirit of it.

I shall oppose the amendment. I shall do so really because I hope that the government will act on this and that the quickest way to get them to act is to vote against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: On motion amendment, carried.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that if I speak now, I close the debate. At the beginning of this whole debate, I made it quite clear that I would be prepared to give way for any comments that honourable members might like to make. If there are any points which honourable members have neglected to make in the course of this long debate, I would be more than happy to give way while they get up and make them or if any honourable members opposite should like to deliberately mislead the House, I shall gladly give way so that they may have an opportunity to do so.

The Hon. Member for Bell Island is able to dish it out but I do not think he can take it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: I noticed that the Member for White Bay South was surprised when I voted for the amendment. I deliberately tried, when framing the main motion, to word it so as to avoid the possibility of any substitutive amendments. I was not completely successful and I do agree that one could interpret the amendment as an attempt to water down the main motion. However, I do feel that in the course of this debate various members have made the point and made it quite well that the whole matter is extremely complex and cannot be rushed into and has to be considered very carefully. It is in that light that I view the amendment and therefore, was able, quite willingly, to vote for it. I hope the government do consider legislation.

I would say further to the opposition that I would urge them to vote for the amended motion. They may not be all that happy with it. As amended, the Hon. Member for White Bay South says that it is meaningless. I would counter by saying that if they are really anxious for the government to bring in some kind of legislation

touching upon this very important point that there is nothing quite as coercive as unanimity. If this House were able to pass this motion, even though it has in the eyes of the opposition an obnoxious amendment or a delaying amendment, if the whole House together, unanimously, can pass this motion, I would say that this would have the same effect as if the opposition motion itself had been accepted and the motion were being passed as amended by the opposition. I think there is nothing quite so strong as unanimity. Whenever this House does anything unanimously, I suggest that this is probably the most powerful action it can take.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: It will not appear so at present but if in the future any honourable member were able to get up and say: "Why has not the government brought in this legislation? What is the matter with the government? Was this motion not passed unanimously? Did not every single person want something to be done?" Therefore, if rhetoric or if urging has any force, I urge and beseech the honourable members opposite to support this motion as amended even though they are not all that happy with the amendment.

The Hon. Member for Hermitage has asked a question and if I understand him correctly, he is asking: "What do we hope to achieve by an amended motion? Is it merely hot air? Is it merely just a platitude? Is it merely a sanctimonious wish that somebody do something about something?"

MR. SIMMONS: Sucked in!

MR. CARTER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage is saying that I have been sucked in. It is true that I have given way somewhat in my desire to have the motion passed as framed, but I have given way deliberately to encourage unanimity, both on this side and I am now urging unanimity from the other side.

What I am saying will become a little more clear when I point out that implicit in this motion are three streams of thought: (1) Election expenses; there should be declaration of sources,

of amounts collected and of amounts spent. There should also be limitation, a limitation of sources, a limitation of amounts collected and a limitation of amounts spent. I feel that there should also be subsidization in case of a federal election by a federal government or in case of a provincial election by the provincial government and in the case of a municipal election. Whereas a municipality is a creature of the province, probably the province is the right agency to ask for subsidization for a municipal election. Nevertheless, I do feel that election expenses should be subsidized to some extent. Now there have been some reservations expressed on both sides of the House, both publicly and privately, about the subsidization aspect of this motion. I think everyone agrees about declaration, everyone agrees about limitation. They may differ to some extent therein, to the extent of declaration and limitation, that is the extent of the amounts but I do not think any honourable member in this House or any member of the public that I have spoken with disagrees with the idea of declaration or of limitation.

If any honourable gentlemen opposite wish to now object to declaration or limitation of election expenses, I shall gladly take my seat while they make a comment or two.

MR. W. N. ROWE: If the honourable member would yield for a second, I would like to make a short statement. It is not exactly a question which is ordinarily permissible but I would like to make a short statement, with the leave of the House and the honourable member.

Our intention I must say was to vote against this motion as amended because it was considered to be wishy-washy, watered down, emasculated, no substance, straw rather than substance, but having heard the Hon. Member for St. John's North, my colleagues and I have had a quick conference here and we must agree that it is better to have this emasculated, wishy-washy, straw-like resolution passed by the House than to have no resolution passed at all. It is

better to have this. Therefore, owing to the eloquence, persuasiveness of the Hon. Member for St. John's North, we have decided that we will vote in favour of the motion as amended, although we have already put on the public record what our position is, that we want a much stronger representation made to the government, a command in fact by this House made to the government to introduce legislation. We have not been able to effect that. We will gladly, since this is the last opportunity during this session opened to us to do so, go on record as supporting this weak resolution because it is better than nothing.

As my colleague, the Member for Hermitage, just mentioned to me as we were discussing the whole matter, although a command would be better, certainly even a resolution which gets this government to consider anything is a step ahead. We are a step further ahead if we can force this government even to consider something because there has not been much consideration given to anything in the past. If we can get this government to consider, just consider the introduction of legislation, that in itself is a victory. If the honourable member speaking now, trying to get unanimity in the House, I would say that he can save his breath, he can save his efforts because we, for our part (I do not know what the Member for Labrador South will be doing) vote for it and hopefully we will have a unanimous request by the House to the government to introduce legislation and implicit in that, I think is "at the earliest opportunity."

I am sure the government faced with unanimity in this regard from backbenchers and their own party, government members themselves, members of the opposition, would not think of taking the false step or would not think of running the danger of misleading the House by not introducing legislation at the earliest possible opportunity, possibly during the next session of the House.

With those few words, we can say with some gratitude to the honourable member that he often expresses some cynicism when he is speaking in debate in this House - it is a debating form and very

little is done to persuade members to vote one way or the other by speech making in this House. I think I can say with a clear conscience today that although our original intention was to vote against this wishy-washy, weak amendment, the words of wisdom he uttered, conciliatory words, have succeeded in persuading this side of the House or at least this side of the House or members who are colleagues of mine to vote for the amendment because it is better than nothing.

MR. CARTER: I would like to thank the Hon. Member for White Bay South for his very generous remarks and also for his acceptance of the principle that progress consists of an infinite number of infinitely small steps. Whereas we may not achieve all that we intended to by this motion, still half a loaf is better than no bread.

Merely to conclude, I just wish to mention a couple of very, very brief points. There have been some reservations expressed, I think on both sides of the House, about the idea of retroactivity, that they would hope that if a bill be brought in or if legislation be brought in that it would be continued as of the date that it is brought in and that there would not be any retroactivity connected with it. They are also concerned that the subsidization of candidates would encourage frivolous candidates (there are enough frivolous candidates anyway, I suppose) but worst, it would encourage the multiplicity of parties. I am a great believer in the two-party system and I do not believe in the three, four, five or multi-party system. I think this permits people to get elected with less than a majority of the vote. I think it can lead to all sorts of shakey bogs.

The Leader of the Opposition, I think made the point that subsidization on election expenses is really a natural progression in that the government or governments in the last hundred years have been paying more and more and more of the expenses of candidates, that is to say free radio time has been given and some of

radio is government radio stations. The mechanics of voting itself are completely paid for by the government. Government very often will take upon itself to advertise the fact that people should go out and vote. They will not say which side one should vote for but they do suggest that one should go out and vote. They do advertise where people may vote. All this costs money. It costs money to advertise. Governments are already spending more money on elections than they did ten, twenty or thirty years ago. It is part of the natural progression for a government to spend some more money on election expenses. How it should be done, I think is a very complex question. We just merely scratched the surface here.

I do thank all honourable members who participated in this debate and I thank the opposition for their generous decision to support this motion, as amended. With those few words I would like to close the debate, sit down and thank all honourable members who have contributed.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the motion as amended. Those in favour of the motion, as amended, "aye." Those against "nay." The motion is carried unanimously.

The next motion on the private member's motions is Motion No. 11 to be moved by the Hon. Member for St. John's South.

MR. WELLS: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have come in since this motion was introduced and put on the Order Paper, I believe, somewhere around the early part of February, the last of January, I have come so many days, so many Wednesdays, prepared to introduce this motion but now that the time has actually arrived, it is somewhat anticlimactic. However, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important thing in my view not simply because of the principle of a house for a house that I am going to enunciate in these remarks but it is also important that for the first time in this session of

the House, the House will be touching on housing. I feel that housing is one of the more important problems, social problems facing Newfoundland today. I will ask now for the latitude of the House in expanding my remarks a little beyond the narrow concept of a house for a house and legislation involving some to somewhat broader remarks on housing because I think other members may want to do the same thing. I think the public time in this House would be well-served, before this session ends, in having some remarks on housing because it is something that touches not only urban dwellers but rural dwellers as well. It is something that is vitally important for some reasons which I may elucidate on in a few moments.

So far as the city dweller is concerned, Mr. Speaker, when we think of housing problems, housing difficulties, we think of the city dweller first because the situation obtains now that with the increase in costs, the ordinary workingman living in the city, be it, St. John's, Corner Brook or the larger towns in Newfoundland, is finding it more and more difficult to put together the requisite amount of dollars to make up a downpayment to buy a house. I have a very great feeling of sympathy and concern for a lot of people, for ordinary workingmen, young men and their wives, their families who when they sit down and assess the matter of housing, when they start adding up the dollars which they can hope to accumulate in this era of rapidly increasing prices, when they add up the dollars, they do not see, even at ninety-five per cent financing, how they can manage to get enough together to get a home.

I remember an official of Central Mortgage and Housing telling me, even ten or twelve years ago, Mr. Speaker, that to have, to own and to buy a mortgage put

the sort of bungalow that was being built in St. John's ten years ago and selling for about \$25,000 or \$27,000 that a man would have to be making, at the prices that obtained then, \$10,000 a year before he could realistically put himself and his family in such a house. \$10,000 a year ten years ago was quite a high salary. Even today it is more than a great many working men are making, if not perhaps more than a great many tradesmen are making, but there are a lot of people and the statistics show that in Newfoundland a very, very great many men who are working twelve months of the year are not making more than \$6,000 or \$7,000.

So if that situation obtained ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, how much more today when the average wage is far from \$10,000? Yet the price of any new bungalow in St. John's is something of the order, I think I can say this without fear of contradiction, something of the order of \$38,000 to \$40,000.

So what it really means, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no way that a young workingman with a family can possibly put away the kind of money that is necessary to acquire such a home.

Let us look for a moment at the outports and what happens: In the outports in the past with the seasonal way of life or the way of life which was determined by the seasons, time at fishery, time at the seal fishery, perhaps a time cutting wood in the lumber woods, all these sorts of things, it enabled a man to lay aside a certain portion of the year to build a home. Very often a young man would cut timbers, cut logs, have them sawn on some basis, either pay or on a shared basis by a sawmill, get together wood and he would go ahead and he would build a home. A great many young men even twenty years ago in Newfoundland were doing that. That is not to say that some are not doing the same thing but the numbers have declined. So now we have reached the stage where the young man in the outport is facing a similar sort of problem to the man in the city except it is not so acute in many cases. The amount required is not so great but the essence of the problem is the same, that there is great difficulty in putting a roof over his head.

Now I think the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation with their system of mortgage loans in outport Newfoundland have gone some way to alleviate this need but they have not gone as far I think as they ought to go. Of course, when I say that I am bearing in mind that it is no good to talk about these sort of mortgage loans unless the money is available to make them.

So there we are, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing now with new housing. In the question of older housing it is even more difficult because a lot of the conventional lenders are not in a position to or at least will not lend money for repairs to older homes. There are people in St. John's today and I have received letters from hundreds of them, it is fair to say, over the past few months who are extremely concerned because they want to renovate and repair homes and they cannot do it because they cannot get the money from conventional sources. I have received letters also from people in the outports with the same sort of concern and again unable to get money from conventional sources.

The few conventional sources that lend money, particularly in the outports, for this sort of purpose require a very high interest rate. This makes it all the more important, Mr. Chairman, that the federal legislation, which provides for the repair and renovation of homes, provides for land assembly and things of that sort, be taken full advantage of in Newfoundland. I intend to, if I should be allowed. if I may, I would like to briefly review some of the federal programmes which obtained here in Newfoundland and which we are trying to take advantage of, but it is not always as easy to take advantage of a federal programme as the federal programme itself may indicate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we do not mind the honourable member having a wide-ranging debate about housing generally in this matter and the federal programmes but we would like to have the opportunity to reply on this side. That is the only thing. I would like for Your Honour to take note of that.

MR. WELLS: I am sure. Yes. Well I said to the honourable member when

I was beginning my remarks -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: I hope so. I think this is important enough for members of this House in this debate to be able to range beyond the immediate resolution. I was surprised myself this winter, Mr. Speaker, when I wrote Central Mortgage and Housing and asked about some of the programmes which they had.

I will refer to them briefly: There is the Assisted Home Ownership Programme, the Non-Profit Housing Assistance, Co-operative Housing Assistance, Neighbourhood Improvement Programme, Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme, Land Assembly Assistance, New Communities Programme, Developmental Programme, Housing for Indians on Reserves Programme, and Purchaser Protection.

The ones of these which interested me most, Mr. Speaker, were the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme and the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme. I would like to refer to these for a moment:

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, whose department deals with the Federal Government in these matters, is here. I would certainly appreciate later in this debate if he were to enter the debate and explain to us some of the details and some of the difficulties in dealing with the Federal Government on some of these programmes.

Now the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme, if I might refer to it briefly, they say offers a broad range of Federal Government contributions, loans, etc. The purpose of the programme is to encourage and support efforts of municipalities, in concert with neighbourhood residents, toward the improvement of their physical environment and the development of social and recreational amenities.

They talk about eligibility. There are four qualifications. The area must be predominantly residential. Significant proportion of the existing housing, Sir, must be in need of improvement and repair. Most of the housing in the neighbourhood to be occupied by people with low to moderate income and the available social and recreation amenities to be considered inadequate.

Now the Federal Government will apparently contribute fifty per cent of the cost of the selection of neighbourhoods for participation and development of improvement plans, fifty per cent of the cost of acquisition of land, acquisition and clearance of land for recreational amenities, fifty per cent of the construction of new or improvement of existing social or recreational facilities, the development of occupancy and building maintenance standards, the relocation of persons dispossessed of their homes by the programme and the local administration of the programme, including the employment of staff, etc.

Then there is the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme, Mr. Speaker, which I think would be extremely important to Newfoundland if we could get more of the Province designated to take advantage of it. That applies to home owners earning \$11,000 a year or less which would certainly take in the great majority of our people. It would apply to landlords who agree to rent controls, to nonprofit corporations and co-operatives. The programme applies to home owners and landlords in areas participating in the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme and in other areas through special agreements with provinces and to nonprofit corporations and nonprofit co-operatives in any area.

In this programme one will be able to repair the house. Priority would be given to the repair of the housing structure and upgrading of plumbing, electrical and heating systems. In addition, nonprofit corporations may obtain funds under this programme for the conversion of existing properties. The nature and quality of repair work should insure a further useful life of the property of about fifteen years. To assist him in improving the appearance of neighbourhoods, some work to enhance the external appearance of the dwelling unit and its immediate surroundings will be eligible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you come to the actual assistance to the home owner which is allowed under this programme. I think this could be - if we could get it in Newfoundland to apply to enough homes and enough areas, it would be one of the best things that ever happened to the home owner. Assistance will be in the form of loans up to \$5,000 per dwelling unit

at a beneficial interest rate of which repayment, up to a maximum of \$2,500, may be forgiven if the housing continues to be occupied and maintained by the applicant. Home earners earning less than \$6,000 are eligible for the maximum forgiveness of \$2,500. The forgiveness will be reduced by a dollar for every two dollars of income over \$6,000. For example, a person earning \$8,000 would be eligible for forgiveness of \$1,500.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can you think of a programme either in rural or urban Newfoundland which would be more beneficial to our people in this Province, most of whom earn less than \$11,000, than a programme where they could be forgiven up to one half of the amount that they borrowed to renovate their homes.

I remember in the past when I have been campaigning, I remember so well when I was campaigning in Bonavista North in the election which I lost and which the member for Bell Island loves to gibe me about but I can remember talking to men who were sitting down in the middle of a summer day in their communities, men on social assistance and men looking at their homes dropping down and not having the wherewithal even to get some materials like nails to do what was necessary, or at least this is what I was told. I might say on this question of the repair of homes that for people on social assistance the Social Assistance Department has I think a wise policy and it has had it for some time, whereby they provide building materials, because I think we have to recognize right across the whole spectrum of government activity that nothing is more important than maintaining a decent standard of housing in this country, in this province.

If we let housing go down below a decent standard, other things happen as well. It is not just that people are chilly. It is just not that people do not like their surroundings. If you let housing go down then you invite illiteracy, you invite crime, you invite all sorts of social disorder and disease. This is something that I think we have to recognize. Far greater, far, far wider than the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, we have to recognize that to assist people to have decent housing is a fundamental responsibility at all public levels,

municipal, federal, provincial. It is something that we have to keep in our minds all of the time whether we are talking about fisheries programmes, educational programmes, whatever, that one of the fundamental things that lead to a decent society is decent housing and in cases where it is necessary, the public have represented by their governments that the public should contribute to this question and to this provision of decent housing.

So, on this and this is something that I am sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs will speak about and I certainly hope he shall. These programmes and particularly the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme and the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme are programmes which on the face of it as they are set out in the federal brochures are programmes that would be of such importance to us. Perhaps all of us who are not directly concerned with negotiating with the Federal Government will wonder why the various areas of Newfoundland are not designated immediately so that people can take advantage of this sort of thing.

What I am told as I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be able to explain to us, that it is not so easy, that there are requirements that the Federal Government impose which are not always written in its brochures and in its literature, which make it more difficult for this Province, I do not know about other provinces, to enter into these sorts of agreements which will enable people to get the assistance which these programmes purport to be offering.

One thing I hope and I hope it very much, Mr. Speaker, is that these programmes are not in any sense a hoax. I think it would be one of the bitterest, cruelest things for a government at any level to come out with programmes but at the same time to lay down the conditions and qualifications which make it impossible for people to qualify and to take advantage. That I think would be ten times worse than if the programme were never in existence. As I say, I look forward to the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs should he chose to take part in this debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am conscious the time is passing. I would be very unhappy if this motion were not dealt with in this session of the House.

I would like to see it fully debated and I would like to see everybody in this House who feel that they wish to express their opinion on it do so, but at the same time I would be very sad if it were to be just talked out and the session were to end or the sitting were to end and we were to all go about whatever other business we do without this House being placed on record with regard to the substantive part of this motion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will move on to the more substantive part of it, having made these general remarks on housing. Now a lot of people perhaps in this country and perhaps in this House hear the word "expropriation" every day of their lives. They hear it, perhaps they feel that they understand it but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, do they really? Because in my experience it is only perhaps the officials who are dealing with expropriation matters and the lawyers who are involved, and some of the people who are involved in the end, but it is only firstly these two groups I think and the courts which really understand the principles of expropriation and how they are applied.

Now before you can talk about something like a house for a house or before you can talk about the Family Homes Expropriation Act, I think you have to realize what the Expropriation Act is itself, what it does, what it means, why you can take people's land. Now, the basic principle of expropriation, the reasons why are outlined and set forth in the Expropriation Act itself, which is part of the revised statutes of Newfoundland. Essentially, without going into great detail, land can be taken for public purposes. Of course, the government of the day, the department concerned or the minister concerned has to decide what is the public purpose and if it is a fit public purpose or a necessary public purpose to come within the Expropriation Act so that they can go and take your house or my house or anybody's house or anybody's land because the public necessity of the circumstance overrides the private good, the private right to hold and own property, which we have in this country.

I think it follows from that, Mr. Speaker, it follows and goes without say that anybody who is exercising this power to take private

property ought only to exercise it in cases of very real and great need when the public need is obviously and clearly greater than the private right. In this regard I would say that in the past twenty-five years in Newfoundland, since Confederation, there have been many occasions of expropriation, some which have been brought to my attention as a lawyer practicing in this Province and as a citizen, when I thought that the public authority was a little too cavalier, too quick, a little too blasé about taking private property from people. I felt that there were times when the remedy or the right to expropriate as given by statute ought not perhaps to have been exercised but rather more effort should have been made to purchase the property or to find alternate property that could be acquired more easily.

So I think it is fundamental to say that it is only in extreme cases, it is only when it is absolutely and clearly necessary and even then care should be taken in expropriating property because it is not something that should be lightly done. I think that word of caution from this House and the members of it is worthwhile because not only has this Province the right to expropriate but creatures of the Province, namely, municipalities and other creatures of the Province have the right to expropriate also.

Now people may not be certain what happens, when expropriation takes place, what it is. What happens is that the decision is made, the order is made and signed by the minister or the other responsible person. Whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, there is something of more interest. I believe going on in the gallery, almost. There are sounds. What is happening? I hope nothing is going to fall on the heads of members.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): If the honourable member would permit me. We have a group of Russian seamen in the gallery, forty-five in number, such that they outnumber us with their guide leader, Mr. Freeman.

On behalf of all honourable members of the House of Assembly, for the Province of Newfoundland it gives me great pleasure to welcome you

gentlemen to the galleries this afternoon. I trust that your visit here will be interesting, informative and on behalf of all honourable members again I welcome you here.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, you cannot say that I am not perceptive. I knew that something was happening in the galleries. I only wish that some member -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: What is that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Oh, no! I only wish that I were

able to add my welcome to that of you, Mr. Speaker, and welcome these men in Russian, because of course I am sure they are interested in the proceedings in this chamber. It would be interesting to know if any of our guests up there this afternoon understand English or have familiarity with it. Certainly I am sure we all hope that they enjoy their brief stay in our legislature even if they are not cognizant of exactly what is going on in the debate.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Well, now that is not exactly true. I would ask the minister to retract that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: With pleasure.

MR. WELLS: Now, on the question of assessing compensation: The rules for assessing compensation are set out in the Expropriation Act. So, after the notice has been signed and issued it is either served on the individual or posted on the land or both and within ten days of the doing of that, the service and posting, the land becomes the property of the crown. So that the land goes to the crown ten days after the expropriation.

It may be that the individual may not be paid or compensated for months or even years. This is unfortunate. Now, the rules of compensation and the act itself set out that in the first place there will be negotiation. The land has been taken, the title rests in the crown but then negotiation takes place. If the parties can agree, then well and good, there is no problem. In due course there is a further conveyance or release as the case may be to perfect the passing of title and the person from whom the land is taken gets his money and that is the end of it.

It does not always work that way, Mr. Speaker, largely because of the rules of compensation. The paramount clause in the rules of compensation and the award of compensation is that the compensation shall be an amount based on the fair market value of the land and on existing use value at the time of the commencement of expropriation proceedings. No account shall be taken of the compulsory acquisition of the land, the disturbance of the owner

or occupier or any other injurious effectuation.

Now, there are sections later on in the bill which soften the blow of that but one can see the basic position. The land is taken as it was at the fair market value at the time of the taking. One can see the problems that arise. Negotiations take place. I will never forget the emotional content of an expropriation on which I acted for one of the parties seven or eight years ago in Mount Pearl when they were enlarging that town. The land was taken. It was raw land, little better than a swamp. By the time the board sat down, approximately a year and a half later, to decide the question of compensation, there was a street there with houses. The people were extremely upset because the criterion for assessing that value was based on the land at the time of the taking. Here they could look at it in terms of so many building lots along a paved street.

Now, I am not suggesting that the criteria be different but one can see, Mr. Speaker, that because the criteria are as they are there is a great emotional involvement, a great deal of upset and a great deal of bad feeling in any expropriation. We in this society and in this system have grown up over the centuries with the idea and the right of owning private property. For that right to be interfered with forcibly and for the rules of compensation not to agree with what we feel is proper compensation, is something which we do not like as a people. I am glad that we do not like it. It is that sort of feeling and that sort of instinct in people in our society that make for freedom. It is that sort of instinct which makes it difficult for people to impose anything in the nature of a dictatorship on this country. It causes all sorts of difficulty when one starts to arrive at compensation for land which has been taken.

So, what really happened, Mr. Speaker, was, with these rules of compensation for taking family homes, the situation became much more difficult than merely the taking of land. This became apparent and started to become apparent particularly in the early sixties and particularly here in St. John's when much of the whole

center of St. John's was gutted for the area on which City Hall now stands and the adjacent land. I think everybody in this House even those of us who were not here at the time remember the honourable Member for Bell Island was here at the time and the honourable Member for Fogo but there was a considerable fight put up by the now member for St. John's Center. He was member for St. John's Center then too, the honourable minister. I may say at this time, we wonder how he is and I sincerely hope that he is recovering from his operation and I would hope that his convalescence has been achieved by this time, Mr. Speaker. We all hope to see him back in this House.

It was he around about 1962, when he and the honourable member from Bell Island I believe were elected, that led the fight for some sort of extra compensation for family homes. The reason is this, Mr. Speaker: If I were renting a house to somebody and it were taken, fair market value is fine because I get the value that this investment would fetch on the open market. I can then go and buy a similar home or I can go and put my money into bonds or I can do anything with it but it is an investment thing.

If I were living in a home in certain circumstances and it were taken from me, this is where the rub comes. This is where the rub came down in the center of St. John's. This is where the difficulty is occurring in so many parts of Newfoundland today. What happens is that if one were to take a home in an area in a healthy residential area, an area, well to pull one out of the air, it comes to mind to say Elizabeth Avenue - if one were to take a bungalow on Elizabeth Avenue from its owner and then give him fair market value for that particular house on Elizabeth Avenue at the time, he can take his money and he can go to Downing Street or Exeter Place or wherever he likes. He can go and convert that money into another home. Therefore, aside from the dislocation, Mr. Speaker, he has not suffered too much. He is all right. He is basically put back in the position in which he was.

If one happen to be a retired man or a retired couple living upon Hillview Drive, on the lower portion of the Southside Hills - there

was one such instance in the news recently, a man and his wife who worked and saved -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand on a point of order. I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that there are only seven members on that side of the House. I will have to call a quorum. I do not want to be discourteous to my honourable friend because his remarks are most interesting but I would like for the member to come back into their seats, otherwise, I am going to have to call a quorum, Sir. At least they should show a little respect and a little courtesy to the member who is speaking, Sir.

MR. WELLS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was referring to the position and the predicament of a person who -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. WELLS: So many people rising, one never knows what to do.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, referring again to the position of a person such as this retired couple who have worked hard and put savings throughout a working lifetime into a small home which is taken from them. They have a lot of land around it so that they are not used to living on a city building lot. It is quite a different style of life. It is perhaps a style of life and a style of living which we are more used to in the outports or in the smaller towns in Newfoundland.

So, an expropriation comes. The land and the house is taken. What happens? Let us say it is valued at \$10,000 or \$12,000 because perhaps if you or I were to go up there and buy it we would only pay that for it because perhaps we would not want to live up there. But to them it is home. If they take the \$10,000 or \$12,000 that the standard Expropriation Act allows, if they take that money and attempt to move into St. John's or attempt to move into one of the rapidly growing municipalities around St. John's, they find that with their \$10,000 or \$12,000 they cannot buy a comparable home to the home that they have built up over a lifetime of work. This is where the difficulty comes in.

So, that what happens in such cases?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Even the Russians cannot stand the thought.

MR. WELLS: Well, it is a considerable compliment, Mr. Speaker, that they came here in the first place. It must have been reported in Russia some four months ago that I would introduce the resolution on this point. So, they are there. Does the honourable member see them?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Go back and my ideas will appear interesting.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the point is and the difficulty is that the rules of compensation when they are applied to such people do not make it possible for a person to buy a comparable home. So, that the person with the type of home that I am speaking of may well have to come in to one of the older and more dilapidated streets in St. John's, put down his \$8,000 or \$9,000 and get something, having regard to the amount of land and the amenities of the house itself, that is not nearly as good in comparison to what was taken away from him on the outskirts.

Of course, this can also apply in the case of the low income person. This applied to some of the people who lived in the central part of St. John's back in 1961 and 1962 when that development down there was undertaken by the city. With the amount of money that they got for some of these homes, they could not possibly do more than raise a down payment for another home elsewhere in the city.

In my thinking, Mr. Speaker, on this it seems to me that when we take people's homes in this province - this should be a matter I believe of public policy that when we take a home we should make it possible for that person - of course, this does not apply in the case of the \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000 home - but when we take a home particularly of a man in the low income bracket, that we should not in any sense force him back into another home of low quality and low standard.

We come back I think to my original remarks about housing, that housing is so important to the well-being of our citizens that as a matter of public policy we should not allow people, especially when government and public monies are involved, to go back to a lower form of home, to a shack, to something which is not going to allow them to raise their standard of living, their outlook on life and give their

children a better chance.

This was the thinking of the honourable Ank Murphy when he was back then a member of the opposition in St. John's Center, behind his pressing for the Family Homes Expropriation Act. I will say, a credit to him, a credit to everybody concerned at the time that act was passed.

MR. ROBERTS: In 1964, was it not?

MR. WELLS: It was passed in 1964, yes.

It is not fair to be unfair to the Minister of Finance who is not here to defend himself.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: No, the minister did not change it.

Now, let me speak if I may, to the honourable member now, on that matter. The minister did not change it. It is unfair to say so. Let us please have the record straight. What happened was that the federal government at that time, bearing in mind that the federal government was about to enter into major urban renewal schemes, the federal government said, "On that principle of the Family Homes Expropriation Act, we will not enter into the schemes and we will not compensate on that principle."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: But the province could have.

MR. WELLS: The province could have and I hope the province under the Conservative Government in the future will do so.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: That is right. But the government at the time looked at the situation and bearing in mind all the considerations - I do not know what considerations were there at the time - but the government, not the Minister of Finance -

MR. CARTER: On a point of order. If Your Honour will permit me, I would like to say a few words of welcome to some Russian seamen who are visiting this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I know it is in order for the honourable member to do it, by leave I suppose. But my understanding is that they are no longer here.

MR. CARTER: I understand they are still here in the corridor, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Well, if I may I would certainly yield for a moment. I would love to hear my honourable friend speak in Russian.

MR. CARTER: I have been asked to just extend a few words, out of courtesy.

Ovazhae mee droozhbya, Oteemenee nashevo parlamenta me pozdravlaem vass s'voshem visitom k'nam. Zhelaem vam vcevo naeeloochshevo nasha droozhba s'vamee probleeyayet na meer vcevo sveta spoceebo.

MR. WELLS: That, Mr. Speaker, was a most welcome intrusion into the debate, I am sure.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Well, I do not know what it was but all I know is that it received approval from those toward whom it was directed. I am very pleased.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course the honourable member for St. John's North will provide a copy of that to our staff up in Hansard because I am sure they are not able to translate it on their own.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it is only long years in court that have given me the ability, I hope, to carry on with all the interruptions that I have had, pleasant though they have been.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: Oh, that is right. I can ride right over it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have fallen into the trap. What with Russian and everything else, I believe I have.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: What was I speaking of? There was some particular area that I was speaking of. Oh yes, I was explaining to the Hon. Member for Bell Island, who has now vacated his seat, that we must lay to rest his blame. I do not think in debate such as this we are here to lay blame on the Minister of Finance. We are not here to lay blame on the Smallwood Government or anybody but we are here to look, I hope dispassionately, at a problem and see if we can correct it. What was done in 1967 was done

because the federal government imposed certain strictures. In order to take advantage of the urban renewal schemes as laid down in the criteria developed by the federal government, the government at the time and the House at that time had to or did at any rate pass the amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back if I may to the act itself. It is a very short act. I am going to read some of it. It is only two pages in total, apart from the schedule. The language in it is excellent. The thinking is excellent. There are some things a House can be proud of. Most of us were not in the House at that time but I think it is something to be proud of that this type of thinking was enshrined in a particular piece of legislation. The preamble itself is interesting in this regard, Mr. Speaker.

"WHEREAS it is desirable to avoid hardship to persons and families whose homes are expropriated under various statutes in pursuance of various public purposes; and

"WHEREAS it is thought right to afford special protection in cases where expropriation disturbs a settled family life; and

"WHEREAS it is recognized that in many cases compensation limited under various statutes to market value is not true compensation;

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT ENACTED ..."

I think that that sets out the thinking that was argued and that prevailed at that time about family homes and expropriation. Now the act goes on. It talks about family homes.

It says in Section (2): "Whenever under any act enabling expropriation of private property it is decided to expropriate any family home, this act shall apply." It defines a family home and one can go into that in great detail but it is a house which is and has for a reasonable time been the home of a family unit, together with the appropriate amount of land. It says: "In case of any such expropriation and notwithstanding any rules or provisions for the assessment of values set out in the statute under which the expropriation is made, the principle of assessment shall be that the owner of the family home shall receive compensation as will at current costs and criteria put him in a position to acquire by

purchase or construction a home reasonably equivalent to that which is being expropriated." Sometimes the language of the draftsman is excellent, Mr. Speaker, and this is such a time. It is so clear, it is beautiful "... a position to acquire by purchase or construction a home reasonably equivalent to that which is being expropriated."

There is a final section which is worth talking about, the intent of the act. It says: "The

intent and purpose of this act is that where it is decided to expropriate the family home the owner shall receive such compensation as will ensure that the family unit is in no worse position as a result of the expropriation, it being recognized that strict market value is not in all cases a true compensation to a family unit which is dispossessed, since it may not provide equivalent accommodation. But the protection given by this act is not to extend to any person in whose case the property or his interest in it is fairly to be looked upon as a money asset or investment and is not a family home."

So that it draws a distinction, the distinction that I drew a moment ago or a few minutes ago in debate, that there is a distinction between a family home which is lived in by a family and a home in the same street or in the same location which you or I or anybody might have as an investment to rent to other people. That person should not get the benefit and under that act he did not. The act set out its true meaning and intent, that it was the disruption and dislocation to families that it was aiming to correct, not to provide an unjust enrichment for somebody who was not entitled to it.

So, Mr. Speaker, this act worked and this act did a lot of good and it was one of the finer little pieces of social legislation on our books and of course, for reasons which I have outlined, in 1966, 1967 the Act number 1963 of that year, it was amended. Now the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and this is something -

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would permit me -

MR. WELLS: I may say, Mr. Speaker, you are getting just like a judge.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has approximately, according to the new rules, two or three minutes left. I understand -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Well he has been interrupted on several occasions and I am sure he could continue by leave. Is leave granted for the honourable

member to continue? Agreed.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not realized that I had gone on so long. Now then, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the 1966-1967 amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: It would be better if there were a quorum.

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us get a quorum.

MR. WELLS: Well why not stay? Why not stay?

MR. ROBERTS: There are only thirteen, including all of us. If somebody would step in we would have fourteen.

MR. NEARY: Send the Whip out to bring the members in.

MR. WELLS: The honourable member for Bay de Verde has made up the number, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOWARD: Always on the ball.

MR. ROBERTS: The biggest thing he has done in two and a half years of public life.

MR. HOWARD: That is your opinion.

MR. WELLS: Come on now, we were debating the - You see I am about to deal with something which I consider of considerable public importance, Mr. Speaker, that is that when the Family Homes Expropriation Act was amended and when the principle that was enunciated in the 1964 act was done away with, it had not done away with all expropriation of family homes in the province. What it did and I will read the relevant section, what it did was say this; "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act where pursuant to any urban renewal scheme a family home is expropriated under any act, by, for or on behalf of the province or any body, corporation or authority and the assessors or arbitrators referred to in section (5) are of the opinion that the family homes so expropriated is (a) substandard by reason of its size, construction or deterioration or (b) unfit by ordinary accepted property standards for human habitation, no compensation shall be paid in respect of such expropriation except such compensation to the owner as is referred to in subsection (2)."

Then they go on to say, "Where public rental accommodation is available the person would be allowed to have a chance at that rental

accommodation." But what it did, Mr. Speaker, was not do away with it but it just did away with it insofar as these urban renewal schemes are concerned. Here is the nub of the matter, Mr. Speaker, a great many people in Newfoundland thought that when the amendment took place that it did away with the Family Homes Expropriation Act. Therefore when their homes were expropriated, they did not realize, if they were outside an urban renewal scheme, they did not realize that the rights of the act were available to them.

Now it is an easy matter to say that knowledge of the law, everybody should be knowledgeable about it, that everybody should know that only a part of the Family Homes Expropriation Act was amended. But how many members of the general public knew that? How many members of this House knew it? Not very many, I would suggest. Why should they? We are not dealing with this every day. We are not all of us dealing with the law every day so that what happened was that the amendment applied only to the urban renewal schemes because the federal government dictated in effect that it would apply. The act itself still applied to all other homes but people did not know it and I suggest sometimes that officials did not know it. I am sure that every town council manager did not know it. Officials would go out and they would use the ordinary standard of expropriation which was fair market value and I suspect and suggest that a great many people, even those dealing with it, did not realize that the Family Homes Expropriation Act and the principles and the law enunciated in it still applied. I believe that in Newfoundland since 1966-1967, people have been shortchanged either advertently or inadvertently because of this. I think that if nothing else were achieved by this debate and I hope that more is achieved by it, but if nothing else were achieved by it I think that is one statement which I hope will be reported and it is this, the statement that the Family Homes Expropriation Act still applies to every part of Newfoundland which is not the subject matter of an urban renewal scheme. I think to say that loud and clear and for it to be reported would do good because there are houses being expropriated, not every day but every week in Newfoundland, which are subject to this act for which people can claim the kind of compensation that I am talking

about if the market value does not apply to them or does not give them an adequate move or an adequate compensation.

Now I have referred to the Minister of Municipal Affairs before in the course of my remarks. There is no question, I think with the problems of municipalities, the problems of housing, the problems of urban renewal and the various social and economic problems that arise out of these areas of life I think that that minister has perhaps in some respects the most difficult portfolio in the provincial government. I would like to hear him speak on this also. But I will say now that I think the management of these urban renewal schemes is one of the more difficult things that has ever had to be undertaken by a minister and his officials and deputies, etc. I think it is extremely difficult to handle an urban renewal scheme because the very nub and guts of a renewal scheme is that you are taking people's homes, you are transplanting them, you are moving homes, you are tearing up a community and making a new community out of it.

What I am saying is essentially that the principle of the Family Homes Expropriation Act ought to be brought back and ought to be applied to every family home expropriation in Newfoundland, including family homes expropriated under urban renewal schemes but I cannot and I have thought about this a great deal - Mr. Speaker, if I could in conscience say that we ought to rewrite the law, that we could change the previous agreements with the federal government that we could go back to 1966 and 1967 and pretend that this had not happened and if we could recompensate people it would be marvellous, but I do not think that that is the way it can work. I do not think we can go back that seven or eight years and undo something that was done at the time largely because of the federal participation. There is no law that we can pass here that can make the federal government provide money that I think it should have provided seven or eight years ago. We cannot do that. I have given a great deal of thought to this and I have given a great deal of thought to it particularly because in my own district is Blackhead Road which was one of the major urban renewal projects.

I know there has been hardship. I know there has been nuisance. I know there has been upset. I was talking to one lady - let us see, I think it was last Friday. She was one of the first people to have her home expropriated. She is an elderly lady now and hers was one of the first homes expropriated on Blackhead Road. She was not able to get another home. She got \$6,800. She could not buy another home. She was treated as fairly as the law allowed. She was found another home belonging to the scheme and she has rented that home from the scheme and has lived in it ever since and now she has a married daughter and son-in-law living with her. But they were turned from home owners into non-home owners as of that date. You know she said to me and there was a certain amount of pathos in it when she said to me, "You know, ever since that expropriation, every since my home was taken, life has not been the same. I have had a feeling of anxiety and uncertainty, because I had lived in my own home ever since we were first married some forty years ago. But in these last few years my husband is dead, I have had a feeling of uncertainty and I felt ill at ease." There is the human side of the problem that I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know if we can correct, I do not think we can go back to 1966 and 1967 and put right these things. I do not know how it could be done but my main concern is that from here on in and I hope that on both sides of the House we can say this, that from here on in, whatever happens, we will ensure in this province and the government and the House of Assembly of this province will ensure that this will not happen to people again, that if urban renewal schemes are conducted in future, whatever schemes, whether they be federal, provincial, joint partnerships, municipal, whatever they are, I want and I am asking this House to say that in future the principles involved in the Family Homes Expropriation Act will apply.

We cannot solve all of the things that have happened in the past. I do not know how we can go back and provide money out of current taxes and borrowings to rectify something involving another government, six, seven, eight years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope and I

sincerely ask my colleagues in this House, on this side and on the other side, to ensure, and we are the only body in Newfoundland that can, we are the people who have the power, the power to make law in this province, and I would ask my colleagues as I say, on this side and the other side, to ensure that from now on, that from 1974 on that no family home will be taken without this concept being involved in the compensation so that people will not have to suffer what some of the people in these urban renewal schemes suffered in the past.

Now I am more familiar obviously with the Blackhead Road scheme. It is now called Shea Heights after I suppose one of the finest and most civic-minded spiritual leaders that have ever been in a parish in Newfoundland and that is the late Father Shea after whom Shea Heights has now been renamed; from Blackhead Road to Shea Heights. Some of the stories of the work that man did and the sacrifices he performed are worth telling and perhaps they will be told in another place and perhaps they will be put into print. But this man was a fine spiritual and community leader. I am glad and I am sure we all are and I know the residents are that that area has now been called after him.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the last year and a half, two years, considerable effort has been made to try, by means of a review board, to solve some of the problems that were left as a result of the urban renewal scheme in Shea Heights. The review board in a lot of cases went and offered a little more compensation, tried to put right wrongs and in fact did a very, very good job I feel, and that some of the evils which I believe that this amendment to the Family Homes Expropriation Act, some of the evils brought about by that I think have been rectified - not all can be rectified.

But I would say again to this House and the members of it that we ought to take a stand now, that we ought to say that in future, from 1974 on, this sort of injustice will not take place and that we will change the law and we will when the time comes vote the monies to make sure that the law can be followed and that people who for the greater public good

have to give up their homes will be compensated along the principles that I have enunciated this afternoon, Because, Mr. Speaker, it is not only a matter of dollars and cents, it is not only a matter of clapboard and shingles and a piece of ground and a lawn and all that, it is a matter of the home, in my view at least, being almost the cradle of our society. If children can be born into a home of a good physical standard, a better physical standard perhaps than their fathers, then it is my hope and I think should be the hope of all of us that we can benefit our community by the wise expenditure of public monies to benefit housing, to bring housing up, to bring it along and thereby to help our people in one of the most fundamental ways that I feel we can help them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the indulgence in letting me go on longer than the time allowed and I do ask, as I say, all my colleagues on both sides of the House for support in this motion which I am proposing.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you! Well, Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate the honourable gentleman on what I thought was a most excellent speech. I know that I speak for my colleagues, four-ninths of us are here, I can only express the wish that more of the honourable gentleman's political soulmates as it were had seen fit to hear his speech because I think that the topic which he has raised in this resolution and the points which he has made in his speech are probably the single most important points to be made in this House in this session.

Somebody, I am not sure which honourable member it was, but one of the honourable gentlemen in the House, it may have been somebody on my side or it may have been somebody on the other side, made the point recently that the House of Assembly is irrelevant. I think, Your Honour, with all due respect to the assembly over which Your Honour presides, I think that if the truth were to be known, in the eyes of most of the people in Newfoundland the House of Assembly is largely irrelevant. Most of what we talk about has no real bearing on the problems that concern the average person. In particular the little party games that we play

back and forth, and all honourable members are guilty of this, if there be guilt. I am not so sure it is guilt. It is part of the system. It may be an inescapable and an unavoidable part but the party games which we play do little to make the House any more relevant. Because of the faults in the procedure under which we operate, it is difficult to raise subjects unless the government choose to raise them. The government by definition seem afraid to raise many important matters.

It may well be that matters such as the one now before us can only come up through a private member's motion and I think the gentleman from St. John's South is to be complimented and congratulated for having brought in this motion. I thought he spoke not only sincerely, the honourable gentleman is usually very sincere, he does not talk with tongue in cheek as a number of honourable members on both sides have been known to do on occasion, but he is usually very sincere. I thought he spoke not only sincerely but with great eloquence because what he was saying touches him deeply, the subject matter is obviously one about which he has thought a great deal.

Now, Sir, for our part we shall support the motion and do it quite happily and quite gladly and with conviction and with enthusiasm. The only complaint we have is that it is necessary to bring in this motion at all. It took a fair amount of political courage on the part of the gentleman from St. John's South to bring in this motion and I know he did so only with regret. Because, Sir, not matter what may have happened in the past, and I will come back a little later to deal with the 1966-1967 amendment to the original legislation,

no matter what may have happened in that far-distant past, the fact remains that the administration which presently forms the government of this province, the political party supported by the gentleman from St. John's South, stand committed and have stood committed to exactly the principle which the honourable gentleman advocates in his motion. Indeed, Sir, they have gone so far as to put that commitment in the form of a throne speech. If Your Honour would cast your mind back to the famous or infamous one-day session when the people of Newfoundland were treated to a throne speech with one or two good things in it, Your Honour will find therein enshrined (As Your Honour knows, there is no pagination in the throne speech but it is quite near the end) the following paragraph:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the honourable House of Assembly, my government believe that decent shelter is one of the basic rights of human beings. My ministers realize the needs and aspirations of our people in terms of housing and have already commenced studies aimed at finding solutions to these problems. At the same time my government maintains that when a person is removed from his home through any urban renewal development that this person has the right to have his home replaced by a comparable home." It goes on, Sir, "We will, therefore, be asked to repeal the Family Homes Expropriation Amendment Act, 1966-1967."

Sir, that commitment was made March 1, 1972. As we know that session ended precipitously. I do not need to go into it now but shall we say that some arrangements were made for shelter for an honourable member, no longer an honourable member, and the session ended quite precipitously. The government cannot be faulted for not having acted at that session in this way.

Sir, the 1972 session, April, 1972, came and went and there was no bill introduced to repeal the Family Homes Expropriation Act.

Sir, the 1973 session came and went and no bill was introduced to repeal the Family Homes Expropriation Act.

Sir, the 1974 session has come, it has not yet gone although it is obviously getting towards its closing days. We have been given notice of seventy-eight separate bills, some of which are so crucially important as the bill which removed a coma .

AN HON. MEMBER: That one passed.

MR. ROBERTS: That one passed, Sir. The ministry put the full weight of their authority behind that one and it went through. We still have not seen any bill to repeal or even to amend the Family Homes Expropriation Amendment Act, 1966-1967. The ministry cannot be heard to plead that the reason they have not done it is because of difficulty with draftsmen. It may be that they have difficulty with draftsmen but the Family Homes Expropriation Amendment Act, Sir, is a simple act to repeal. It can be repealed as simply as any act can be repealed, as a bill in its entirety would read: (I will get any bill to get the exact wording) "Be it enacted by the Lieutenant Governor and House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows: (1) This Act may be cited as The Family Homes Expropriation (Amendment) Act, 1974. (2) The Family Homes Expropriation (Amendment) Act, 1966-1967, is hereby repealed."

Sir, that is all that is needed to implement that promise. That is all the legislative action that is needed, a bill which would read in its entirety the words that I have just used. It is that simple. It is not a matter of drafting or anything else. It is a matter of will power or more explicitly, in this case it is a matter of "won't" power. The government made the commitment. Now they can sway what went on in the past, if they wish. They can say that the Liberal Administration brought in a piece of legislation in 1964 which was a good piece of legislation. Indeed, Sir, it was one of the best pieces of legislation of its kind in Canada. They can then say that in 1966-1967 that act was amended.

I was glad that the honourable gentleman from St. John's South pointed out the purport and the effect of the 1966-1967

amendment. It has been misrepresented deliberately or negligently by many honourable gentlemen opposite over the years. In any event, that is history.

The point I make is simply that in 1972 the administration stood pledged to that. They were returned to office quite handsomely and they have not moved in any way to implement that promise. I do not know what it would cost them. Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he speaks, as I hope he will, will have some words to say on what it would cost to implement that principle. Obviously, it will cost something. Sir, presumably that was calculated in advance. Surely, when the administration wrote the 1972 throne speech, they knew what it would cost them to implement the principle. Indeed, I suggest that it would cost them very little because at present we have no urban renewal areas in this province. We have some in effect but we have no new ones.

As I understand the current Government of Canada policy, no new ones are contemplated, because they have switched their emphasis in the housing programmes away from the concept of urban renewal as we saw it in the Blackhead Road and now Shea Heights and as we saw it at Mundy Pond and as we saw it in Corner Brook, in the Crow Gulch and on the west side area. That concept has gone. It may well be that the amendment would not cost them a plug nickel. It is highly unlikely, as I understand the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approach now and the approach being adopted by Mr. Basford and his associates and his officials at Ottawa, that we will ever again see an urban renewal scheme of the type we saw in the Shea Heights Area and the type we saw in Corner Brook and in Mundy Pond. That concept is gone. They are now using different concepts, different approaches.

In other words, Sir, the gentleman from St. John's South put it into perspective. He had to stand and make an eloquent plea for something which was promised to have been done two years ago, which could have been done with very few words. It was not

as if a draftsman had to be found to draft a one hundred section piece of legislation. I read the full bill. It is all that would have been needed, all that will be needed. He has to stand and plead in this House to have enshrined in legislation a principle which his colleagues - he was not in the House in 1972 when that throne speech came down, neither was the gentleman from Placentia East. The gentleman from Placentia East at that stage was still a Liberal. He had not yet declared his true colours. However, the Member for Gander, the Minister of Fisheries, was in the House. He was in the cabinet. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was not in the House when that throne speech was brought down. He was enjoying a brief respite from the cares and duties of public life, a temporary holiday at the request of the voters of Fortune Bay. He will be getting a longer one in due course.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, the government have not moved. They could have moved. I say now that they should move. I go further and it is a point which I did not hear the honourable gentleman from St. John's South raise and it may be a new point to him, that is that I doubt if the amendment would ever have any effect because the present Section (6) of the Family Homes Expropriation Act, which is the one to which the objection is quite properly taken, applies only in urban renewal schemes. Urban renewal schemes are not defined so they obviously would have to bare the meaning of the words. There is no special definition of them. There are to be no more urban renewal schemes. It would not cost anything. Ottawa, as I understand it, have abandoned that concept. They are now talking of a different type of approach altogether than the approach of sending in the bulldozers to remake whole areas.

I hope the Minister of Municipal Affairs will speak to that point. It may be that I have not completely understood the Central Mortgage concept. They do change them quite frequently. It may be that I have not understood them. As I understand them, the

principle enshrined in that 1966-1967 amendment is no longer relevant to the tack being taken by the Government of Canada through their chosen agent, Central Mortgage. The fact remains, Sir, that we saw a commitment made in the throne speech two years ago and the government have not honoured it. They have not made any move to honour it. They have not given any reason why they have not honoured it. I think they should be heartily ashamed of it. As I say it was an act of political courage for the Member for St. John's South to raise it. He knew it would be embarrassing to the administration which he supports.

The points I just made, which were obvious points to make, are correct, relevant, accurate and truthful but they are obvious. I could go further to let Your Honour know that this was not just a casual commitment that was put in the mouth of His Honour the Governor.

In February, 1972, just before the House met, when presumably the administration were thinking that they might soon be appealing to the people, according to a report in that scurrilous rag of yellow journalism, "The Evening Telegram," (we know it is a scurrilous rag because our Premier has told us so) the following story appeared which was headlined, "Home for a Home on Hill." The story reads, Sir: "Premier Frank Moores met with representatives of the Blackhead Road Householders Union on Thursday and promised that legislation would be introduced this year to provide a home for a home in future expropriations in the area. Ed Harlick, president of the union, said that the organization members had worked closely together over the past eight months since the group was formed and their one main aim was to secure a government commitment for the house for a house concept. Mr. Harlick said that it was a tremendous step forward and that the union was enthralled with the reception they received from the Premier. He described the Premier's commitments as tremendous."

Sir, I will read the part that is unfavourable to my side as well as the part that is favourable: "The union president said

the group had held meetings with former Premier Smallwood and other Liberal Government representatives in the past but had always come up against a stone wall." It was a stone wall embodied in the 1966-1967 amendment.

"Premier Moores also promised to form a committee, once the public hearings on expropriations were over, with representatives of both the union and the provincial government representatives, 'to clean up the mess.'" It is another of the Premier's eloquent phrases.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: I was going to go on and say that. Yes, the gentleman from St. John's South reminds us that the committee was formed. It was not enough but it was formed.

It has been brought to my attention that there are really only thirteen in the House, counting Your Honour. Ah, the gentleman from St. John's South has returned. I am glad. It is important enough that there should be some honourable gentleman present.

The story goes on: "Mr. Moores will also visit the Blackhead Road personally to make an assessment of the problems." I do not know whether in fact he has. If he has not, he should.

Sir, the point of that is that this was not a commitment lightly entered into by the government. Here you had the Premier, a week before the House met, with a public statement that the legislation would be introduced; a commitment. Then you had the throne speech itself. The commitment was not kept. It was so many empty words.

I suppose when the Minister of Municipal Affairs gets to his feet and gives us his side of it or the current position of the administration, he will tell us that they are studying it and that they hope to have a task force report shortly and that in due course we shall have legislation. I really expect that he will say that

and he will probably even be able to say it with a straight face. Sir, nobody will believe him. The honourable gentleman is not misleading us but nobody will accept those reasons or explanations. There can only be one explanation. There can only be one reason why the government have not moved and that is that they have changed their minds. They do not stand behind that commitment any longer. There cannot be any excuse for inaction, none. We have put through legislation in this House, Sir, that is of infinitely less importance than this matter.

Sir, I know that the gentleman from St. John's South brought in his resolution only after repeated representation amounting almost to importuning of the administration to honour their promise. Then when he saw that they would not honour it, that they had no intention of honouring it, that they had not the least scintilla of desire to live up to the commitments which they had made, the only thing he could do to show his good faith to the people who elected him was to bring in this amendment. It will be very interesting, Sir, to see who stands to vote in favour of this. I will be interested to see if any cabinet minister votes in favour of this motion, Sir, when the time comes. For a cabinet member to vote for it would be an act of sheer hypocrisy. Anyone of them, Sir, who votes for this will be guilty of hypocrisy in the extreme. They stand committed to bringing in a policy. It will not be an expensive policy to implement. That reason does not stand up. It will not be a difficult policy to implement. That reason does not stand up. The only reason there can be is that the administration do not have the courage of their convictions, that they made the promise, garnered a few votes with it, sucked in a few people and then when the crunch came, they could not live up to it and would not live up to it. It is a shameful and degrading performance.

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Fisheries is part of it. He was in that

cabinet. He wrote that throne speech. He was Minister of Municipal Affairs for a year until he was driven out of it. At the unanimous request of the municipalities of Newfoundland, he was taken out of it.

MR. COLLINS: I was the only minister who ever received a plaque.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right. He did receive a plaque. They certainly have been sending the honourable gentleman plaques ever since. Most of them, Your Honour, have been delivered at the point of the toe. The honourable gentleman left Municipal Affairs because the municipalities made it quite clear to the Premier that the honourable gentleman was the biggest disaster to hit Municipal Affairs since the honourable gentleman from St. John's North hit Education, and that is saying a great deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. STAGG): Order please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is probably digressing into matters which are not relevant to this resolution. I suggest that he address himself to matters which are relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour for directing me to the fact that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as the event was, is not relevant to the resolution and I shall attempt to honour Your Honour's ruling.

As I was saying, Sir, the present cabinet, this is a shabby performance. We all know that promises are made and we all know that promises are not always kept. Sometimes there are even valid reasons why promises are not kept. The administration's record in this field has been shabby and shoddy and second rate and altogether beneath contempt. As men they should be ashamed to stand for this.

Now, Sir, the subject raised by the motion, the one to which the gentleman from St. John's South spoke, I assume that I shall be allowed exactly the same latitude as the gentleman from St. John's South. The subject raised by the motion is really one of housing. It deals with an aspect of housing. I think it is

entirely appropriate to direct a few remarks towards a solution. I think, Sir, in working towards a solution, we should begin by doing something that no government of this province has done. The Liberals did not do it during our first twenty-three years in office; Dr. Carson did not do it; Sir Phillip Francis Little did not do it; Sir Robert Bond did not do it; Sir William Whiteway did not do it; John Cabot and the fishing admirals did not do it and the present government have not done it.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from St. John's North is once again at his best with his silly grin and once again making it obvious that every time he opens his mouth on this or any other motion why it was the Premier dismissed him so ignominiously from the cabinet, and in so doing confirming the wisdom of the Premier's decision. The only thing I regret, Sir, is that the honourable gentleman did not have the wit when he came out of the cabinet room or the Premier's room that day to say, as did his colleague from the South Shore of Conception Bay, the gentleman from Harbour Main, in that eloquent phrase,

"I was shafted." If the honourable gentleman had not been quite as honourable but had been less willing to be shafted he would probably still be in the cabinet today. Newfoundland would then have had good reason, Sir, to sing our national anthem, "God Guard Thee Newfoundland."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking about housing, speaking entirely about housing, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Stagg) If the honourable member were speaking about housing it certainly escaped the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: If it escapes Your Honour that surely is Your Honour's problem. What I was saying was that we should lay down in this country, in Newfoundland and in Canada, a principle. I would like to see it enshrined in statute law and made a policy accepted by the people of this Province, by the society as a whole, a principle that people as a right shall have decent and adequate housing. We do not have that. No government has done it and I can find 1,422 examples this day of instances where people in Newfoundland do not have adequate housing.

If every honourable member spoke to the point we could find not more than 20,000 or 30,000 people in Newfoundland tonight who by any standards have access to adequate and decent housing. I say now to the administration that the time has come to adopt a policy that states as a right a person is entitled to a decent and an adequate home, a home adequate to his needs, a home that is adequate for the climate in which we live, that is adequate for his needs, the size of his family, and a payment for which is related to his income and his assets. That is the principle. We have accepted it with education, Your Honour. Maybe the Tory Government have not fully implemented it but we have accepted the principle as a society in Newfoundland that an individual has the right to an education and it does not really matter whether his father is making \$100,000 a year or \$100 a year. We have accepted it with an education.

Mr. Speaker, we have accepted it with medical service. Fifty years ago, one hundred years ago, twenty-five years ago medical services were a matter of either money or charity. My father practiced medicine in St. John's

for thirty years. In the days when he started, in the late 1930's, a doctor either collected the fee on his own or did it out of charity. Like most doctors, he did his fair share of work knowing he would never be paid and not begrudging the opportunity at all. It was considered in those days an obligation to the medical profession.

Now we have accepted the principle that people are entitled as of right, as of a birthright, the very fact that they are Canadian citizens gives them the right, the very fact that they are here and alive gives them the right, the right to medical services. It does not matter whether they are rich or poor. In Newfoundland, Sir, I can recall at least one case when an individual citizen, the hospital and medical bills came to over \$100,000. I do not think we should begrudge a cent of it. We accept that with medical services. If a person is sick today he gets the medical treatment he needs. It does not matter whether he is rich or poor, whether he can pay or not, he is taken to a doctor or to a hospital. There is no question that the doctor is paid for his services and paid by the state and so is the hospital.

The first principle that was accepted was welfare. We have come a long way from the Elizabethan Poor Law when the parish had to provide sustenance for the paupers. We had the spectacle described by so many of the great English historians of paupers being chevied over the parish boundary, out of the parish and on to the next parish. Why? To get them off of the poor rates. It is the origin of course of the well-known phrase, "If you are down on your luck you are on the parish." Well that was four hundred years ago in England. We have come a long way since then in Canada and in England, needless to say.

Today a person who has no income, who has no assets, who has no means to feed himself and to clothe himself gets that assistance. He may not get as much as he should. He certainly will not get as much as he would like to have but he does get help, not because of his political affiliation nor his academic standing nor his creed nor his height nor his wealth nor the place where he lives. He gets it simply by virtue of his

birthright. It is his birthright.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to get into a serious discussion with the gentleman from Bonavista South. Every time the honourable gentleman opens his mouth it is quick easy to see why the Human Rights Association twice defeated him for president.

MR. W. ROWE: Rejected him.

MR. ROBERTS: Rejected him. The honourable gentleman, Sir, speaking of a house for a house, is in this House now and he has five times tried to be elected to public bodies and made it once.

MR. W. ROWE: Once and last.

MR. ROBERTS: The Tories turned him down in Bonavista North. The people of Bonavista South turned him down and the people were fooled by him.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Am I out of order? I am sorry, Your Honour. I am trying to make a very relevant point. If the gentleman from Bonavista South should want to do me the courtesy of allowing me to make my point in the silence to which I am entitled to speak, then he can be quiet.

Mr. Speaker, the only problem in Bonavista South is the rush to get the nomination on the Liberal side.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Before honourable gentlemen talk themselves into a battle royal either verbal or otherwise, I suggest that all honourable members observe the rule of courtesy and parliamentary procedure that the member speaking has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, and I would certainly not engage in a battle royal with the gentleman from Bonavista South. Any battle in which one engages with him has to be based, by definition -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Put in on the Order Paper, please. I have had enough of the honourable gentleman's serious questions. Put it on the Order Paper, please.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's North has the right to participate in the debate. If I really thought he had a serious question - I have had enough of the honourable gentleman's serious questions.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, the people of St. John's North will not take a chance on him and neither will I. I say to him, let him write it out and I shall have it checked out by my counsel. Let him send for a page. He can write it in Russian if he wish. My colleague from White Bay South will be happy to translate it. We will have a theologian check it out and then we shall deal with it according to its merit.

Sir, what I was saying before the gentleman from Bonavista South inserted himself into the debate was that I believe that the right to housing should be as much a birthright as the right to medical care or the right to education or even the right to food and shelter, the rights guaranteed under the basic welfare legislation. That is a new principle, Sir. It is not a new thought but it is a principle that is not enshrined in any law of this Province or in any policy of this Province.

The Welfare Department, the S.S. Department they call it now, will tell you that they have a policy that any person will have his house waterproof and windtight. Well that is a damnable misleading statement. I have run into a case recently in my district where the welfare officer signed a letter saying, "Well, so the lady's house is damp!" A window, with ten children, eleven in the family, and they are living in a house to which they have to close the upstairs in the winter. Why? Because it is damp and the welfare officer, bless him human little heart, sent me a letter in which he say, "Well, it is true. It is damp. Ice forms on the walls in the winter." That is the result of the present welfare policy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It did not happen overnight, did it?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it did not happen overnight. It happened last October. The house was built in 1973, by the government, for this lady. That is how well they built it. I have already written the Deputy Minister a very stiff but proper note about it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the problem is, well, I cannot go into it. It is personal. Now, Sir, the honourable gentleman's question has been passed

upon by the Policy Committee. It reads, "Re: house for a house" That is what we are on in case Your Honour has lost track of it, in case my colleague has lost track of it, in case I have lost track of it. It is "Re: house for a house." The honourable gentleman from St. John's North will be well advised to remember the old saying of Ms. Polly Addler: "A house is not a home." I would rather talk about a family home but he would rather have a house for a house. "How" it starts, underlined not once but twice for emphasis, "How could you implement the suggestion that the rights to housing should be a birthright?" It goes on, "The fact that welfare pays \$150.00 per month rent is a step in this direction." It is signed, "St. John's North." Much the sort of note one would get in the House of Lords, Your Honour, where if the Duke of York were to drop Your Honour a note to ask Your Honour to drop around to the Duke of York's for tea tomorrow, it would be signed "York". If the Earl of Cholomondley were by some misguided thing, some utter aberration to ask the gentleman from Bonavista South for a cup of tea or a meal, in a spirit of Christian charity, in a spirit of good works, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South would get a note signed "Cholomondley". Well, I have one signed "St. John's North", in exactly the same spirit.

I want the honourable gentleman to know that I pay due heed to him. He is at least, Sir, a marquess if not a belted earl.

Now, Sir, let me deal with this question. The way to implement the principle is to first of all establish it and accept it. Secondly and I am going to speak at some length on this because it really is the heart of it. Even the honourable gentleman once in a while comes close to the nub of the matter, which is to set up some standards and then to make sure that they are adhered to. We have not done that in Newfoundland today. We have not done that in Canada.

Welfare will not provide you with a home, Sir, but what they will do is say, "If you can find a place we will pay the rent up to a certain level." Although the level has been raised recently within the past year it is not high enough. Will they pay \$150.00 a month in St. John's now?

MR. NEARY: They lowered it after we got thrown out.

MR. ROBERTS: What will they pay now?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They might go up to \$150.00.

MR. ROBERTS: They might go up to \$150.00 in St. John's.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A family with eight kids.

MR. ROBERTS: I invite Your Honour to find accommodations for a family anywhere in St. John's for \$150.00 a month.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have a family in Clarke's Hotel out in Springdale for the last three or four months.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably. The Brownsdale Hotel down here that Savoy of St. John's West, that clarages, the Ritz Carlton to name another hotel with which the ministry are familiar, has been kept going for years on people put in these by the Social Assistance Department.

The present policy will not meet what I am suggesting. What I am suggesting is a legislative affirmation and then a move towards it because merely providing rental assistance is not what is needed. What is needed is a positive and a forward-looking policy that sets forth to provide every family with a home and for which that family pays in accordance to their ability to pay, their income and their assets.

I do not know if it should mean more public housing. It means more public money. I will come back to that question in a minute. The standard should be simple, Sir; a decent home. Central Mortgage will have to find standards for numbers of square feet and bathroom facilities and plumbing and wiring. These are accepted. They should be adequate for the needs of the family concerned. If a family have eight or nine children they obviously need more room than a family with two or three children.

Indeed, one of the real weaknesses of the present welfare thing and it has gone on for years, is that they take little cognizance of how many children are in a family. I could show Your Honour twenty or thirty letters from my own files of letters, from my constituents, where welfare officers have gone in and see nothing wrong with six children sleeping to a room or with two or three children sleeping to

a bed. I think that is wrong. I am not blaming the present administration for that but certainly they have not changed it. For that they must accept the blame. It is a wrong principle. I do not think it is unreasonable to say that if two or three people share a room, that, Sir, is enough. I do not think it is at all unreasonable to say that a person be he a child or an adult -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Probably sleeping on the floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there have been cases of that but a person, be it a child or an adult, is entitled to one person one bed, like one man one vote.

Now, Sir, there are some things which can be done if the government will accept that principle. I think we should begin by making a survey of the housing stock of the Province. There is today no registry, no list, no compiled document showing what housing we have in Newfoundland. Certainly it was done on, I keep referring to the Blackhead Road because that was the urban renewal, Sir, but the Shea Heights, the sociologists or whoever does it went in there and took stock of the housing up there and they said how many homes there were and how many could be made habitable with addition of bathroom or other facilities and how many could not be made habitable under any circumstances and how many were habitable but not adequate for the people living in them.

Let us do that all over Newfoundland because our housing problem in Newfoundland just is not in St. John's and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and Gander. The housing problem in Newfoundland, Sir, exists all over this province. I see the gentleman from Port de Grave, he would agree with it. In his district there are many homes that are not adequate. They were not adequate thirty or forty years ago and today they are even less adequate, hard to heat, small. One of the reasons why we had such a high tuberculosis rate and why we still have such a high tuberculosis rate in Newfoundland is the close quarters in which we live. That contributes greatly. All over Newfoundland, Sir, we have that problem.

I think the government are going to have to move, not the tokenism that was in the Budget. The Minister of Municipal Affairs laboured mightily and brought forth a mouse in the Budget. It might be a lot of dollars, \$30 million I think it was, but when you start breaking it down and looking at it -

MR. EARLE: \$37 million.

MR. ROBERTS: \$37 million. I thank the minister. It is still not a drop in the ocean. It is not coming close to solving the problem. I think the government should make a massive assault on this. We can find in Newfoundland \$200 million or \$300 million or \$400 million or \$500 million for this or for that any time we want to. We are talking of building a \$500 million or \$600 million highway across Labrador and so we should. Why can we not find the money needed to provide our people with housing?

Ottawa will do their share. We never really put it to them. We have never put it to them yet. We have never gone to them and said, "We want to borrow \$50 million or \$100 million a year and put it out on mortgages," not just in the areas where you can now get a central mortgage, a CMHC mortgage. What about in Roddickton where a school principal to finance his home had to go to the bank and had to pay back the cost of that home in three years and just about drove himself into penury to do it. It was all he could do to keep food on the table because every cent he could get had to go to the bank. They would only lend it to him for three years. Central Mortgage would not have looked at Roddickton. They still will not as far as I know. Then we need an agency that will go into it.

We had hoped the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation would do that and that is why we set it up. That is why a number of us in the Cabinet worked hard and got the Cabinet to agree to the policy of small loans of \$6,000, now ranges to \$9,000.

MR. EARLE: It is now raised to \$17,500.

MR. ROBERTS: No, going to be raised to \$17,500. But there is still not enough. There is not enough staff, not enough money, not enough

accessibility and they are still arguing over legal title.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too much red tape.

MR. ROBERTS: There is away too much red tape. They have standards of title that would do well for somebody lending \$50 million on a mortgage for a building on Wall Street. In case after case I do not blame the solicitors. The solicitor is told to get clear title and he insists upon clear title. But to establish clear title in some of our outharbours, Sir, is something that cannot be done except by legislation or Order-in-Council or by some such act by the Crown. So the minister should simplify that programme.

I am not suggesting to fling it out. I am not suggesting a give-away programme but I am suggesting making it accessible to the people and if the present minister wish to make a contribution during his fortunately brief stay in

Municipal Affairs and let him work at that. It is a fairly simple reform but it could mean a great deal to a lot of people and I know because many of my constituents have tried to take advantage of that programme and they have had little success.

First of all you have to wait for months for anybody to come to talk to you. So what has happened? I will tell you what has happened. Your Honour, we now have those gentlemen of charity, the last of the great charitable institutions, the finance companies, those knights of the common man, those friends of the poor people, the finance companies have now brought their beneficence to St. Anthony. They have blossomed forth like say some nightshade and I will tell you what, there are now two in St. Anthony I will tell you why they are there. Because the people cannot get loans for houses any other way and ninety per cent of the business being done at St. Anthony I will wager and I have not access to their books, but ninety per cent of their business I will wager is not even in consumer things like television, etc., cars, but is in housing loans, loans to help with housing.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Bonavista South, with his usual perspicacity, has missed the point entirely. The Housing Corporation does not meet the need. It does not.

MR. MORGAN: It did before.

MR. ROBERTS: No it did not before either, and when John Cabot came to Bonavista it did not meet it then.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure!

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: When the \$6,000 figure was established it was a far greater proportion of the cost of the average home than the \$9,000 figure is. But I say, Sir, the reason these finance companies have moved in, and they are doing a legal business, a legitimate business, wacking in their twenty-two and twenty-four per cent interest, bless their pointed little heads, The reason they are moving in is that the government

have fallen down. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation should be given a good solid kick in the rear end. When did we start the New Town? Five or six years ago?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, about that.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean I know Rome was not built in a day but my God they built Rome in less time than it has taken them to get 1,200 or 1,400 lots going out here in Mount Pearl. There is no excuse for it. I do not know why they burned down in the fat. They think their job with the Housing Corporation is like an old-age pension. What is the minister doing about it? The only new lots coming in in St. John's this year are the New Town lots. There were a few last year from New Town.

Well let the minister set me straight. I would welcome it. The Housing Corporation say they are not bringing in any. The minister's shortsighted policy with respect to water supplies has been a great deal of help there. He is going to blame Ottawa for it now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Including the time the minister was in the cabinet. There is nobody more against alcohol, Sir, than a reformed alcoholic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The Chair draws to the attention of all honourable members the matter of relevance. While the speaker may sometimes draw comparison and go somewhat afield to make his point I think now that the discussion has gotten into the general debate on the Department of Municipal Affairs which I do not think is relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. I am trying to make a point and I shall try even harder if you wish to confine it to housing. But I say that not enough has been done and I say that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is an excellent idea but it has not in practice worked out. It has not done enough. Let it do more.

MR. MORGAN: It is doing twice as much as before.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South persists in defying Your Honour's rulings. The honourable gentleman is obviously ignorant of the rules of the House and he has made no attempt to learn. I would invite him -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Look he is in trouble with everything in Bonavista. The trouble with the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South is that he has exposed himself to the voters and they now know him for what he is.

Now, Sir, to come back, I think it is the job of the government of the province to come to grips with this and to get a programme going. I suggest to them they should start with a survey of the housing stock of the province. Let us see just how large the problem is. Let us take defined standards and let us get a crew of people. Why not take on fifty or one hundred that will be coming out of the university now, young engineering students and science and arts students, for the summer, looking for something to do many of them, thanks to the Tory policy? Why not hire fifty or one hundred of them and make it a Confederation celebration. It is better than hiring George McLean and some damsel from Los Vegas to display her talents. Why not hire fifty or one hundred young men and women and send them throughout the province and let us find out what housing stock we have got? That could be designed in a very simple form, no more difficult than the census. The Government of Canada manage to run a census every ten years with some precision. There may be a lot of information in the census about houses. But let us find out precisely what is the problem. Let us find out how many houses there are and what state each is in and that would include Bally Haly Place and Burns Place down here where the housing would generally be considered adequate Your Honour, on one end. Some of the houses with which we are all familiar, scattered throughout the province. such as the one I named in Goose Cove where the lady with ten children is living in a house that has got ice on the walls upstairs, a house built by the government in 1973.

We will know that then. Then it is fairly easy to set up standards. I think they are commonly accepted, easier to arrive at them, so many square feet, such and such level of facilities, such and such level of construction. Then we will know what the gap is to be filled and know in addition how many family units, how many new families come into being

each year, how many people move out of the home market into the apartment market, older people who no longer wish to have a home as such but wish to live in an apartment. They do not want a separate house. Let us then arrive at the figure of new homes we will need each year, not just in St. John's but across the province. There is something wrong in an economy where a house - "The Telegram" did a long series of articles on it on Saturday past, where a house doubles in value in three or four years.

The same is true, Your Honour, maybe not quite on the percentage basis but all over this province. Houses which used to cost, in an out-harbour you could be adequately housed for \$5,000 or \$10,000, now it is \$25,000 or \$30,000 for any sort of accommodation. I know incomes have come up but I say, Sir, our people cannot afford that level of housing. It is our job to come to grips with it. So once we know the dimensions of the problem, how many houses we are going to need each year, where we are going to need them, how many are going to be needed to fill up the under-supply there is now, then let us set to work to provide them. Let us just say that everybody is entitled to a home and he will pay for it according to his ability to pay.

We do not ask anymore about medical care, health care. We do not ask what the cost is of supplying an extra doctor. If an extra doctor is needed somewhere and one can be found he is sent there. Nobody says can the people there afford to pay him, or they can afford to pay him for a general office visit but if they get any complex surgery they cannot have that because they cannot afford that. There are all sorts of devices we could use. Most of them have been described time and time again. I suppose there has been more study on housing policy in Canada than there has been on anything anywhere in the world.

The home ownership plan in Ontario that my friend from Bell Island talks about is a good one.

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MR. ROBERTS: The home ownership thing in Ontario.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, right.

MR. ROBERTS: Home ownership made easy and the acronym is "HOME". Home ownership made easy, which basically is a scheme under which the Government of Ontario directly or through one of its crown agencies develops large areas of land. It does not sell the land. It leases it on long term leases. It is a way of taking \$4,000 or \$5,000 or \$6,000 out of the initial cost of a home. Sure the cost is borne by society. But what is wrong with that? We bear the cost of schools and roads.

MR. NEARY: You can pay it off when you get your house paid for.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, you can buy the lot. You do not have to. You know we do ask about roads. We do not say that you pay more on roads if you are rich than if you are poor. Everybody pays for roads according to his ability to pay. The man driving the Volkswagon pays according to his ability to pay and the man driving the Lincoln Imperial pays according to his ability to pay. All I am asking is that the same principle be applied to housing.

The administration are getting to this now. They have been pushed into it by Ottawa at long last. Mortgage subsidies, the cost of a mortgage has reached a new high in Newfoundland. The other day, I am told, eleven per cent. What does that mean? Money doubles in seven years at eleven per cent, compounded? One of the financial wizzards can tell me. None of the lawyers present are listening. But at eleven per cent money will double itself in six or seven years.

MR. WM. ROWE: Divide that into seventy-two.

MR. ROBERTS: Divide it into seventy-two, six and one half. That means, Your Honour, if Your Honour borrows \$10,000 at eleven per cent for twenty-five years, Your Honour will pay back something like five times that amount, principle and interest. Staggering! Staggering!

AN HON. MEMBER: A \$40,000 home costs \$115,000.

MR. ROBERTS: A \$40,000 home I am told costs \$115,000 when you add in the interest costs which all have to be paid over a period of years. So then come the mortgage subsidies, there are some tentative beginnings in the Budget. They are very tentative and very much beginnings. People in

St. John's cannot afford housing now. If they ever banned the basement apartment in St. John's, and the basement apartment is surely a substandard form of accommodation, if they ever banned the basement apartment in St. John's what - I turn to honourable gentlemen who practice at the bar. Three-fourths of the mortgage loans could not be made because most of them rely upon the basement apartment to pay the mortgage. I turn to honourable gentlemen, I mean I am not in practice but it is a very high percentage. It is the accepted means of - you drive through these new subdivisions and almost every street has basement apartments in them. It is the only way people can afford them. They do not get a 1600 square foot house, they get an 1100 square foot house and a 500 square foot apartment and the apartment is rented out. It is the only way people can afford housing.

Basement apartments are substandard as a type of housing. They might do on a short term, for a very short period of time. But there are thousands of people in St. John's, Sir, in Gander and in Grand Falls and elsewhere who can never see beyond that. They just cannot see getting the money. Outside the urban areas and to a very great extent in the urban areas they turn to the gentlemen who lend money at twenty-two and twenty-four per cent, finance companies and their ilk. They turn there because they have no choice.

We could look at row housing, town houses they are now called. They go against the North American thought of four houses to an acre. I am not so sure that four houses to an acres is like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, I am not so sure it is immutable. We might look at that as a much better use of land. There are a number of townhouse developments, so-called, around St. John's now and they seem to work out very well. As far as I know most of them are on a rental basis. Perhaps we could have homes sold, not just rented.

These are the techniques, Sir, there are many more. I do not pretend to be expert in the housing field. There have been studies and surveys and commissions and task force reports and what have you. The answers are all there I am sure. My concern is to have the principle established and I think

that is what the gentleman from St. John's South is really getting at when he brought in this motion, to have the principle established that a man is entitled to a home, a home according to his needs, for which he pays according to his ability. If he should not make enough, then let him be assisted by society. If a man cannot afford medical care we do not say to him, "Well, tough buddy! You need expensive heart surgery but you are only making \$100 a week, you can die!" We go ahead and the Minister of Health says, "Get your heart surgery done and send us the bill and we will pay it." So it should be. I think the housing question is the next greatest social question facing Canada. Over the years the welfare issue has been dealt with, roads, all these things, medical care has been dealt with, pensions.

Ten or fifteen years ago, before Mr. Pearson brought in the Canada Pension Plan, if you did not have your own pension you could starve when you got old; ten years before that when the universal old age pension was brought in, again by the Liberals. I put it forward, Sir, as a principle that is well worth adoption. I would like to see honourable members join in this debate. I think it is the real point of the motion put forward by the member for St. John's South. Housing is a basic birthright. That is the position I advocate.

Now, Sir, in closing let me say that we do support the motion, support it with conviction. The original legislation was very good. It was probably the best of its kind in North America, a home for a home, not just a dollar value. Then because the Government of Canada insisted upon it, I was in the cabinet that brought in the bill. It does not matter. If I did not vote for it, it is because I was not here or there was not a recorded vote. I heard no objection from honourable gentlemen now who are so sanctimonious about it. I do not include the gentleman from St. John's South in that nor do I include the gentleman from St. John's Centre who is unfortunately not here, the gentleman from St. John's East Extern who again is not here. Boy the illness is taking a savage toll of the Cabinet, that is three of them down now.

The 1966-67 Act was a regression, a step backward. It was done

for open motives, be they good or bad as a matter of judgement. It was done openly. It was not done with any joy on the part of the government or even I am sure on the part of the minister who introduced it, who now sits in the Cabinet as the Minister of Finance. It was done to apply to urban renewal schemes but urban renewal schemes as they then existed and in my understanding no longer do exist. But the principle is one which should be accepted and which is still enshrined in law. Any home expropriated by the government other than in an urban renewal area must still be compensated on a home for a home basis. The act was not ended. The principle was not abolished. It was abrogated only in respect of people living in defined geographic areas and I do not know how many in fact there were. I know of at least three, the Mundy Pond Area, the Shea Heights Area and the West Side Urban Renewal Area in Corner Brook.

An urban renewal area is defined and I suppose in proclamation or regulation in the Gazette it is a defined geographical area. If any other home as defined in the schedule to this act is expropriated, if any other home is expropriated then the government are still bound by this law to compensate on the basis of a home for a home, not just on the basis of monetary value but market value or replacement value, the common standards used in expropriation law to develop the standard of compensation.

Sir, the government have acted shoddily and shabbily in not bringing in the amending act. There is no excuse for it. There are reasons obviously. There is no acceptable reason. There is no excuse. They made a commitment. They made it openly. People took them at face value. The people on the Shea Heights took them at face value. When news of the meeting to which Mr. Harlick refers came out in "The Evening Telegram," I am sure the people on Shea Heights were delighted and pleased and I would venture to suggest that one of the reasons why some of them, many of them, supported the present P.C. Party was that promise which they believed would be honoured. Now here we are, two years later, three sessions later, and not the least move has been made towards it.

I cannot accept the fact that they have not done it because they are studying it. Surely they had studied it when they made the commitment. They made a commitment. They did not say they would think about it or they would try to do it, they made a commitment. Nor can I accept the fact that it is a difficult bill to bring in. It could be drafted this day by any of the lawyers of this House, a perfectly adequate bill to repeal the 1966-1967 act which after all is what the commitment said in the Throne Speech. It said, "To repeal The Family Homes Expropriation Amendment Act, 1966-1967." That can be done with a bill which in its operative part says simply, "The Family Homes Act, 1966-1967 is hereby repealed." That is all it takes. It is that simple.

So the minister, his predecessors have to answer for some shoddy and shabby and cheap act. Let them now bring in the bill. Let it be done tomorrow, the notice go down tomorrow and we will have first reading on Friday and then on Tuesday or Wednesday, whenever the Marshall axe has fallen and the debate on the estimates is gagged and chopped off, then let us bring on that bill for second reading. It would not take long and there would be unanimous agreement I feel sure and put it on the statute books and then the Moores Administration could say, "At least we have honoured one promise in our two and a half years in office. We have not done many others. At least we have honoured one."

MR. EVANS: You put a few million dollars with it.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from Burgeo knows about millions, Sir. He is the most expensive man ever elected to the House of Assembly.

MR. EVANS: Thank God for that!

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not thank God, Sir.

MR. EVANS: The people do though.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not blame God for that.

MR. SPEAKER:, Order please! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman, Sir, may thank whom he -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman, Sir, may thank whom he wishes.

But I say that this will not cost millions. And I say that if they now say

it costs millions, why did they not say that two years ago? The honourable gentleman sat in his seat and applauded as the Governor said, "The Family Homes Expropriation Act will be repealed." Now he tries to weasel out. Now all of a sudden, Mr, Speaker -

MR. EVANS: Point or order, Mr. Speaker, does the temporary member, the temporary leader from White Bay North remember that when we took over they only allowed \$6,000 in a loan to build a house, from Newfoundland Housing? We have already raised it to \$9,000.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The so-called point of order raised by the Member for Burgeo-LaPoile is not a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I understand that it is not a point of order but I could point out that they allowed \$2.6 million to allow the present gentleman in the House and they are now going to write off the full \$2.6 million, a gift to the gentleman -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: A gift to the political fates of the gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile, the honourable gentleman who just raised the point of order.

Now, Sir, let me repeat the point because obviously the honourable gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile did not hear what I had to say. He sat in the House when the Governor (he was here that day in all his magnificence) said that we shall repeal or my ministers will repeal the Family Homes Expropriation Amendment Act. He probably thumped his desk, thump, thump, the great thumper. In thumping his desk, he approved that and so he should have. Now the great thumper has thumped his last thump because now the great thumper says, where are the millions? Where was the talk of millions then, Sir? He thumped too soon. He should have looked before he thumped. He should have thought before he thumped. He should think before he speaks. The great thumper, Sir, should thump his way back to two years ago.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Thump, the great thumper. I have been miscalling him the "Burp from Burgeo," which is an insult to the name Burgeo. We will call him, "The Thumper."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition I am sure is aware of the rule of relevancy and I feel he is not at all being relevant to this resolution now.

MR. ROBERTS: I am surprised by that ruling, Your Honour. I would have thought the thought of the honourable gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile thumping for a proposal to amend this act two years ago was exactly in point with the resolution moved by the gentleman from St. John's South. The gentleman from St. John's South can speak with integrity on this because he was not in this House two years ago or in March, 1972 he did not have his seat. He did not stand and thump. As a matter of fact he could not thump like the gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile thumps.

Sir, thump or swim is what I say to the gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile.

AN HON. MEMBER: I like burp better.

MR. ROBERTS: It would be think or swim. That is as close as he ever came to thinking in his life.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, having disposed of the gentleman from Burgeo for the nonce, but he will be back I predict.

MR. EVANS: Oh, definitely.

MR. ROBERTS: He is like a bad penny. He is like a cod's head which one throws overboard, which gets bloated and floats back up.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, a thump is like that (rap, rap, rap). That is how one thumps. I say the honourable gentleman, Sir, should thump in silence. "Thump on, oh Ship of State."

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir, the art of communication is in communicating to one's audience. When I speak to the gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile, I try to communicate with him, and that means baby talk.

AN HON. MEMBER: Impossible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is impossible to communicate with him because even baby talk will not get through.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

For the second time in a couple of minutes, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not been relevant at all.

MR. ROBERTS: What happens on the third time? Does one strike out on the third time, Your Honour?

Now, Sir, I do apologize to Your Honour. The gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile does lead one astray and I realize it is an irrelevance as is he.

Now, Sir, ten minutes ago I started to say in conclusion "because I want to hear the minister speak before six o'clock. He should have a chance to start his remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: We will all thump for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the thumper from Burgeo will thump on. What he should have is a thump-pump.

Now, Sir, the resolution is a very good one. The principle put forth by the gentleman from St. John's South is one which should be adopted. It is in large measure the law of this province already. It would take a minor bill to carry into effect fully the principle which he advocates. No honourable member will be heard to speak against this. No honourable member will be seen to vote against this I predict, nor should any honourable member speak against it or vote against it. Surely, this is a principle which commands universal respect and universal support. All I say is that the government two and one half years ago said that they would do it. Now let them do it. The time has come. Thank you.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate my colleague the Hon. Member for St. John's South for bringing in this resolution. I think his speech will probably mark one of the highlights of this session of the House because it is on a level and on a subject which I am sure all of us feel is one which should be dealt with with extreme seriousness and deep thought and not possibly

on the level of some of the discussions which we have heard recently in this House. Unfortunately, while the Member for St. John's South made an excellent speech and covered his points most concisely and I think put a reasonably good case, it was followed up by the Leader of the Opposition who also, I admit, made some very good points but completely spoiled it by making the whole argument absolutely and completely partisan-political. In other words in trying to camouflage this whole serious issue by shifting all of the blame on to this government and in the arguments which he used, he tried to take away or attempted to take away from a subject which should be dealt with by both sides of the House with the deepest possible concern. The subject of housing for our people is not something which can be dealt with lightly or dealt with hastily or without indeed very serious thought indeed.

Sir, I think the top requirements or the top needs of people are easily expressed insofar as it is a given right I contend of all people to have freedom of speech, as we all know, adequate food and, hopefully, proper shelter. I do not think any government throughout the world and particularly our Canadian Government and the Government of this Province are going to attempt to do anything less than try to meet that need, the latter need I mean, and that is in adequate housing.

It is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that this afternoon we had a visit from a group of Russian seamen in the House. They represent a country which tried a completely different experiment to try to provide the basic needs towards people. It is a matter of opinion as to how successful they have been in their efforts and as to how successful they will prove to be in the future. I well recall that approximately ten years ago I was in Russia and one of the things I was most particularly interested in then was how they met the needs of their people as far as housing was concerned. One had only to read the press of that day and even up to today to

see how deplorably they have failed. At that time there were old women in the City of Moscow carrying back-loads of bricks up over scaffolds to try to build houses. Apartment houses were going up all over the place and in every street one turned there were apartments going up. It almost looked like, to the casual observer, forced labour. Men, women and children digging in, trying to build themselves homes.

Sir, on the outskirts of what was a beautiful and very large City of Moscow, there were houses consisting of logs and mud, right on the very outskirts of Moscow. They were doing their utmost to try to provide housing for their people.

At that time at least, under the system which they had developed, they had gone a long way from succeeding in providing their people with homes. I believe, to somewhat lesser extent, the same applies today. There was a government dedicated to a socialistic policy of making announcements to provide the need or contending that they could provide the needs of all men at all times.

Under our North American system, we have found that that is literally not possible to do. So far no form of government has been able to do it.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in suggesting some of the things they did with regard to housing, in getting adequate houses for all people, is getting quite near to that concept of trying to do what virtually may be in this North American thing an impossible accomplishment.

Now I am not taking a defeatist attitude because I think North America and the Canadian Government in particular and most certainly our own government are trying to approach the problem rationally and with sense and hopefully with greater speed in providing that need or meeting that need as times go on. In coming out with a

broad statement, which in its simplicity is over simplification of just providing everybody with a house, is a tactic which unfortunately I think the former government was very, very guilty of. Saying something which would appeal to the public, which they themselves knew could not be accomplished for years, years and years to come, is an excellent aim, a wonderful objective but it has to be approached rationally.

Now, Mr. Speaker, time is running out. It is getting close to six o'clock. I want to first of all deal with the Family Homes Expropriation Act and the subject of this motion. Actually, the Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat today because he thought that I might get up and try to excuse a government for not bringing in the amendment which was promised. I am not going to make any excuses for the government. Actually, of course, I was not in the House at the time that that was put in the Speech from the Throne but I have to accept responsibility for this government in making the statement. I am not trying to excuse it. I am not going to attempt to try to excuse the government for not putting through this necessary amendment at this stage. What I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that the government in the meantime has done far more because the people who were interested, who were concerned in having this amendment put through because it affected their daily lives, in the types of homes that they were occupying and what their requirements were, were not so much interested in a formal, parliamentary move in the House of Assembly to cancel out one section of an act. What they were interested in was getting proper accommodations.

In the meantime while this amendment has not been cancelled out, the government during the past three years has been very busily engaged in trying to rectify some of the wrongs of the past which were perpetrated on these people. The Shea Heights is one shining example, Corner Brook West is another and now Mundy Pond is still a third. In these three areas alone, Mr. Speaker,

in order to try to correct some of the ghastly mistakes of the past, we have had to plow out tens of thousands of dollars (it will be hundreds of thousands and eventually millions) to try to correct these schemes. We are doing, in effect, what this amendment so desires in trying to find proper homes for people.

The fact that I noticed the sort of sneering remarks from the other side that I was a member of the government which brought that in, I already have admitted my responsibility for my part and some of the mistakes of the previous government. This government is attempting to rectify many of these mistakes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. EARLE: Recently I have made several visits to Corner Brook, particularly to see the West Side of Corner Brook, the urban renewal scheme and to see how that was progressing. It is a very expensive scheme indeed and very difficult to deal with. We are making excellent progress and hopefully, before 1974 is out, we will have that whole thing tidied up to the point that the people will be adequately housed and have good homes. It is costing a fabulous amount of money but it will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable minister permit me to interrupt? I believe we should call it six o'clock now.

AN HON. MEMBER: I move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I note the honourable minister moved the adjournment.

It now being six o'clock, I do leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow Thursday, May 9, 1974.