



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 20

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

HON. WILLIAM N. ROWE: (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to this hon. House, a petition received from what appears to be all of the voters of the community of Westport, in my district of White Bay South, about 150 voters have signed their names, your Honour. And the petition reads, "We the undersigned residents of Westport protest the Government's delays in serving Westport with electricity. We would like very much to have Westport included in the 1970-71 Program for electricity".

Sir, I am wholeheartily behind the import of this petition. I agree that Westport and other communities like it, should have had electricity before now, and they would have had electricity had capital financing been available.

Westport is one of only two communities left in my whole district, which are presently without electricity. And it is, Sir, high time that the community of Westport and Purbeck's Cove adjacent to it, had electrical services extended. I am led to believe that this year, Westport will have electricity and to make that belief a firm fact, I move that this petition be received by this hon. House and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. F. W. ROWE: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to that petition from the people of Westport, which is an old community of White Bay, a progressive community and one which for several years now has been looking forward with eager anticipation. Perhaps, I should say in defense of the Government, and of the Power Commission, that some years ago, some six or seven years ago, plans ^{were made} to put electricity in the community of Westport, but at the time there were a number of people there who had their own private generators, and it was difficult to get any community consensus of opinion, and as a result the opportunity was lost at that time. However, since then they have come together and it seems to be that the time is now passed when that community and any other community near it, in this particular case Purbeck's Cove, should have a supply of electricity.

And I heartily support the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

1129

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. E. M. ROBERTS:(MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I told the House that I would have the Annual Report of the Department of Health ready for tabling by the tenth of March, I think, was the date, Sir. Thanks to the speedy and efficient work of my absent colleague, the Minister of Supply and his officials, Sir, the report is now ready for tabling. I have one copy here, Sir, the Clerks office I am told has sufficient copies for the members as well as for the press. If any person should wish additional copies, Sir, my Deputy Minister or the Administrator of Health Services would be only too happy to make them available in reasonable numbers to any interested party.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. ERIC S. JONES:(MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the Rules of the House be suspended, on the motion for Interim Supply now on the Order Paper, and on the Supply Bill pursuant thereto.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 107 on the Order Paper of February 27th. in the name of the hon. the member for St. Barbe's South, addressed to my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who is unavoidably absent from the Chamber today. The answer to (1) That I have the list. (2) It is usually not possible, usually it is not possible to prepare a lump sum tenders for repair work. Because the nature and the extent of the repair work usually cannot be precisely determined. Firm prices were sought wherever it was feasibility to do so, otherwise contractors were asked to come in and do the work. The list of those who did the work and the list of the work done, and the list of the amounts paid are hereby tabled.

HON. WILLIAM J. KEOUGH: (MINISTER OF LABOUR): Arising out of question No. 185 on the Order Paper of March 6th. the hon. the member for Burin addressed a supplementary question to me. And as I did not have the information at the moment, I said I would supply it later.

The information he wished was a further breakdown of the Architectural Fee of \$7,700 paid by the Workmens Compensation Board for the design of the office space lay out it occupies in Philip Place on Elizabeth Avenue.

This I hope will give him the information that he wishes. First of all the fee was paid to T. Portus Bolton Associates. The fee is for the design of office

lay out, and supervision of the work. The work done for the Board was designed and location of partitions, electrical outlets as required in each office, and each desk space, telephone location etc. as well as complete supervision and certification of the contractors work.

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY: (MINISTER OF WELFARE): Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand, three questions put by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. No. 198 on today's Order Paper. Question No. 1. reads, Did the minister post or caused to have posted in a window in a Bell Island store a letter to the Minister of Highways outlining his recommendations for road and bridge improvement and construction for the coming Fiscal Year? The answer to this part of the question Mr. Speaker, is a very positive affirmative. As one facet of my continuing program of two-way communication with my constituents, I have placed that (the hon. gentleman did not ask the question?) I have placed at strategic points throughout the district of Bell Island, bulletin posters which are changed from time to time. There are uniformly headed, Mr. Speaker, "Memo from your Member," and are of a constant eye-catching background colour and headed sufficiently boldly so that as the Greeks said, "Even he who runs may read." I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this device has proved to be one of the most economically and effective ways of communicating with my constituents on matter of public interest and an excellent complement to unbiased information they get in the "Newfoundland Bulletin".

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it might be well worth his while to attempt some similar means of liaison with the electorate of St John's Centre.

MR SPEAKER: In answer to a question, the matter should be answered simply and as concisely as possible.

MR NEARY: Well, I have a number of copies here, Mr. Speaker, to table, and I would like to table copies for the information of the hon. member who asked the question. As to Part (2) the answer is No and therefore Part (3) does not apply.

MR T. ALEX HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, are we led to understand that confidential letters from hon. members, to the ministers, can be made public by posting them in a public place?

MR NEARY: I did not get the question.

MR HICKMAN: Is this House to understand that letters from hon. members, to Ministers of the Crown, confidential letters, can be posted in a public place?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give to that is, that when I write a letter ^{on} /behalf of my constituents, I think, they are entitled to know what it is I said in that letter.

MR. HICKMAN: Okay, I am agreeable, if you are.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, with reference to 198. Was a letter to the Minister of Highways posted in any window on Bell Island stores?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would not be so unethical as to post a letter from the Minister of Highways, without his permission, and I think I have already answered the question in part (2) by saying, "No."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister said that he did not post or caused to be posted, my question is was there a letter from the Minister of Highways posted?

MR. NEARY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

HON. AIDEN MALONEY: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 159 on the Order Paper of March 5th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. In answer to (1) reso-jet process is being used by the company to convert herring into meal and oil. The operators are of the opinion that the reso-jet process has proven to be successful. (2) During the calendar year 1969 the company was engaged entirely in testing, therefore, no products were made for commercial use. Several tons were shipped out, however, for feed tests. And I should like to say that the company have completed one year of a controlled feeding program on mink using these products and the tests were very successful. No other products were made during the year. (3) The plant employed during 1969, twelve men with a payroll of \$63,710.91. Office employees numbered four; with a payroll of \$26,840.00, the vessels eighteen men, the payroll \$93,840.00; and local work contracted \$75,464.48. The company's payroll, the company had in its employee, the week ending February 28th. 1970, a total of eighty-two men and a payroll was \$7,513.00; for the office there were four employees, and the payroll was \$622; and the vessel eighteen men employed and the payroll was \$9,036.00.

I have the reply, Mr. Speaker, to question No. 163 on the Order Paper of March 5th. asked by the hon. the member for Burin. And I have to reply

MR. A. J. MALONEY: The speaker, Mr. Speaker,

1132

March 9, 1970

Tape #252

Page 1

HON. AIDEN MALONEY (Minister of Fisheries): On the Order Paper of March 5, asked by the hon. member for Burin. And I have to reply as follows:-

It is entirely the right of the Government of this Province to grant or withhold permission to build a herring reduction plant on Newfoundland soil. It is entirely the right of the Government of Canada to grant licence to Canadian ships to fish in Canadian waters. The jurisdiction is thus divided the Government of Canada having sole jurisdiction over fish in the waters, methods of fishing, number and sizes of fish that may be taken and the like. And the Government of Canada having sole jurisdiction over the number of fish, the Government of Newfoundland rather, having sole jurisdiction over the number of fish processing plants there may be.

It is obviously in Newfoundland's interest to consult with the Government of Canada and for the Government of Canada to consult with Newfoundland, and these consultations have taken place on a matter of herring reduction plants in this Province.

In the view of the Canadian Department of Fisheries there is as yet no evidence that the stock of herring in Newfoundland waters has reached a maximum sustainable yield. The department however, are studying Ways and Means, if it should become necessary to exercise effective control limiting the number of vessels which may enter the Fishery. As a precautionary measure in this matter, a new department of Regional Economic Expansion has been requested not to make their industrial incentives available for the construction of any more herring reduction plants.

I have the answer to Question (189) Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of Friday, March 6, asked by the hon. the member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part of the question: As of the end of February, 1970, the employees situation was as follows: Newfoundlanders - eighty-three. Others - twenty-two - for a total of 105. The breakdown of the employees under the heading "Others" - United Kingdom - fifteen - Mainland Canada - seven. Part (b) of that question - total number of personnel employed at various times since the start of operations at Marystown. Newfoundlanders - 446 - Others - seventy-seven - for a total of 523. And the breakdown of Others - United Kingdom - sixty-three, and Mainland Canada - fourteen. Part two of

// 33

March 9, 1970

Tape #252

Page 2

the question which has to do with payrolls. The total payroll for the fiscal year 1968 was \$1,422,016 paid to Newfoundlanders - \$1,097,442. To others - \$324,574. The total payroll for the fiscal year 1969 was \$1,220,994, paid to Newfoundlanders - \$926,345 - and to others \$294,649.

HON. E. S. JONES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of March 6, 1970, asked by the hon. member for Burin Question (180)-Tabled.

MR JONES: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to return to Notice of Motion?

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, entitled, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Alcoholic Liquors Act."

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with Orders of the Day, I rise on a point of privilege a matter affecting the privileges of the House and not just any one member of the House. Mr. Speaker, under legislation passed by this House, known as the Melville Pulp and Paper Limited Authorization of Agreement Act, 1966 - 1967, Subsection 3, Section 4 of that Act, requires that every agreement, trustee, trust indenture, guarantee, contract, undertaking, or any other agreements of every nature whatsoever entered into executed and delivered pursuant to this Act shall be laid by the Minister before the Legislature within fifteen days after it has been so entered into executed and delivered. If the Legislature is then in Session and if not then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing Session.

Now Mr. Speaker, the whole Province understands that or is led to believe that in November of 1969, there were agreements and indentures and contracts entered into by the Government and executed under the provisions of this Legislation. Despite this, despite the direction in this Legislation passed by this House that such agreements be tabled in this House within fifteen days after the Session commences, and I believe the Session commenced on February 18. These documents have not been tabled in accordance with the directions of this House, which I submit is a breach of the privileges of members of this House, the Government and Minister responsible being in default of a Legislative directive. I accordingly have a Motion here Mr. Speaker, that one must have in connection with a matter of breach of privilege, which states:

WHEREAS a Melville Pulp and Paper Limited authorization of Agreement Act 1966-67 . In Act Number 44 the Statutes of Newfoundland 1966-67 requires a

1134

March 9, 1970

Tape #252

Page 3

Minister of the Crown designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to lay before the Legislature within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing Session every agreement trustee trust indenture, guarantee, contract, undertaking or any other agreements of every nature whatsoever entered into executed and delivered pursuant to the Melville Pulp & Paper Authorization of Agreement Act. AND WHEREAS it is understood that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has entered into certain agreements with Melville Pulp and Paper Ltd., and others pursuant to the Melville Pulp and Paper Limited Authorization of Agreement Act, as announced publicly by the hon. the Premier. BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly censure the Minister of the Crown designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council under the provisions of the Melville Pulp and Paper Limited Authorization of Agreement Act and the Government for its failure to observe the provisions of the Melville Pulp and Paper Limited Authorization of Agreement Act 1966-67, by laying before the Legislature all such agreements, trust deeds, trust indentures, guarantees, contracts, undertakings or any other agreements of every nature whatsoever, entered into executed and delivered pursuant to the said Act within fifteen days after the commencement of this Session of the House of Assembly and directs the said Minister designated and the Government to comply with the law of the Province of Newfoundland immediately by so tabling every agreement trustee, trust indenture, guarantee, contract, undertaking or any other agreement of every nature whatsoever entered into executed and delivered pursuant to the Act immediately in compliance with the law. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a serious matter, these are agreements in which the people of this Province are involved and guarantees up to \$53. million we are entitled under the Legislation to have them tabled in this House. The Session has now been in progress nineteen days, at least the nineteenth day has now been reached after the commencement of the Session, and I therefore move this Motion, seconded by the hon. member for St. Barbe South.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, today is the twelfth day of the Session -

MR. CROSBIE: It is the nineteenth day -

1135

March 9, 1970

Tabc #252

Page 4

MR. SMALLWOOD: Today Mr. Speaker, is the twelvth day, and we have three days to go and the hon. gentleman's Motion is therefore out of order in my view. In the second place I doubt that this is the proper time in the sitting of the House to move such a Motion just before the calling of Orders of the Day. The hon. gentleman had ample opportunity earlier in this sitting to move it when he might have done it properly. I believe it is improperly done now, and that in any case as to the substance of the Motion I believe it is out of order because today is only the twelvth day of the session Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the point raised by the hon. the Premier. The wording of the Legislation is quite clear Mr. Speaker, if not then within fifteen days not fifteen sitting days, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session. The Session commenced on February 18, 1970 - today is the nineteenth day following the commencement of the Session. If sitting days was meant then clearly Mr. Speaker, the Legislation would state fifteen sitting days. That is one point. As far as the proper timing of raising a Point of Privilege, the book of Standing Orders and Beauchesne state, that it is the practice in the Canadian House of Commons to bring up a Question of Privilege before the House has taken up the business of the day. However, the proceedings of the House may be interrupted at any time except during a Division by Motion based on a matter of Privilege.

So I submit Mr. Speaker, that this Motion is quite in order as far as time is concerned, and that there has been a prima facie breach of the directions in this Legislation. The Legislation does not say fifteen sitting days, it says within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing Session.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (President of the Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and the attention of the House and hon. friends to the fact that on the opening day, which is a Wednesday, this House adjourned until tomorrow Monday. And I submit that in the eyes of the House of Assembly the days are sitting days. Every time we adjourn we adjourn until tomorrow whatever day that happens to be. In the eyes of the House tomorrow

March 9, 1970

Tape #252

Page 5

is the next sitting day. And I might say further in reply to that I had these documents on my desk since Friday, I intended to file them today and I forget to bring them up. Actually we have been so busy occupied here, every afternoon and every night, that I have not had a chance to check through and make sure that there are no documents missing. But the documents are on my desk and they will probably be filed this afternoon.

MR. A. J. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I heard you intimate you would take the matter under advisement. I would like to add a few words that from my recollection in the years I have been in the House it has been fifteen days notwithstanding whether it is sitting days or not. And with reference to the Premier's objection at the time that the matter was raised I think Sir, that you ⁱⁿ and your wisdom allowed the thing to be raised, and I do not know if it a reflection on your knowledge of Parliamentary procedure. But I am willing to go along Sir with your judgement, but I feel that it is a very valid question that has been raised, and we look forward to your judgement on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is under advisement.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance and that is when he expects to bring the Budget into the House and the Estimates?

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, notice will be given in time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: No. (3) The Hon. the Minister of Finance to move that the House

1137

Motion: That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty:

MR. E. JONES: (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public services of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March 1971, by way of Interim Supply and in accordance with the British North America Act 1867 as amended.

I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

Signed:

E.A. Harnum
Lieutenant Governor

Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): Order

Resolution: That It Is Expedient To Introduce A Measure To Provide For The Granting To Her Majesty For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-One The Initial Sum Of Sixty-One Million Six Hundred And Eighteen Thousand Dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the resolution carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I presume that this is the motion that is debatable. The resolution asks this hon. House, the Government asks this hon. House to precede now with granting the Government and Her Majesty \$61, 618, 000. Interim Supply for next year. That is money for the Government to commence spending on April 1st. 1970, in the next year. Not Supplementary Supply, not extra additional money the Government has spent this year that has to come in for Supplementary Supply, but Interim Supply for next year. The Government is now requesting Mr. Chairman a vote, a blind vote really of \$61,618,000. Now this is only March 9th. Mr. Chairman and the Government has until the end of March to bring down the Budget or to bring down the estimates and do things in the regular way.

Certainly Mr. Chairman, I certainly take this view that the House should not be asked to vote Interim Supply to vote the Government \$61,618,000. without at least the estimates of expenditure for the next year before us. Surely Mr. Chairman, when a House of Assembly or a Parliament is asked to vote

substantial sums of money for a Government it should at least have before it, as is the practice in the House of Commons, and certainly in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, the estimates, the detailed estimates for the coming year.

Now Mr. Speaker, this is an amount of \$61 million which is almost one would guess twenty per cent of the Government's expenditure for next year. That the Government is now asking this House to vote in block, and under the Bill there will be certain lump sums for each department. I submit Mr. Chairman, that the members of this House should refuse to vote the Government Interim Supply unless the Government is prepared to table now, or in the next several days the estimates of expenditure in detail for next year, and the total required for next year.

I refer Mr. Chairman, to Beauschene, Parliamentary Rules and Forms page 198. It is one of the old standing principles of our constitution that the House of Commons should control the finances of the country, that is the right, privilege, and duty of the House. It has been achieved by means of struggle lasting through centuries beginning from the fourteenth century down to the seventeenth century, when it was fully confirmed, and since then it has never been disputed.

The cardinal principle on which the whole of our financial system is based is that of Parliamentary control and by this is understood not the control of Parliament in its constitutional sense, but controlled by the Commons alone. Of course Mr. Speaker, we are the Commons and Senate all in one in this House. The ancient doctrine that the redress of grievances should be considered before the grant of supply is maintained in the House of Commons of Canada.

On page 202 Mr. Chairman, Beauschene refers to supplementary estimates, and he says about supplementary estimates "When treated as customary and as a matter of course, instead of being restricted to occasion of unforeseen contingencies, do more to destroy effectual Parliamentary control than any other indirect method that could be devised, because, it loosens up Parliamentary control of spending. That is supplementary estimates."

Of course Mr. Chairman, when supply is called for and the House goes into Committee of Supply page 210, it gives an opportunity for the debate of grievances and of many questions of policy. I refer also Mr. Chairman, to Parliament by W. Iver Jennings who has been referred to favourably in this House.

The function he says on page 295, of the Committee of Supply is to examine and consent to the estimates. Now Mr. Speaker, we have no estimates here

except block votes to examine and consent to. He goes into the whole business of course, of control, of Parliament's control through the Committee of Supply, and the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, my submission is that the members of this House, certainly the private members of this House should refuse to blindly vote the Government this Interim Supply of \$61,618,000. without the Government, unless the Government is prepared to table the estimates for next year in this House so that we can see what is the total vote for next year, what is the total vote in the various departments. What are the detailed proposals for expenditure. We all realize that if the House goes beyond March 31st. without giving the Government some Interim Supply that the Government would not be able to pay its bills, would not be able to pay civil servants salaries and the rest of it, but and therefore of course, we have to be reasonable and do what we could to see that that did not happen. But in return Mr. Speaker, the Government must be reasonable and the only power that the House of Assembly has over the executive Government, one of the only powers is that power of the purse.

Our right to know in detail what the Government proposes to spend, and on what, and when, and how. This Interim Supply Bill Mr. Speaker, I submit is number 1, too large. If the Government could operate several months on it next year without this House of Assembly ever having approved in detail their spending, and that it is being asked for without our being given the estimates of expenditure for the next year, which I submit is not Parliamentary practice. It is certainly not good practice, and if this Government Mr. Chairman wants the support of the House in the matters that it brings before it, then it should consider also the rights of members in this House. And since this is the time to bring up grievances I refer again, although I will not dwell in any length

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, if I may to a Point of Order Sir, may I refer the hon. gentleman who has been so thorough in his reading of Beauschene to page 198, citation 234-1 the time to bring up grievances is when the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair is made. Sir, the Speaker has left the Chair and that is why Your Honour is Chairman. I think the hon. gentlemans statements are out of order at this time, at another time they might be quite appropriate. They might Sir.

MR. CROSSBIE: Mr. Chairman, since I have not had a chance to express what the grievance is I will not call it a grievance. I will just discuss any matter of Government Policy that I feel needs to be discussed, and Mr. Chairman it appears to be the policy of the Government to ignore the rights of other members of this

House by refusing them adequate office space in the precincts of the House of Assembly

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD (Premier): Point of Order. The hon. gentleman now is proceeding to violate the rules, blatantly and brazenly.

MR. CROSBIE: Is there a Point of Order Mr. Chairman or is there not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me state my Point of Order, and I know how to state it.

MR. CROSBIE: Well your are not stating the proper thing now

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the hon. gentleman is not supposed to use the words "you" or "your"

MR. CROSBIE: Well the hon. gentlemas is not

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the time to express any grievance is when there is a motion before the Chair, Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and go into a Committee of the Whole on Supply. That is the only time that there is the right tp speak to a question of grievance.

When the House goes into Committee of the Whole, then the rule of relevancy applies automatically. The relevant remarks now, the House being in Committee of Supply is as to whether or not this money, this Interim Supply should be granted. This is not an occasion like the debate on Address in Reply or the Budget Speech. For any kind of a ranging speech, or talking about grievances, or the general policies of the Government the question is very narrow. Shall the Government be granted Interim Supply pending the bringing down of the Budget and the Estimates. That is all.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with that Point of Order I would submit that when the House is in Committee of Supply, being asked to vote Interim Supply of \$61,618,000. it is relevant and in fact widely held over a long period of time that any matter of Government Policy in connection with the expenditure of these funds can be discussed by the members, and that we are not held down to any... How Mr. Chairman can there be any narrowing of debate when the Government comes before the House asking for \$61. million for twenty departments?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the ruling I have to make is that if there is a particular grievance which a member wishes to raise he has to do that on the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair. That the debate now must be restricted to the rule of relevancy on the resolution which is before the Committee.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I refer Your Honour to Beauschene page 210, wherein Beauschene says "our Committee of Supply consists of 264 members who can hardly be expected to consider effectively the details of finance and so on. A body

so large and so ill-equipped for enquiry would be a very imperfect instrument for the control of expenditure even if the discussions were devoted entirely to that end. But these discussions afford the only opportunity in the course of the year for the debate of grievances and of many questions of policy."

That is what Beauschene says.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with the hon. member but I think the procedure that we have to follow here is clearly set out in page 198, paragraph 234 - 1, and while it is true that grievances may be raised on a question when the money comes before the House, the redress of grievances should be considered before they go into supply and so on. That is taken on the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair.

We are in Committee now, and there has been referred to us only this particular resolution, and members must I feel adhere to the rule of relevancy and discuss this resolution only.

MR. CROSSIE: Very good Mr. Chairman, while dealing then with this resolution Mr. Chairman the Government in my submission is now asking this House to vote the Government \$61,618,000. for next year without a jot or tittle of information on how the Government plans to spend the money or on what. When this motion was introduced before this hon. committee there was not a person on the opposite side of the House stood to give outline in detail what this money was stood on. It appeared to be the assumption of the Government that the members of this House were just going to vote \$61 million without asking for any explanation. It was not preceded by any introduction, and Mr. Chairman this appears to be part of the policy of the Government. Do not give them any information except what they can absolutely hammer out of us.

This is in line with the policy that has been adopted in other respects in the House. The difficulty in getting information, and the same thing now applies to this Interim Supply Bill. I submit Mr. Chairman, that this is a derogation Mr. Chairman

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a Bill, the Bill is not before the House, this is a resolution, the Bill is to follow

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order

MR. CROSBIE: My submission, this is a derogation of the authority of this House for the government to approach this in such a cavalier fashion. We all realize Mr. Chairman that there will be a Bill that is being tabled now or was a few minutes ago, and that this will show under various departments just one amount of money. It will give us no detail and the point that I am making is that no House of Assembly or no parliament should be asked to vote any government interim blindly unless at least having before that House the estimates for next year, and the procedure Mr. Chairman, at the House of Commons in Ottawa and in the United Kingdom is that the estimates are tabled in the House long before the government asks for interim supply. And in fact the government may have to ask for interim supply on several occasions during that session, and that we should be treated no differently here that our rights are just as sacred as representing the people of Newfoundland in control of the financial affairs of this Province all the money has to be voted by this House and we should be treated in exactly the same way. And that the government should not come before this House three weeks, twenty-one, twenty-two days before the end of the financial year and ask us to vote about twenty per cent of next year's expenditures without presenting the estimates and giving us a fuller explanation.

This is another change Mr. Chairman, in the policy of the government that should be made. Another change that is badly needed like the change in the treatment of the Public Accounts and the Report of the Auditor General. And the change that should be made in giving us information willingly without hedging about questions and going by the literal wording and the rest of it, such as we have been treated to for the last two weeks. We are here on behalf of our constituents and the rest of the people of Newfoundland representing ^{the} private members of this House and asking this government which has had uncontrolled power for the last twenty-one years, to now start explaining to us why they need this money, why it is \$61 million instead of perhaps \$20 million or \$25 million. It should be Mr. Chairman the lowest possible amount the Government needs until it can get its budget down for next year and the estimates down and approved.

It should be just what they need to sneak through, not to come into this House and ask us for \$61 million, which is going to cover at least two months operations for the Government and perhaps even more. So I therefore move Mr. Speaker,

HON. DR. F.W. ROVE (Min. of Education): Before the hon. gentleman sits down I wonder

1145

if he would permit a question, Mr. Speaker? I am listening to his protestations against this, by inference, irregular way, he said he does not understand why we do not use the regular way I have been wondering, why, in the five or six years the hon. gentleman has been in this House, several years at any rate he has been here. This is not anything irregular. This has been done more times than not done. In the twenty-one sessions that I have attended this has been done more times than it has not been done, and I am wondering why, my hon. friend waited until this time to protest against it, he was in this House when it was done before, it was done last year, just a year ago, why is ^{it} he waited until now to protest and find that this is a denial of the democratic rights of the House? He must know it has been done here for twenty-one years. That is my question Mr. Chairman, why does he wait?

MR. CROSBIE: The answer to that should be quite obvious. But first, I am not sure that the Government has come before this House in every previous session, such as this.

MR. ROWE: I did not say every previous session.

MR. CROSBIE: And ask for Interim Supply, in this way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not say "every".

MR. ROWE: I did not say "every".

MR. CROSBIE: Well every year, or whatever the hon. member did say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not use the word "every" at all, he did not use the word "every".

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I exercised the prerogative of mercy by allowing the hon. minister to ask a question. I did not have to let him, allow him, to permit him to ask a question -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh what a big-hearted statesman,

MR. CROSBIE: At this particular time, as Mr. Chairman knows, and now the hon. minister is going to quibble with every word I use in answering it. I do not know whether this exact procedure Mr. Chairman, has been used before in previous years but in previous years I was subject to the discipline of the government party. And whatever my views were, ^{or} were not on the matter, they were not requested, they were not invited and they were not consulted. I am now sitting in this House as an Independent Liberal not subject to party discipline, and I am not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member's position is interesting but the Bill, the resolution.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I am just answering his question. The point

is Mr. Speaker, the question is quite irrelevant, that this is a serious matter that Interim Supply should not be requested without the detailed estimates in this way, this Government could have started this session of the House much sooner, it has been meeting afternoon and night since we did start, if the estimates are not ready now certainly they should be ready because they start to be prepared by the Government I believe in the fall of each year and I therefore move Mr. Speaker, and I further suggest that the amount requested is unreasonable it is too great and I therefore move Mr. Chairman that the Chairman leave the Chair without making any report, seconded by the hon. member for St. Barbe South.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker it is not the hon. gentleman's privilege to make such a motion. It is the Government that has the right to call the time of the House the business of the House not any hon. gentleman sitting on the opposite side. Your Honour I simply cannot accept that motion. Your Honour can accept a motion only -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The position is that we are now in Committee of the Whole on a particular resolution, and the only motion the Chair can entertain is an amendment to this particular resolution.

MR. CROSBIE: I have the floor I am referring to page 203 of Beauchesne. Where it is stated the only motion allowed when the resolution is under consideration in Committee of Supply is that the amount be reduced or that the Chairman leave the Chair, either without making a report or to report progress on certain resolutions I therefore submit Mr. Chairman that in accordance with Beauchesne my motion that the Chairman do now leave the Chair without making a report is quite in order. In accordance with Beauchesne who is used as a guide in this House Parliamentary Procedure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the House of Assembly since Confederation has met for in each of 21 years, this is now the twenty-first year, since Confederation. Of the twenty-one years Interim Supply has been sought in fourteen years, fourteen sessions. Last year, I believe the year before, this makes the fourteenth year in the twenty-one years in which Interim Supply has been sought of the House through Committee of Supply. The reason always is that the Government fearing that it may not be able to bring the budget down together with the estimates of expenditure for the coming year in time for the beginning of the coming year which is April 1, frequently brings in a request for Interim Supply. I have never known request to come for less than two months supply. It has been three and sometimes four months, but this year it is two, it has never been less than two

months supply, Interim Supply. Now we are going to move tomorrow that the House of Assembly at its rising at 11 p.m. tomorrow shall adjourn until some date in the month of April. Tomorrow will be the final sitting if the Government's motion for adjournment is accepted by the House for some weeks. Five of the ministers are leaving Newfoundland on Wednesday night, leaving Gander on Wednesday night for Europe. We will be gone about a week. There is Easter week and that is two weeks. It might be said Your Honour that five ministers of the Crown gone from the House of Assembly the House could carry on and that of course is literally true, strictly true. But with the Leader of the House my hon. friend the President of the Council, Minister of Justice going, with the Premier going, and three other ministers going from the House it is the feeling of the Government that it would be a sound practise for the House to adjourn during that period. And as there is another week, Holy Week during which the House has always or normally adjourned, that is a fortnight, and when the House does re-assemble, there will not only be the matter of the budget and the matter of the estimates of expenditure for the ensuing year the coming year but there will be other matters of greatest possible importance to the Province to come before the House and so therefore we come to the House today asking for Interim Supply as we have done on thirteen other occasions since Confederation. and we are asking for two months supply, enough to carry the Government forward for two months from April 1.

The departmental breakdown is not contained in the resolution now before Your Honour but it is contained in a Bill which would be brought forward immediately after the Committee disposes of the resolution. And the breakdown that is given is the normal breakdown it is exactly the same, except in the figure, the figures opposite each department, it is exactly the same as had been done year in year out for thirteen years before this year. No variation no difference whatsoever. Furthermore Mr. Speaker, never has Interim Supply been requested in this House never, before Confederation or since Confederation, Never in the history of this House has interim supply been sought, after the estimates were tabled, always interim supply is sought before the estimates are tabled and there is a reason for that. The reason being this that the practise in this House has always been to bring down the budget speech and the estimates at the same time. In other Houses estimates are tabled substantially in advance of the date of the budget speech. But not so in

11-12

this House our long established practise in this House is to bring down the Budget Speech and the Estimates of expenditure in the one day when the Minister of Finance, who I regret had been called out of the Chamber with other ministers to meet with Canada's President of the Treasury Board, the Hon. C.M. Drury, who with these ministers is now holding a conference on the floor below dealing with important matters affecting this Province. The Minister of Finance when he delivers his budget speech then moves that the House go into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, the Deputy Speaker takes the Chair of Committee and then the Minister of Finance tables the estimates so that both come in the same day, the Budget speech and the estimates, and by then and well before then interim supply has been requested and granted, if there is interim supply. Where the budget speech can be brought down and the estimates for the coming year tabled before the beginning of the financial year there is then naturally no interim supply, none is needed. The money is granted

granted on the estimates and on the budget speech. Where there is any doubt that the budget speech and the estimates can be brought down and considered by the House before the beginning of the Financial Year, Interim Supply is the only way of getting sufficient money to keep the Government going until the budget is brought down, and until the estimates are brought down. Now, Sir, I am only describing the situation as it has always been in this House. I am not suggesting that we depart, that we innovate, that we introduce something new, I am merely describing what has always been our practice in this House.

I want also, Mr. Chairman, to draw your attention to the fact that Interim Supply is commonly sought in the Parliament of Canada. And Interim Supply is commonly sought also in the House of Commons at Westminster, and Interim Supply is commonly sought in parliamentary bodies throughout the British Commonwealth and Empire, wherever elective assemblies exist. In Ottawa, they frequently ask for Interim Supply. And I remember one year under the Premiership of the Right Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, I remember one year under his Premiership of Canada, they were asking for twelve months supply, and got it without a budget speech and without estimates, well/without estimates but without the budget speech, without any attempt on the part of the Minister of Finance to explain where the money was coming from, or how he proposed to raise it or/and without any explanation whatsoever of how he proposed to find^{it} the twelve months, Mr. Chairman, twelve months Interim Supply was requested, and granted by Parliament, the full amount. Normally twelve months supply is not requested as Interim Supply, normally three or four months or may be four or five months Interim Supply would be requested, in our case, in our House, it is has been two, three and sometimes four months. At the present time, it is two months supply. And we are quite confident that before the two months supply is granted, if granted by this committee and the House, following the committee, if the supply is granted to the Government we are quite confident that before it is spent, the budget speech would be brought down, the estimates will be brought down in this House, and the House given every conceivable opportunity its heart can suggest, to debate every last individual item of expenditure, that is in the Committee of Supply, and to debate the budget speech in the regular budget debate. There will be every possible opportunity, but as we intend, to propose to the House tomorrow night adjournment until sometime in early April, we are asking for this Interim

Supply and in so doing following the perfectly normal procedure of this House for over a hundred years.

MR. NOEL: The motion that was made by the hon. member for St. John's West that the Chairman leave the Chair without report, and that is now the question before the Committee.

MR. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, speaking on that motion, I speak as one who has never been subject to party discipline. I speak as one who had been seven years on this side of the House repeating the same arguments over and over again. So I do not think there is any inference in the hon. Minister of Education remarks, about the member of St. John's West that applies to me.

Now I am beginning to, among other things, consider this Government as a Government in a hurry. People will recall when this House of Assembly opened a few weeks back, we had to meet afternoon, and night, there was so much to be done, the people of the Province expected us to be here, they were paying us to be here. On the official announcement on radio station V.O.C.H. this morning, I presume it was official, I heard the Premier say that the House may adjourn. Now it has been confirmed here this afternoon that we are going to adjourn for three weeks, because the Premier, and I think four cabinet ministers, and I do not know who else, have to go to England for this signing of this document. It still leaves twenty-five members on the other side of the House. They have a comfortable majority.

Today we bring in this Supply Bill, the first motion made, and perhaps, people, I think all members are pretty well familiar with it, the first motion made that the Rules of the House be suspended. Now this in essence means that to introduce a Bill in this House; we give it first reading on one day. The second day it is given second reading, and then we go into committee on it. In other words, it is a three day effort just about, am I right in this Mr. Chairman? Basically, I think I am right.

But we bring in this Bill to grant the Government or the Queen \$61 million. Now basically we could have a couple of days perhaps to go into this thing, but no, we cannot do this. This all must be discussed this very moment in this House and for the next few minutes or hours or whatever the case may be.

What is all the hurry? I have asked this on so many times and I have yet to get a satisfactory answer. Why we have been driven on this side in

11/4/70

the passed two weeks? Afternoon and night in the House, and in the morning trying to do a bit of work to prepare for it. We are granting approximately three months supply to the Government, \$61 million, and these are millions, not thousands, not hundreds, these are \$61 millions. I asked the hon. Minister of Finance on Orders of the Day, when the budget was expected to be brought down with the estimates? We will be advised, we will be advised, no not next week or next month or something else.

On February 6th. there was a quotation, attributed to the Premier from one of the daily papers, "Premier Smallwood says, he does not know when the budget will be brought down in the House of Assembly, but predicted that it might be around the middle of March. All government departments have completed their estimates of revenue expenditure, and the estimates are now in the hands of the Provincial Cabinet." Now this was a month, just about over a month ago. All these estimates have been submitted, and are in the hands of the Cabinet.

Now, I would suggest that it would have been far better for this House of Assembly to have one session a day to give these Cabinet Ministers a chance to prepare the budget, which is after all the guts, if you like, of this Province, the money we have, where are we going to spend it? Where are we going to get it? I think this is what we all operate on, if we have no money to spend on public services, we must give up public services. I have heard statements through the pass~~ing~~ couple of weeks. The hon. Minister of Health says, he is going to give a \$100 thousand to Grand Falls for something that happened in the hospital out there, defect in the heating system: The, hon. the Minister of Education says there is \$500,000 for the high school education, and if these things have all been said, we do not know, Mr. Chairman, until the estimates are brought down, and we can just get a chance to go into them to see where these dollars are being spent and in our wisdom on this side. And in the interest of the people of Newfoundland, we think these monies should not be expended, we have to vote against them, this is our right.

Now today as I say, we are asked not to consider it today, and perhaps we can talk about it tomorrow and then vote on it the next day, no. This very day, we must vote to give the Government \$61 million.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Who said that? Who said that?

MR. MURPHY: There will be a Bill introduced.

1156

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who said that? Besides the hon. gentleman that this day we must do that. Who said that?

MR. MURPHY: There will be a Bill introduced?

MR. SMALLWOOD: But, who said that? Besides that gentleman that this day we must do that. Who said that?

MR. MURPHY: All right the debate continues, well why suspend the rules.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The debate can go on all day to day, and all day tomorrow, and all day and all night tomorrow night.

MR. MURPHY: Now if I can continue, I will accept that. I will accept that, but as I say, this Resolution and the Bill, I presume, will have to be done in just the one period of time without first, second and third reading so on and so forth, it must be all put through at the one session.

So, Mr. Chairman as I said earlier, the seven years that I have been in the House, we have always questioned the right of Government particularly where ^{are} we/only have three weeks away from the end of our Fiscal Year, the Fiscal Year ends at the end of March. And by that time we should have had our estimates down and our budget looked at. But, this Government has never, I will not say never, very seldom met early enough in the year to give this House a chance to really consider these matters, which are very vital matters. These are the millions, and millions, and millions of dollars that have been spent.

So, I, Mr. Chairman, I can only support the motion as submitted by the hon. member for St. John's West, because it is not anything different that we have been arguing in the passed number of years, I think, it has been brought in for fourteen years. I think you will find if you want to check the records, that for fourteen years, the official opposition has still been raising the same questions, that let us have our estimates, let us have our budget, and then we can pass the thing, so as we can know what we are voting these monies for.

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of points I would wish to raise in this discussion. The fact, that today twenty-two days before the commencement of the New Year, we are being asked to vote Interim Supplies, it seems to me all together too far ahead, and in so doing there has been no indication given us that the estimates are ready. It is true it happened other years, because I was a member on the other side of the House. Last year I was particularly familiar with it, because I was Minister of Finance. And at the time Interim Supply was requested estimates were just about ready, if not

completely ready, which made of course a considerable difference because they could be produced at any moment.

Also, there is another very fundamental point, this happened last year also, the supplementary supply could normally pass for the current year, the year in which we are before Interim Supply was asked for. Last year that did not happen, Interim Supply was requested before supplementary supply was passed. In other words, you are asking for money for next year, before you know what you have spend in the current year. Well, last year this was approved and agreed to, because supplementary supply was also ready, and was brought down in a few days of Interim Supply. Now, we have had no indication yet of supplementary supply or what it is likely to be or when it is likely to be brought into this House. And I think in fairness, this ^{is} information this House is entitled to, that members should have some indication of supplementary supply, before they vote on Interim Supply.

MR. T. ALEX HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, in support of the motion the hon. member for St. John's West, the request for Interim Supply which is not unusual to this hon. House, nor is it something that is peculiar to it. Rather it is a request that you will find in most parliaments brought about generally during the middle of the session, in most parliaments, with the exception of this hon. House, because the House has been dilatory in passing the main estimates. And the significant thing about it is this, that in most parliaments according to the Government of Canada by McGregor Dawson, "When the Supply Bill comes before the House, or when Interim Supply is sought in the Resolution that comes before it, it states categorically the percentage that is being sought, in the Parliament of Canada it will read \$X millions being one-twelveth of the fund necessary for Parliament and Government to function during the ensuing Fiscal Year".

Insofar as this present Resolution is concerned, there is no indication other than an indication that is now been given by the hon. the Premier, but none in the Resolution itself, as to the period that this covers. We have been told this afternoon for the first time that it covers a period of two months. But this is simply an expression of opinion, we do not know if it is two months, or three months. It does not follow the accepted Parliament Procedure of saying this House is asked to vote \$10 million or \$60 million being one-twelveth of that required by Her Majesty's Government to function.

1152

And this right, Mr. Speaker, of granting Interim Supply is one that is not treated very lightly, and is not one that Parliaments have passed with a great deal of enthusiasm and a great deal frequency. In fact, most authorities on Parliamentary Procedure indicate that because of the obvious necessity and to quote your words, Mr. Chairman, "the right for the members of the House in their supremacy over the Government to control the purse strings that when there is an immediate need for funds, the opposition is placed in a position where it can state the terms on which this urgency supply will be granted.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked in this Resolution to simply vote \$61 million without the slightest indication other than in the Bill to follow, as to what each department requires.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do this, if we are going to be asked to pass Supply twenty-two days before the end of the fiscal year. I think that we can be pardoned on this side of the House if we look upon this with some concern, because you will recall Mr. Speaker, that either before or just after the commencement of this Session in statements made by Ministers of the Crown, we were to have the Budget brought down in the very near future. We have now been in Session since the middle of February, and up until now the logical assumption that has been made by the people of this Province, particularly people whose very welfare depend upon the bringing down of the Budget. The Budget will be brought down very quickly and very early in March.

Well Mr. Speaker we now hear for the first time that there will be no Budget brought down before the end of this fiscal year. Indeed we now learn for the first time that this hon. House is going to be asked on tomorrow to adjourn until sometime in April. This means no Budget before the end of this fiscal year. This means no provision to meet the demands of certain public servants, such as hospital workers in this Province, before the end of this year.

Now Mr. Speaker, I say that the Opposition is only doing its duty if on a Resolution such as this, or on a Motion that is presently before the House, it refuses to simply go along with the Government's request that this Bill now be passed. Because Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to some statements on this very matter that have been made, no one can accuse me of being unbiased in this or partisan, because I very briefly refer to statements by three party leaders in Canada.

When public finances are involved, said Mr. R. B. Bennett, it is the duty of every member of the Opposition to endeavour to show whether the country got the greatest value possible for its money. Members may demand information in great detail and can hold up the Estimates until the desired material is produced. In 1931 the Liberal Opposition refused to pass Estimates until certain contracts had been placed before and examined by the Committee. Mr. M. J. Caldwell has stated the position of the private member in strong but exaggerated terms. Quote "There is one place and one place only in this Parliament where private members are supreme,

namely in Supply when discussing the Estimates. This is His Majesty's purse and the age-old right of members of Parliament is to decide to what extent His Majesty's purse shall be filled. This is what we are doing now, and I certainly wish to protest against any precedent being established that would curtail the right of this Parliament to discuss any matters in connection with the administration of the Ministers' department.

True it is Mr. Speaker, that in this hon. House, Interim Supply has been asked for on occasions when the main Estimates have not been tabled. But I submit Mr. Chairman that that does not make it right, because that Mr. Chairman is surely taking away from the members of this House the right to question every item of Estimate, every item of Expenditure, before we decide in this hon. House to fill Her Majesty's purse. And that is precisely what we are being asked to do in this Resolution.

There is nothing in this Resolution, nothing in the Bill which will follow the Resolution to give any details as to how each department will spend the monies that we are now being asked to vote. Nor indeed is there any firm categorical statement in this Resolution which will have the effect of making it binding on this House as to whether we are voting for one-twelfth of the monies required for the next fiscal year, or whether we are voting for one-third or one-quarter or a half or what it is.

We have had simply one indication from the Leader of the Government that this constitutes two months Interim Supply. Mr. Chairman, if this Bill is now passed, then surely the Government will have to answer to this House now and reasonably satisfy this House, as to why three weeks ago, or a month ago, the Budget for the fiscal year 1970-71 was just a short time away. It will certainly have to answer to the public servants of this Province as to why they too will have to wait until after April for the bringing down of the Budget. And more than that, the Opposition will certainly be called upon to answer to the people if they allow this type of expenditure to take place without trying at least to insist upon this House being furnished with the details in far more particularity than we find it before us today. And for that reason I support Mr. Chairman, the Motion of the hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I announce with deep regret the death a few minutes ago of Mrs. Lillian Barbour, widow of the late Captain Key Barbour

March 9, 1970

Tape #256

Page 3

and mother of our member of the House for the district of Bonavista South.

I am sure that our hearts go out to the hon. member for Bonavista South on the death of his mother. He has been called away from the Chamber and I am sure our hearts go with him.

Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on the remarks of the hon. gentleman who just sat down except to say that for three years he voted for this very thing that he now opposing as a matter of great and profound principle. He has suddenly discovered great principles that he did not notice the past years. The hon. gentleman who preceded him, the present hon. member for Fortune Bay is the very hon. gentleman who last year moved the very motion for Interim Supply and he has this year suddenly discovered some nefarious something or other about it that he had not noticed in earlier years. But it is amazing what twenty odd feet difference will make. Men sit here, here they are slaves, they are party discipline. Over there they have no party discipline. The party discipline is only over here. This may explain why we are still over here, and they are over there. We do have a party. We do have party discipline, and we do try to have loyalty to our party, so as to have strong Government, strong government. And they do not have party discipline over there, and that is perhaps why they are over there.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is really abundantly clear, whether we are right or wrong, whether it ought to be so, or ought not to be so, whatever is right or wrong, whatever ought or ought not to be so, whatever is right or wrong, whatever ought or ought not to be so, the fact, the fact is, that there is to be no Budget until next month. That is the fact, which means, because we will not be ready to bring it down. We are still as of this moment the Cabinet, not at this moment, because at this moment we are here in the Chamber, but the Cabinet are still dealing with the Budget, still dealing with the question of Civil Service salaries. Salaries for nurses, salaries for hospital workers, salaries for policemen, salaries for firemen, salaries for wardens in the Penitentiary. The Government are still going over that again and again. We have done endless exercises to see how much money we can find to pay increases, and so we are not, I repeat not ready to bring the Budget down Mr. Chairman, we are not ready.

1156

March 9, 1970

Tape #256

Page 4

Now whatever maybe said about that, it cannot be denied, it can be denounced, it can be condemned by anyone who has the wit or the voice to do it. And so be it, let them condemn it, but they cannot deny it. It is a fact that we are not going to bring the Budget down in what is left of the present financial year., because it is not ready. And we are not going to bring it down until sometime after the new year begins.

Now Sir, that being so, when the first day of April arrives - if we do not have Interim Supply, we cannot spend one dollar legally, it is unlawful for the Government to spend a dollar which has not been voted by this House. That is why we are asking the House not to vote the full year's supply, but two months supply. That is all. We have done it thirteen other years. This is the fourteenth year out of twenty-one.

Suddenly someone has discovered that it is nefarious, it is abominable, it is everything short of criminal, and the same hon. gentlemen who now find it to be so reprehensible a thing, year in and year out voted for it when they were slaves. Now they are free men, they can see straight and they can reason straight, and they can be honourable, and they can be decent, and they can be statesmen, but whereas before they crossed the floor they were slaves, slaves with the whip and the lash, lashing them in the backs, and the great welts coming on their backs, and able to sleep except on their bellies, could not turn over on their backs, because of the welts of the slavery of party discipline.

Now the hon. gentlemen across know how true that is. They know how true it is that they were slaves, and they know how untrue it is. So Mr. Speaker, I am only answering the points that were made. If the hon. gentlemen make points I suppose it is in order for me to answer them. No? Well if they make points, if they make debating points -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When I was answering a question asked by the Hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Premier was very quickly on his feet to cite the rule of relevancy, and now my point of order is this Mr. Speaker, that the Premier as he is so often been irrelevant, as the hon. gentleman has been so often, irrelevant and should be kept to the point.

MR. MURPHY: I wish to join with the hon. the Premier in our expression of

1157

March 9, 1970

Tape #256

Page 5

sympathy to the hon. member for Bonavista South, and I would like on behalf of all of us to say how sorry we are on the death of his mother.

MR. CROSBIE: Before the hon. Chairman puts the Motion I would like to join first in the expression of our sympathy to the hon. member for Bonavista South on the death of his mother, and we are all sorry of course that this has happened, and that the hon. member has had to leave the House.

Mr. Chairman, just before you put that Motion. It is an awfully poor argument Mr. Chairman, that if something has been done even for one hundred years, or it has been done for thirteen times before, or if it has been done twenty-five thousand times before, that because a government was able to do and get away with something for thirteen years or twenty years or one hundred years, that that practice should be continued. And the fact is Mr. Chairman that whether or not this Government has been able to ramrod Interim Supply through this House of Assembly in previous years in this fashion, it should not be the practice any longer. Now Mr. Chairman, there is no point in the hon. the Premier or any hon. gentlemen opposite raising his hue and cry, that if we do not pass Interim Supply there will not be a cent to pay out of the Treasury on April 1.

Every member of this hon. House and every member of the public is quite aware that the Government has sufficient votes on this side of the House to pass this any way they wish to have it passed. That does not gainsay the fact Mr. Speaker, that if the Government comes to this House of Assembly looking for Interim Supply they should do it properly. We should not be pressed to accept it any way the Government wishes to do it, because somebody may not be paid on April 1, which is fiction, they are going to be paid anyway, the Government has the votes to do it.

The Government is not asking this House to pass Interim Supply properly. The Government is refusing to give this House information as to how that \$61 million is to be spent. And Mr. Chairman I pointed out before, it is the practice in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

In the House of Commons in the United Kingdom, which the hon. Premier cites so often when it is on his ^{side} of an argument, that the Estimates are given to the House - the next year's Estimates are given to the House before they are asked to vote Interim Supply. And as the hon. member for Burin pointed out, they are told what percentage of the next year's Estimates

March 9, 1970

Tape #256

Page 6

it is. Now Mr. Chairman, another point. The slavery point, the great slavery point. White slavery point. Mr. Chairman, this question of how the Government was going to go about getting Interim Supply was never discussed before me while I was a member of the Government. I was never consulted about it, never asked about it, never asked to give an opinion about it. So that if any matter came up before the House, the way it was done, it was done by the Government. You either had to vote for or against it in the House. So much for this nonsense.

1159

this nonsense. We know, Mr. Chairman, who is in charge on the other side of the House from our own experience there, and it is not a question of whether people on the other side are slaves or non-slaves. It is a question that certain; a certain party, Mr. Chairman, is in control.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): The hon. gentleman is now getting into something objected to a short while ago.

MR. CROSBIE: Very good, Mr. Chairman. The question. The issue before the Chair, no matter how anyone in this House, Mr. Chairman, whatever stand they took in this matter before, this is now a fresh issue. There is a right way of doing it and a wrong way and the way the Government approaches it is the wrong way. It is the arrogance of a Government twenty-one years in power.

Refusing. It is all on a par. Refusing to answer questions informatively. Refusing to appoint a public accounts committee. Refusing to give certain members proper facilities. Refusing to bring the estimates down.

The hon. the Premier, himself, being quoted by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition as stating in the Press several weeks ago, that the estimates of expenditure for next year are ready. The estimates do not have to be brought down with the budget, Mr. Chairman. It is the practice at Ottawa to table the estimates long before the budget is brought down, or certainly before it is brought down. It has been done that way. There is no natural law that estimates must be brought into the House only when the budget is brought down.

So, the Government can table the estimates for next year. The Government has had months and months to consider what it is going to do about Civil Service salaries, what it is going to do about hospital workers' salaries, what it is going to do about the police salaries, what it is going to do about firemen salaries, what it is going to do about the salaries of everyone in the Government service and that is now what is delaying this budget now.

I think it was Marie Antoinette said, "Let them eat cake". And the hon. Premier tells us there will be no budget in March; let them condemn it. It

1160

is the same kind of attitude, Mr. Chairman. Marie Antoinette lost her head and the hon. Premier may very well lose something, too, in the next few months when he calls it if he continues this attitude. Let them condemn it.

Never consulted about this matter. \$51 million, Mr. Chairman. Now, today, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, we are told that this hon. House is going to adjourn tomorrow until April. We are told that, after being pressed for two weeks, afternoon and night, after being met with sneers by the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources that we were filibustering and holding up the business of the House, what do we now discover? That the House is going to adjourn tomorrow for two or three weeks. Two weeks, until April.

We are not getting, Mr. Chairman, information. We cannot get it on Come by Chance. We cannot get it on ENCO. We cannot get information on Melville. Documents not even tabled as they should be. Public accounts and we are met with this tired old argument that now becomes such a frequent argument in this House.

We got away with it, the argument is. What are you hon. gentlemen doing opposite? You sillywillies. You nit-pickers. We got away with this for twenty-one years and now you are starting to talk about it. That is not much of an argument, Mr. Chairman. The fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite were able to get away with this kind of high-handed tactics for the last twenty years does not mean that it is right for it to continue.

MR CHAIRMAN: Order please! The rule of relevancy here is just about gone. The motion is that the Chairman leave the Chair without Report. And I do not think this is the occasion for a wide-ranging debate at all. Anything like that should come on the other motion.

MR CROSBIE: Well taken, Mr. Chairman. So I will finish my remarks by stating that our request to the Government is a reasonable one. We want time to consider this matter. We want and we request that we be given the estimates for next year, so that we can study them during the adjournment. If the House is going to adjourn, we should have these estimates to study during the adjournment and we should certainly have them before we are asked to vote on the \$61 million. We should be told what the percentage of the estimates for next year is; and this whole procedure should be changed.

1161

APR 2, 1950 PAGE 27 PAGE 3 OF 4

MR. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the estimates are not ready. Now, either I am a dirty foul liar, or the hon. gentleman across.--

MR. H. MURPHY (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): The hon. Premier has already spoken in the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will speak ten times more if it is my wish, and so may every hon. member of the House. There is no limit to the number of times.

MR. CROBBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I never said that the Premier said that the estimates were ready - quoted in the newspapers that the estimates were ready. What the Premier said before was that the budget was not ready .

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the point of order, Mr. Speaker? That is just debating. That is not a point of order. I did not say that he said that I said. I did not say it. I repeat that the estimates are not ready. Now, can I make English any clearer than that, Your Honour? Because we are still struggling with the question of what increases we will give to the hospital workers, to the nurses, to the Civil Servants, to the police, to the penitentiary wardens, and to other employees of the Government. Naturally we want to give the largest increases that we are able, financially, to do. Naturally. Inevitably. Logically. We are trying to give the largest increases that we are financially capable of giving and so we are going over and over and we are getting our servants, that is the officials, to go over and over and over the exercises.

What would it cost if we did this? Well, they ^{would} spend a day doing that. They bring the results. We look at them in the Cabinet. Then, we say, well now we will try this. Suppose we did that, what would it cost? And so again and again, the exercise is being done and we still have not got our estimates ready. They are not ready, Mr. Chairman. They are not ready.

Therefore, they cannot be tabled. Therefore they will not be tabled until the House reassembles in April. Now, it is as simple as that. We are told by the hon. gentleman who just sat down that we are asked, the committee are asked and later, the House will be asked to vote this money to the Government without having any information as to what the money is for.

Now, if I were to attempt to speak in Committee of Supply, on a bill which is not before the committee, Your Honour, would very properly rule me out of order. But, there is a bill, Your Honour. The committee at the moment is discussing a resolution. Here is the resolution. That is all there is before the committee. That is all Your Honour will allow to be discussed at this moment. The committee is met on this resolution. 1162

Be it resolved, so and so, that it is expedient to introduce a measure and the measure is this: a bill. This is the resolution, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31 day of March, 1971, the initial sum, initial sum, of \$61.618 million and then if the committee passes that resolution, the committee will rise.

Mr. Speaker will go back in the Chair, and you, Your Honour, will report to Mr. Speaker that the committee have considered the matter to them referred and passed the same. Then, the question of a bill with the details will come on immediately after and this would presumably go in the committee where, if I were allowed, by Your Honour, I could describe right now; the breakdown of the \$61 million.

It is not just a lump sum of \$61 million. That is what is in the resolution, but in the bills that follow, there is a breakdown by Departments and while I am not allowed to discuss ^{it} and I do not intend to try to discuss it at this stage, this will come if the bill comes before the committee. I would then point out that \$16 million of that is for education to pay teachers' salaries.

I would point out that \$19 million of it is for Public Welfare.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This should come before the House and should be debated then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah, that Parliamentarian! That profound and experienced Parliamentarian who is trying to prove, who is trying to prove to the House what a magnificent Premier he would be, although he got squashed and squelched in the Leadership Convention.

MR. CROSBIE: You are the greatest squasher in the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I squashed the hon. gentleman pretty effectively. He has never got over it and he never will.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is a great lickier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He will never get over it. He will never, never. He will never get over it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, we can go on debating this until 6:00, and we will adjourn then until 8:00 and we can go on from 8:00 to 11:00 and we

can go on again at 3:00 tomorrow and keep it until 6:00. We can have a thorough going debate. Let it not be said that we are trying to throttle debate. I can speak as frequently as I like and so can any hon. member of this House in committee. There is no limit to the number of times. There is only a limit to the amount of time that any hon. member may take in any one speech. That is the only limitation there is. So, let us have a thorough going debate on this at the moment we are debating that Your Honour leave the Chair and we do our business.

So, let us have a discussion on whether Your Honour should leave the Chair and then after the discussion is thoroughly completed, then let us put it to a vote and see what happens.

MR. HICKEY: There are a couple of questions I wanted to raise. First of all, may I say, Sir, that I feel I have to vote against, vote in favour of the motion made by the member for St. John's West. My colleague, the member for Fortune raised a point of supplementary supply. I think this is a very important point. It is rather strange why we are asked for interim supply, when we do not even know what the financial state of the Government is for the present fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, another interesting point is that if this resolution should pass, I feel sure that there are enough hon. gentlemen on the other side going to support that at will.

There must obviously be the fear expressed that the Government can carry on, meeting its expenses for two, possibly three months, however long this amount of money of \$61 million can covers. They need not bring down the budget or estimates. They may then come back to the House say at approximately June month and say, we would like interim supply again for another three months or two months or one month, whatever the case may be.

This House may never sit again to discuss a budget for how many months? This could go on continuously. We are not told - we are not given any reasonable time as to when the budget will be brought down or when the estimates will be tabled and surely it must be obvious why the members on this side of the House would not want this resolution to pass and it is rather difficult to understand why hon. members on the other side would not be somewhat concerned as to the possibility of this happening.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people throughout the Province, I suppose all our people, but there are some people particularly interested in the budget this year. For that reason, Sir, I think the Government have the responsibility to bring this budget down just as quickly as they possibly can.

The thing is that we are in one heck of a hurry to get this Resolution passed and to get this Bill passed. We are told that the House is going to adjourn because the Premier and certain Cabinet Ministers are leaving for England. Mr. Chairman, some of our people who are not too familiar with politics nor the running of the Province might well think that this Bill is being passed so that the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers may take Supply to Her Majesty when they go to England.

It is all

It has almost gotten as bad as that. The rules of the House have been suspended in order to get this measure through and one begins to wonder just what is the right. As some of my colleagues have already pointed out, we have sat in this House in the afternoon and in the night to deal with the business that was to come before the House. We have quite a number of bills already distributed. One would have expected that we would work on those bills, meet in the afternoon and night and continue to do so, so as to clear up this very important work and now we are told that the House is to be adjourned for two or three weeks.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I cannot understand how or why it is so important that we approve this resolution. I think that the important thing for the Government to do is to get as many people as necessary, working on the estimates and to bring down the budget. And I feel sure that we are not going to go broke between now and the 31st of March.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, between now and then, the budget can be brought down, the estimates distributed and when we find out what condition we are in for the current fiscal year, then let us talk about interim supply for 1970 - 1971.

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could I direct a question to the Premier? I wonder can he assure the House that pay increases to be granted to Civil Servants, no matter what category they are in, and irrespective of the date the budget was brought down in this House, will he assure the House the pay increases will be retroactive to April 1st.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, of course. Of course, they will be, not only these, but every category that I mentioned: hospital workers, police, firemen, wardens, civil servants; all employees of the Government, all employees not of the Government would get their salaries from the Government, all increases will be retroactive as from April 1 regardless of the date of the budget.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to ask the hon. the Premier a question, too, before we proceed. Could the hon. the Premier assure the House that if interim supply is passed, the House is going to meet in April?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is that the Chairman leave the Chair without Report: Those in favour "Aye", Contrary, "Nay". I declare the motion lost.

Shall the Resolution carry?

MR. HICKMAN: What are we doing now? Has the Chair ruled on the Division?

MR CROSBIE: Pardon! Before the hon. member commences, what was your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the vote. Can we have a recorded vote or - ?

MR CHAIRMAN: No, we don't record it. The question before the Committee now is: "Shall the Resolution Carry?"

MR HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, before you put the Question on the Resolution, during the course of this debate certain information has come to the attention of hon. members for the first time. We now know that (1) this hon. House will sit in April. That has been stated categorically, definitively, if ever any hon. member should welch on that he would be run out of the country. This is a clear, firm commitment; that hon. members of this House will sit and that a budget will be brought down in April - given by the Leader of Her Majesty's Government, who has never been known to change his mind.

So that, Mr. Chairman, another question obviously must come to the attention of hon. members. We have been told that the amount sought in this Resolution covers supply for two months. That would be for the months of April and May. But, Mr. Chairman, the budget is going to be brought down in April, so obviously Her Majesty's Government does not require funds by way of interim supply for May.

Maybe this fact was not known to hon. members on the Government Side until the hon. the Premier made that announcement just a few minutes ago. And I presume that now that this is known to hon. members, now that they are fully aware of the fact that the budget will be brought down in April, that therefore interim supply will not be needed for May, could not possibly be required for May, could not possibly be spent in May, then, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that they are not going to depart completely from parliamentary tradition and completely throw away the purse strings or cut them up and destroy them. Because, Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious to all hon. members that interim supply is something that no government likes to ask for. It only asks for interim supply to meet the exigencies of a situation dictated by the very problem that the hon. the Premier has raised, the difficulty that he is experiencing with the servants of the Crown in preparing next year's estimates and deciding just how much of an increase the public servants will receive.

And this is the only reason for interim supply, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be. It would be impossible. It would be unthinkable that any Government would ask for interim supply for the sole purpose of taking away at all, any of the rights of Parliament to control the purse, but rather it is because through no fault of their own the public servants have been so busy, and so many questions have been asked of them that they just have not been able to find the time to prepare the main estimates.

So, that is all settled. We now know that the public servants will complete their work by April. We now know that the budget will be brought down in April. We now know that interim supply is not required for May. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, interim supply is not required for May and obviously, when this resolution was prepared by the hon. the Minister of Finance on the advice of his colleagues, he was in error.

Now, the hon. the Premier has corrected that error. I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. the member for Fortune Bay, that the sum of \$61,000,618.00 being the amount sought in the resolution, be reduced to \$30,000,809.00, which will cover interim supply for one month.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, in April I think, there are thirty days. Is that right? Thirty days in the month of April and I have informed the House that the House will reconvene in the month of April. Now, if it reconvenes on Wednesday, the 29th of April, I will have kept my promise. The hon. the member for Fortune Bay has just jumped to his feet and - of Burin has jumped to his feet and drawn attention, dramatic and spectacular attention to the fact that I had said that I had said that the House would reassemble in the month of April and he says that if I do not do that, I would be run out of this country. I think he probably meant run out of this Province.

Now, I agree, but I also point out to the committee that if the House meets on Wednesday the 29th, or even Thursday the 30th of April, I will have kept my promise.

I want also to invite the committee's attention to the fact that under the Election Act, twenty-one days between the proclamation and polling day, so we could have a General Election in April month and after the General Election, the House could be called together, still keeping the promise that the House will reassemble in April month.

MR. HICKMAN: And bringing down the budget?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And we could bring down the budget. We could meet on the 28th and bring the budget down on the --- We could bring the budget --- meet on the 28th, bring the budget down on the 29th after the election was over and we had come back with a thumping big majority.

Now, this can happen in April month with no promises broken, but there will not be the same personnel in here. Over there, will be a much thinner crowd and not the same faces. I believe there are two over there that will come back. Two will come back into this Chamber. The rest, we will see no more, after the election in April or whenever the election is; whenever that election is.

MR. HICKMAN: You have got to get by that committee at Port au Port.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, in the event that all of these desirable things which have just been announced do not come to pass. We are all very hopeful on this side of the House that they will, of course. There is still, on the 29th or even the 30th of April, an opportunity to bring down the further request of interim supply, if it is required.

Therefore, I support the motion of my hon. colleague.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surprise! Surprise! Surprise! He supports it.

MR. EARLE: Actually, there is plenty of time. We have, or we are now suggesting an amount of money which will see this House, this Government through, the month of April. That is twenty-two days now to run in the old year and the full month of April.

I think hon. members on the other side, will realise that gives ample time for reconsideration of salary-votes or anything else that may be desirable in that time.

This is only in the sense of 'red herring' to say that further time is needed at this stage. So, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we vote \$30.800 million, is it?

MR. HICKMAN: 809

MR. EARLE: \$809,000.00 (\$30.809 million)

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly support whole-heartedly the motion moved by the hon. member for Burin. Not even subject to his Party's discipline, I can see the good sense of it. The gentleman is a fountain of good sense, at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, we understand on this side of the House, that the hon.

the Premier and four of his ministers are going to Europe, later in the week, on important Government business and we sympathise with the fact that their minds should be set at ease when they go, that they, they should, they want to feel that they have got tucked away in the Governmental budget a wallet, the Governmental wallet, two months supply of funds for when they come back so that they can operate - the Government can operate here in this Province for April and May without having to come back to face this House, without having to come back to listen to our questions or to listen to our points.

On this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, we are reminded very frequently of the hon. the Premier's tremendous desire to get rid of us. He is constantly talking about this election that might be coming. He is going to get a thumping big majority. Well, Mr. Chairman, I say that he is asking for a thumping big whack of money, now, today, for us to vote blindly in this House, to vote as blindly as he hopes the voters will vote when they get their chance in the coming election.

\$61,618,000.00 requested by the Government contemptuously, with contempt. Let them eat cake. Give us the \$61,618,000.00 or we are going to take it anyway. That is the attitude of the Government. There will be no budget in March. You cannot argue about it. You cannot deny it. You cannot support it, because it is a fact.

A certain person says there will be no budget in March and now we are asked to vote \$61.618 million. It is far more sensible, Mr. Chairman, for the Government to support this resolution, moved by private members in this House, that the amount be reduced to sufficiently cover one month's operation.

So, that is arrogant Government. We will have to come back to this House before the end of April, either to get further interim supply passed or to present a budget and we have been promised a budget in April.

If there is an election intervening, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier will not be able to carry out his promise because he will not be in a position to let - put down a budget, not having a majority of the members of this House after that supervening event.

Mr. Chairman, while there has been a few jocular moments in this debate, in actual fact, the matter that we are discussing could not be more serious. Would it happen in any other Province that a Government can just expect to

obtain from the House, twenty percent of its budget in two days? There is a motion being made in this House that the rules be suspended tomorrow. That means that tomorrow the Government proposes to pass through all three stages, the bill, that is to follow this resolution, because the rules are going to be suspended to permit the Government to do that. The Government suspends the rules whenever the Government sees so fit to suspend them and the Government has a majority in this House that permits it to do that.

Is it right that authorization for \$61 million worth of spending should go through this House in two days without any detail other than it is going to be in the bill a certain set amount for each department? If the Government gets its \$61 million, Mr. Chairman, it does not have to come back to this House again until the end of May. It may not even bring down a budget. It may go to the country without bringing down the budget or it may not. It will not have to bring down a budget and we are asked now to adjourn or the Government is going to adjourn the House for two weeks.

No consultation with the hon. members on this side. Is the Government going to permit the select committee on the public accounts to function during the next two weeks while we are adjourned as it should? Is that committee going to have a Chairman, one of the members of the Opposition as Chairman and at least two members from this side on it? Or is it going to be an attempt to whitewash? None of these questions dealt with? Or at least not dealt with yet.

It is the practice, Mr. Chairman, in other Parliaments and Houses where the normal courtesies apply that the order of business of the House is discussed between the Parties so that people can know a day or two ahead what the business of the House is going to be.

On this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, we hardly ever know a half hour ahead what the business will be. Tomorrow we discover we are going to adjourn for several weeks. We did have a little advance notice of that.

So, Mr. Chairman, we can - this whole matter can be gone into again tomorrow, department by department and I am sure that it will be, but at the present time, there has been no argument advanced as to why any member of this House should vote against the resolution proposed - a motion proposed by the hon. member for Burin.

1171

One month's interim supply in these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, is more than enough and should satisfy any Government, even one with the rapacious ability to spend money that this one has.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the motion just by my colleague for Burin, first of all one must wonder why it is so necessary to close this hon. House at all. The fact ---

MR. COLLINS: the fact that the Premier and some of the Ministers are leaving the Province to go to England for a week is nothing new I would suggest. We have seen examples where the Prime Minister of Canada and several Ministers have left and the House of Commons still remained open. And I am sure that a lot of hon. members and certainly the public in Newfoundland would possibly enjoy having the Deputy Premier run the affairs of the country for a week. And answer questions back and forth across this illustrious Chamber.

Now Sir, to get to the more important part of the Motion. Certainly there is no excuse at all for this Government or any Government to ask for more monies than is necessary, and I would say Sir, that in this particular instance, they are asking for more than is necessary, certainly more than they have told us is necessary. We have the Premier's word that the House is to be called together in April, in which event one month's supply is adequate for March. And realizing the record of this Government Mr. Chairman, in its spending habits, I would much rather agree to giving them a blank cheque for \$30 million than giving them a blank cheque for \$60 million, and I certainly Sir would support the Motion.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Amendment is that the amount stated in the Resolution be reduced to \$30,809,000.

Those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay". I declare the motion defeated.

On motion Resolution carried:

On motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and directed me to report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same.

On motion report received, and adopted.

On motion Resolution read a first time.

On motion Resolution read a second time.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending 31 March, 1971, and For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

March 9, 1970

Tape #259

Page 2

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. ALEX MOORES: Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in this debate has set a very difficult role for me to follow, however I want to avail of this opportunity to congratulate him on his contribution to this Session. It was one of the finest speeches I have heard for some time. It contained the type of information that people want to hear. A very refreshing experience after all the bickering we have been exposed to the past couple of weeks.

I also want to associate myself with all the other hon. members who spoke before me and compliment the hon. member for Trinity North, St. Mary's, for their contribution to proceedings on opening day. I would also like to congratulate the hon. member the Leader of the Opposition on his promotion, and I wish him well during tenure of office, a great responsibility rested on his shoulders, but he is built to take it, including the curved balls and off center plays which he contends are hurled at him from time to time. I do not mean St. John's Center players, these are always curved.

To the hon. Premier who received such overwhelmingly support as the party leader last November. I want to wish him continued success in his chosen field, and long may his big jib draw.

In my opinion Mr. Speaker, one of the most important ^{and} significant sections of the Throne Speech is that section which relates to the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. I can see arising out of DREE an opportunity which if fully embraced could be the means of developing this Island in such a positive manner as never before realized. In fact such an opportunity ^{never} existed before. Ottawa is fully cognizant of the fact that in order for all Canadians to have equal opportunities, a way must be found to put in their hands, those who do not possess the material resources, means whereby they can develop the areas in which ^{they} live, work and raise their families.

There are many such areas in Canada and Newfoundland, as an Island Province, being one of the most farthest points away from the great industrial heartland of Canada, ^{it} should qualify for full benefits under the DREE program.

1174

The success of this program is going to depend, in my opinion, absolutely and entirely on the people who make up our Province. Our own Newfoundland people. I cannot subscribe to the negative approach displayed by some members of this House and their counterparts on Parliament Hill in respect to this program. We have enough knockers already in very influential positions in Canada who have no time for Newfoundland or her problems; a number of them would like to write her off, anyone who entertains that kind of thinking does not know what he is letting himself in for. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that all Newfoundlanders regardless of their party affiliations should show a very solid front when it comes to debating the DREE program.

My observations of the DREE Act and the benefits that will result therefrom has led me to the conclusion that it could be the greatest blessing that has befallen Newfoundland since Confederation. However, the success of this Program is going to depend absolutely and entirely on the approach which the people of Newfoundland are going to adopt toward it. It is going to mean total involvement on our part to obtain the best results. I am afraid if we do not embrace this opportunity now we may never get the same chance again. The Conference which is to be called to kick off the program will enable those who will be invited to attend an opportunity to make known their views on what they figure should be done in the areas from which they come. I would suggest at this time that the Minister whose department is responsible to Government to see to it that all pertinent literature on the program should be circulated if at all possible to those who are invited, in order that they may be fully conversant with the subject and be able to intelligently apply it to their areas. This is most important. It would be a great loss of valuable time during the Conference if a full explanation of the program has to be given at that time. Prior details in the hands of those attending would send matters along much more smoothly and swiftly.

Everyone coming to this Conference should be prepared to make his views known on what he considers to be the primary needs of his respective area.

I would expect Mr. Speaker, that the ultimate goal will be to rationalize the number of communities in our Province and to encourage growth centers that have aptitude and potential for development. This can no doubt be

March 9, 1970

Tape #259

Page 4

achieved successfully, but as responsible people we must ensure that the means used to achieve this end are practical, sound and viable.

In order for a sound and solid foundation be laid for growth, it must all tie in with industries represented in the various areas. We cannot move people for the sake of moving them or closing out a settlement for the sake of making one less. The move must be made to aid and abet an industry that has good chances of growth in special areas. The end result of which can give our people the necessities of life: a comfortable home and a community in which they want to live and raise their families.

Having dwelt at some little length on the DREE program, I want now to devote a part of my time to a subject that always commands a lot of attention in Newfoundland and rightly so, because its influence provides a job for one out of every four Newfoundlanders. I am referring to our Fishery.

Every hon. member in this House has one special field of endeavour to which he tries to aspire. In addition to our political affiliations some hon. members are Union leaders, lawyers, doctors, communication experts, real estate experts, insurance underwriters, school teachers, politicians by profession, business men etc.,. A truly representative cross section of our society, which after all is the way our democratic Government system functions: irrespective of our professions, every Newfoundlander can deeply become involved when the word fish is mentioned. It comes naturally, It is one of our heritages, not much perhaps by mainland standards but it is ours.

As a people we must have greater involvement by way of knowledge of our Fishery, be familiar of all aspects of catching, processing, what it means to our economy, ways and means we could adopt to make for better quality. Find out where our fish is sold, the manner in which it is presented to the consumer, after all it is our products and we must be proud of them.

I am about to make a prediction, and it is this. We are going to find under the DREE program that our fishery is going to play a very vital and important role in the expansion of our Province, the like of which we did not anticipate say five years ago. Ottawa now fully realizes the potential which exists off and around our coasts. Fish is in fact become

March 9, 1970

Tape #259

Page 5

one of the great foods of the world. Nations must turn to the sea to feed the peoples of the world. A lot of concern is being expressed over the pressure that is being exerted on known fishing areas, and there is a move on foot to endeavour to establish quotas from certain well fished areas. There is already a quota for Haddock on George's Bank.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of mention through the years in respect to the twelve mile limit, and I am sure all hon. members of the House are very pleased to learn, over the weekend or a few days prior to that, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries has started in Ottawa, has started to get some action in that respect. Protective lines are now being drawn especially to seal off the Gulf area to foreign ships. Now it is not the intention to literally move them out, but to just ask them politely if they would just please move away because this is an area which we have reserved, and it is part of Canada's territorial waters.

MR. MOORES: I fully support that move and I am sure that in due course we will receive full implementation as far as the twelve mile limit is concerned.

Now there is a lot of pressure on our fish stocks at the moment and this pressure of course is being applied by European trawlers. Now the trawler operation is one aspect, and hook and line operation is another. I think personally it would be a mistake to bar the White Fleet, the Portugese White Fleet or any other European ships that use hook and line to catch fish on the Grand Banks or outside the twelve mile limit anyway, but the idea of the quota system is to put certain sections of the continental shelf on a quota basis. I contend that the hand lining, or the hook and line method of catching fish is such that you usually catch the larger fish, and by so doing of course you are aiding and abetting the smaller fish to grow to maturity. I think it would be a mistake to debar the hook and line method of fishing.

Now I do know as well that the pressure that is being exerted locally
HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD: (Premier): Would the hon. member allow a question? Is he suggesting that the more of the larger fish that are taken the better for the smaller fish that are left, it give them a better chance to survive?

MR. MOORES: That is so Sir, I meant to lead on to that, we have a situation in Trinity Bay when we started to take turbot, we tried to catch turbot. When the initial orders were placed in Newfoundland for this particular type of fish it was for the large size fish. That was the only size the buyers were interested in, the fish had to be five pounds or over. In the initial purchasing of this fish it was found out that seventy-five per cent of the fish taken were on a size smaller than five pounds so the problem arose what were we going to do with the fish that were under five pounds. It was no point in going to a fisherman and tell him sorry but you can only keep the large ones the small you have to throw away. The industry then had to find a market for the fillets, this was eventually found in the United States. But we carried it a step further, instead of using hook and lines we started using gill nets, and by using the gill nets in Trinity Bay and the other bays we did a real job on the turbot fishery in Newfoundland.

The large fish was then mentioned that if we continued to use the hook and line we would take the bait, we would have a ready market for the large fish, it would give our smaller fish an opportunity to grow, but by using gill nets we smothered whatever was on the bottom. This was most unfortunate.

HON. A.J.MALONEY (Minister of Fisheries): Would the hon. member permit a question. Are you suggesting that the gill nets are destroying to some effect

MR. MOORES: Yes Mr. Minister I am, and I have sufficient evidence of it. It is a great mistake to encourage the use of gill nets in Newfoundland's inshore fishery. Now in addition to catching all these small fish.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even the Japanese light weight ones?

MR. MOORES: That is right Sir. In addition to catching all the small fish we are up against a quality problem. This is the most serious aspect of, or one of the most serious aspects of the gill net operation. The gill nets are set on a day, possibly it would be two or three days before the nets would be taken back because of inclement weather and so on. Imagine the fish that entered that net four or five hours from the time it was set and be taken out of the net seventy-two hours or ninety-six hours afterwards. What quality of that fish is left? The fish becomes attacked by other fish and goes to the bottom and becomes chafed and so on, you can just keep on going. But it does do very serious damage to the quality of our fish, and I certainly and respectfully suggest we take a very close look at our gill net operation.

Now in the modern way of catching fish, with our longliners and our gourdies and so on, there is ample equipment available for fishermen to acquire and install in their boats to set out miles of crawl. They contend that we are using gill nets, and this gives them an opportunity to set four nets and taken in bigger quantities of fish but they are only defeating their own purpose, we are killing our resource, whereas with set lines we come up with larger fish, better quality fish, and it would be all pluses in my estimation.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Social and Community Development was speaking on the DREE program a few evenings ago, and he referred to Newfoundland as a great wharf existing in the Atlantic. He found that this wharf for our fishermen who were stuck with job of catching fish down through the years will in the future realize a greater return for their efforts. I predict that our men who have stuck with the fishing boat and the companies who has stuck with the industry, all of them together through high prices and low prices, good catches and poor catches, will form a very strong nucleus in our economic growth in the seventies.

Now recently we have heard discussions from time to time on the pride that seems to be lacking in a lot of our Newfoundland people, the pride of what we are doing, the pride of our accomplishments, but I think this is one particular area where we are sadly lacking. It seems that if the pride of achievement, the pride of accomplishment has not driven home as far as our fishermen are concerned. Now granted down through the years we have heard a lot

about the ups and downs of the industry and the way all the fishermen were treated. But that is not the way to look at it. We have all of that behind us. We have reached a point in time now, where a fisherman in Newfoundland can look with great pride on what they have accomplished to date. They can look with much greater pride on what they hope to accomplish in the future. This is where this hon. House and people in influential circles can make their point, and put it across. What is wrong with a person who catches fish or produces food. He is associated with an industry that after all is producing a product that sustains life. What higher calling in life can a man undertake than that. Why should a fisherman look upon himself as not being as good a man as a man who fixes a television set, or repairs a car, or repairs a tractor, or drives a bus, or drives a train? I contend Mr. Speaker, that we have to instill in our people, we have to get pride into our people, and I think that pride is what is lacking, in a lot of our Newfoundland fishermen at the moment. I mean it takes quite a man to set out on a foggy morning and go out and find a trap and set it, or it he set a trap, then haul it and get a load of fish and bring it back to a plant. He is a clever man, a fisherman is, anywhere in this world you will find it.

Take the Portugese and put them on the Grand Banks, one man in an open dory, foggy, put him loose, but he has to catch a load of fish before he comes back to the ship if at all possible. The fishermen are clever men.

Mr. Speaker, it is some twenty-five years now since Newfoundland first started to fillet and freeze cod fish for export on a large scale. Twenty-five years in the development of markets for a primary product such as frozen cod fish is but a short span of time, provided of course we are on the right track. Twenty-five days in the month of July is too long if you are on the wrong track. There has been many set-backs during the period of development of markets for our fish, but most of the companies engaged in the business, even though they hung on their hopes, and on many occasions some went under, but those who knew the game and liked it, and one must like it, otherwise he would be the unhappiest person on earth. They did press on in spite of all insurmountable odds to make something really worthwhile of our fishery. Fishermen who did not heed the call of the big construction jobs, and who preferred even at less return for their efforts to stick with the industry are going to find themselves in the enviable position of being amongst the biggest wage earners in Newfoundland. In some instances, even now the biggest wage earners in Canada.

I know of instances Mr. Speaker, in 1969, where inshore fishermen in Newfoundland landed fish in quantities in excess of 1,250,000 pounds. There was

one community that has four such boats, multiply that by say three cents per pound the average price of fish, and you will come up with a nice tidy sum of money. Something like \$35,000. or \$40,000. There is not many places you can go in Newfoundland or in Canada and make that kind of money in that period of time.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many shares would be advanced from that?

MR. MOORES: These are real fishermen, fishermen who plan their work, and plan their time so that they will reap the greatest benefit.

Markets are now available for practically every specie of fish, if it cannot be filleted and frozen it can be salted, and as a last resource it can be processed into fish meal. Our younger men coming on should avail of whatever technology is available to them.

Our college of Fisheries, Trades and Technology is making a big contribution to this end. Now I know it takes quite a selling job at this particular point in time perhaps to entice young men to go into the fishing boat. They say what their fathers and grandfathers went through. But now we have brought it along on a little different plateau, a little better plateau. Granted fishing as such can be a very difficult operation. But by the same token if it is properly carried out it can be very rewarding. As I mentioned earlier, fish is one of our heritages in Newfoundland. We have to extract from it all that it possibly can stand, and our young people going to our Trades School, going to our College of Fisheries, the wonderful opportunity being exposed to modern trends, modern developments, modern ships and so on, and it will give them an excellent opportunity when they are ready to seek employment, that they will consider our fishing industry.

Now I feel for an awful lot of young Newfoundlanders who packs their suitcase and figures that the pastures are greener in Ontario, and they head for the mainland, Toronto, or Montreal or different places. As a lot of hon. members know many of us have lived outside of Newfoundland but for some unknown reason there is something way down deep in us that the call of Newfoundland is always there, and we always like to come back. I venture to say that you could meet any Newfoundlander anywhere this day in the world, and the first thing, the first question will be about home, how is so and so, what are they doing and what is the opportunity to come back? I do not know why, but that is the situation.

There is one other race of people in my estimation who are somewhat similar, and that is the Norwegians. Now the temperament of the Newfoundlander

and the Norwegian is very much the same. They come from a very rugged country they earn a living by methods similar to Newfoundland, and there is something about a Norwegian and Newfoundlander, we have a lot in common and we could learn a lot from the Norwegian approach.

The College of Fisheries, and school of Trades and Technology I think was one of the finest investments that thei Government ever made. As I mentioned earlier it takes time when you are working on a basic industry. The next twenty-five years. I would say possibly we can see it in 1970. There will be results from our Trades School and College, the College of Fisheries. But it is going to be more predominant going into the seventies, much more predominant, add especially with the emphasis that is going to be placed on fishing and the interest and all that is going to be generated from it.

Reference was made in one of our local papers a short while ago about our inshore fishery, saying it was "doomed" What trash to print in a paper. What is going to happen to all

what is going to happen to all the people who live in Cape St. Mary's around Cape Race and up along our entire northeast coast including St. John's and Labrador? Send them to the Mainland, No, Mr. Speaker. We cannot send them to the Mainland. I can see 100,000 or 120,000 people from St. John's, there is nothing for them, there is no industry to keep them employed apart from the two Governments and the C.N.R. The local paper of course was looking through the eyes of a native St. John's man. Every firm in St. John's who had anything to do with fishing along the waterfront with one or two exceptions packed it up. I can understand a suggestion for 100,000 or 120,000 to leave St. John's. but not our outports no provision, Mr. Speaker, was made in the city to ensure that an industrial development would take place. The fishery was neglected, and when you neglect the basic industry like that in a port like St. John's, when the wheels roll over be prepared for the eventualities.

Take the Faroe Islands, you have 37,000 people in the Faroe Islands. As every hon. member knows in the Faroe Islands they fish. They fish, that is their main industry. Deep sea fish chiefly, but some inshore fishermen. There are a 100 fishing ships or more of a deep water class that fish out of the Faroes, imagine trying to crew 100 ships in St. John's today with four times as many in the population as the whole Faroe Islands. Mr. Speaker, you would not man three ships in St. John's today to long line for fish off our coast. No wonder the local paper says it is a doomed, but I want to say something else without our inshore fishery we can pack up the whole North East Coast of Newfoundland, there is no future absolutely none without an active inshore fishery. On the North East Coast we are not going to have any Petro-chemical plants, we are not going to have any paper mills, we got mines in Baie Verte, and a mine on Bell, that is closed down. All these type of industries are all very fine for the areas they serve, but we have our fishery on the north east coast. Now we have it there ever since John Cabot discovered it, and we must give it all the attention and help necessary to move it into a greater industrial activity, DREE will help us achieve this.

Now the Federal Department of Fisheries in conjunction with the Provincial Department of Fisheries, I understand in 1970 commencing in April or May are going to undertake a survey, a very thorough survey of the north east

coast to see if they come up with appreciable quantities of herring that will be commercially viable. And in addition, of course, to the herring I understand they are going for caplin and sandlings. The stocks of caplin, the stocks of sandlings have proudly been determined, and this is very important and very vital. Now if this survey is carried out as thoroughly as I would like to see it done, and I think it will be done, I think the area from, start at Cape St. Francis and go to Cape Race, but definitely from Cape St. Francis all the way north, all up the Labrador Coast, no one knows what we can find as far as the herring is concerned. I think the herring are there. I had an experience a short while ago in Harbour Grace, one morning we were loading frozen mackerel bait, and a gentleman came by, and he said, where did these come from? I said, these were imported from Nova Scotia, the United States, and some from Norway. He said, that is most interesting. I said, why is that? Well, he said, I am from Battle Harbour. I fished in Battle Harbour last summer. He said, we had to take our traps out of the water in Battle Harbour because they were filled with mackerel and they sunk to the bottom.

The Norwegian scientist^{went} ~~was~~ over here in August or September, and they had a look, they confirmed the fact that caplin were in commercial quantities and also that mackerel, there was every indication that the Labrador Coast could support a good mackerel fishery. Now the mackerel fishery in Norway is a good fishery with terrific quantities of mackerel taken and these purse seiners go for mackerels just the same as they go for herring. They don't have to see them above the water like we have to see them here in Newfoundland or possibly Nova Scotia, they just look through their equipment and they can see them right away and they come back with their mackerels just the same as our Newfoundland skippers come back with cod or flounder. So the stocks of fish are there, what is needed is the capital, to bring the ships into the operation to get these fish from the waters and brought into our plants. I would say, Mr. Speaker, many people in this hon. House have had the pleasure of viewing a television show about a month ago. It was Russian Siberia. On that show it showed the Russian involvement in developing Siberia, and I really learned quite a lot from it.

They talked about the timber stands in Siberia, the timber stands one thousand miles in width, a distance from Cape Race to Cape Cod, three thousand miles in length, that is from Cape Spear to the Head of the Great Lakes. When we think of that portion of land with timber on it in Siberia. Then it went on to talk about the temperature where people live, 98° below zero. People were breathing and you could see their breath

freeze on the air and stay there.

Then they showed the little horses they have. A horse does not grow that way it grows this way in Siberia, it is so cold.

Then they talked about going to the grocery store for a quart of milk. They do not get their milk in a container nor in a tin but get it in a slab, like a pane of glass, and take it home and thaw it out.

the Russians have
Just take that approach/to life in Siberia and take our approach to the Northwest Coast and the Labrador Coast and the Newfoundland Coast, with these wonderful harbours we have, with all those fish that the Russians and all the nations of the world are coming to take. Just think about that for a moment; and see what we could do with the huge resources we have. It is a tremendous resource.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How long will it last?

MR. MOORES: Well, there is a lot of pressure on at the moment. Unfortunately Canada does not exert the pressure that she should have. My reason for saying that is this. Canada is not a fishing nation. She is not orientated to fish. Russia, Portugal, Spain, you name it, these countries in Europe must have fish to feed their people. They must, if necessary, dig up the ocean. Here they come, out there off the Canadian Coast. Ottawa is starting to think a little differently, in my opinion, now, and they are thinking that if the Russians and the Germans and the Portuguese and Spaniards and all can come to our coast and catch this fish to take back with them, why do we not put the effort there as well and be recognized in it?

I think, and this is what I said earlier, that DREE is going to be our salvation. DREE is going to be the salvation of our fishery, if we go about it right. The hon. member for Harbour Main mentioned here, when he spoke on Friday, about Marystown and the future for Marystown. It was most enlightening, and he hit right on a very important point

MR. MOORES: and he hit right on a very important point. And it was this; he talked about the trawler fleet that would have to be replaced in Newfoundland a few years from now. Well what are we going to do to replace our trawlers. There is only one natural place to build our trawlers, we have our own shipyard in Newfoundland. Well let us carry that just a little further. We can build our trawler for ^{our} deep sea fish. Let us build some small inshore longliners in Marystown, fifty foot longliners, seventy-five foot longliners, and let us get these longliners for off-shore fishing off the northeast coast. The inshore fishermen did a good job. They made good money, I just mentioned it earlier about the quantity of fish they took, which they caught and the money that they made. That is a trap boat longliner.

Let us go one step further. We have the young fellows trained out of college now. Put them in the seventy-five or eighty-foot longliners, let them go off the coast, stay for three or four nights, and you will see a big difference.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the northeast coast -

MR. MOORES: Northeast coast, yes Sir. Now Mr. Speaker, here is a big investment by the Government, Provincial Government, Federal Government on the southwest coast, in plants and in trawlers. It is a big investment deal. It is doing a good job, it is employing a lot of people -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well over \$20 million.

MR. MOORES: Right Sir, thank you very much. Now then it goes back a few years I believe, when the late hon. Jack Cheesman was Minister of Fisheries, when the southwest development committee was set up, and he looked very closely at the southwest coast to find out what they could do to increase the earning power of the people and so on. And the recommendation was, springing up from that was the Rose Blanche plant, Harbour Breton plant, and possibly one or two more. Well everybody knows, it is common knowledge -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And a small ship building yard right up to the head of Marystown.

MR. MOORES: What I am suggesting here now, we do not need that amount of capital investment on the northeast coast. It is not necessary, because we do not have far for fish. On the southwest coast you have to go a long

distance for your fish, but not on the northeast coast. Your fish is closer to you, but if we had a committee - a committee could be set up to take a very close look at what could be done along the lines which I have mentioned, especially with our longliners, our off-shore longliners - The plants are pretty much set up. I am talking about - they want to go on. Any fisherman who wants to move farther north can go down to Valleyfield or may go up to White Bay and so on. They are moving further north, but they are trimming the coast, they want just to go off-shore, to the Baccalieu Bank, then off Cape Bonavista, the Funk Islands and so on.

Last summer a Faroe ship came into Harbour Grace and I was speaking with ^{the} skipper. He was a young man, he was twenty-five years old. He had a boat, his boat was a hundred feet in length, and fairly heavily built. He came into my office and we had a discussion. I knew him, knew his father very well, he came to Harbour Grace for years. And he said to me, "are you handling turbot this year?" I said, "Oh, yes we are handling turbot, why?" He said, "I just arrived in and I fished the Funk Island Bank." He said, "I had to leave the Funk Island Banks, we were looking for codfish, we couldn't salt it so we had to take it off the hook and let it go." He looked out the window and he said, "that boat can carry 150 tons of fish. I can load that boat in ten days on the Funk Island Banks, with turbot. Now these are real turbot, not this small stuff we catch in the bottom of the bay. Just think what we can do with that type of long liner. Imagine. We do not have to invest the kind of money that the Norwegians and the Faroese do. In fact I saw a boat that was built in New Brunswick a couple of days ago when I was in Halifax. It was a boat about eighty feet, she was a small stern trawler, but she had her winches and all. She was a nice size boat that could easily be adapted to our inshore operations.

Now there is another aspect of our Fishery which I want to touch on. I did mention it awhile back, and it concerns quality. Much has been left undone in this regard, and much more remains to be done. Now when ~~we~~ ^{we} have our new salt fish development which has passed third reading in the House, just needs Royal Assent to become law. It comes into effect in 1970. It is good legislation for a salt fish industry. I have been around long enough

to know that it is not going to be the cure-all a lot of people think it will be. It will eventually because the Federal Government ^{will} find it necessary to imple~~ment~~ legislation to make the corporation worth it.

So if this legislation is going to hurt - but it is going to be a good thing because it will achieve what the corporation has been set up to achieve, to upgrade the quality of our fish in order that we may make a greater contribution for the value of our export products. However, fishermen will benefit in the long run, but it will take legislation to achieve this goal. And I hope that ^{is good} ~~transpires~~ ^{the} for the sake of ^{the} quality of our fish products. A lot of people may not agree with my remarks, my next remark, but it is this: The only difference between the new salt fish development corporation and our present system is all wrapped up in one word - quality. Good quality salt fish has always been in good demand at top prices. The trouble was we did not produce sufficient of the good quality to fill our orders.

The Corporation will have to come up with good quality. Tax payers money is going to be used now and they must account for their stewardship. We are going to be compelled to make good quality or else. That is why I say it is going to be a good thing in the long run.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? I would like to ask him if he would explain how a marketing organization could produce the kind of quality fish which is desired in Spain, particularly Spain, and in Italy, and in certain West Indian Islands, where the quality is of a light-salted sun-cured, hand-handled salt fish. Will the salt fish ^{cod} organization be able to ~~divert~~ fishermen to that kind of operation?

MR. MOORES: I would hope so Mr. Speaker. I think 1970 is going to be the year we will see the Salt Fish Development Corporation come about. That is a big job, that is over and done. Now we start moving into '71-72-73/ This is the year when you are going to see legislation brought in and quality control makers to come up with good quality fish. We must have it, we just cannot continue producing bad quality fish, fresh, salt, it does not make any difference. We have to have good quality, if we are going to be responsible people

//PS

we will have to get the message across. Now references, I have heard references made in this House from time to time talking about all the millionaires that live in Newfoundland and no doubt they think about millionaires associated with the fish business. Well I have been around for a few years and I do not know of one millionaire that existed that had anything to do with the fish business. He may have a million dollars worth of concrete, a million dollars worth of meal plants a million dollars worth of ships but he does not possess it, as such, a million dollars dry cash. His million dollars is invested in something that is giving a lot of Newfoundlanders work. There are millionaires, no doubt that made it on breweries, made it on selling motor cars, so on, that is another type. But I do not think that you will find many millionaires in the fish business. They are all pretty dedicated people. People who stuck with it and as every one who has ever associated with the fish business knows what it is. Because if you do not like it, it is no place to be.

Now the same situation exists ^{on} quality with out frozen fish. I was very happy to see that the laws governing quality and all types of fresh fish is about to be proclaimed. I trust that sufficient teeth will be put into it to make it work. A law is only as effective as its implementation, it is long overdue and if properly exercised tens of thousands of extra dollars can go into the pockets of our fishermen and go into workers pockets for producing better quality fish. Just consider for a moment fishermen with 30,000 pounds of fish, throws over the lines out in the middle of St. Mary's Bay and heads for Admiral's Beach, Admisal's Beach is one of the centres for buying fish, comes in there is a wharf, there are no shades over the wharf, there is a concrete wharf, it is the middle of July, hot. summer day, temperature 66^o, he starts to put the fish on the wharf, the first thing he got to find out if there is a buyer, how much fish is on the north east caast, how much fish is around, I wonder can I sell my fish. Anyway while he is trying to find a market for his fish he has his crew dressing his fish. So as I said there are no shades over the fish it is just laying there on the wharf in the sun and the rain whatever is falling. So finally after dressing down his fish he finds that yes there is a buyer for the fish, but it is going to be two or three hours before the truck arrives in the community to pick it up. Just imagine, the deterioration that sets in in that period of time. But Mr. Speaker, what we want in a place like Admiral's Beach or in Branch or any of these places that produce a lot of inshore fish, are special centres setup, we have them, there are one or two in existent at the

moment there are a lot of community stages in existence but just carry that one step further.

In each of these community stages we put in, first of all we put in, we equip the plant, the plant should be equipped, it should all be done by the Federal Government, they are the ones that participate in the exports of fish or unexported. They put in the proper facilities for dressing the fish, proper shades over the wharf, proper facilities for washing, fish to be boxed, forklifts to take the fish into the scales to be weighed, and from there into a warehouse to be iced down. And fish can stay into its place like that for 24 hours, properly iced in a cool room. But you are licked, you cannot get off the ground, by starting to buy fish that has been exposed to the sun in the month of July on the wharf and truck that into Conception Bay or on the southern shore. I have seen too much of it, I have seen tens of thousands of pounds that end up in the mealplant which should never have been. But, I am sure that I was most disappointed to hear the Federal Government's decision last to cut back on Community Stages. Community Stages for salt fish in Newfoundland was a good thing, in my opinion, a real breakthrough. But we can utilize the section of community stages or build another place for it. The fresh fish is equally as important and proper facilities should exist. I contend that fish should not, that the bulk of fresh fish should be in certain specific defined areas where all these suggestions which I have just made should exist. If they exist well then you are at fault if they just do not exist you just cannot go in and buy fish. There is nothing to prevent a buyer of fish today to walk down any wharf in Newfoundland where a pair of scales and a receipt book in his pocket and start to buy fish. It does not have to be gutted, it does not have to be washed, throw it in a truck and take it to a plant it just should not be allowed.

1190

March 9, 1970

Tape 264

Mr. Speaker, I want to revert once more to the state of the Northeast Coast of our Province. This is the area that produces the bulk of our salt fish, possibly eighty-five per cent of it, and it is the area in which the Salt Fish Corporation will be most active.

Our entire turbot industry is centred on the North East Coast. In order for our Province to achieve its greatest potential possible for this area, an indepth study should be done. I made reference to that a short while ago and I just want to repeat once more what I think we should do. It is accepted as the-Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and you can take from Cape St Mary's, embrace that section, come around Cape Race and go up the Northeast Coast, that is the area where the salt fish operation is going to function. It is not going to function to such a degree in the Straits of Belle Isle. There are one or two points there. You move up the area from St Barbe North, you come from Corner Brook and Grand Falls and Curling and St George's down to Cape Ray, there is no salt fish as such, to any degree, carried on in these areas. These are areas that fish fresh and sell their fish in the wintertime, but when you hit Cape Race and Cape St Mary's you have a little different situation, you are getting in then with the salt fish, where the Salt Fish Development Corporation is going to be the most active.

I think that we, as responsible people, elected people to this hon. House from the various communities around Newfoundland, will have to bring it to the attention of Ottawa. It is our job. I mean we do not expect anyone in Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver or Halifax to make this recommendation, this is our responsibility, ours, our job. Let us make that known in the proper place.

I am sorry I am taking up so much time talking about fish but I certainly get a little bit carried away with it when I start talking about it.

When I first spoke in this hon. House I mentioned that I would like to see the further processing of fish carried out in Newfoundland. What I mean by fuller processing of fish, is thinking of block fish and cutting it into sticks and portions and so on, breaded, fattened and cooked. We are moving along now in these, very much so, and the fact that fish is becoming so important

MR SPEAKER: If the hon. member is going on with his speech, I think possibly it would be better now to call it six o'clock and he can continue on at eight o'clock.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 21

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Resumed at 8:00 P.M.

MR. A. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, when we arose for dinner, I was on the point of elaborating on the further processing of fish in our Province. And as I mentioned, when I first spoke in this hon. House back in 1967, I could see then the signs on the horizon that our fresh fish industry, especially as far as the processing of cod blocks were concerned, we are getting into real trouble. We had a heavy production, a heavy world production and we did not have the consumption which one would like to see. And we had that situation here in Newfoundland where we are confronted with a lot of cod blocks arising from our inshore cod production, especially in the summer, then of course the production of cod arising from dragger catches in the winter. There are only four or five large buyers of cod blocks in the United States, maybe a half a dozen at the most. There were in 1967 possibly one or two large buyers of cod blocks in Europe. One can readily see the situation where develop where you get a heavy production of fishing in a producing country and were eight or ten buyers can decide on what the price of cod blocks is going to be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me, did I understand him to say that in the whole of the United States there are at the present time only five or six concerns that buy cod blocks, in the whole of America?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would say as far as Newfoundland's production of cod blocks are concerned, that ninety per-cent of her production would not get into any more than seven or eight hands, I think that is fair to say. I know of five or six, I will just stretch it a little and say seven or eight. I do not think there are many more than that. Now it could be spread out these buyers could farm their fish out to be produced amongst other packers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member say who some of them are?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the largest buyer of cod blocks is Gorton Corporation, Gloucester, Mass. Grade A and P.&D. Company of Boston, Commodore Foods of Lowell, Mass., O'Donnell Houston, Gloucester, Mass., of Boston, Seapass Corporation, and they have just/been taken over by Brown and Williamson, the great Tobacco Company. Croager and Company, in Cincinnati, a big chain store. Mrs. Paul's kitchen.

I would say that these are the top buyer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the big one in New York there, downtown.

MR. MOORES: Teddy's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Teddy's.

1192

MR. MOORES: Teddy's in New York.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will be eight.

MR. MOORES: That is it, yes. So these are the buyers. These are the fish buyers of our cod block production.

Now in Europe, of course, in 1967 Unilever was the biggest buyer on this side, and Ross Group were buying some blocks as well. It was very easy to see what kind of a situation we were getting into, when we start talking about the producing of cod blocks. Now when the warning signal started to come that we were going to be caught with a lot of blocks, I mean the industry was going to be caught with a lot of blocks and there might be a possibility of a fall in prices. It was then that I started thinking that possibly we should, a lot of people no doubt did at the same time think the same way. But I had very strong views and very strong opinion over the fact that we should certainly get into the further processing of fish. If we did not get into the further processing of fish, we would be finished. And what I mean by that is that we have to consider getting our plant set up, where we could take our cod blocks, and there is one point I would like to make here, in order for a fish producing company in Newfoundland, to get into the further processing of fish, it only requires a fraction of the capital compared what a fishstick manufacturer has to get involved with in the United States. We have the plants, we have plate freezers, these are the two biggest items, I am not talking about the plants, I am talking about the warehouses to hold the fish. All actually is needed breading, your cooking and salt and so on, and for the amount of capital invested into a cooking plant, compared with getting into a cooking operation in the United States, you have to build a plant, a warehouse, you have to buy the plate freezers, and all the refrigeration equipment that goes with it, and buy the raw materials.

Here in Newfoundland we could best see again, the inshore codfishery, this is most important and the most vital because as I said, this effects all the north east coast. We could go all out producing cod fish in the summer months, when fish is being offered for sale readily by the fishermen. Freeze our fish, ~~and~~ take sufficient orders to get a catch flow coming in, so you will not have the banks breathing down your neck everyday. And when your production season tapers off, then you turn on your plant, let us say in October or November, then you start to cook your fish, then see what will be

you will be maximizing on your, first of all your fish will be maximizing on catching the fish, your workers would be working throughout with the fish coming in the summer time, then in the fall you start to cook your fish, now that would take your right through into October, November, December, January, February, which are the big months, which fish is consumed.

Now another question, which comes up from time to time talking about the price of fish in Newfoundland, that is compared with the price of fish

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. gentleman goes into that aspect of the problem, would he give the House some of his impressions of the possibility considering GAT, the Kennedy Round, considering tariffs generally, the possibility and the likelihood of our being able to market in the United States any considerable quantity of breaded and cooked fish, or must it go in raw for the processing to be done in the United States. Would he give us an account of that?

MR. MOORES: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I was leading up to that, getting into our production of fish like I was saying in the winter months, in the off months when our workers could go from filleting to freezing into the production of fish during the winter months. Now the Kennedy Round is starting to take effect, I think at the moment it is fourteen per-cent, a few years ago it was twenty-two or twenty-five per-cent, actually it was so high, that we just could not entertain the idea of cook and breaded fish in Newfoundland and shipping it to the United States. But, with the Kennedy Round coming in now, we will soon be in a position where we can start to ship our fish to the American market. GAT, this is the assistance from the Federal Government where new products and all coming on and assistance can be made available to the industry. And I think we have to fully explore that. Now I have very set views on this, I think, I contend that there is going to be a good demand for our fish, our Newfoundland fish booming into the seventies, well into the seventies. Now, I would not want to see, now I would not want to take a position where we would refuse to sell fish unless you would take it in the manner in which we would like to present it. I think, we are going to have to encourage a certain production of our fish going into the United States and to the buyer by the same token. If you want to buy some of our blocks, I think we should make a deal that a certain amount of cooked and breaded fish should be sold at the same time. I think, we have to bear that in mind, for instance it is all very well to say, well fine, we got an order for so many blocks, Yes,

that is grand, but are we getting the full value from the market, for the blocks that we are selling? Can we not further process that fish, and still sell the fish and get a greater return back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That answers my question, we can do it.

MR. MOORES: Yes, we can do it, Mr. Speaker. I would say that by 1975, it will take us four or five years to really get this going, but by 1975, I think, we can look forward to a good market in the United States. I am not forgetting Europe either, I think we will your cooked fish out of Europe, or our breaded fish out of Eurpoe. I have every reason to believe that. But we have to think positively about it, and do a lot of exploratory work in the market sounding out the situation. And I think we should not overlook that, and I will go back again to what I said earlier, I think this is where DREE is going to make one of the biggest contributions, that it ever made in Newfoundland.

Now we might ask the question, what is DREE? Well, as everybody knows it is

everybody knows the department of Regional Economic Expansion. Well the department of Regional Economic Expansion is industry, the expansion of industry. Industry creates jobs and jobs pays wages and wages entice people to come. We have the fish, we have the workers, we have the plants, what we have to do is maximize more of the fish, catch more fish. The South West Coast is pretty much, pretty well taken care of, you have a trawler fleet and you have your inshore plants. We want the same kind of a deal on the North East Coast. Not so much in trawlers, not the heavy cost of deep-sea boats running into a million, a million and a quarter dollars, but the smaller boats off shore long liners. Seventy-five to eighty feet long liners these are the boats that can stay out three or four nights. These are the boats

MR.SMALLWOOD: What would they cost?

MR.MOORES: They would cost, or just as a rough estimate, I would say Mr. Speaker possibly \$100 or \$125 thousand.

MR.SMALLWOOD: So you get seven or eight of those for the price of one big dragger.

MR.MOBRES: That is right, this is so, Mr. Speaker.

MR.SMALLWOOD: And how many would they carry? How many men? How much fish?

MR.MOORES: They would carry five men, and about 60 tons, and carry about 25 to 30 tons of fish.

MR.SMALLWOOD: How many pounds of fish? Sixty thousand pounds.

MR.MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the advantage of that, just think about your off-shore long liner for a moment and embrace what other things you could do. Have an all-purpose boat, an all-purpose long liner. You go from that into a purse seiner this boat can be rigged to handle a power block, she can also be rigged to handle drift netting for salmon, she can be equipped for catching catching queen crabs anything whatever is offering. Your off-shore caplin, and one other very important species of fish, I guess you will refer it to a fish as an animal and I am talking about animals. There has been a lot of talk this last month or so, this is about the time of the year it always comes up, but it has been in the limelight quite a bit in the last four or five years and I am talking about our sealfishery.

Now the sealfishery as we know it here in Newfoundland was always one of our mainstays of the island, It was the industry that men started to bring in some new dollars this season of the year, fresh dollars, they were not very nice to go around as everybody knows years ago. We have a situation where a gentleman sponsored by S.P.C.C.A. who with a travelling expense account around \$25,000, he does not receive any wages, he gets a travelling expense account for \$25,000 he

is free to go across Canada, around Europe talking about the seal fishery in the way Canada prosecutes the seal fishery. Let us face it, there is only ~~one~~ Province affected by seal fishery and that is Newfoundland. Nova Scotia to a degree. Nova Scotia is manned by Newfoundlanders no Norwegian Captains or Canadian Captains but the crew by and large are Newfoundlanders. and I am talking about the North East Coast again, the North East Coast is where the seals come, from Cape Race, you do not have to come as far south as Cape Race you take from ^{Cape} Bonavista North, they tell me that a seal consumes 45 pounds of fish a day, and they tell me further they estimate the herd of seals to be two million seals, multiply 2×45 and you have 90,000,000 pounds of fish being consumed a day. and they are talking about restriction on fish you are only wasting your time, the thing to do is to kill the seals.

Let us think what the seals mean to the North East Coast I am still talking about this boat that could be built in Marystown. coming into your inshore fishery, into your herring fishery, your mackerel fishery, your salmon fishery, and on into seal fishery this time of the year. Today there is talk over a fact that the Federal Department of Fisheries is talking about, yes, your boats can leave the shore kill seals but they cannot exceed thirty feet in length. As every hon. member knows in this House there are a certain number of boats on the Newfoundland coast thirty feet and less but the big fishermen in Newfoundland today got a bigger boat than thirty feet. What they are trying to achieve here is to discourage fishermen to go out in the boat, which he owns, 60 or 70 foot boat to kill the seals. But what they should do is just define the fishermen's boat, what does he do with his boat until July and August if it is a long liner, and she is 60 feet long he goes fishing, but except, that is the boat that he should be free to go and catch the seals with. I believe in restrictive measures to protect the seals. That is all very fine up to a point, but not up to a point to destroy our fish, and here we are letting our seals populate we sitting back on the banks watching the seal herd go by, they are destroying our fish the next thing we will not have anything. We will have lots of seals and no fish. The seals will be wandering around, and everyone with a tag on them, they balance the balls on their noses and everyone will be happy.

But I think, and I have a suggestion to make, and it is this, there are 41 seats in this House and a petition be drawn up and circulated in every district in Newfoundland and let this mass petition be put on, put in the Department of

Fisheries in Ottawa. I heard a civil servant the other day in Ottawa say that the reason why they brought this restriction in was because of the pressure that was put on by other people, perhaps by other nations, let Newfoundland make their voice sound and put a petition in Ottawa and let them know that we are really seriously concerned over the seal fishery. It does not mean a row of peas to Ontario or Quebec or Vancouver, or Saskatchewan or Manitoba, not a row of peas talk about killing seals, but it means a lot to the north east coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned I rambled a lot as far as the fishery is concerned, but it is dear to my heart. But one point I want to make here now to make it very, very clearly and distinctly and the fact is this that my thinking my thinking in the fishery is hand in glove with the way this Government thinks. When I associated myself with the fishing industry back in 1947 I felt that, in fact I knew that we have to make a future out of it. I knew that a terrific sacrifice had to be made a terrific dedication had to be forthcoming by our people in order to make a success of it. I remember when this frozen fish industry was first started in Newfoundland but one thing that we felt very confident over and that was the fact that we figured we were on the right track, and nothing was going to stop us, of a more appointed task. But as I said there was a lot of ups and downs on the way along. But if needs be Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to emphasize, I want to emphasize it very distinctly very clearly if these terrific dedications by everybody associated with it and involved in it, every fisherman, every plant worker, every plant owner, every M.H.A. and every Government department has to be deeply involved in it, deeply dedicated. You know the industry is the whole basis of your society. You can have all the Arts and Culture Centres you like, you can have all the ballet classes in schools you like, there is only one thing that pays the shot for the whole issue that is a good successful viable industry. and we should never divorce one from the other. Let us get the industry going first, feed that, with the fuel that you have and then you can have all your Arts and Culture Centres and your ballets and all that goes with it. But first of all let us have a good sound viable industry, and let us get out people thinking and think about quality, we have to think about quality in Newfoundland. Quality is the thing that is going to put this over and now that we have the buyers, the markets are starting to come towards the fish let us give them good fish let us not say well that is fine, here it is take it or leave it. There is no time for that. There is no comeback. You know a buyer will come in and he will put down his

good hard cash and whether it ^{is} five cents a pound or fifty-five cents a pound he wants value and this is what we have to give.

A remark has been made too here Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear it on this side of the House over the fact that we are slaves. We are slaves to a party, we are slaves to an individual, that to me is all nonsense. I am slave to no man. Free to think what I like and say what I like. Support the party, sure we support the party it is a good party, it is a good party for Newfoundland It had done a lot for Newfoundland.

MR.CROBBIE: Who have you heard say, who has the hon. member say anything about slaves except somebody on your side of the House, have you heard anybody on this side of the House say that you were slaves over there?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I heard the word in this Chamber, and I know which side of the House it came from.

MR.CROSBIE: Which side?

MR.MOORES: It came from the opposite side.

MR.CROSBIE: No it did not come from this side it came from that side ~~the side,~~

MR.MOORES: Anyway, I repeat Mr. Speaker, that we stand and we speak and we say our piece.

just about getting through with what I had to say, a few things in connections with my district, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to bring to the attention of this hon. House. We have in Harbour Grace the district which I have the honour to represent men who are fully conversant with all phases of construction, you will find them practically on every construction job in Newfoundland and Labrador. The construction industry means a lot for my district, and I know I speak for a lot of people who live in the district, they come to see me from time to time, just hoping that this great project at Come-by-Chance will become a reality, so that they will be able to participate and build this great enterprise which is in the offering.

The District of Harbour Grace has one of the biggest labour forces of any in Newfoundland, I would say, as far as the production of fish is concerned. Now granted we are living up in the bottom of Conception Bay to a degree, but we are not to the headlands, the headlands are fishermen, that is all essential, fishermen who fish on the headlands, but they effect Harbour Grace, Carbonear, and in the bottom of the Bay, where the rest of the people who cut and process your fish. They are very important and very vital people. And I am hopeful that our fishermen, our workers, our industry and our Government and all, and I mean our Provincial Government, will fully participate in all that DREE has to offer. And I think that we are going to have to take a very positive stand on this, we are the people who got to go to Ottawa and tell the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and ready to explain to them, and tell them our problems. I think the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion is the department which we go to, to talk about these boats they mentioned, in assistance for that partner to build his boat, so we can catch more fish, because after all that is the raw material, and the capital expenditure was already spend, it is all ready invested in the plant. I am not talking about any more capital in plants, I am talking about capital invested in mostly to catch fish, and there is a lot of difference.

Another thing to as far as Harbour Grace is concerned, as every hon. member knows possibly, but I want to repeat it, and it is this the town is a growth area. And being a growth area, of course, any fishermen who moves in and settles and qualifies to the maximum benefits, in the Resettlement under legislation. Any fishermen who wants to come to Harbour Grace to settle, will be welcome with open arms. He has everything to gain; a nice well laid out town. He can avail of a new home, thanks to our Government. Good schools, good churches, hospitals, and a few pubs.

I am about to make a statement on this, and it is this, there is a market in Harbour Grace for all the fish that can be brought to the wharf in Harbour Grace. I think, that he must live in Harbour Grace in order to qualify for that benefit. None of this 2000 or 3000 pounds none of that, no T. V. Cameras going over and taking pictures of the fishermen forking fish out in the water, nothing like that. An open order for all the fish he can catch. All the speices he can catch. This is one thing the Harbour Grace plant is going to do, it is going to try and do, and I know it can do, when the fish comes in it is brought to the pier, and by

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the hon. gentleman allow me, if twenty fishermen or fifty or eighty or a hundred or two hundred moved into Harbour Grace, where there is a fine big fish plant, and a fine town, what would have to be the practically nature of their fishing effort for them to make a good living? I mean what kind of boat, where would they fish, how far, how much of a run, out and back and so on?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we have a little different situation in as far as it is concerned, I want to explain it this way. First of all, you could have the trap boat long liner, a trap boat long liner could be something similar to the boat that is operating in Port de Grave today where the fishermen go to the headlands, go to Cape St. Francis, go to Baccalieu Bank and north of Baccalieu. But this is primarily for our inshore fishery. But, what I see in Harbour Grace is this off shore long liner, I am talking about, that could take our young men from the College of Trades and Technology, and the Fisheries College, and I understand that there are some pupils present here tonight from Old Perlican who are here interesting in taking a course in quality and so on of fresh fish and that is all very important and vital, and I am very happy to see them here and welcome them here, and I hope there stay in the Fisheries College will be very beneficial. You have taken on a great vocation, and I am sure that you will do well by it.

Getting back to the question again, what I see is off shore long liners that will operate from Harbour Grace ^{spen} ~~and~~ three or four nights at sea, and return with their fish, let us say in four or five days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where will they go?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, these boats could fish on the Baccalieu Bank, off Bonavista, Cape Bonavista, on the Funk Island Banks, the Funk Island Banks, is one of the finest fishing banks on the north east coast of Newfoundland.

They are only about fifteen or sixteen hour steam out of Harbour Grace to the Funk Island Banks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Each way?

MR. MOORES: No, in one direction, north one direction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is about as far as they go.

MR. MOORES: Well, they could not have to go any further than that, I mean that is far enough. I mean there is sufficient fish available on the Funk Island Banks, and along that strip of the coast, when you take the Fogo Islands, and up towards Baccalieu, and Cape John, and Grey Islands, that particular area. This is where the big concentration of ships are, at the moment they are on the Labrador Coast, but they are going to follow the fish south, and they will come right along outside the twelve mile limit, but they will haul that fish south, as the ice goes south, the fish goes south. And this is the opportunity as I see it now, with these boats that I mentioned, and getting the young men from the Fisheries College interested. And we are to the point where, one further point I want to make on this, we talk about the price of these boats, I think what we should is make arrangements somehow whereby the captain, the skipper of these boats will have a direct interest in the boat. He must have a direct interest in the boat, and have the opportunity to buy that boat eventually. And the necessary financing set up for him over a period of ten, fifteen or twenty years, whatever is necessary to do it. But make sure he is directly involved, he owns the boat and calls the shots, and he engages the crew, he looks after the gear, he gives a good quality of fish, and then you are getting your business on a good sound basis.

Reverting back again to my district, there are several stretches of road that needs upgrading. One is on the southside of Harbour Grace, through Tilton, and the Bishop's Cove shore road. All this road is in badly need of repairs. Upper Island Cove, Spanfard's Bay have water and sweerage plans also Shearstown for 1970. And I trust that consideration can be given to these request, Mr. Speaker.

I want to publicly thank our Government for arranging to extend power services into Bristol's Hope. As I mentioned in this hon. House last time I spoke last year, I spoke to the Throne Speech Debate, I mentioned Bristol's Hope was where the first white person was born in North America. They were the last to get electricity, but finally they have it and they are very thankful

for it, and they wish me to pass it on to this hon. House.

One further point of course is most depressing as far as Harbour Grace is concerned was the failure of Koch Shoes, to find markets for their products, this is most regrettable and works quite a hardship on the people who are directly associated with that craft. Harbour Grace, of course, has quite a few people who know that type of work, and I trust, and we all trust in Harbour Grace that before long, orders for Koch shoes will come forward whereby Koch shoes can once more get back into production to be able to employ these people.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. B. J. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the Address In Reply to the Speech from the Throne, there are several matters on which I would like to speak. First matter, is that of the cost of living and the minimum wage.

During the passed year, the cost of living has gone up another seven per-cent, making the situation of those on minimum hourly pay very difficult. It is well known that the people living on minimum wages today in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador are doing so because of their lack of education, lack of health, or a lack of training.

The cost of living is gone up twenty-one per-cent during the past five years. But no word in the Speech from the Throne, that Government intends to increase the minimum wage at this time. I should like, however, to commend the hon. the Minister of Labour for his attempt to improve the lot of the working man. But the Provincial Minimum Wage of \$1.10 per hour for a male, and eighty-five cents for a female, should receive immediate consideration. I am pleased to note that the Speech from the Throne refers to the increase in the Minimum Wage for female workers in fish plants, without running the risk of hurting the Fish Industry.

March 9, 1970

Tape #268

Page 1

MR. B. J. ABBOTT: without running the risk of hurting the fish industry. I am sure hon. ministers have read the Economic Council of Canada Report, which has become accepted as an authoritative study. And there are certain income levels which the Council claims must be attained if people are to live above the poverty level. The Report says that the majority of nearly 5 million people in Canada live in poverty today. Most of them work for minimum wages set by the Federal and Provincial Government. And the Council takes as its average family, one to two dependent children, and says that if such a family is to live just above the poverty level, it must receive an income of at least \$3,500 a year.

Now here in Newfoundland and Labrador, a man receiving a minimum daily wage works a standard of forty hours a week, which gives him forty-four dollars. And if he works for a full year, earns \$2,288. And because he has two dependant children he receives an additional \$200 in family allowances. Thus making a total income of less than \$2,500.

I submit Mr. Speaker, this family is living in poverty. If the breadwinner earned another \$1,000, he would still be below the poverty line or level. Poverty in the midst of plenty, or what is disturbing our society today, is poverty in the midst of affluence. I should like for us as members of this House to bear in mind that conditions endured by a great many people of Newfoundland are indescribable. There is a great deal of poverty in our land. What are we going to do about it? What is our policy to deal with it? Are we convinced that poverty does exist?

Let us bear in mind the poor people who cannot eat pious platitudes. They cannot clothe themselves with pious platitudes, and they cannot shelter themselves from the cold wind and rain with platitudes. We live in a dynamic change and social ferment. Not only are far reaching changes taking place in our economic fabric of our country and world around us. Policy decisions of this year or next will in many cases have their major impact over a considerable number of years in the future. Indeed there is an increased emphasis on the value of human resources. Our nation, Canada, is regarded as one of the world's most affluent nation, yet the wants, demands and needs of this Province and other Atlantic Provinces continue to advance. Poverty is real. Its numbers are not in hundreds

1204

but thousands, and there is more of it ^{than} our society can tolerate. More than our economy can afford, and far more than existing measures and effort can cope with. The new poverty exists at a time when the bulk of Canadians enjoy one of highest standards of living in the world disturbs me. And one of the notable characteristics of poverty in modern time is that it is located in both City and outports, and often so disguised that it can pass largely unnoticed by those in more fortunate circumstances.

The problem of poverty in developed industrial societies is increasing, is viewed not as a sheer lack of essentials, but as an insufficient access to certain good services and conditions of life which are available to everyone else and have come to be accepted as basic to a decent minimum standard of living.

Poverty is more than simple income deficiencies. It is the kind of low income situation that carries with it a sense of hopelessness. The statistics not only hint at this, they also hint at a solid atmosphere of poor health, bad housing, despair, inherited by the next and succeeding generations. And one of the reasons there is so much unrest and unhappiness is that far too many people are poor in the midst of a society, in the midst of an age in which they are given pictures of the kind of life, the kind of life that we see in other cities in other towns. One of the main things wrong today is the gap between the poor and the rich is really wide and becoming wider. We must really take steps Mr. Speaker, to bring up the standard of living of our people in this age of affluence, in this age of technological capacities that are beyond our imagination, which hold together only if people are able as a matter of right, and as their share of the standard of living to produce.

I submit Mr. Speaker, the time is overcome for an increase in the minimum hourly pay for Newfoundlanders. I have in mind another particular group of Newfoundlanders, or Canadians, if you wish to call them, who are apparently overlooked. This is the large number of solid citizens forced to subsist on this income. Pensioners, particularly retired Civil Servants, and retired Policemen Officers are a ghost army that must haunt any Government with a conscience, but one is inclined to think they have been excluded from the fabric of the so-called just society. I believe they constitute

March 9, 1970

Tape #268

Page 3

a specter that will torment the Government in the months ahead. These retired persons do not enjoy the general benefits that flow from rising income and improved living standards. They are the helpless targets of inflation with fixed income and diminishing purchasing power, the cost of living increasing, these people suffer the most. And some of them have a measure of flexibility through personal initiative to try to offset the ravages of inflation. Others of course are dependant upon pension plans, or some through superannuation, provincial or private, more modern more effective, and more humane.

I should like to give the House some figures to support what I am trying to say. Experience indicates that Civil Servants who retire at sixty-five, live for seventeen more years. About those who retire at sixty, live twenty more years. And about twenty percent of Civil Servants live twenty odd years following retirement. And in view of the advance continually being made in Health and Medicine, this period of life may be expected to increase and not decrease.

In 1950 a pension of \$150 a month was considered reasonable, if not princely. Today, twenty-one years later, it barely pays the rent, if the pensioner is living in the City and has to rent an apartment. Many of the twenty percent of pensioners who retired the year we entered Confederation are still eeking out an existence on pensions too often below the \$150 figure. I know retired clergymen who on superannuation receive less than \$150 a month, and are paying rent in excess of their superannuation. And what is unfortunate, do not qualify for the supplementary old age security, because their superannuation is in excess of the amount set by the Government of Canada, but this Mr. Speaker is not within our control. But the point I am making is that social justice and common decency demand that the real value of the pension in terms of current purchasing power should be maintained for these public servants. They should not be penalized by society for having been born twenty years too soon, and nor should their career of service to the country be set so cheap as to condemn them to degradation and want. And as a good employer, and as an exemplar of the rights and protection of the individual within a just society the Government should insure that their retirement allowance, or their

12c 6

March 9, 1970

Tape #268

Page 4

pension are automatically adjusted to the increase costs of Canadian life. I think Mr. Speaker, the time has come to consider some means of making close retirement adjustments that will provide retired Civil Servants, retired police officers with a standard enjoyed prior to retirement. And to help reach this desirable objective, those intimately concerned with it, the Newfoundland Government Employees Association should have a voice. The Civil Service Retirement system of the United States has a cost of living increase formula linking pensions with the consumer price index. And I think the same justice should apply in Newfoundland to ensure there is an automatic adjustment to meet changed economic conditions. And I realize that such a formula would entail additional cost, but the cost Mr. Speaker, should be met.

Speaking of retired officers of the Newfoundland Constabulary, from figures from answers I received to questions I find that there are thirty receiving less than \$100 per month. And sixty-five receiving less than \$195 a month. We have thirty-one retired Civil Servants receiving less than

/207

we have thirty-one retired civil servants receiving less than \$20.00 per month. One hundred and forty civil servants receive less than \$100 per month. Seventy-seven get less than \$150.00. In other words, the number of civil servants on pension receiving less than \$150.00 per month is greater than those in excess of \$150.00. Any retired civil servants or police officers living in the city of St. John's with a pension less than \$150.00 per month is finding life difficult. During his years in the civil service he never did acquire an equity in a dwelling house, but rented a flat or some apartment, and now having reached the even tide of life he finds a modest apartment in this city costing in at less \$135.00 per month. The only thing he has to live on, is his old age pension. This is the plight of a great many retired civil servants, and we know there is and has been for some time, quite a bit of dissatisfaction and unrest among the non-professional employees of hospitals in this Province, and rightly so. How some of the employees can live in Central Newfoundland on what they are receiving surprise me. We all know that the cost of living is higher in Central Newfoundland and in Corner Brook. The Government recognizes or has recognized that when it voted costs of living allowance for some of its civil servants in these areas, that others should receive it as well.

I lived in Central Newfoundland for ten years, and I know what it cost to live there, when compared to other parts of this country. I say now that some of the employees are living below the poverty level. And I know too, you do for hospital employees in Newfoundland and Corner Brook what you should do for the other hospital employees in other parts of Newfoundland. This is quite true, but if the need, Mr. Speaker, is there, there is no alternative Government pays a bonus or extra to civil servants living on Labrador. You can call it isolation pay, or whatever you like. Nevertheless, extra pay is being given to people who live on Labrador.

And the question is being asked, where are we going to get the money? I say, Mr. Speaker, we should look at some of the items of expenditure in Government, and see if there are not some expenditures that can be suspended or deferred for a year or two. The vote for operational aircraft by Government last year was \$1.2 million. The Newfoundland Bulletin over \$100,000. Sure those items are in order, if Government can afford it. If we have not more pressing needs. In our good times we never did spend that money on what is regarded by other provinces, as luxury. And I trust when the budget is brought

down, it will reveal liberal increases for the hospital workers, Newfoundland Constabulary, firemen, retired pensioners, those who are on the poverty level, teachers and other low paid civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak of a topic that is on the minds of a great many people in Newfoundland today and that is pollution. Pollution far from being a source of inspiration many of our rivers and lakes are the source of discontent and frustration. And at times even a danger to our health and well-being. This is a situation which we ^{find} once beautiful water as clear as crystal flowing through our communities in our Province. Debris, odor, high bacteria account, discarded cartons are the normal surroundings, finest recreational grounds. The time is come when every municipality, every industry and indeed, every citizen should act, if we are to roll back pollution and thereafter manage our resources for the benefit of those who will require this precious heritage tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, our rivers and lakes have many uses, most are used for our recreation, for drinking water, for fishing, for hydro power generation, and yes quite properly also for the disposal of waste. Not all of these uses can be reconciled easily, and yet they should be. We do not question the use of streams for recreation, or drinking or for hydro power or waste disposals. Yet, each one of these uses may conflict with all of the other uses. Waste disposal is an unavoidable factor of our modern way of life. It does not interfere with other uses of water, because our waterways, if not over loaded can purify themselves. It is not hard to imagine today, not far off, if we do not act, when there will be no place within easy range of this city where a person can go to swim in a natural river or a lake, or an accessible place where fish can still live, or any place to just walk beside a pleasant stream. Our society will have its two cars in every garage, but no fit outdoor place to which to drive the cars. The salmon that run in certain rivers and streams may be dying because of our pollution. And with it would die the source of revenue, as well as of pleasure. Our other fisheries have already been threatened by pollution. And I am sure the people of Placentia Bay will always remember the summer of 1969.

Our Tourist Industry depends in no small part on the cleanliness of our streams, rivers and lakes. And I need not remind you of the importance of that industry. And the lesson that we can learn from the past is a vital one. It is simply this that the unplanned and uncontrolled use of our resources

even though they come free, as does water, can lead us to disaster. Experts of all persuasions say that no longer can we afford the unplanned and uncontrolled use of water resources. No longer can each individual, each industry, each municipality use our water resources as each sees fit in that absolute freedom lies the mistake of the past, and the disaster of the future. Those that pollute our waters should be compelled to pay for cleaning up what they discharge or by paying others to clean it up for them. In other words the user should pay for putting it back into the condition in which he found it, and for improving it, if it indeed requires improvement.

The Government of Canada has enacted an Act, known as the, "The Canada Water Act." The jurisdictional responsibility for waters divided between the two Governments, Federal and Provincial. Hence the importance of the Federal Government approach to water problems is a co-operative spirit with the Province. So as the responsibility is split or shared, I presume, therefore, that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has been asked to comment on the Bill.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, there will be ten Federal/Provincial Joint Committees, one for each province, and on each committee there will be three Federal and three Provincial members from high official levels, and no doubt the committee of Newfoundland and Labrador will determine priorities for research planning and implementation and report to his Minister. There are certain rivers and streams in this Province with a high degree of pollution, higher degree than others. And the rivers with a high degree of pollution will no doubt receive attention and plans for alleviation of problems instituted. But the prevailing spirit of this Canada Water Act, is co-operation between the two Authorities. If we as a Province do not co-operate, the Federal Jurisdiction is clear, where there is a national interest involved the Federal Government reserved its right to move unilaterally on certain aspects of water resources. In other words, the Federal Government move in and clean up of course where existing Provincial pollution controlled authorities and facilities exist, they can and will be utilized. Municipalities which deposit human and industrial waste in our waters must do their part. Of course, the municipalities have little or no funds in Newfoundland. Central Mortgage and Housing should be called upon to make funds available from which municipalities may borrow under favourable circumstances. I know at present there is a shortage of funds, but we hope, this is temporary and here again, I use the word

priority, although there are members in this House, who say the word should be removed from our vocabulary. This is an area where the private citizen must play some part and public opinion must remain strong on this issue. We must all demand that the job be done, and the price we pay, if we are to win the struggle.

The Water resources and Pollution Act, No. 57, which was passed by this Legislature, April 25th. 1967 was proclaimed Law last August. And it provides that a permit must be obtained for the establishment of sewerage works or even alternations to existing sewerage works. Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Law, I am wondering, if sewerage works are not being installed and discharge being made in ponds, streams and rivers of this Province even today. We hear of installation being made, in fact a plumber, a plumbing establishment informed me some weeks ago, that it has to refuse applicants for installation of water and sewerage systems due to no permit being obtained from the Department of Health. But, he felt ^{that} very applicants do go ahead and install on their own. And I am wondering if the authority has contradict that this pollution of our streams and soil. Everyday I see buildings going up along the highway, other than the Trans-Canada, of course, there are no protected regulation prohibiting development, no control whatever. But eventually some form of Government be it Federal, Provincial, or Municipal will come to realize that the whole land is polluted, and then a human cry may be some epidemic will necessitate immediate measures to clean up the mess, at a cost much greater than if the problem were attacked now.

Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a well in our outports where drinking water is not in some ways or another contaminated. I am sure the Department of Community and Social Development must have on hand hundreds of applicants or inquiries for well diggers. I recall when the vote was expended by the Department of Municipal Affairs, inquiries by the hundreds were on file long before the vote for community water services had passed the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the news of the Argentia Naval Base phase down, has come as a shock to all Newfoundlanders. I should like to extend to my genial and hon. friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, who represents the district of Placentia, and through him, to the fine people of that area my sympathy at this particular time. I trust that the joint efforts of Federal and Provincial Government, will bring about a solution to alleviate the economic blow. It occurs to me, that decisions to lay off 200 civilian employees is not made over

March 9th, 1970

Tape 269

PK - 5

night. Certainly days, weeks or months authorities must have wrestled with the problem, and if they did why was not it made known? But those who are affected are given the inclination of the phase down with very little time to make other plans or preparations. Many of those effected have spend the best of their lives in

1212

many of those affected have spent the best of their lives in the service, now to readjust to other work will not be easy.

Futhermore, financial investments have been made in homes and obligations have still to be met and I am sure the sympathy of the whole country goes out to the people of Argentia.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, since my election to this hon. House fourteen years ago, I have been intensely interested and indeed involved in housing for the people of this City and Newfoundland in general.

A few weeks ago, I was informed of statistics released by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to the effect that Newfoundland, one of the Atlantic Provinces, had a miserable year in housing construction; miserable year during 1969. Where the Atlantic Provinces showed a gain of 34.9 percent, Newfoundland had a decrease of 30.7 percent housing starts.

Here in this city, the total starts reached 771 during 1969, as compared with 977 in 1968 - a drop of 22.1 percent. It is generally known that Newfoundland has the lowest per capita income in Canada. Forty percent of Newfoundland families must find housing at a cost less than \$90.00 a month, but we find a steadily increasing costs of building construction and land development, well in excess of the national average.

The demand for a new dwelling unit in the early '60's averaged 2500 per year. The present year, we are told the demand is expected to reach 4000 units which will involve an investment of \$70 million, but will we come near this figure? Not likely, unless suitable measures are introduced to improve the ability of the low income families to obtain adequate housing.

I shall cite, Mr. Speaker, some building costs. Single bungalow - detached bungalow, which is the most popular with prospective home owners; 1100 sq. ft. bungalow in 1960 cost \$13,800.00, but in 1967 that same bungalow was \$19,000.00, an increase of forty nine percent.

Now, the national average in the same period was twenty-three percent. That bungalow in St. John's would cost \$22,000.00; Corner Brook and Gander, the cost per sq. ft., \$15.67 per sq. ft.

I have confirmed that building materials in Newfoundland are thirty-seven percent higher than in Ottawa and nineteen percent higher than Halifax. There is another contributing factor to cost and it is the cost of land. Since 1960, land in Newfoundland has increased 124 percent; in the Atlantic Provinces, seventy-three percent; big Ontario, sixty-five percent;

big B.C., fifty-two percent; Canada as a whole, 33.3 percent. Canada, as a whole, 33.3 percent, but Newfoundland, 124 percent.

The cost of land in St. John's area has risen faster than in other regions of the Province. In 1967, a building lot at St. John's was \$4,160.00. The same year at Corner Brook, \$3,800.00; Grand Bank, \$3,500.00; Mount Pearl, \$3,160.00; Grand Falls, \$2,700.00; Gander, \$2,710.00; Trepassay, \$2,700.00; Metro St. John's, the average cost is \$60.00 to \$80.00 per ft. frontage.

Now, we find it is gone to \$85.00 to \$100.00 per ft. frontage.

Mr. Speaker, we know why housing in this Province is costing so much. I have mention the difference in the cost of building sites. In other words, the land. Then, the very high price of materials. We know the price of labour is not extortionate. We are convinced our people must have houses. They must have a place to house their families.

The Speech from the Throne mentions shell or partially completed housing units. This is a good idea, but there is still the cost of land to contend with. Quebec has the right idea. Quebec - the right idea of buying up land, developing it, and leasing it to homeowners on a long-term payment basis and this has kept the price of land down in Quebec.

Whereas I stated the increase in price here in Newfoundland has been 124 percent, in Quebec, during the same period, it has been only eighteen percent.

The condominium housing is literally the existence of dwelling units within a dwelling. This type of housing consists of the construction of a two-storey dwelling, each with a seven-foot entrance, but a common horizontal wall. So, you have each family able to purchase a separate dwelling unit.

Condominium housing is cheaper than other forms of housing. It enables the occupants to accumulate an equity in the property and provides interim accommodation until the individuals income increases sufficiently to permit the purchase of a bungalow or alternative housing.

Our present building regulations do not permit the construction of condominium housing.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador while by no means, the only Province of Canada with problems in the field of housing, does have special needs created by economic disparity and low per capita income. Notwithstanding, the great progress that has been made, many Newfoundlanders are still living in substandard homes.

1214

The 1961 ^{survey} indicates that Newfoundland houses are more crowded and lack more of the basic facilities than those in other parts of Canada. One in every three reported no running water. One out of every two report no flush toilets. Three-quarters of the dwellings have no central heating and 26,000 were overcrowded. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of these houses were occupied by families in the lower income group and we still have a long way to go.

It has been the Canadian ideal that every family should be able to buy a home of its own, but for thousands this ideal seems to be taking on the shape of a fantasy. It is really, Mr. Speaker, a nightmare and the problem is at its worse for thousands of young couples in larger towns and cities where high rent keeps them from saving the down-payments required to buy homes or even to buy a piece of land.

For other families, their inadequate accommodation, whether they are rented or owned, seriously effects the tranquillity of family life and the educational prospects of their children.

A painful paradox of our time is that the numbers of the poor are constantly growing in an age of plenty and many of the families living in the slums of this city, buy the cheapest hamburger in order to get the taste of meat. They have insufficient clothing to keep them warm at night and sleep, four or five persons in a bedroom where filth and cold and noise erode both body and spirit.

One concerned counsellor of this city describes some of the housing conditions as ghetto problems with large numbers of people living in inadequate old houses. She had visited some of the homes and she found as many as twenty-five souls living in one house - five sleeping in one room, children sleeping in bathtubs.

The hon. Minister of Welfare, in his speech last Monday night, is reported to have blasted millionaires landlords, doctors, lawyers and a few unethical businessmen for extracting every red cent possible from the tenants. I am wondering if the minister's department has been doing business with the millionaire landlords, for the report of his department ended March 31, 1968, states that \$360,655.67 was spent in rentals for persons on short-term assistance. This amount was double the amount spent the previous year.

1215

Certainly some of the rentals must be substandard. How comfortable are hon. members? Does it bother us that some people in this city are living in homes infested with rats? Do hon. members snore away under the sheets in a thermostat controlled room when little children are shivering from the cold? It bothers me, Mr. Speaker and I am most anxious that it bothers other members and I am most anxious that we come to grips with this situation.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has constructed 100 economic rental units in the town of Marystown. Of these, forty were unoccupied February 1. Forty. The rents for these units ranged from \$90 to to \$190.00 per month. The average rental of unoccupied unites is \$136.00. That would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with forty units unoccupied, the Corporation is losing over \$5000.00 per month income in rent.

Then you have 160 subsidized rentals of which forty-six are unoccupied. Of course, the monthly rent for these unoccupied units cannot be determined because under the rental structure for subsidized rental houses, the rent is not fixed but is charge on the basis of ^{the} family income in accordance with the graduated rental scale. Here you have in one town of this Province eighty-six housing units locked up - no one occupying them. The units have cost the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland plenty, and are we to assume there must have been poor planning or insufficient information relative to the possible need?

I know the Commissioner for housing and his staff are highly efficient and no blame can be laid at their feet but someone must have been misinformed as to the requirements of the housing in this particular area. If the fish plants at Trepassey, Fortune and Burin had half that number of houses built, their operations would certainly benefit and operate more efficiently.

I understand a large percentage of plant workers - fish plant workers in the towns that I have mentioned had to commute to their employment, there being no housing for their families.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward with great anticipation to the programme of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for this Province. It is true we have not heard very much todate. The wraps have not being taken off. Much lies concealed. All we can do is speculate. We do hear a great deal about growthcentres and the attraction of industry. Of course, we in this country have been carrying on a campaign of our own in that direction.

1216

But, this concept of growth centres is a much better approach than the old hit and miss approach of granting assistance whenever it was requested. However, before growth areas can attract new industry, they must have the social capital. In other words, to attract new industry to a growth centre, you must provide the roads, the transportation facilities, the landbanks for housing, the work for the workers who come into the area, sewage facilities and those municipal services that the municipality concerned probably cannot afford to finance.

Now, one of the chief —

criticisms of the Resettlement Programme, enough care and planning had not preceded the moving of people. In a great many cases people decide where they were going to settle and the thought of school facilities for children was never considered and many problems were created even greater than the one already solved.

Today, we hear a lot about incentives for industry and that is to be expected for the Government has been trying to induce industry to move into areas. We might reasonably expect that our incentives would work more effectively if we could offset at least some of the disadvantages that a company which locates in Newfoundland has over a company located in Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver.

The disadvantages of ^{extra} transportation costs, the difficulty of securing rapid delivery, and the added difficulty of that company being located away from large pools of skilled labour. Even companies in the Ottawa Valley area and in Northern Ontario complain of transportation costs. They have to compete with companies that are located only one mile away, from those who buy their commodities and if something could be done to diminish this disadvantage, then industrial decentralization could occur.

But there appears to be little interrelationship with other departments of government. One would think that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion would have access to the Departments of Fisheries, Public Works and Transportation.

What I now have in mind, Mr. Speaker, is a most prosperous fishing community in the electoral district of an hon. minister of this House where there are about sixty good, honest, hard-working fishermen and about forty-five boats in the community and they need a public breakwater to shelter their boats, they need a community stage. The hon. minister has been trying hard to get such utilities for the fishermen but they are being told, repeatedly that although there is no question about the need funds are not available, that we must lick inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of Newfoundland are not stupid, they are not blind, they can read (the majority of them) and they can observe from television and they listen to the radio and they know that Ottawa has the largest cabinet in Canadian history with parliamentary-aides and parliamentary secretaries falling over one another; and so they do not believe any more that funds are not available.

1218

Our fishermen have become tired and frustrated, receiving the same stock answer to their requests in order to facilitate them in their calling.

In my district, Bonavista North, there was quite a revival in the Labrador fishery, last year. Men were encouraged to take risks to invest thousands of dollars and their lives.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes we forget the human investment, the risk of life in the fishery and we emphasize the economics of the venture. For hundreds of years, fishermen from many parts of this Island, have reaped the codfish harvest. In return, the North Atlantic has exacted its price in the lives of those fishermen in the loneliness and widowhood of their wives and in the orphaning of their children.

The history of this Province is interwoven with the history of the fishing industry and last spring, our fishermen went forth to Labrador in their vessels. They toiled, but caught practically nothing. Some came home to use the old expression, 'clean' and when representations were made orally and otherwise for assistance, financial assistance, because of the catch failure, the same fishermen were told the only assistance forthcoming was to see the Welfare Officer.

A great many of them, or indeed, the majority of them had never been to a Welfare Officer and they considered it a bit of stigmatism. It was a terrific jolt. It was a shock to the fishermen. The supplier of salt, and gas and other necessities for the summer's voyage had also gone in debt and was not in a position to further assist. Credit obtained for their families during the breadwinner's absence had to be honoured and in many cases, there is still a charge against them.

Yes, able-bodied relief because of a catch failure. In this our twentieth year of Confederation, the fishermen of Bonavista North will never forget it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Labrador fishery expedited the act or the bill to establish the Canadian Salt Codfish Corporation.

I suppose it salves the conscience of those who suggested relief. Some years passed. The salt codfishery now is ^{Extremely} ~~being~~ relatively unimportant in terms of gross national product because the fishermen who lived by that

industry have, despite their efforts, been unable to earn sufficient income to become eligible for income tax and the purpose of this Canadian Saltfish Corporation Act is to bring great economic benefits to the saltfish producer. This is the primary objective to increase the income and improve the living standards of the producers. This is very necessary and worthwhile and if you want the fishermen and their families to be happy, then it is indeed a good thing.

The remedies brought forth and tried prior to this legislation, lacked capital and modern methods of curing, grading, processing, storing and market promotion. Duplication in costs will be reduced and increase returns passed on ^{to} the fishermen.

According to the Atlantic Saltfish Commission's report of 1964, known as the Finn Report, the basic difficulty was the low productivity per unit of the fishermen involved in catching. This maybe a problem to overcome this coming year.

And I suggest, to offset such low productivity, the corporation will have to act in close consultation with the rehabilitation and social agencies of the Provincial and Federal Governments.

Needles to say, Mr. Speaker, we have the highest unemployment rate in Canada and a low standard of living. We must be careful to do nothing to compound our problems. The Saltfish Corporation will be in a position to control the export trade in the salt codfish as it relates to production in Canada, but when it comes to selling saltfish, it will have to compete in world markets with other saltfish producing nations such as Iceland, Spain, Norway and Denmark and this will indeed be a challenge to our fishermen to produce the quality of the salt fish products which it can offer in the world markets.

However, Mr. Speaker, representing a fishing district, I trust the Saltfish Corporation will achieve all of its objectives so that our primary producers, the men who must work in the saltfish trade under great hardships, with only faith at times to sustain them, will secure under this legislation, now before the Senate, more of the fruits of their labour.

1220

Mr. Speaker, I was indeed delighted to hear the Honourable Member for Harbour Grace speak of the attitude of Ottawa in respect of the killing of seals. I concur with him in every word he says. I think the latest blow to our fishermen, I say a blow, because they consider it such, is the closed season on the killing of white coats, on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. Can you imagine intelligent men in Ottawa being influenced by Brian Davies and a few old fanatics here and there to pass an Order in Cabinet permitting fishermen of the Northeast Coast killing a young harp seal, before March 22nd. and then they say he has graduated to a beater. I spent ten years at Twillingate engaged as a Magistrate in the thirties. We were in the depths of depression at that time, I know what seals mean to the fishermen of that area. I witnessed hundreds of seal nets in the waters around that coast every fall from November up to the time that the Northern slob coming, usually the first week in February. Thousands of seals were caught the carcass used for meat, and the pelts sold to merchants. Many children would have gone hungry but for the seals, many garments of clothing to keep them warm were purchased from the seal pelts. Many homes obtained their fresh meat supply and in some instances, the return from the sealing yielded more than from the codfishery. Now this spring, in this the year of Our Lord, if the winds should bring a patch of white coats inside of Twillingate Long Point, the fishermen are not permitted to kill one, not one hair of a whitecoat is to be touched, but the people must sit down and let them grow until they graduate to beaters. Then they can fire away at them with the guns and they will kill one out of five and the others fall away and die.

This, Mr. Speaker, is ridiculous to say the least, and if the fishermen happen to go out to kill a whitecoat then the sky will become dark with helicopters, fishery officers from Ottawa by the score, will come down, swoop down, take the name, take the whitecoat, and prosecute them in the Court. I remember, Mr. Speaker, when we entered Union, our fishermen were not allowed to kill turrs. For twenty years, it took Ottawa twenty years to be convinced that the few fishermen in Newfoundland would not eliminate the colony of turrs that existed around our coast. Why, I know fishermen who were not permitted to exchange a turr for a pound of salt meat. It is only this past year that the law was repealed. I recall 7227

people dragged into the Courts, why even the Cabinet Minister, Provincial Cabinet Minister became one of the casualty in the Court because he killed a turr- a terrible crime, and now if they kill a whitecoat its a terrible crime. They can kill the beaters, and some of those would not know what a beater looked liked, they would not know what a doghood looked liked unless the doghood chased them, then they would know I assure you. They would not know what a square flipper looked liked, they never heard talk of the word square flipper.

Mr. Speaker, I submit as my Honourable friend, the Member of Harbour Grace has already stated, within five years the whitecoats will have destroyed so much fish and salmon in the waters around our coast that the Government of Canada will be paying men to exterminate the seals the same as here in Newfoundland, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, Thirty-five years ago the Newfoundland Government was paying the fishermen a bounty of twenty-five cents for every tail of a bay seal. In other words, get all - kill all the bay seals you can kill and we will give you twenty-five cents for every tail. Now this will repeat, will be repeated I predict in five years time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a great believer in accepting obligations that go with the privilege of living in a free society and I also enjoy the excitement of creating a new world, if that is possible. We in Newfoundland today need committed trained, educated, right-thinking people who are willing to meet the challenging opportunities of our revolutionary age. We have lots of young men and women with skills, ideas, ideas, brains and enthusiasm and they are to be found in our University. Leaders are needed who are willing to accept changes, not for the sake of change but where times demand change. If we are to leave our children and our generation the kind of Newfoundland all of us want, we have to be just as concerned with other things that make a country strong, and that make a country great and these are enduring, strong moral basis for our society, integrity and honesty in everything we do in public life no less than in private life, a visible and acceptable quality among all Newfoundlanders whatever their origin or unity of purpose.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I remain a Member of this House, I shall strive to do those thing which I believe to be in the interest of the great majority of this Province.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not hold the House up too long. I know that there are other speakers behind me and this is not going to be of great interest to the people of St. John's, because it is mostly about my district. I must say Sir right away that the last week has been most exciting in the House. I think I have enjoyed almost every speech, especially some by the members like the senior member for Harbour Main, the member for Harbour Grace, and the member from Bay de Verde. I think actually the first week sounded like true confession week. Most of the so called "dissident Liberals" were trying to actually confess all our faults and many of our Honourable friends on the other side were trying to justify why they did certain things. But, I am afraid this is about all we are going to have to say about that because I do not intend Sir, to get into any bickering with anybody. I think the people of St. Barbe South actually sent me here to hear all their complaints, do as well as I could, and hope that within another year or so that they would be voting for me again.

Now, a few comments about some of the things my hon. friend from Bay de Verde had to say: He picked a great subject, Mr. Speaker, actually it was the subject of small industries. Unfortunately, he picked a couple that have not been that good, but that was not the purpose. One of them, of course, was Koch Shoes Limited, which I will not have anything to say about. The other one was herring barrels which seems to hit right home because over where we come from herring has always been a staple product for many, many years. We have grown up with it. We have seen great changes in the herring industry from the days when thousands and thousnads of little ponies and sleighs went across the Bay of Islands to get herring to ship out to UNRWA Markets and to the United States. All that is changed now, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years and I was just talking to a few of my friends over the weekend down in Fundy - the Bay of Fundy, they have slmost depleted the stocks down there. There are only very, very small herring coming out of it now, if anything. In the Gulf, which I am lead to believe, is an all together different school than on the Southern Shore, the herring are still there and quite good, quite plentiful. But, it has been hard to get at. In the last few years years they have had a tendency to wander all over the place. But an interesting subject came up when we were talking about it and this particular man said, well, if you have anything to say about it ask that some regulation be put in force to ban fishing for herring in the Gulf only for dehydrating purposes, for food purposes, no; he said, if nothing could be done until more surveys are made and have been made.

1223

March 9, 1970, Tape 271, Page 7

He thought that it would be a very interesting experiment to find out just how much is left of the Gulf herring. He did say also that he felt that within a few years, if we kept feeding the plants there at Stephenville and down on the South Coast there, that pretty soon there would not be any thing left of the Gulf Herring. We have already closed the Gulf to the "Whitecoat" and I would like to see it closed to herring. I would also like to see it closed Mr. Speaker, to shrimp and scallops. Now, shrimp and scallops are something not new to the Coast in the Gulf, but there are tremendous beds over there and they hope that they will equip so many boats this next year or so. They have done a lot

1224

MR. MYRDEN: A lot of experimenting right along through the top part of the gulf, into even Labrador. They feel also that it will have to be limited or else they will clean up the whole area like they did in St. Georges Bay a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to condemn the Government. I think if anybody, and I doubt if everybody has seen it, but last month this pamphlet went out to my district. It is a little pamphlet that I would like to table sometime, or put it out in the clerk's office if any of the members would like to see it. It is an idea that the hon. Minister of Health gave me a couple of years ago, and I started it sometime in September. It actually condemns nobody it thanks the Federal Government, Provincial Government, and there is a picture here on the left hand side of the bald headed fellow who represents the district and a tribute to NARDA, one of the greater associations in all of Newfoundland, and a thank you to the Liberal, or the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, and a little more actually Sir, a little more Sir, thanks to the people who have done such a great job of combining and getting together with everybody down there to help their own district. They are a bunch of down there I think that everybody can be proud of in Newfoundland. They are agitators, they like to get up and shout and scream and bawl, and then go to work. They are great workers, they always have been all over the century. They have been know for that right down through.

In health services Mr. Speaker, we have not been too well off actually. When I hear of hospitals over in Bay Roberts with about, or expected to be in Bay Roberts with another nine miles to go down to Carbonear to another great big regional hospital, I sort of hope it never happens. Not for the sake of the people in Bay Roberts, because I know they are entitled to as much or as many health services as we get, but actually there is about a two hundred and fifty miles span between St. Anthony and Norris Point, and Norris Point really we would call in our district because it is a regional hospital for that, or a small cottage hospital taking care of the needs of most of the people in my district. Thank God over the last six or eight months a \$100,000. extension has been put on that hospital, but we have always had trouble in the district, and unfortunately this happens in many other districts. We have great trouble finding district nurses. They tell me, (and I have a daughter down here in the nurses training now) they tell me it is awfully hard to get district nurses. I can understand it very, very well because, being down into these places they have to take full responsibility for every thing that happens. It is a hard coast

to look after, there ^{are} a lot of needs and we are badly in need of many nurses throughout the district. But going a little further Mr. Speaker, over this last year we have been very fortunate in starting some industrial development in the Hawks Bay and Port Saunders area. I guess many of the people have heard about it, the big lumbering industry that has just started or will be starting I think this month. It is going to put out something like 30 million to 40 million board feet. It is going to employ a lot of people, I wish there were a lot more actually, but that is another thing that I will speak about in a minute.

There is no health services as such in that whole area. It has a nurse at the Port Saunders clinic, but it would be a wonderful opportunity actually to ask for, and hope that a doctor will go down into that area. It is going to an industrial area that everybody is going to be proud of, it has everything in the world. It has a beautiful fish plant in Port au Choix, there are hopes that another smaller industry will be starting in Port Saunders and of course in Hawks Bay with the new lumber industry, we hope that a doctor will see fit to go into that area as soon as possible.

While we are on health, actually Mr. Speaker, many people I guess who travel the coast like I have and many other travellers, have always had this same complaint over the summer months especially, that water has been hard to take down there. It is a sort of water that runs off the long range into boggy land and in a lot of cases out through the settlements, and a lot of the local water supplies are not contaminated, but they would be contaminated to you and I Sir. Actually it is a contamination that runs through you in the middle of the summer. For the people who live there, they have sort of become used to it. They have become immune to it over the years, and it is a problem that I think exists in the whole Northern Peninsula. They are in great need of water supply and sewage supply, and I know and I suspect that there is no Government alive that can actually be putting \$500,000. water and sewage systems into small areas without some money coming back.

I am hoping actually Sir, that many of these thing will be though of when this DREE program comes, and yet like you say, you will never know, these are things that the people are asking for, and I know that they need it just as well as I do.

The logging situation throughout Newfoundland. Well most of our area on the whole West Coast depends a great deal on the great pulp mills there in Bowaters, and logging of course, is a very great pasttime down the coast when

they supplement their fishery income with it, and of course with Hawks Bay starting up there is going to a lot of work done this year in that area. There is going to be a lot of logging done all along the coast, and they expect that actually within a very short while most of these logs for those mills are going to be cut right along the whole coast.

I would like to bring this up, and I was very pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Health say the other night that the Government are thinking of buying back the land. All the land, and all the timber resources that the companies now own. I think it is a big job, I do not see actually how it can be done, and maybe they will change their mind after thinking about it, but it is something maybe even a different thought could go into. Maybe a control, actually — if you own land and tie up millions of dollars into owning land, all you are going to do then is to cut up little pieces and say, you can cut here, and you can cut there, and then come back to Price and you can cut here and you can cut there. But I think legislation could be passed actually with the thought that maybe if we controlled all these timber cutting areas, I think this is the idea actually that the Government would eventually want to get to. If they controlled it and passed legislation saying that we will have control over Bowaters cutting here, and the Price Mill cutting here, and the Stephenville cutting here, and the Shaheen Mill cutting here, I think this would be even a better system.

Going into that a little further Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest tragedies in this country today, and I think the Premier has spoken about it too, is the actual rape of our forests. Now I know progress has to come, and I know that there are many things that we have to put up with, but actually if you fly over this country, and I fly back here, I fly over this country every week, and it seems to be an awful disgrace. Now I do not altogether blame the paper companies, they are looking at the best piece of machinery that they can get to do their job the cheapest, and without that they cannot exist. I know that, I have seen enough reports from Bowaters and that to state that they are, sometimes their profit is a very, very small picture. But I think what we should do Mr. Speaker, is sort of have some supervision, some regulation over the equipment that is brought in and used, or better still actually for every piece of equipment they bring in, they should be made to reforestate everything that they go over and build another new forest right behind them. I think it would be a very small thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, on fisheries I would like to just say a word about that. In the salt fish marketing board of, like our hon. friend said from Harbour Grace

the great thing will be quality and I think that is going to be a wonderful thing. Now he did say the he thought most of the salt fish was put-up in the north east. Well I think the hon. Minister of Fisheries will agree with this that a great bulk of it is put-up in the northern part of St. Barbe, and that would be from the Brig Bay right up through the Straits into St. Anthony I believe. I have seen truck loads and truck loads of it there, out in the sun and it has been, I know they must supply quite a bit actually to the whole of the economy of this coast or this country.

In our little town of Port au Choix, as the minister has stated, they are trying pier seining, and that of course if anybody does not understand it is two vessels with a seine between them, small little boats go out early in the morning, they go out and they do their fishing during the day time, they bring in their catch and they sell it in the evening, as against the gill nets which are put out in a lot of cases some day, and maybe four or five days after the weather settles down they can back to these gill nets. Now that way of course like you say the sifh is spoiled, they are getting poor catches, and poor quality fish, and many time many of our big troubles as I have stated in that pamphlet right here, when in 1968 the Provincial replaced free of charge over 800 nets, 800 Mr. Speaker, along the northern coast there, that had been lost by dragger destruction, and I do not think right now that there is too much hope of keeping the draggers out of the gulf. I wish they would, I would love to to seem them.

Over this last year we have done something new in Port au Choix. We have tried to change over some of the boats to shrimp catching, some of them at the bottom of Hawks Bay and many of them over into the coast of Labrador. They have done quite well, they have gotten good prices for them, eighty to eighty-five cents per pound, and they have done very well indeed. Of course, like I have said before we have had many, we have many small settlements over in St. Barbe South coast that actually are just fishing cod fish and lobster, such as Trout River which had something like 1.5 millions pounds of fresh fish this year.

In the secondary industries of course in our district, many of them are people who fish all summer, and who like to go into the saw mill industry in the fall. They have been doing it over the years, and they have done quite well. Actually they have been sort of supplementing their income that way, and the only way actually, they have very small saw mills. They have done quite well over the years, and most of our people have had good employment all this past summer and fall.

fall.

At Rocky Harbour of course Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister knows that they have had quite a small boat industry going there for quite a few years the Shears Brothers in Rody Harbour. They have been building longliners and it was very interesting to hear that the north east coast, I do not know if they have any, but it did not seem, but the hon. member from Harbour Grace seemed to imply that there was none up in the north east coast.

Over our way Mr. Speaker, we have something like sixty-five longliners right from Bonne Bay right up through to St. Barbe North and most of those do their fishing in the Gulf and on the shores of Labrador, and they do very well. Like the hon. member from Harbour Grace says, they do very well, very well indeed.

I would like to say that electrification in our district has been almost beaten. We have about four or five areas, and they are Bell Burns, Portland Creek, River of Ponds, Eddies Cove West, and Wiltondale. Of course we are hoping that with the line going down into Hawks Bay now into the great industrial area there, that these places will be hooked up.

The DREE program. I have spoken to the Minister and he seems to be very, very interested in the DREE program. From what I have heard of it.....

March 9, 1970

Tape #273

Page 1

MR. MYRDEN: he seems to think that it may be good for the larger areas but maybe some of the smaller areas may have to go. But may I say Sir, what I have recently read in a paper in Prince Edward Island actually. It is about their program. Now I am not going to say this is going to be our program because I do not think it is, actually P.E.I. although we all felt at the time that they were so far ahead of us in getting plans ready, getting them into Ottawa, getting them sanctioned and now they are almost in the process of starting immediately. It seems very interesting though, that this little item should come up. It says, "starting with the fact that the Federal Government has said, that \$728. million would be spent over the next fifteen years," Mr. McQuade who wrote this article I guess, pointed out (he was a member of the present administration there in P.E.I.) He point out that the Province must raise two-thirds of the amount, which leaves \$235.million to be contributed by the Federal Government. But of this amount \$36.6 million to be a loan from Ottawa and is repayable with interest.

This part of figuring on the part of Mr. McQuade reduces a share of the Federal Government to \$188.4 million over the fifteen year period. "However, he says, this is not all new money, as it includes Ottawa's share of joint programs already in existance, which if continued over the next fifteen years, even at the 1968 rate, will total \$127.5 million."

So what is left of the Federal¹ contribution? Mr. McQuade figures it at \$60.9 million, but suggests that \$60.million of this could be spent in salaries for the estimated 400 people, that will required to administer the plan. Assuming this man's figures are correct, and they have not been challenged as yet. It appears that not much is left of the Federal contribution under the plan that could go toward the physical project in this Province.

Now I only read that actually only to find out or to state that this is their program and I do not think it is ours, according to what the Minister tells me. But he did say, and this is what worries me actually about our own DREE program. He did say here that this is not all new money, as it includes Ottawa's share of joint programs, and this is what worries me about the new DREE program. Are they going to include Mr. Speaker, are they going to include all our joint programs that we now have in

123c

March 9, 1970

Tape #273

Page 2

existence? That is all I want to say about that.

I have another item that is of particular interest to me. And that is the Bonne Bay Park. Mr. Speaker, Bonne Bay has been known throughout the years of its history, as one of the most beautiful areas of all Newfoundland. At the turn of the century it was a great commercial center supplying needs for the whole of the great Northern Peninsula, and the merchants of the day dealt directly with England, the United States and Canada of the day. And of course most of the people were very highly educated, and had the finest of learning possible.

These were the days when hundreds of schooners prosecuted the fishery in the Gulf, Labrador and of course off Bonne Bay. And it was often known as a great herring port. There was always a great boast that you could run the entire length of the waterfront jumping from wharf to wharf in Bonne Bay. Things were never prosperous however after 1922 - then of course the fire destroyed the place almost. Although this may have been the start of the commercial decline, it would be many years yet before the almost total collapse of the commercial life in Bonne Bay.

When eventually the road system was completed on the great Northern Peninsula, this was the death-blow of a once prosperous area. Mr. Speaker, the tourist potential has always been the center of attraction of a great many people with vision. Back in the '30's when the luxury cruises of that day included such ships as the "North Star" and the "Northern Voyager". The areas most attracted by tourists were the Trout River in the Bonne Bay area. And Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a sight to behold, a sight never again realized by many many people, was to sail into Bonne Bay on a moonlight night, and see these communities nestled in among the most beautiful grandeur of the mountains. And when those ships travelled up the arm, and turned around the western arm, then travel into eastern arm into Lomond looking at the majestic Gros Morne, was the lovely areas of Norris Point, and the quiet contentment of Eastern Arm which was something they would always remember.

Many of the hon. members in this House of Assembly, and I am now speaking to the hon. member for Trinity North, have no doubts on this. Maybe not

1231

March 9, 1970

Tape #273

Page 3

aboard the great luxury ships, as I have described, but possibly along the lines of my hon. friend's boat, the Minister of Public Works, who came sailing into Bonne Bay aboard the "Western Star", where he disembarked in a crump, because of the limitless space in that forward compartment. Undoubtedly he had as many headaches aboard this boat, but I know he enjoyed this first, his first years of travelling the Coast.

The physical beauty of Bonne Bay, I do not think ever could be explained in great detail here. You could go on with endless and endless adjectives, and yet Mr. Speaker, would wonder if this beautiful spot really existed.

AN HON. MEMBER: The girls are not too bad either over there -

MR. MYRDEN: True Mr. Speaker, I concur with that. The people on the East Coast must realize that the beauty that we describe is entirely different than what you are used to in this part of the country. So to explain great mountains and placid waters may not interest you as a person, but the difference is so extreme that to people who never visited there before they have all without exception been high in its praise for the simplicity of the surroundings, the great hospitality of its people and the numerous advantages this areas holds for the people of all Newfoundland - so today I ask you to realize that this issue right today, is not just the Bonne Bay issue. It is the fact that all Newfoundlanders almost without exception will say, "Let us try and save some part of this beautiful Island to enjoy in our leisure moments."

Mr. Speaker, from the grand spectacular Gros Morne, rising almost three thousand feet above the sea, to the beautiful moonlike area that the Trout River gulch illustrates, to the deep fiords of Western Brook, to the highly productive salmon rivers of Trout River, Lomond River, Eastern Arm, Baker's Brook and Western Brook, along with many other salmon rivers such as Portland Creek, River of Ponds, Little East and of course these last four are only on the northern edge of the proposed park - to the picturesque table lands of the Gregory plateau, we can surely show the people an area in which some of the last of the Artic Hare, where some of the beauties of the areas of the Northern Caribou ranges, and where naturalists whom I know, and many other private citizens, have travelled to the top of many of these plateaus including Gros Morne. It is an area where Newfoundlanders

1232

March 9, 1970

Tape #273

Page 4

will be proud to spend many many days enjoying the very few remaining wilderness delights that many of us as children just took for granted.

In fact it was a pleasure Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. the Minister of Supply speak about such a small delight as taking children to ponds, where they could fish for small trout and enjoy something that he, as a boy must have taken for granted. These I might add are still the pleasures we enjoy in Western Newfoundland at the present time.

What better holiday can any family have than to take their children into such areas as this beautiful seashore to explore many wrecks of great ships such as the "Ettie" which our great Newfoundland dog held such a star role. I do not know if many of the hon. gentlemen remember this story, but it is one of great courage and devotion to duty that saved a shipload of passengers on the St. Barbe Coast.

The wreck is still there, and the history is still in the minds of many people. There has never been in the minds of people in Newfoundland, that a greater area could have been picked for a National Park. Mr. Speaker, it was proposed many years ago by many people, but in the early '60's, the great interest of former Deputy Minister of Resources, Dr. Stewart Peters, became a great advocate of this program. The Federal Government at the time had been discussing a second National Park with provincial authorities, and had also looked into another area known as the Blomidon Hills area. However, I think that through Dr. Peter's forte, and at that time the Minister of Mines and Resources, the hon. W. F. Keough, were strongly in support of the Bonne Bay area, and of course later, the now member for Trinity North.

When the Federal department agreed that they would like to take a look at the area, they employed Dr. W. O. Pruitt to do an ecological survey and make recommendations on the area. Of course Dr. Pruitt being one of the most highly qualified men in North America, and himself, a great naturalist, proposed that an area of 1500 square miles north of Bay of Islands to Daniel's Harbour be set aside for the following reasons: The Artic Hare, a very rare species of animal, as well as a pine martin in the same category, and also the woodland caribou. For this region did also include many rare plants found nowhere else in Canada, and held excellent

March 9, 1970

Tape #273

Page 5

tourist opportunities. After considerable negotiations between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, they came up with proposals of a maximum of 800 square miles, and a minimum of 480 square miles. And Mr. Speaker, I have the proposed areas illustrated on the map here, by the planning division at that time. The maximum area included a line drawn from the coastline, just north of Cow Head into the electoral boundary of the White Bay South district, and continued down to a line opposite Lomond. And would be starting as far as the highway is concerned, around the Wiltondale area.

There was at that time also, a second phase which would include the Trout River Pond gulch, and an imaginary line drawn out towards Western Arm, but excluding all the settlements such as Woody Point, Shoal Brook, Glenburn area. The minimum area would be a somewhat reduced northern section from the Lomond, Wiltondale area, to the area north of Cow Head. And of course the present silica controversy started in the fall of 1968 and came to a head when the Federal survey crews were notified to cancel all survey work and vacate their headquarters at Rocky Harbour.

From then on the Bonne Bay Park became a very vital issue to all Newfoundlanders, and if Sir, you will bear with me, I would like to go through some of the statements that were issued at that time. The N.R.D.A. Association proposed a meeting to be held at Woody Point on March 1, 1969. The Premier and the present Minister and myself, and many other people attended the meeting, and explained to the people, their position in relation to the Silica Mine. The position was that general surveys had produced a high grade silica, and they felt compelled in the interest of all Newfoundland to survey this area to find out for sure if this could be of any great value. But the great statement that came out of the meeting was that the people would be advised by the end of September, 1969, whether this mine could be developed, and whether we could get right on with the Park. Because the statement was that there would be a Park regardless of whether there would be a mine or not.

1234

the people did not like this statement nor were they very happy with it but they accepted it because there might have been 40 or 50 jobs available. But if it came down to one or the other the Government would favour a park, and there was nothing yet then about oil concessions.

Mr. Speaker, the great controversy began then between the minister, the hon. minister and Doctor Pruitt over the value in dollars it would bring into this Province. I do not think to this day that anybody is convinced that a mine will produce anything like the benefits that a National Park will. But it is interesting Mr. Speaker to relate some of the statements about what was holding up the park. Such as this one by the hon. minister as early as January 17, 1969 (and this is quote) "Word of the discovery at that time, silica, came at the very moment that a conference of federal and provincial officials were being organized at my request for the purpose of finalizing certain aspects of the Gros-Morne National Park proposals." We heard nothing about oil concessions then. Of this statement by the hon. minister, "the exploration to determine the size and value of the silica deposits should be finished by mid-June and early September and by that time we will know whether the silica is worth going after or not," and still no sign of oil. The statement made in March 1969 by the present minister (quote) "acquiring the land for the federal government to take over the develop^{ment} would cost the provincial Government \$2 million." As we already know from tabled answers in this House the minister has given us the figure of \$3 million. That has gone up now almost one million dollars in one year. In the same breath, the minister wonders if it would be best to use this money to develop a provincial park, and it is also interesting to note that speaking in the House of Assembly the minister of Education the hon. member from Grand Falls said that there had never been an issue that gave rise to more misinformation and distortion than the Bonne Bay Park. And that the Government had done all in its power to encourage a national park at Bonne Bay but the impression has been given that for some nefarious reason we are holding it up. May be Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister of Education knew little about the oil concessions at Parsons Pond. As late as December 1969 the present minister was stating that he was still trying to clear up all the details that led to the park. He said that the federal government was still busy doing survey and other preparatory work, and Mr. Speaker of course the mining surveys as any sensible Newfoundlander realize, had to be done and we appreciate the great interest the Government had in looking into the possibilities of any mineral

deposits within the land that they would be giving over to the Federal Government. But the truth was Mr. Speaker, that it was not just silica they were looking for there had been a mental lapse somewhere along the line and nobody thought about doing the survey before 1969.

When the present federal member of Parliament was elected to office, that is the present member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, his concern about the park proposal was very high on his priorities and he began digging into some of the more recent matters. He asked Mr. Speaker, that all correspondence be tabled in the House of Commons between both governments so that a fair evaluation of the situation could be given to the people of his district. He has publicly stated Sir, that the Federal Government had agreed to table their correspondence but that the request to the Provincial Government had been denied. Now, Mr. Speaker, we come up to the present matter over the last month or so. Mr. Marshall in Ottawa has stated that the Federal Government's National Parks Branch has budgetted \$1,971,000 to be spent in the area during 1970- and 1971 and it is interesting to see that this item is only listed as a new highway for Gros Morne. So it seems that even the Federal Government were not too anxious to make known that they were going to have this money available for the next two years. After further digging into the federal minister's budget Mr. Marshall now finds that the monies earmarked total something like \$5,200,000 over the next five years, and that \$1,971,000 was listed as road construction to upgrade highway 73 which will be going through the National Park, and will be brought up to National Park standards as well as 20 miles of internal park roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a lot of money to be spent in this area and we are badly in need of it to help the unemployment picture this of course will be a total of almost 50 miles of National Park standard highway from Wiltondale to about four miles north of Cow Head. But just listen Mr. speaker to some of the other monies to be spent. Almost immediately there is \$384,500 of which \$250,000 is allotted for land acquisition and the rest for fencing, landscaping and survey work, that is involved. And of course this would be of great interest at this present time, and of course Mr. Marshall states that the Historic Parks Department said that the Resources Minister Mr. Callahan, or the hon. W. R. Callahan, has known of these plans for some time. I am not sure whether he did Mr. Speaker, I really feel that he has not. But anyway Mr. Speaker, as late as February 20, of this

year Ottawa was still saying that an agreement in principle has been reached to build a National Park in Bonne Bay. But nothing further can be accomplished until the Provincial Government hands over the land to Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker it seems that we have the same story again that we have been hearing over the last two weeks. That this Government will not give the information to the people and are holding it for some particular reason. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the latest issue, which has risen over the oil concession business. We have known in the district that Canadian Javelin have been exploring oil possibilities at Parsons Pond. There was never any thought that it would extend southward into the proposed boundaries of the National Park and it was my impression even until last fall that they had decided to discontinue oil drilling in that area. And until the Evening Telegram came out with the latest map of oil concessions by these people nobody, at least I was not aware that they existed, at least nobody outside the present administration. The greatest tragedy of this whole affair Mr. Speaker, has been that the people of my district has been given the greatest runaround in history and if this continues I am sure that the National Park people are going to be totally fed up with the whole affair, and cancel plans that they may have to develop the National Park.

Mr. Speaker, the history of oil being in Parsons Pond area goes back before the turn of the century, when fishermen used some of this oil that seeped from the ground in ^{their} the motor boats. Since that day hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by speculators who have been trying to find the source of any commercial amount of oil. May be it exists but why should we continue to speculate with our natural resources when we have them all around us to develop. I do not doubt Sir, that if oil existed there it would be a great boom to the economy. And if the southside hills were made of gold or if Ottawa dumped a billion dollars in our lap it would also have the same result.

And Mr. Speaker, before I finish I would like to make a few observations: We may ever be cursed by our grandchildren for allowing this opportunity to slip through out fingers to retain something that every Newfoundlander would be proud of, and the slogan of 'industrialize or perish' because of silica mines and oil concessions will undoubtedly destroy every chance that we have to retain this great beauty spot, and I wonder why we are doing it. We must develop the Trout River area because this holds the most picturesque spot in

the whole park and there is no reason why this has to be in the second phase, And I believe the Premier has agreed that it will be coming in in the first phase. We should not destroy the fishing areas of Trout River, Sally's Cove they are self-sufficient God-fearing people who are contributing to our economy, They are wonderful workers Sir, and I am sure ^{we should} retain these areas for they will be natural attractions in themselves, so why waste millions of dollars or may be hundreds of thousands of dollars moving them?

If a National Park is developed, as Dr. Marshall Laird stated at the Liberal Convention, The whole area lends itself to an underwater national park; therefore we cannot pollute Bonne Bay with the silica mine because we will be destroying any chance of future development in this area, This alone would be a first for Newfoundland so why destroy this chance? And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state right here in this hon. House of Assembly that if it is within our power to cancel oil concessions or to exclude that small area outside the park I ask that every member of this House stand up and be counted because this will be a blot on every man's conscience that only time will erase, so do not let it happen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a small item here in a paper that has come down to me, and it concerns exactly the same situation that exist now in the Gaspé Park area and may be this will convince all hon. members of the seriousness of the situation . It is called the "New Clash Over The Gaspé Park Plan." It is from the Star's Ottawa Bureau, and here are the facts as they give it. There will be no National Park in the Gaspé until the Quebec Government withdraws all oil exploration permits which have been granted for the designated park area. The federal minister responsible for National Parks was adamant yesterday that he is prepared to wait out Quebec City on the contentious issue. The history of the proposed Forillon Park has been marked by repeated conflicts between Quebec and Ottawa and so far Mr. Chretien has won every round. The latest problem of the park surrounds the fact that the Quebec Government granted a permit last April to the Ladaboro Oil Ltd for oil exploration there, however, under the terms of the National Park agreement, which was signed three weeks after the permit was granted, no natural resource exploration or exploitation is permitted. Mr. Chretien said yesterday that the Quebec minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Marcel Masse, has requested that Ottawa amend the federal law on National Parks. However, Mr. Chretien told reporters he would not approve the requested amendment which would have permitted continuation of the exploration permit. The minister said

1238

other provinces specifically Alberta had previously asked for permission to undertake mineral explorations on national park land but this had been refused. Mr. Chretien gave every indication yesterday that he expects to win his showdown with Mr. Masse, as he did the previous test of wills last spring. Nationalists in the Quebec cabinet had previously stalled Quebec acceptance of the park idea because they did not want a federal park to be called National. And they objected to giving Ottawa the land for more than four or five years. However after local pressure on Quebec, helped by a trip to the Gaspé by Mr. Chretien, the Quebec cabinet finally agreed to a long-term lease. Quebec commitment was to expropriate the land and donate it for the park without any legal encumbrance such as an oil permit and Ottawa will pay development cost which are estimated at \$8 million. Pockets of oil have been discovered in the Gaspé in the recent months but the oil companies have been unable to determine yet whether the deposits are large enough to be profitable. Mr. Speaker, what I have been saying is not new to this Hon. House.

MR.F.W.ROWE: My hon. friend would permit me to ask him two or three questions: I have been following or yet I have missed the first part of his dissertation (I think is a good word for it) on the west coast an area, Mr. Speaker, as this House knows, he and I are particularly interested in, for special reasons. In connection with the comments he has made here tonight there are three questions I would like to ask him in all seriousness, not with any view of embarrassing the hon. gentleman because much of what he said I am in entire agreement with it, much of it. There are three points there, that he made, at least he implied if he did not say it; one was that the development of the silica would pollute Bonne Bay. and the question I would ask him is, in view for example of what is happening in the great asbestos development at Baie Verte where you have tremendous mine, one of the biggest in Eastern Canada almost at tide-water and yet they have not polluted one bucketful of salt water/^{yet} and have - no, I do not think they will do^{so} /, does it follow then that the development of the silica deposit in the Bonne Bay, in the eastern arm of Bonne Bay up in the mountains there would necessarily pollute Bonne Bay? If my hon. friend knew - he does not know, I do not know, The drilling has gone down to four thousand feet but if my hon. friend knew that at six thousand feet there were great commercial deposits of oil would he then advise the House and the Government to forget it? To forget it completely, in view of what ~~is~~^{has} happened for example, to the Province of Alberta, where oil has made that Province the wealthiest in Canada and given

it the highest standard, would he advise us in view of our standard our need for employment, our need for revenue, to forget the fact that there was oil six thousand feet down; and it may be there, We have only gone down four thousand feet, When I say we

1240

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Who ever has drilled it has only gone down 4,000, which is nothing. My hon. friend must know it is nothing compared with the depths that they have gone in the Middle East and other places.

The third question is: Does the existence of a concession area as outlined by him just now, oil concession I mean, does that existence nullify the whole idea of a national park in the Bonne Bay area? I have lived there as he has. I know the area, I have gone over every inch of it. And certainly I would have no great difficulty in delineating four or five hundred square miles there for a national park. Does the existence of that concession area, in the Parsons Pond area, does that nullify the whole concept of a great national park at Bonne Bay? Which, incidentally, I will tell my hon. friend in case he was not here, that I was the first man to stand in this House and advocate, and not two years ago, but nineteen years ago.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, the first one on the silica mine I am only thinking that it is going to be ^{open} mining. There is bound to be runoff, there is bound to be drainage from that area going into the Bonne Bay area. I do not know, but I really think, my honest opinion is that there cannot be a silica mine there, in the area proposed, the area in which they have been drilling, because I have no idea where you could put an entrance to that park. I have no idea unless you went over the hills, or you came down through Woody Point and the other area. I do not know. I am wondering if it gave forty or fifty people employment in a silica mine there, and it would run out in ten, twenty or fifty years would that be more of an embarrassment to this Government, where silica is so plentiful all over this island? I do not know, I do not know, I have not seen the grades even of the thing, but I am only going by what I hear down in the district.

Now the second part of it, of the oil concessions, I believe I stated in one of my last points there that, if it would be possible, and I think it is possible, where it is, what I have seen in the northern section there, if it is possible at all we could exclude that and add many squares miles on the southern section in the Trout River area, which I know and which my hon. friend knows is the most picturesque in Newfoundland. In the Gregory Plateau and in the table lands we could add it on there. There is all kinds of possibilities without going in there.

Now the last one you mentioned oil. I am just repeating what the Federal Government feels about oil concessions in the park. Now that came out of Ottawa.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): The Federal Government, you mean the parks?

MR. MYRDEN: Yes the parks people. You know they have just stated that they are not going to even set this \$8 million up for this park. They have just said that there will be no national park in the Gaspé until the Quebec Government withdraws oil exploration permits. Well I do not see how they can do it for us, and not do it for them. That is only my opinion, and that is all I am stating. I really do not know.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Well my hon. friend has answered it. The answer to it is to shift the boundary is it not?

MR. MYRDEN: Yes; oh yes you know I would be willing to state that this is not infallible. I mean I think that the upper section where that area is in the Parsons Pond, which is not in the park anyway, Parsons Pond is outside but, from what I saw is in the St. Paul's area, you know inside the thing which could be cut off and they could continue. I do not see anything wrong with that, but I feel that if we are going to take so many square miles off them for oil concessions, I think it should be added on the other section. I think the people probably would go along with that.

MR. ROWE(F.W.): But nobody has objected to it have they?

MR. MYRDEN: No Sir, that is why I am giving the speech, this is why you know I am just stating my view. The Government has not given any view on it and that is why I am stating it.

As I was saying Mr. Speaker, this information is not new to this hon. House and I have asked in every session, and I guess many other Members before me, what progress has been carried out in the national park? The Minister I believe, and I honestly ^{say} the present minister, whom I have gotten great cooperation from, the present Minister of Mines Agriculture and Resources, I honestly feel that he I would say, knew nothing about the oil concessions and that they came as a great surprise to him that they are within the park area although he must have known, or may be he never, even thought about it. But anyway I ask again, Mr. Speaker, if it is at all possible, that any information on the national park I would like to ^{see} it tabled in the House, because I understand this situation is not only in the interest of Bonne Bay, I think it is in the interest of all Newfoundland. Thank you very much!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member begins his speech on this debate, I said this afternoon that I would take the resolution for the Point of Privilege as raised by the hon. member for St. John's West, and I would have a few comments on it later. I now do so. First of all we have to try and consider, and I am not going to repeat what I said the other day in connection with the question of

privilege, but we have to consider what is a breach of privilege of the House first of all. The authorities have been vague, and they have kept them vague deliberately I think, because once something is annotated and you say that this is a breach of privilege, and this is something else and you list them, then anything outside of that automatically becomes in a category of not being a breach of privilege. So it has been kept rather vague, and unwritten as it were, but it does say this "anything which may be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal is a breach of privilege if perpetrated against this Parliament, such as wilful disobedience to, or open disrespect of the valid rules and so on." Such as wilful disobedience to, or open disrespect of its valid rules, orders and processes." Now the question that raised this Point of Order is this: According to provisions made in the statutes, certain documents should have been filed fifteen days after the House of Assembly convened for this present session. That was on the eighteenth. It is nineteen days ago since the House, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor opened this session with the Speech from the Throne. It is contended by the hon. the member for St. John's West that therefore these documents should have been tabled in accordance with the statutes fifteen days after the opening of the session.

Now the hon. the President of the Council, says that that in his opinion the question of time, the number of days being sitting days, and he was therefore within his rights in not filing until, or not putting these documents on the table of the House until this afternoon, or this evening rather. He claimed in his statement today that he was counting sitting days, and he was well within the fifteen day limit by filing as he had intended to do. I take his statement as correct, the documents are ready on his desk and he will bring them up into the House this evening. He did that, so the question is one of interpretation to begin with, as to which is the correct day definition here. Is it fifteen calendar days from the beginning, or whether it is fifteen sitting days. I am inclined to agree when the statute at least says fifteen days from the commencement of the session. Now if the Act says fifteen days from the commencement of the session, and they meant or they intended that it should be fifteen sitting day from the beginning of the session, then I think the Act should have said so, and I am inclined to agree that it may be the fifteen day interpretation is the correct one. That is, fifteen calendar days from the beginning. Although I can see the arguments that can be put forward in both sides of the case in order argue one way or the other. But even if we were to accept that, then is this a question of privilege? We have said at the

beginning that anything that is considered a breach of privilege, if it is a contempt of court that would be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal and it was wilful disobedience to, or open disrespect of. Now I think if we take these terms as being the valid bonds, or the words that are operative here, any person who committed an offence wilfully and in disregard, in wilful disobedience or open disrespect of the rules of the House, then he would be in, there would be a breach of privilege. Under these circumstances we heard the President of the Council say that in his opinion he was going by the fifteen sitting days from the first of the session, and the hon. member for St. John's West of course had fifteen calendar days from the beginning of the session. If we were to get extremely technical and not allow for the words "wilful disobedience or disrespect of the rules," then it would be a breach of privilege. But I do not think under the circumstances the explanation which the hon. the President of the Council gave brings it into the category of breach of privilege or any disrespect or wilful disobedience. He has stated clearly to my mind that he was going by his interpretation of the fifteen sitting days, not calendar days. The report was ready, I do not think there was anything wilful about it, I do not think there was any disrespect for the valid rules of the House, and therefore I do not think that this comes under the matter of the breach of privilege of this House.

MR. CROSBIE: If a disregard of a statute is not

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I must say to the hon. member that we had -

MR. CROSBIE: Before I sit down, as I do not take orders from anyone but yourself, but since you are now speaking I will sit down.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down, you are breaking the rules

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier does not order me around

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for Port de Grave continue

HON. E. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I appeal from your ruling. With all respect I cannot agree with it and therefore I appeal from the ruling

MR. SPEAKER: ^{The Question} Order before the House is that the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Will those in favour of the motion please say "Aye" contrary "Nay" It is my opinion that the "Ayes" have it, and the ruling of the Chair is sustained.

HON. E. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to associate myself with other hon. members who have spoken in this debate, and offer my sincere congratulations for the excellent manner in which the mover and

seconder presented the Address and Reply in the gracious speech from the Throne.

I am sure this is very heartening for us on this side of the House in having two hon. members who have such wide and varied experience in the affairs of our Province expressing such optimism for its future as we enter the seventies.

Mr. Speaker, the gracious speech referred to the proposed conference on the economic future of our Province to be held in St. John's early this year. I feel sure that this conference will be welcome by all levels of municipal government in the Province, because each council concerned will have the opportunity to ascertain how their particular community can take part and share in this development.

and from the information gleaned, will then be in a better position to determine the best course of action their community should take. The officials of my department having been working very closely with minister and the officials of the Department of Community and Social Development for the passed several months, in helping to prepare plans and programs for submission to our Federal Minister, Mr. Marchand, and his officials at Ottawa, for the inclusion in the first phase of the DREE program, which is as we know is to commence early this year, and as well, the five year program that is to be agreed upon by all levels of Government to be announced later this year.

And as I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this conference will give us all the opportunities to swap ideas, and suggestions to correlate all the information received from the experts, so that we will be better informed and be assured of the best possible direction we should take for the future.

Mr. Speaker, during the short time in the office that I now hold, and from the various meetings with councils from all areas of the Province, I have come to the conclusion that the main concern, as far as public service is concerned, is the provision of water and sewerage systems, servicing of land for house construction, and the improvement of streets by paving, adequate fire protection and recreational facilities. Last but not least, industrial development with the hope that they may be fortunate in having new sources of employment located in or near there community.

Mr. Speaker, this Government since Confederation have accomplished much in this direction. And I feel sure that if we were to look back over the past twenty years, anyone would not have visualized that we could have made such tremendous progress in the short period in our time of history. However, there is a limit in my department, ^{but} such as ours can do, bearing in mind the sparseness of our population, and spread over such a wide area of the Province, and, unfortunately, the relative low income of some of our people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of these circumstances and the increasing demands of our people, all communities wish to have equal services and opportunities with their other communities, and because of this high capital cost involved, it is difficult for the Province to provide these services without the support and help of the Government of our nation.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this conference will give much information, when the program is enlarged to encompass other areas of the Province, now not included, every members' district in this House, will be effected

directly or indirectly by money provided by DREE. First, because of the employment it will provide. Also, it will lessen the burden of the Province so that the Provincial Government will be in a better position to provide these services in any of the districts that may not be included in the DREE program.

And I wish to assure to the the hon. the Premier that I will along with the officials of my department render all assistance possible to help make this conference ^{the} success that we wish it to be.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to refer to statements made outside this House with regard ^{to} this Government's lack of interest in support of local or secondary industry. I can speak, Mr. Speaker, from personal experience of my family that we have been closely associated with trying to provide local industries down through the years, and we know what a problem it is for a secondary interest to survive in this Province, more especially since we became ^{part} of the great nation of Canada.

I would just like to point out to the House, just a few products we have been associated with in Newfoundland, and I regret to say not one of these products have been produced. I would like to refer to the various furnishings, such as church furnishings, windows, doors and sashes, at one time they were making church furniture, birch broom handles, birch plywood, butter tubs, fish boxes, barrels and drums, herring barrels, oil drums, sawmill and lumber production, paper wallboard, birch chairs, school desks, concrete bricks, nails bolts, and various phases of the salt fish industry. And I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time practically all these have ceased to produce, and now they revert to a condition of buying and selling. There must be a reason for it, it is because, I think, ^{of} the lack of major markets within the Province, and one of the greatest weakness I could see for local industry is that what we would need in a good province-wide, sponsored by Government, sales organization. I feel that the local industry could produce a quality article that could set up the production that would be needed, and I feel that because of the low production and the high cost involved in setting up a good sales organization this is the greatest weakness point, and I feel that before we could have a good viable secondary industry within the Province, you would want a good organization to assist in the sales. But, I would like to throw out at least a suggestion for a good viable local industry that we could sponsor, and I refer to the paper carton industry, as we all know that at Stephenville within the

next two years, we will have liner board produced in vast quantities. And if we had some local concern to set up a modern fiber board box producing plant to be located at the industry itself, I do not see why that no single paper carton should be imported into the Province, when this industry comes into being. As we know, there is a tremendous amount of demand for this type of carton, we have our local beer and soft drink producers who are wide users. We have the local butter factory, we have the biscuit factories, the paint factories, and now, I think, there is a certain amount going into the export of fish. But, I would say, that this is one local industry I could feel that could be set up, once this liner board comes into production. As I say, Mr. Speaker, the local plant would be set up, would be guaranteed therefore it would be priced at the mill itself. The products should be sold to local industry at the price they will sell on the world market, and I believe, not only could we sell this type of box within the Province, but there could be a wide export market especially in the Maritimes and in the New England States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak of the concern and satisfaction with which the fishermen of my district are eagerly looking forward to the setting up of the salt cod fish marketing board. They are very appreciative of the Government's action in this direction, and new confidence will be restored to this industry, especially should the aims of the board be realized by increasing the returns to the fishermen, as it is anticipated. Also, I feel that much needed employment will be found throughout the Province with a more stabilized fishing industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

March 9, 1970

Tape #277

Page 1

MR. DAWE: The fishermen of Port-de-Grave as you know have always produced a very high quality of fish, mostly because of the assistance and help they receive from their women in the production. This production consists mainly of the light salted or pickled quality, and I know from experience Mr. Speaker, that have no difficulty whatsoever in selling their product. And even now at this time in the season, it is impossible for them to supply the demand of this type of fish.

The inshore fishermen of my district had a very successful year last year. They tell me it was one of the most successful in many years, and the most difficulty was experienced by the fishermen themselves in not being able to handle all the fish caught. I understand that some of the crews over there ~~they~~ average from 1500 to 2,000 and I believe that one of the crews itself a man with three of his sons, reached as high as 3,000 ^{fish} in a short season, the Fisheries of Port-de-Grave, and this would give them an average net return on their operation, their net or gross return - forty to fifty to sixty thousand dollars. And I would hope Mr. Speaker this problem of not being able to get clear of their fish ^{they} should have a successful season this year will not develop.

Mr. Speaker, preparations are now going on for the coming season, and they are confident that the take-over of the plant at Port-de-Grave and Harbour Grace by the new owners, will eliminate the difficulty they had last year in disposing the fish caught. And I would like to thank the new manager, the hon. member for the district of Harbour Grace on behalf of the fishermen for his assurance that they are taking steps at both plants to see that these conditions do not re-occur, if they are fortunate enough in having a good fishery again this year. However I regret Mr. Speaker, to report that the fishermen who did prosecute the fishery at Labrador last year, had a complete failure. And I feel that if this condition should prevail again this year, I am doubtful if it will be continued after such a failure as we had last year.

MR. A. J. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder if the Hon. Minister was right - just to correct himself in Hansard. If he was happy to report - I am just wondering in your actual word, do you say we are happy to report that the Labrador fishery was failure, and it might have been just a slip

1249

MR. DAWE: No I say I regret Mr. Speaker the report that the fishermen who did prosecute the fishery last year in Labrador had a complete failure. And if this condition should prevail again this year, I am doubtful that they will continue.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham Morgan, a local fisherman in Port-de-Grave has come with ^{his} I think, is a novel idea, and if it proves successful, and within the financial means of the fishermen, this could greatly improve the income of the fishermen concerned. And it is his opinion, it could be equalled in importance to the introduction of the longliner trap boats. And I refer to his idea of a small compact fisherman's drier. He has constructed one himself last year, using a heavy fan and an oil stove at a very nominal cost.

The quality of this fish produced was excellent, and this was confirmed by the reports he received after the fish reached the markets. He is continuing his experimentation, and a local firm is very interested and is now investigating to see if a more sophisticated equipment could be provided with proper controls and still be in the price range that a fisherman could afford.

The erection of the drier with proper installation to hold the fish would be built by the fishermen's crew themselves. And when I refer to the fishermen's crew, I am talking ^{of} three or four men because this is the usual number in a crew. And they are either members of one family or other men sharing in the voyage. So actually the cost of operating the drier could be divided similarly to the operating cost of the boat. And if this type of drier should prove feasible, it will also help to lessen the risk of a bad year because of low production.

With this drier the fish could be processed to its final stages, thus fetching a top price when sold to the markets or the local buyers. To further simplify what I mean, Mr. Speaker, I say, for 200 quintals of fish fully-dried, the average price secured is twenty-five dollars per quintal, thus making a total of \$5,000. I would just like to repeat this simple method. For 200 quintals of fish fully processed, the fishermen will receive twenty-five dollars per quintal of \$5,000, while the value of 400 quintals fish sold fresh, would only realize about \$4,500. So we can readily see that if we had a low-production year and the fishermen

could produce the fish themselves to the fullest possible extent, he would receive the top price and thus reduce his earnings, and he would be in a better position than if he had sold his fish fresh.

He also further states that due to the change in our weather patterns this past years considering the amount of dampness that was experienced, thus hampering the fishermen from drying their catch. The hon. the Premier and the Hon. Minister of Fisheries have met with Mr. Morgan and he appreciates their interest shown to him. A further and new development as far as the fishermen there are concerned is that many of them are now up-grading their stages providing good water supply and freezing equipment is being installed to provide small freezing capacity in order that they may supply themselves with their own bait.

And before I pass on Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House that the fishermen of Port-de-Grave have been expecting improvement to the harbour facilities for many years, and as we know it is their intention to continue to operate larger boats, and this naturally requires more mooring space, and I do trust that we could receive some assistance under the DREE program to provide these fishermen with better mooring facilities.

I was heartened by the address by the hon. member for Harbour Grace here this afternoon, and he spoke in a similar vein, and I am sure the fishermen of Port-de-Grave will do their utmost to make sure that the fish plant both at Port-de-Grave and Harbour Grace is being fully stocked with fish as far as they are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a few minutes to give you some of the history of the developments of local government that has taken place in the Province the last few years. And I feel probably I would not go on with this now, but as I say it just about 11 o'clock and I adjourn the debate.

On motion the House adjourns until tomorrow Tuesday at three of the clock.