

*Adjournment Debate*

\$10 million, still a significant figure any way you look at it.

Once the government had taken the position it did, why did the companies allow this strike to happen? I can understand them waiting before July 8 because they may have hoped something different would happen and they would be faced with a new ballgame. However, in the month following that, they really had no reason at all.

I would like to observe that among the losers in this strike are the men who have lost their time and wages, and the farmers who have lost through the significant demurrage charges. However, the losers do not necessarily include the grain companies. This year they will likely move every bushel they would have moved in terms of throughput with or without this strike. They will likely store more grain because it will be there a little longer than it would have been without the strike. They will not be the losers.

My hope in urging them to settle was based on the fact that the most significant among them are in fact farmer-owned. I thought they should have been subjected to the fact that the losses to the farmers would be significant and should be counted in their calculations. That was not to be. Therefore, we are here this evening with this legislation, legislation in practical terms, inevitable in its terms once the independent conciliator had brought down his report. I therefore say to hon. members at this late hour, one minute before 10 o'clock, let this bill have second reading now, go to committee, and let's get on with the work without further partisanship.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek rising to begin to speak?

**Mr. Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to call it ten o'clock.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure you understand it is the intention to proceed with this debate tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** On that same point, I might inform hon. members that with the continuation of this business before the House, the House will meet at two o'clock in the afternoon.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### HOUSING—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES TO EXPAND PROGRAMS

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to bring the Minister of State for

[Mr. Lang.]

Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) back into the House at this late hour.

**Mr. Danson:** I haven't left yet.

**Mr. Marshall:** I especially regret it because I know how hard he is working to bring more housing to Newfoundland. On October 1 I asked the minister about the progress being made to implement various programs under the National Housing Act, particularly insofar as they refer to the Neighbourhood Improvement Program, the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program and the rural and native housing program. While I appreciate the reply he gave, the urgency of the situation dictates further clarification.

● (2200)

The situation is not only urgent, it is desperate. I requested an adjournment debate, Mr. Speaker, because it is impossible to elaborate on a question in the House in the time allotted to us. Incidentally this should be the subject of consideration when we are talking about reforms in the House of Commons, to which reference was made in the Speech from the Throne.

Since the announcement of the aforementioned programs I have been a strong advocate of them but was naive enough to think they would come into effect within a reasonable period of time. However, all I have experienced is frustration in dealing with the various elements which fall within the minister's responsibility, and I continue to receive answers which do nothing more than emphasize the need for rethinking our priorities.

The RRAP program, for example, provides loans for citizens in the low income brackets. Those whose income is \$6,000 or below can qualify for a loan of up to \$5,000 with 50 per cent being forgiven. This is fine. It is exemplary, it is wonderful, and I give the government full marks for its introduction. But after 15 months virtually nothing has been produced.

I am sure the minister will tell us once again that the consultative process is going on to speed up its implementation. Nevertheless, here we are, some 15 months after the amendments to the National Housing Act were introduced, and little or nothing has been accomplished. A member who troubles to make inquiries receives only the usual excuses in letters such as the following which I received from the President of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. In a letter dated September 17, 1974, Mr. William Teron stated:

Thank you for your letter of August 23 concerning Neighbourhood Improvement and Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programs.

As you are no doubt aware, RRAP is to be delivered in two separate approaches; one in the urban context linked with NIP and the other as an element of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation's Rural and Native Housing Program. Under the 1974 NIP agreement between the federal government and the Province of Newfoundland, \$1.34 million is provided for activity under this program. Of this total, \$639,000 was approved last June for Corner Brook and we anticipate the remainder will be allocated very shortly for St. John's. In both instances, the funds will be used to complete projects financed under the old urban renewal provisions of the National Housing Act. In all likelihood, the delays to which you referred were engendered by the necessity of identifying and recasting older proposals so that they could meet NIP and RRAP objectives.