



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 90

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at ~~3 p.m.~~

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

DR. JAMES A. McGRATH: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here from six or seven of the northern settlements in St. Mary's Bay; attached to it are 1,300 signatures.

The prayer of the petition is that we, the undersigned, do hereby petition both the Federal and Provincial Government to continue and complete the road from the community of North Harbour to the community of Branch, St. Mary's Bay. The advantages of this road are the saving of thirty-five to forty miles of road to the Branch people which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest, single settlement in St. Mary's Bay. It will benefit the transportation of fish plants; accessibility to travel salmon rivers; a great tourist potential by opening up the most scenic area and the most beautiful salt-water beach in Eastern Newfoundland at Barachois. The improvements will add a great deal to the communities - in the main communities: Collinet, North Harbour, Branch and other northern settlements of St. Mary's Bay.

I would wish, Mr. Speaker, most strongly to support this petition. I do not know, if any members of the House are familiar with that particular area, but it is one of the most extraordinary undeveloped areas, I would say, in the whole country. It has one terrific advantage. I do not know, if it exists anywhere else and that is that the place called Barachois, where there is an enormous land-locked lagoon with a beautiful sandy bottom that has warm salt water all through the summer, from June on. The reason being that the entrance to it is comparatively small - the area of water is very large and the affect of the sun on the water over the sand warms up the water in this huge area and the warm-up does not escape and by the time that some of it has gone out, the tide has turned again and, therefore, it retains a large amount

Dr. McGrath.

of warm salt water that gradually builds up.

It would be quite close to the continuation of this road, and I think, myself, that once this became accessible, it would become the finest summer resort in all Newfoundland and I would think, possibly, as good as anything anywhere in North America. Because, as we know, warm salt water is almost nonexistent in this country. This is one of the few places that would be ideal as a summer resort. It is a tremendous place for sea trout and salmon. There are, at least, three fine salmon and sea trout rivers there that are practically untapped.

The commercial value of the place is also quite high. There is a tremendous lot of very fine timber there and, of course, with the opening up of the plant at Come-by-Chance, there will be a source of income to the residents around that place. Pulp wood could, very easily, be brought by water from there to the plant in Come-by-Chance. The scenic beauties down there are terrific, and it has about four or five advantages that would make it well worth developing.

About, I think, three to four years ago about twelve miles of road or so were built with the help of the Federal Government. In fact, I think, almost exclusively at the expense of the Federal Government. It needs about another twelve to fifteen miles to complete the road through to Branch and the prayer of the petition is that this be done and I very, very strongly support it. I accept it and table it and forward it to the department to which it refers.

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

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I never supported a petition with greater pleasure than I do this one for the very good reason, I suppose, and the very sufficient reason that I am the person who started that road in the first place.

The peninsula that is separated by Placentia Bay more or less to the

Mr. Smallwood.

west and St. Mary's Bay to, more or less, the east - that great peninsula is now reachable by road running south from Placentia, along the Cape Shore to Branch, and there it ends.

Now it ought not to end at Branch. It ought to go around the point, around the corner so to speak of that great peninsula and come up the east side of the peninsula or the west side of St. Mary's Bay. It would open up one of the most dramatically beautiful parts we have on this Island of Newfoundland today. Last Fall, I drove up to Branch for the first time in many, many years, and I was astounded by the beauty of that landscape, the beauty of the whole shore, the whole coast. It was nothing short of dramatic up to and including Branch itself which strikes me as being one of the most spectacular spots we have in our Province today.

Now, I have had one flight in my life that gave me a glimpse of the east coast of that peninsula or the west side of St. Mary's Bay where we did set out to build a road all the way up that coast to Branch, in which case, we would have a road encircling the whole peninsula, and I know that there is a very important stand of timber on that peninsula, which as the hon. member presenting the petition has reminded us, could be harvested and marketed at Come-by-Chance or for that matter anywhere as valuable pulp wood and in the marketing provide a living, a decent living for a good many men for a great many years to come; especially, if it is properly harvested and spread out and not allowed just to be butchered and destroyed in three or four or five years. It could be rationed. It could be organized in such a way as to provide a living for so many men for many, many years to come.

The scenery on that side of the bay used to be described to me by Mr. Gregory Power who had often gone up there by boat, landed on this very beach in this Barachois and done some swimming, he and his family, in that lagoon, which I am told and which the hon. member now confirms is one of the most

Mr. Smallwood

impressive things of its kind, perhaps, the most impressive to be found in this Province today. It is a place that is rich in fish, salt water trout, salmon and other trout, rich in scenic beauty and rich in natural resources, and we do not know what these resources are. We know of the timber, but has that peninsula ever been looked at carefully from a geological point of view. I have my doubts. I doubt very much that it has ever received a great deal of attention.

The Minister of Education tells me that there are spots up there where there is grass growing and places to which fishermen for many years past have gone, indeed, to cut wild grass. It is an entrancing part of the Province, and I support the petition gladly and I hope that it may prove to be possible, if not this year, well then as soon as may be to resume the construction of the road.

I think we have finished twelve miles of it. I think the hon. member for the district may be wrong. I think he may be wrong, when he assumes that the full cost of that was borne by Ottawa. Now he may be right. I do not think so. At any rate, it was our idea to build it, wherever the money came from, whether out of our own Treasury or out of Ottawa, via our own Treasury.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Brown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not think he had anything whatever to do with it. I do not think so. I am not sure that he was in the Cabinet at that time. I am not sure he was in the House of Commons at that time. In all events it had nothing to do with Mr. Brown.

We were very proud of the road at the time, and if I were asked to save my life, I would not be able to say now, why we did drop it. I suppose other things seemed to be more pressing. After all - no, no, Mr. Brown had no more to do with it than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Nothing at all - nothing. Why should I deprive him of any credit that is due - why should I? He is no longer a political opponent. He is just a retired

Mr. Smallwood.

gentleman and, as I will be, eight or ten years from now, and we will meet occasionally and compare notes, after I have retired. Why should I have any feeling toward him?[?] I am willing to give him any credit that is due him. But I do not think any credit is due him at all in connection with that road. However, as I say, I warmly support it and I hope that it may be possible this year to do something about it, to get the thing reactivated. I would love to get it done. I would love to drive over it. I would love to have the pleasure of opening it, of cutting the ribbon on that beautiful road and the member for the district and we will go up there together and if, after careful research, we find that Mr. Brown, even as much, ^{as} cocked an eyebrow, even if he as much as -if he just as much as spoke in favour of it, I would invite Mr. Brown to come along with us and as the Leader of the Opposition, today, is in favour of it, I take it he is in favour of it? He is going to speak in favour of it. If he does, if he favours it, then I will invite him along to watch me cutting the ribbon.

MR. ANTHONY J. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to thank the hon. Premier for His kind invitation, and I know that someone will be weeping in the Chair that he will be sitting in.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition, I do so, because it is one of the great mysteries to me why this beautiful area, in all the years, and those of us who have spent many, many years on the Salmonier Line, fishing so on and so forth, all down through St. Mary's and perhaps it is a little away from the subject, but why the main road to Placentia was not continued through on the Salmonier Line to tie in St. Mary's Bay, I can never understand it. I do not know what the hon. member feels about ^{the} thing but I could never understand it. So many thousands of people use that area and you have access to: St. Mary's Bay area, Collinet, North Harbour so on and so forth and the road today.

DR. McGRATH: I suppose the funds available went to places of greater urgency.

MR. MURPHY: I am talking about the access road that fronts through the wilderness. I do, very sincerely, support this, because after all, if you want to go to Branch now or St. Brides or any of these, you have to travel, either go down the access road and right through Placentia, Jersey Side right on or take the Salmonier Line right through down the southeast and then across through Point Verde out through, and I think this road from North Harbour will cut almost in a straight line due west, I presume.

DR. McGRATH: It will take about thirty to forty miles off.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. When the hon. member speaks of the scenery, no doubt about it, if anybody drives from Point Verde across to Branch and hits these hills and vales, it is really a breath-taking scene, and I could never understand again why Branch is in the district of St. Mary's and St. Brides is in Placentia East and you have to drive to three of these places to get out and the only way the hon. member could get to his district is leave Hurley's Bridge there around Salmonier and drive right through. But, Mr. Speaker, that is beside the point. I think that it would be a wonderful thing, and I understand that right through there, there is a beautiful plateau of great grazing and what not. I hear quite often about sheep grazing and cattle grazing, and I am very much in favour of this petition and I support it very heartily, indeed.

JOHN C.

MR. ACROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to speak in support of this petition. There is no district in the Island of Newfoundland that more badly needs money spent on roads than the district of St. Mary's. I cannot think of any district where the roads are worse.

MR. HICKMAN: Fortune Bay would give you a good run for your money.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Fortune Bay does not have many roads, but in St. Mary's Bay where they do have roads, they are not in very good condition and not only for new roads and reconstruction of roads but paving of roads is badly needed.

DR. McGRATH: If these roads are bad, in your opinion, the hon. gentleman must have a very high standard, indeed. St. Mary's roads are not as bad as you indicate.

Mr. Cresbie.

My experience of driving on the roads in the St. Mary's District is that they are extremely bad and among the worst of any in Newfoundland, as far as the condition of roads are concerned, and if anything can be done in St. Mary's Bay to improve the roads, ^{it} is something well-worth doing and, therefore, we support this petition.

HON. G. A. FRECKER (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is very nice to see both sides of the House so genially supporting a very worth-while project, and I would like to add a few words in support of the plea. It was my pleasure last summer to attend the Fisheries Conference or meeting rather up on the Cape Shore and Mr. Aiden Maloney and myself went by helicopter. We passed over all that area. Everything that the Premier and the hon. member for St. Mary's have said, we could see the road as far as it went, where it ended, the bridges that were incomplete and the magnificent country side for trouting and fishing and everything else. It was also a pleasure of mine years ago to spend a very pleasant fishing trip at Little Barachois, and I can vouch for the statement made by the previous speakers of the attraction of that particular area.

Now quite apart from that altogether, I think, if they did not have any of these things, we should still support this petition very wholeheartedly. For one thing, you have the Economic Development Committee on the Branch side - the St. Mary's Bay side, and you ^{also} have an Economic Development Committee recently developed or come into existence on the Placentia Bay side of the Cape Shore. These two committees are coming to grips with their economic and social problems, and we should do everything in our power to facilitate their work. They are trying to develop sheep raising and agricultural possibilities something such as what is being done in the Eastport arear and anybody who knows what is happening at Eastport will say that that is something that should be promoted wherever possible over the Island.

The Cape Shore is a natural. It has the grass lands. It has the fishing.

It has the bakeapples. It has, you mention it, Mr. Speaker, and it is there potentially.

There was a time, I understand, when the Cape Shore really felt quite on top of the parts of the area that have now come into their own; namely, Placentia and all of this area. I was told by some very elderly people on the Cape Shore that there was a time, when the Cape Shore sort of was an agricultural feeder for that whole area and there is tremendous agricultural and economic potential, including the fisheries on that Cape Shore; So, we should do everything humanly possible to support this petition.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of the record, I would like to add a word in support of this petition. As it happens, it was one of the last documents that I signed, as Minister of Highways and so I want it to be recorded that this particular road was part of the first Atlantic Development Board program whereby they offered to help us. I think the maximum - I am speaking from memory now. I think the ceiling was a total of \$ 7 million. My hon. colleague may remember. I think it was \$7 million and on a 50/50 basis, and we were asked to submit - we were asked to submit projects for consideration, and I want it to be recorded that in that list, this particular road was included for submission to ADB at the insistence of the hon. the Premier and the member for the district.

I would like, also, to add, in fairness, to my hon. friend - my hon. friend seems, it seems that his breakfast did not agree with his digestion this morning, if I judge from the sour look on his face. I should say, in fairness also that on many occasions in this House, I heard the hon. W.J. Brown, when he was a member of this House, expatiate and elaborate on the virtues of that particular region and the need for roads there, so that should be recorded. This road was actually included in our program at the insistence of the Premier and member for the district, and it was

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

the first. There were several other projects. By the way that is how the Bay d'Espoir road, the great highway that is now built, was first started. The first segment of that came under ADB as did a portion of the Baie Verte highway and a portion of the Trinity-South highway. There were five projects, I think, altogether and four of them, I remember, and there was a fifth. I think it was the connecting link between the road to the Isle and Gander Bay. I think that came under that project as well.

It is worth recording, however, that this was part of the first ADB project undertaken in Newfoundland. I would like to support it.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate. I feel that I should rise to support this petition. I travelled over the roads of the Cape Shore for four and ^ahalf years, and I can well appreciate the wishes of the people of Branch and St. Brides who have to travel over that very hazardous road. I certainly add my support to the petition and I would suggest, Sir, that not only should that road be built but when it is build it should be paved and the Salmonier Line paved as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. L.R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Public Utilities Pension Act, 1968."

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Respecting The Disposal Of Waste Materials."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, Question 558 on the Order Paper of May 29th., asked by the hon. member for Humber East. It is pretty well in baby talk, Sir, and I do not think there is any doubt of anybody misunderstanding

MR. JONES: Pretty well, in baby talk, Sir, I do not think there is any doubt of misunderstanding him.

Mr. F.W. ROWE: Yesterday, or it may have been the day before, Friday, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition, asked for information regarding the inventory in the Book Bureau. Who was that? The member for St. John's West, somebody over there asked for that information. And I undertook to give it, and to answer it during the question period. I have the answer here now, anyone who is interested in it, at the end of the school year in 1966, the Inventory was \$252,000, in round figures. In 1967, the Inventory was \$192,000. In 1968, it was \$186,000. In 1969 it was a \$147,000. And in 1970, right now, it not the end of the school year, it is now \$532,000, and this of course, is a logical thing, because the Inventory is now building up, and will build up to about \$2 million, by around the first of July, at which time, of course, the shipment of books out to the schools of Newfoundland start and by the end of September the Inventory will probably be at its lowest point again, probably down to \$100,000.

MR. MURPHY: If there are no changes in the mean while, they will be able to use these in our schools, the various textbooks. There are so many changes, it must be quite a handful now compared to other years.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Because we have earned all of those changes. It is a big change to someone who has to get a new history in Grade XI or Grade X, but all the total number of books -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.W. Any way these are the figures, Mr. Speaker. the inventory builds up, the point I want to make the inventory builds up until about the 1st. July, the orders are coming in, and then they start to go down and probably goes down to its lowest point in the Fall of the year.

HON. E.S. JONES: (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of today, Question No. 445, Does the Government of Newfoundland hold in trust or in any other manner an amount of money belonging or claimed to

MR. JONES: belong to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen? The answer is "no". And therefore parts two and three do not apply.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Minister permit a question? What happened to the \$600,000 or \$700,000 a number of years ago, that was referred to as being held for the fishermen?

MR. JONES: Right, but this question says; the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, not the fishermen of Newfoundland.

MR. WELLS: Well, Okay. Would the minister answer that question, is that the amount that is really referred to the Fishermen of this Province? It did not belong to the Federation.

MR. CROSBIE: This question just says, claimed to belong, he does not say it belongs.

MR. JONES: Probably the hon. the member for Gander would like to redraft his question. I am quite prepared to get the information.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, there was a reason for asking the minister, on account of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, because, as I recall it, a similar question was asked last year or the year before, whether it was in the name of the Newfoundland fishermen, we were told no. I will redraft the question, and get the answer, hopefully.

MR. JONES: Now, I would like to referred to Question 224. I attempted to table the answer yesterday, and the hon. the member for Fortune Bay injected to say that the answer had already been given. Part (1) he said, an answer had been given that the amount outstanding was \$28,446,000, actually I have corrected this answer, the amount advanced was \$28,446,000. But the answer given in my answer, the amount outstanding as of the 1st. March, which is \$27,795,207.65.

And to refer to a supplementary question raised by the hon. the Chief, as he called himself, the hon. the member for St. John's West. I would refer him to page three, as I indicated yesterday, of my statement of March 5th., at the bottom of page three, with references to the Auditor General's comments on paragraph 27, in his report, where I stated as follows:

MR. JONES: Paragraph 27, merely provides details of the prepaid expenses and deferred charges, and in this connection it should be noted, that the arrears on the R.C.M.P. service rental contract for the period 1st. of October, 1968 to March 31st. 1969 reflects the normal situation as payments are always made of six monthly periods.

Now, I understand further this morning, Mr. Speaker, that if we have not received a bill from the R.C.M.P., we do not consider that we owe them money. When we received a bill, we pay it. And apparently the R.C.M.P. are never in a hurry to present their bills, so at any one time, we owe them the money, we know we owe it to them, and they know we will pay it. We have not received the bills, so we do not know it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. JONES: Well that has not happened yet, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before we get on Orders of the Day, I have a question which I was going to direct to the Premier, actually it does not matter whether it is to the Premier or the Minister of Finance. Arising out of the Federal Government's recent decision, decision over the weekend, to unpeg, as it were, set the Canadian Dollar loose and let it float on the International Money Market, and the possible serious repercussions certainly some adverse affects on Newfoundland exports, such as fish, and pulp and paper, what is the Newfoundland Government's official position in this regard? And what representation has been made, if any, to Ottawa? I wonder could the Minister respond?

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is this, that as early as eight thirty yesterday morning, we were in touch with our financial advisers, Ames and Company and others, eight thirty our time, I am afraid we had some of them out of bed, because of the three and a-half hour time differential, and we are taking a watching brief, if that is the way to put it, we feel that the Canadian Dollar has risen in the London Exchange, it is up, I think, four

MR. JONES: points on the New York Exchange, and our information is that there are going to be some very, very rapid gyrations in the Canadian Dollar for a short period. And we have been advised not to take any hasty action, make any snap decisions in the hope that the Canadian Dollar will very soon level off, and when this happens we would -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is it this morning.

MR. JONES: I did not hear this morning, I was in Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. It is the feeling generally, in monetary and financially circles, that the Canadian Dollar will level off, and then it will be the time for the Newfoundland Government, and of course other governments as well, to take a look at the new position and formulate their policy accordingly.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is to be a Federal-Provincial Finance Ministers' Meeting in Winnipeg shortly, I presume the minister will be attending; has he formulated any policy or any position which he might take at that meeting?

MR. JONES: I am attending along with the Comptroller of the Treasury, and Mr. David Mercer our Senior Economist, Mr. Speaker, and probably by that time we will be in a better position to assess what, I do not see how the Government of Newfoundland can formulate any policy, it is going to control the Canadian -

MR. COLLINS: I believe the Federal Government needs some instruction somewhere.

MR. JONES: I cannot see any stand, though, Mr. Speaker, honestly, that the Government of Newfoundland can take that is going to control the fluctuations in the Canadian Dollar. We certainly will have certain representations to make, I have no doubt, that this matter will be on the agenda, Of course it is not on the proposed agenda at the moment, because the agenda was formulated before this thing happened on last Sunday afternoon. But I have no doubt in my mind that all Finance Ministers and Premiers who will be attending will have something to say about this sudden change, and I am quite aware of the affect that this might have or might not have depending on what happens on our export market in the fish, and in other things that we depend on for an exchange for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am in constant touch.

MR. CROSBIE: I have a question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day. And that is, can the Premier confirm or deny the report from Mr. Andrew Chatwood, who is Executive Assistant to the Minister of Transport, that the Shaheen Group have agreed with the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland that they will pay five percent of their gross profits from the refinery operation at Come-by-Chance each year, to the Government of Newfoundland, and that this change is being made at the urging and assistance of the Government of Canada or the Minister of Transport? Could the Premier tell us something about that?

It maybe, Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not hear the question. The question is, Is the report from Mr. Andrew Chatwood, Executive Assistant to the Minister of Transport,

MR. HICKMAN: Part of the Government of Canada.

MR. CROSBIE: Part of the Government of Canada, that the Shaheen Group have had to agree to pay to the Government of Newfoundland five percent of their gross profits from the operation of the Oil Refinery each year, that this was insisted upon by the Government of Canada in return for their spending money at Come-by-Chance on the harbour improvements, whether that statement by Mr. Chatwood and as reported in the Toronto Globe and Mail quoting, Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, whether that is correct or not?

I am sure that the people of this Province, would be interesting in knowing whether there are going to be several millions of dollars each year from the Refinery Project coming to the Government of Newfoundland?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. the Premier want notice of the question, perhaps it might be better if it was put in writing. The Premier might understand it, does he want it put on the notice? Notice of the Questions.

MR. A. HICKMAN: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Finance. There was an announcement today of an alleged unholy alliance between the Governments of Ontario and

MR. HICKMAN: Quebec preparatory to the Finance Ministers Meeting in Winnipeg over the weekend, where they are going to call for a division of the tax-sharing agreement, which obviously if implemented will be to the detriment of this Province. Has the Minister of Finance or the Government of Newfoundland formulated any policy in opposition to this proposal, because it will seriously effect this Province?

MR. JONES: No, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Finally, Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, to the Minister of Highways, the section of the Burin Peninsula Highway which is presently under construction and almost completed, the area between Piper's Hole River and five miles leading from their towards Terrenceville is practically impassible, in that the grade or sand that is being used at this time, probably necessarily, is causing motor vehicles to be stuck there time after time. Has the minister received any complaints? Has the minister taken any remedial action, such as providing some of the heavy equipment there with towing gears to get the motor vehicles out of the difficulty they find themselves in, as one who was caught on Firday? I know what I am talking about.

MR. STARKES: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any official complaints about it, I have heard that there was some difficulty in cars getting through. I will take it as no reflection, and get a report on it for the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKMAN: Just one suggestion, towing equipment would be a good help.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, before we go to Orders of the Day, the answer tabled by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, this morning, did not contain certain information that I had anticipated it might contain, as a result of statements that were made. The Government has answered a question tabled earlier by me in the House indicating that there was 49,500 total square footage area in the Janeway Apartments, that works out to \$6167 per square foot. I brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and asked him, on last Wednesday, if he would investigate, because it just seems out of wack.

MR. WELLS: The minister's rather contemptuous answer was that he wanted a written notice of it put on the Order Paper. I have since been talking to Mr. Arthur Lundrigan, who has indicated that there are in fact 100,290 square feet. That changed the picture entirely, and makes it at a cost of \$30.44 a square foot. I wonder if, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, somebody else could confirm whether the figure 49,500 is correct or the figure 100,290 is correct. Because it is rather important, and I think in fairness -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Both are correct.

MR. WELLS: How can both be correct? Look, if there are 49,500 - the question is what is the total area of the floor space constructed? Now which is the correct answer to that? Both, cannot be correct. Which is the correct answer to that question?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. WELLS: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, since we now have gotten contemptuous, obviously, an incredible display. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather important matter, very important to the people of this Province, extremely important, it just has arisen this morning, in fact, and I would like to ask the hon. the Premier, if he would confirm or deny, one thing or the other, the statement made by him of a couple of days ago, that the Shaheen Group would not be paying five percent of its profits or any, did not make any other concessions in favour of the Newfoundland Government, in the light of the statement reported this morning, whereby Mr. Chatwood state that there is. Now the hon. the member for St. John's West has asked the question and the Premier has sat contemptuously silent. The people of this Province have a pretty big stake in this, and would he say one way or the other what is in fact the situation?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, would the Premier confirm whether or not Mr. John Shaheen is correct in his statement reported over the weekend wherein he says that there has been no agreement by him nor his group to pay five percent of their gross profits to the Newfoundland Government in connection with the Refinery operation at Come-by-Chance. Will the Premier state whether or not Mr. Shaheen is correct in that statement because both Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Chatwood and Mr. Jamieson cannot be correct in saying directly opposite .. they have made two absolutely contradictory statements. The Minister of Transport and his executive assistant that there has been agreement they pay five percent..

MR. SPEAKER: We are just repeating the question. This is the third time it has been asked. It is the same question. Now I do not think it is in order to ask the same question three times in the same sitting.

MR. CROSBIE: I will naturally accept what the hon. Speaker says, but I am only asking it again because it is such an important matter. It could amount to tens of millions of dollars.

On Motion the hon.the Minister of Finance, a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend The Income Tax Act, 1961, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8-01-01 - Shall the Item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister was going to speak last night.. but before we leave this general topic Mr. Chairman, I just want to Back up what I said last night when we were discussing the mineral policy of this Province, I pointed out and now I have brought the references so that there can be no doubt that in the Royal Commission Report on economic prospects, the Pushie Royal Commission Report, the members were Mr. Douglas Fraser, John Grubb, Arthur Lundrigan, Albert Martin, John McCarthy, Harold Mifflin, Frank D. Moores, John R. O'Dea, Albert B. Perlin, Chesley A. Pippy, H. D. Roberts, Norman H. Smith, Leo B. Stead. And in the section of that Report that dealt

with mining, the Mining Sector Report mentioned at Page 120, the Commission recommended that the Newfoundland Government take immediate steps to strengthen the Department of Mines. The Commission on Page 132 recommended that the concession system for mineral exploration be changed to meet the conditions that have arisen since its conception and that a new system be evolved. It drew attention to the fact that the taxes levied by the Newfoundland Government and the Mineral Industry of Newfoundland and Labrador appear to be somewhat more lenient than the mining taxes levied by other Provinces. That was a quote from the report of their advisors, and they go on to say, "this is a somewhat mild comment," that is what the Commission said. A study of mining taxation is therefore urgently recommended, and this Commission suggests that such an investigation with the powers of a Royal Commission should be undertaken without delay. This proposed Commission should be asked to report before the end of 1968.. while the Commission never reported Mr. Chairman, because the Government has never appointed one despite that recommendation. On Page 135 of their Report, the Report prepared by the Mineral Resources Division of the Department of Mines at Ottawa, said a long-term progressive program to revise mineral legislation and taxation policy should be undertaken by the Provincial Government. And at the end of their Report on Page 147, here was the conclusion of these experts Mr. Chairman. The Mineral Industry of the Province operates under three inter-related shortcomings. Too few companies are active in exploration, that is one. Funds available for exploration are inadequate, that is a second shortcoming, and far too much land is held in concessions by a very few companies, that is the third shortcoming. And they go on to say, that it appears that the last condition has a strong overall effect on the others. That is the conclusions of these people who have studied the Mineral Policy and the way it is administered here in Newfoundland. On Page 150 they say. "Since the assessment of the overall mineral potential of the Province based on the number of known occurrences, and the geological environment is favourable, one is led to look for other reasons than an inadequate resource base to account for the relatively slow growth in the non-ferrous sector. This

Commission after studying the position Mr. Chairman, concluded that in the non ferrous, that is the non iron sector of the minerals of this Province, there has been relatively slow growth.. not a record since 1949 that one could be absolutely proud of and stand on, a record of relatively slow growth. The form of legislation, they go on to say, the form of legislation that resulted in enormous land concessions being given to only a few companies, may now be considered as one of the causes of slow growth. This is what they conclude, notwithstanding that the agreements provide for periodic surrendering of portions of such concessions, a large percentage of the most favourable mineral ground is now tied up for a considerable length of time. Company exploration expenditures in most cases are insufficient to warrant such large holdings. As a result some areas remain relatively unexplored. That is the conclusion of an impartial team of experts who examined the mineral situation in Newfoundland. And I referred last night Mr. Chairman, to this study done by the Atlantic Development Board. Mineral Resources and the Atlantic Provinces, that was presented last year, and what did they say? They say, "a thorough examination of the economic effects of the present mineral rights, (this is Page 12) dispositions, policies and practices, suggests that the form of legislation that results in large land concessions being given to only a few companies, can be considered as one of the causes of slow growth in mineral industry development on the Island. The industry operates under three inter-related handicaps. Too few companies are active in exploration, that is one. Funds available for exploration are inadequate, that is two, and far too much land is held in concessions by a very few companies. The few companies now operating, some of them not primarily in the mining business, do not possess the required capital and know-how necessary to justify their large holding of mineral rights. From the exploration point of view much favourable ground stands idle. Now these are the two reports I referred to last night, impartial studies done by people having no stake in the matter at all, and that is

what they find to be the result of the Government's mineral exploration policy, and these are the weaknesses they point out and that they say should be changed. If the Premier can get up and dismiss it all (I have forgotten the word used last night) -- pathetic, pathetic arguments. These are not pathetic arguments Mr. Chairman. These are serious views on what the mineral policy of this Province should be and on its present inadequacy.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we are still on Ministers' Salary, I would like to make one comment on one aspect of his duties and responsibilities as Minister of Mines. And that is, for the enforcement of safety regulations in the mining industry in Newfoundland, and as I understand it, this is the absolute responsibility of the Minister of Mines and those who work for him. There is no suggestion, in fact it would be unthinkable, it would be crazy if it was ever suggested that the mining companies themselves would take over this responsibility of enforcing safety regulations in the mining industry. The fact is that mining in any part of Newfoundland even open pit mining, is not the safest occupation in the world, and Governments everywhere in North America or anywhere in the world where they have large mining operations, have very rigid safety rules; highly competent inspectors. They do not scrimp on the monies that are to be spent on the protection of the miners who are engaged in this important industry. And we have in this Province certain safety regulations in the mines, and we have some mining inspectors. Now Mr. Chairman, we have a most unusual and appalling, and I suggest, a complete avocation of responsibility by the minister and by Government with respect to the mines at St. Lawrence. About three years ago, the Fall of '66, or the Spring of 1967, Government in its wisdom, appointed a person to live and work permanently in St. Lawrence to monitor the radon count in the mines at St. Lawrence. This has worked pretty well. It has given the miners who work there a feeling of some security and that improvements in the safety regulations are being carried out. And daily the radon count, radiations, made by this employee, although not a permanent

employee regrettably, this employee of the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, in the person of a Mr. Rex, and he has been doing very good work there. He has been doing yeoman service. But it is just too much for any one man to handle, and each day the readings, the radon count, or the radiation count for all parts of the mines at St. Lawrence, is shown, published, made available to the Union, made available to Company, and made available to the miners working in the mines in St. Lawrence. And this is as it should be because the person responsible for safety in the mines at St. Lawrence, or the mines in Labrador City, is the Minister of Mines, nobody else. Certainly it is not the Iron Ore Company of Canada. They do not have the primary responsibility. The first responsibility rests with the Minister of Mines. And this Mr. Chairman, has I believe, brought to the miners of St. Lawrence, a certain degree of security and peace of mind. So much so that when the Royal Commission on St. Lawrence conducted its very intensive study into this problem in the mining industry in St. Lawrence. It commended the minister and Mr. Rex for their effort in continuing this personal monitoring within the mines at St. Lawrence. But it went a step further, and in recommendation fourteen, it said as follows, and this is recommendation fourteen of the Royal Commission on radiation in St. Lawrence. "That until continuous personal monitoring is developed, two full-time radiation monitoring technicians should be employed in the mines in St. Lawrence, not because one technician cannot give a technically satisfactory picture of radiation conditions there at all times, but because workmen at St. Lawrence are morally entitled to have every working place in the mines monitored once in every twenty-four hours and the results posted daily. And this Mr. Chairman, is most important, because the slightest thing can happen to drive up the radiation count in the mines in St. Lawrence. A workman for instance can turn off a fan for the purpose of using a telephone, and inadvertently, leave without turning it back on and within a matter of hours up goes the radiation count. And an exposure to that is not very desirable at all. And this is

why the Royal Commission recommended that in addition to this one man who is now working for the Department of Mines, ^{that a} second monitoring technician be appointed on a full-time basis, so that there could be continuous around the clock inspection and monitoring of the radiation count in the mines at St. Lawrence.

Well last week, or the week before last, the Government through the Minister of Labour tabled a shocking paper indicating what Government was going to do with respect to the report of the Royal Commission at St. Lawrence. And the one that is particularly relevant applies to the Department of Mines Agriculture and Resources, is the decision of Government concerning recommendation number fourteen. And Government's decision is as follows, according to this paper that was tabled. The operating company at St. Lawrence will now be asked to take over completely the cost of maintaining the Government monitoring technician as an employee of the Company. In other words, it is the responsibility of the company to implement this recommendation and that of the Department of Mines is to see this implementation is properly done.

Now Mr. Chairman, that is a complete and absolute advocacy by the Minister of Mines, of his responsibility to insure the safety of miners in the mining industry at St. Lawrence or any other part of Newfoundland for that matter. Surely, nobody can take that seriously, that we are now going to turn over to the Company, the right to check on itself, the right, no matter how cautious a company is, even if it was capable of doing it..even if it did do it, the fact is that if we are going to maintain within the minds of the miners at St. Lawrence who have undergone more hardship than any single segment of the mining industry in this Province or probably in North America. If we are going to restore their confidence, and if we are going to maintain it, and we have started to do it, they have slowly but surely realized that the Minister of Mines and the Government of this Province was beginning to show some concern for their safety in the appointment of this first monitoring

technician. Now Mr. Chairman, let us see what the Minister of Mines has done. Not only has he refused to carry out the recommendation of the Royal Commission and appoint a second monitoring technician, but he says that from here on in monitoring and checking on radiation count in the mine at St. Lawrence is going to be responsible for, the responsibility of the Company, not of the minister, which means that Mr. Rex or anyone who is there as the monitoring technician will no longer be an employee of the Government. He has never been accepted unfortunately as a full fledged recognized civil servant, but he has always been on a temporary basis there. And he too now, will pass out of the picture. And I suggest Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines by adopting this attitude, by refusing to discharge his responsibilities insofar as the mining industry at St. Lawrence, has done untold harm and damage to the morale of the miners in St. Lawrence. That he has set back to where we were three years ago, the uncertainty and the conviction of the miners in St. Lawrence that this Government does not appreciate their problems, that this Government is not interested in protecting them, is not interested in providing for the safety of the miners at St. Lawrence. And I feel as a member for the district of Burin, that this decision, this nonsensical paper that was tabled by the minister on May 20, the Minister of Labour, in this House, indicating what Government will do and what it will not do, and the emphasis seems to be on what it will not do. It is an absolute insult to the miners of St. Lawrence, a complete rejection of the main proposals in this Royal Commission report on radiation in St. Lawrence, and an absolute abrogation by the Minister of Mines in the discharge of his responsibility to protect the miners in St. Lawrence or indeed to protect the miners in any of the mining industries in Newfoundland. And I was going to say with regret, but not with regret, because when I see this sort of cavalier treatment to the primary producer in this Province, and when I see this utter and wilful and wanton disregard the rights of the primary producer, the rights of the miners in the mines at St. Lawrence by the Minister of Mines, then I have no hesitancy in moving, and I so move, that the minister's salary be reduced to one dollar.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that the hon. gentleman is working very hard not only to mislead this House, but also to cause the kind of loss of confidence or breakdown in moral that he attributes to me or to the department or to the Government, I would not pay very much attention. But, I think, the hon. gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. Chairman, I was not in the Government at the time the technician, to which the hon. gentleman refers, was appointed. It is my understanding and has been and is that gentleman was appointed for the reason that the hon. gentleman has mentioned, namely, that there was some lack of confidence, and essentially was appointed, I think, pending some documented reliable evidence as to the situation in the St. Lawrence Mine.

Now, I submit to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that we now have that reliable evidence. The hon. gentleman read a portion of the Royal Commission Report with particular recommendations found on, I think, page 63. And he read only one paragraph of that conclusion and recommendation, Mr. Chairman. And I suggest the committee should be apprized of the context in which that paragraph is found. It begins at the bottom of page 62. I bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the technician, to whom reference has been made, was appointed, I think, about two and a-half years ago. I do not have the exact date.

The Royal Commission makes reference on page 62, to records going back to 1961, which is some ten years ago. And this is what the Commission says: " Since monitoring began on a routine basis in 1961, the readings taken by the mining company have always been in generous compliance with the mining regulations, and the requirements of the Chief Inspector of Mines, and cross checking by Government Inspectors has been heavy. Even so, to remove all doubts, that radiation levels in the mines had been reduced below permissible limits, and kept below those limits every day, the Government in 1967 appointed a full-time monitoring technician to the mines. Now bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it was to remove all doubts, that radiation levels had in fact been brought down, and that in fact the company's inspection system, which was monitored in turn and cross checked by the Government, by the

MR. CALLAHAN: Government officials to prove two things, that the company had brought the level down and that they were providing reliable inspection of it. The Government appointed this man. Weekly reports of this full-time technician showed that the Government's purpose in this respect had been achieved. The Commission goes on, by comparison therefore, it can be seen that monitoring practice in the St. Lawrence Mines (these are the Commission's words, Mr. Chairman) is at least sixteen times the required frequency in Ontario, at least twelve times the desired frequency in New Mexico, and forty-eight times the required frequency in Colorado. All this means that there is less chance for a miner to be exposed to dangerous levels of radiation, in the mines of St. Lawrence, than in the mines of Ontario, or in New Mexico or Colorado. In the Congressional Report referred to earlier in this Chapter, B.R. Butt, President, Mining and Metals Division, Union Carbide Corporation asks and answers the important question, "how often should we be monitored? Actually, you might say, that the only way, under present conditions, you could do it, would be to have one man following each miner, continuously monitoring that particular area. Then the report goes on, and all this, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, I do not know why refused or at least neglected to relate to the Committee, but it is all certainly pertinent conclusions and recommendations, number one that the average concentration of alpha radiation in the mines of St. Lawrence as determined by each of the two monitoring technicians, company and Government, (because the company is doing it now, Sir, and have been doing it for years) the average concentration as determined by each of the two monitoring technicians for the period January to June inclusive 1968, is 0.325 working level, this average was determined from 2,913 readings. (2) That the prevailing concentration will produce an annual exposure to workmen as 3.90 working level months, if they are employed four and a-half weeks each month of five eight hour days each week. And this is the key, Mr. Chairman, to the situation. (3) (This is the Royal Commission, to which the hon. gentleman refers) This is a better working condition than prevails

MR. CALLAHAN: anywhere else in the world, where alpha radiation exists in mines. Now I will repeat it, Mr. Chairman, so that everybody including the press will get it. This is a better working condition in the St. Lawrence Mines than prevails anywhere else in the world where alpha radiation exists in mines. And then it goes on, nevertheless, beginning on 1 January 1969 mine operators are required by law, mine operators are required by law to protect any workman, in any mine, in Newfoundland from alpha radiation exposure in excess of 3.6 working level months.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the context in which the hon. gentleman's remarks must be put. And the principle conclusion to be noted is the Royal Commission conclusion after very intensive work-study that a better working condition prevails in the St. Lawrence Mines, which we have just been told had been neglected, where responsibility has been abdicated, a better working condition prevails there than in any mine in the world where there is alpha radiation. Now, let me add something else, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman referred not only to St. Lawrence, although it would be hard to find the other references in his remarks, but he went on to say that there had been an unusual appalling complete abdication of responsibility by me and by the Government, not only in respect of St. Lawrence, but to mines anywhere in Newfoundland and Labrador, for that matter, he added. I wrote it down, Mr. Chairman, as he spoke. He said, St. Lawrence or anywhere else in Newfoundland and Labrador for that matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a standard approach anywhere in the mining industry, anywhere where there is a civilized society in which the mining industry exists. And the approach is not, that Government go into mining operations and establish their armies of mining inspectors and safety inspectors, and safety divisions, and safety supervisors, the approach is that governments lay down standards and provide supervision under relative laws and regulations, of the safety inspection responsibilities, or the carrying out of the safety and inspection responsibilities of the operators. Because, Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility, as mine operators

MR. CALLAHAN: in Newfoundland are required by law to do, to protect any workmen, in any mine, whether it be in respect of alpha radiation, which is the particular and essential problem in St. Lawrence or any other province. It is the responsibility of the company to protect its workers. And it is the responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to see that the company protects its workers. So that the Government must set the standards of working conditions for the safety of workmen in any mine in the province, and having set those standards and laid them down in law, has then the responsibility to see that companies carry them out at their cost. So it is the responsibility of the operator to maintain the standards, the responsibility of mine inspectors of the Government to see that operators maintain the safety standards. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Government cannot trust the operators, which is what the hon. gentleman suggests, he is telling the committee, that the operators of the mine at St. Lawrence cannot be trusted. If we cannot depend upon them to do the inspection and the monitoring, therefore we have to move in on them and do it for them, and do it in their place.

Well, I do not accept that, Mr. Chairman, and the Royal Commission and have gone back to 1961, do not accept it, and have proved that that argument is not accepted; But was done, in the case of St. Lawrence, was done for the reason I mentioned in the beginning, the technician appointed by the Government was appointed for the particular purpose, in a particular case of ensuring workers in that mine and people in that community, assuring them or reassuring them that in fact the radiation level had been reduced and that in fact the monitoring and inspection done by the company's own technician was reliable and could be taken as a true indication of the condition in the mine.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it were the case that only during the tenure of the Government's technician the company's reports and inspection reports were found reliable, then I would say we could put some credence, the committee could put some credence in the hon. gentleman's remarks. But, in view of the fact, that the Royal Commission went back to 1961, some seven or eight years prior to the appointment of a Government technician,

MR. CALLAHAN: and checked out and cross checked and subjected to every possible test, the findings of the company inspectors, and found that these inspections not only were reliable, but that the levels, as established, of radiation were far, far below what is established as acceptable. This to me indicates that, in the years prior to the appointment of the Government technician, the company had been discharging their responsibility and that in itself is evidence that the company will do so and that it is safe, and it is proper and it is appropriate to regularize the situation by putting the total responsibility for day-to-day monitoring and inspection on the company and creating the proper situation which is that the Government inspectors then see to it that the company and the company's inspectors do the job that they are required to do by law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been no unusual or appalling or complete or any other kind of abdication of responsibility in this matter. What was done, was done for a temporary purpose, namely, to reassure the people and the miners as to the safety, the levels, the maintenance of the safe levels in the mines, and as to the quality of the inspection procedures that were being carried out. And we think now that the company should not only, Mr. Chairman, carry on the responsibility it had prior, but double it, like taking on a second technician, so that there will be a more adequate inspection than before always working towards the system of personal monitoring, which we feel and which industry standards indicate to us, is the only real solution to proper monitoring in this situation.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the comments of the hon. the minister, The hon. minister's comments confirmed to me what I have always known, that he does not appreciate the problem that exists in St. Lawrence.

MR. CALLAHAN: I appreciate it very much.

MR. HICKMAN: Has no comprehension of the problem that exist in St. Lawrence and in the mines, or the people who work in these mines.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is causing that very problem right now.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the reason why it is my responsibility to raise this, and I will continue to raise it until these recommendations are implemented, is because there was twenty years of neglect and complete misunderstanding of the problems that existed in St. Lawrence and that misunderstanding and neglect is continuing right to this present moment. And if we needed any confirmation of the fact, all we had to do is listen to the speech and the comments of the hon. the minister during the passed five minutes. He reads, recommendation thirteen, and recommendation thirteen says and concludes, "that a better condition than is known to prevail anywhere else in the world where alpha radiation exists in the mines". But, this is all factual everybody knows that, every miner in St. Lawrence is fully aware of that, the company is aware of that, the inspector of mines is aware of it, we all know that. We have known that for quite sometime. But, that Mr. Chairman, is not what prompted the Royal Commission to make recommendation number fourteen, what prompted the Royal Commission to make recommendation number fourteen is this, that after twenty years of exposure, after thirty years of neglect, and after adamant refusal to face up to the problems in St. Lawrence, the miners of St. Lawrence, the residents of St. Lawrence naturally have become very apprehensive over working conditions in the mines. This is quite understandable, it has got nothing to do at all with the present radiation count in the mines at St. Lawrence. But what it has to do with it, is this, that the people in St. Lawrence want to know beyond any reasonable doubt, that the health of their miners is to be protected, and not just by the company, It is silly to say, that we do not trust the company to do inspections, That is nonsensical, that is not dealing with the problem at all. The company can have twenty monitoring technicians, if it so desires, and I have no doubt that if they have them they will do their work properly. But that will not eliminate the suspicion and the concern and the fear of the people

MR. HICKMAN: of St. Lawrence, that their rights are not being fully protected unless there is a continuation of this completely independent monitoring in the mines at St. Lawrence. And this is why the Commission having found that the radiation count in St. Lawrence, which it is, is considerably below the level that you would find in similar mines throughout the world, then went on, (and this is a significant one) and made recommendation number fourteen, that until continuous personal monitoring is developed, two full-time radiation monitoring technicians should be employed in the mines at St. Lawrence, not because one technician cannot give a technically satisfactory picture of radiation conditions there at all times but because workmen at St. Lawrence are morally entitled to have every working place in the mines monitored once in every twenty-four hours and the result posted daily. This is why I say that the feeling that is envisaged and contained in, running right through the Report of the Royal Commission on Radiation In the Mines at St. Lawrence, is not being appreciated by the hon. the minister. He is taking the factual findings and excluding everything else. He is excluding the whole background of the development of the mining industry in St. Lawrence. He is excluding what has happened to so many miners in that area during the past forty years. This is not to be taken into consideration at all, it is less simply, look at the facts as they exist today. But you cannot look at these facts, as they exist today, to the exclusion of the feelings and the fears that have continued in St. Lawrence for now over a generation. And the appointment of this gentleman as a monitoring technician was in my opinion the first step toward allaying these fears, it would appear maybe the hon. minister is not aware of this, that I am not alone in feeling that he has abdicated his responsibility in not appointing the second monitoring technician and in suggesting that this should be handed over to the company.

MR. CALLAHAN: There are two there now.

MR. HICKMAN: Because last week, Mr. Chairman, both the Mayor of St. Lawrence,

MR. HICKMAN: Mayor Fabian Alyward strongly condemned the Government over there publicly, last Friday, over Government's refusals to implement many recommendations and they emphaized in particular recommendation fourteen. And Mr. Leo Slaney, the President of the St. Lawrence Workers Proctective Union in a similar public release that emanated from his office, and from Mr. Slaney, and it was recorded and carried over the Provincial Radio Network, said precisely the same thing. It is not a question as to whether you have one monitoring techician, two monitoring technicians, or twenty, the simple fact is, that these men have to be completely free and independent. It is not a question of whether the company is capable of accurately monitoring the raditation count, or enforcing any other safety regulations in the mines. Any responsible mining company is going to do that, of course they will and so

Mr. Hickman.

Newfoundland Fluorspar did a first class job over the last twenty years, but what the minister cannot get into his head and what Government have never been able to understand, and I know that the hon. the member for Fogo concurs with what I say in this. I know the hon. the senior member for Hr. Main, if he were here, because he has even stronger views on it than I have ever had. What they have never been able to get into their minds is the fact that the concern and the apprehension that is built up over years and years and years of absolute neglect and a complete misunderstanding or lack of understanding of this problem and this is why this Royal Commission made recommendation No. 14 - not because they were not satisfied with the work that was being done by the company - not because they were not satisfied as to the safety of the mine, but they wanted this to continue into the foreseeable future, this monitoring and an increase in it so that these miners and their families would have peace of mind and this concept is the one that completely misses the mind of the Minister of Mines and today he has confirmed it.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, just one or two general comments under this heading, concerning the very large grants of mineral concessions throughout the Province. I feel that I agree with the previous speakers and most certainly this should be looked at and a more proper approach, if that is the right word, be taken to the overall granting of concessions, but one of my worries is that concessions, as such, seem to get into the hands of very large promoters of the energetic promoter type who in their enthusiasm for their ^{own} project, probably, are apt not to be as discreet as they might be in the mining and exploration field. Most certainly in mining and in looking for oils, it is a very sensitive sort of thing and the promoters themselves and the people they influence are very, very apt to react quickly to any announcements of any sort.

It is typical of the mining industry that everything goes completely haywire when somebody thinks he has struck a bonanza. Now we all recall a few years ago, where there was a great safari down to the Parsons Pond oil

Mr. Earle.

well where all the members of Cabinet went down there in the middle of the winter to have a look at what was supposed to be an oil discovery. We were all taken in by helicopter, and we saw what looked like a very shaky, old rig in there with an old man and a couple of others running it, and they did not appear to be any more oil in that particular area than enough to grease the machinery that was running it.

But in spite of all that, there was a big announcement and everybody got excited about it, and I have no doubt that this had a great effect on the shares of the company that was promoting this thing at the time. I think it is ^a most unethical approach for the promoters themselves to encourage that thing and it is even more ghastly for a government to take part in such a thing. In my own area of Fortune Bay, there has been or supposed to be a mineral discovery there for thirty years in the Roncontre East area, molybdenite.

Now, that has been explored and looked at and gone over time and again over the past thirty years and the unfortunate result is that the people in that area are remaining there in very isolated conditions, based on the hope that something will develop. They have been waiting year after year after year in this particular area - a little exploration party goes in, something stirs up, and the people are encouraged again and they get all sorts of rumors going, and they just stay there and hope that something will develop.

Now, a couple of years ago, there was a Government announcement, on this particular area, when it was said that very exciting mineral discoveries had been located there. Of course, the people in that area got tremendously excited and enthusiastic about the whole thing. At that particular time, Mr. John C. Doyle was in this Chamber, and I went outside and spoke to him and I said, "Mr. Doyle is there anything in this or is it just so much malarkey?" He said, "Mr. Earle, there will be a town in Roncontre East, bigger than

Corner Brook." This was two or three years ago and this has all been built up into a big thing, the people were very enthusiastic. Now nothing has happened since. There have been small exploratory parties in there and nothing has happened. But Government, as such, and certainly the promoters should be discouraged from giving out information of this type where it has a detrimental affect upon the livelihood and the conditions under which the people live, because if there is nothing there the people should be told so. If there are minerals in the area all for the good. They may be developed sometime.

But most certainly a Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources should, itself, exert some influence over the sort of propaganda and the sort of things that are let out on exploration things. They may not be able to control the promoters themselves, because they may be doing it in their own interest, but they certainly should keep the brakes on with their own Government. This sort of thing should not be built up out of all proportions with the idea of creating excitement and enthusiasm for something which nobody knows at that stage, whether it really exists or not.

In the final analysis, when it affects the livelihood and the ambition and the interests of the people in any particular area and literally these are moulding^{on} the rocks in the vain hope; I think it is a ghastly thing to do.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add one word to what I said earlier about the situation with the St. Lawrence Mine. I refer again to paragraph (4) of the Royal Commission recommendation. The recommendation is that until continuous personal monitoring is developed, two full-time radiation monitoring technicians should be employed.

Now I point out again, Sir, because it seems to have gotten lost that there are two full-time technicians there now. One of them employed by

5733

Mr. Callahan.

the company as has been their practice and one of them employed, especially, by the Government for the purposes that have been described.

What is proposed now, Sir, very simply, is that the company double its monitoring and protection force and that in addition to that, cross checking and double checking of reports, double checking of the monitoring that will be done by the technicians. This being done, this cross checking and double checking by Government mining inspectors will continue, obviously.

But what the commission says, Sir, is that - I interpret to mean in the regular way, they do not say that the full-time technician employed by the Government be continued. I understand them to mean, because it is reasonable and it is standard practice in the industry that the company double its monitoring force which, as I have said, would still be supervised and double checked and cross checked by Government inspectors.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I am still waiting for the minister to answer the question raised earlier by the hon. member for St. John's West. Has NALCO and Mr. Doyle's other corporations and all other companies receiving exploration rights to certain areas in the Province, have they lived up to all their obligations under the Statutes or have they not, and if they have not to what extent have they not lived up to their obligations and in particular have NALCO lived up to its obligations in the Bonne Bay Park area?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that is a pretty broad question, and we could be here for a month, as I have said before in respect of NALCO, there are some twelve, I think, eleven or twelve pieces of legislation, and there are more than fifty agreements and the agreements bind the company in every way shape and form even to complying with other pieces, other Acts and other regulations in force in the Province, right down, as I think I have said before, to have licence plates on their vehicles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I can tell the House is what I have told the House before. Mainly, that I am not aware that in any substantial fashion, any company that has a concession agreement in this Province, has violated this agreement. So far as NALCO is concerned, I can say the same thing. I can

Mr. Callahan.

say two other things about NALCO. The question that the hon. the member for St. John's West asked on April 13th, asked whether NALCO had performed and complied in a particular respect at that time and the question could not be answered in those terms, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. gentleman knew. He obviously knew what the legislation said. The legislation requires a company to file its expenditures in audited statements by 1 June.

Now yesterday was 1 June and the company have done this, and I am not aware of any substantive respect in which that company or any other company, under concession agreement in this Province, have violated their agreement.

MR. WELLS: Would the minister tell the House, whether or not NALCO have spent all of the funds that they are required to spend in their concession area? Whether or not, they have, as required under the legislation?

MR. CALLAHAN: They have spent, at least, fifty per cent more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that 801-01: Salaries be reduced from \$16,700 to \$1. Those in favour please say "aye." Contrary "nay." I take it the motion is lost.

801-02-01

MR. WELLS: I noticed recently that the minister in travelling has, on occasion, I believe, used the Government plane. Should this not cut down rather than increase, if this is proposed to continue rather than increase the travelling allowance?

Is the minister going to answer?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the answer to a question like that is. The aircraft is there. It flies on some kind of semi-schedule basis and when it is convenient to use that aircraft, they use it, and this does not, in turn, expense, presumably under this head. But the aircraft goes

5735

Mr. Callahan.

all over this Province, and there are times, when it is convenient to use that aircraft. I do not know how material it is..

MR. WELLS: Why does the minister foresee double in the travelling allowance? Is there any particular reason?

MR. ROBERTS: Every minister - you will find one in each department, 01-02-01 vote. This is where ministers travel on Air Canada, EPA...

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister was responsible, I believe, for Government aircraft up to sometime..

MR. CALLAHAN: 1 April.

MR. CROSBIE: I know, not anymore, but last year the minister was responsible up to several months ago.

MR. CALLAHAN: Up to the end of the last fiscal year.

MR. CROSBIE: There have been quite a few questions asked to table in the House about the operation of Government aircraft and about the operation of the Twin Otter, the executive aircraft that the Government operates - none of which have been answered to date.

Now can the minister tell us why they are not answered. Were the records in his department in connection with these aircrafts in such bad shape that these questions cannot be answered? Some of them have been tabled here since early in March. Why cannot this information be given?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I have answered that question and numbers of questions similar to it over and over again. For a period of months, we have been phasing the aircraft operation into the Department of Supply and Services, and I have told the House time and time again that such questions should be referred to my colleague the Minister of Supply and Services who officially from the first of April, this present fiscal year and unofficially, over a period of time phasing in, is responsible for aircraft.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that this vote be reduced from \$2,000 to \$1. As far as I am concerned, there is no evidence that the minister is administering his department in any satisfactory way and that, therefore, his travelling is not resulting in any benefit at all to the Government. The minister, week after week in this House, refuses to give information, obscures the issue. He is administering the Government's mineral policy laxly. Whatever policy there is, it is certainly not being enforced nor adhered to very strictly by the Minister. He has registries in his department or parts of registries which should be opened to the public, which were those mentioned here last night; the timber grants, forestry grants and others including this famous mineral one. So, for all of these reasons, I move that this vote be cut from \$2,000 to \$1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that 801-02-01 be reduced from \$2,000 to \$1. Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Motion is lost.

Shall 01 carry? Carried. Shall 02 carry? Carried.

802-01, 02-01, 02, 03, 08, 09-01, 02, 06 carried.

811-01:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on this item - wildlife salaries for wildlife officers - \$239,300. Would the minister tell the House - it is almost useless to ask the question, but would the minister tell the House how many wildlife officers there are and of those wildlife officers, how many are qualified in the sense that they are graduates in some particular course in wildlife and would he outline for the House what the position is with reference to the Fur Trappers' Guide that was prepared in his department last year and issued, I understand, without the minister's picture in the front of it and then it was ordered to be taken back - the publication had to cease. Distribution of this Fur Trappers' Guide had to cease and then the minister, once again, permitted it to be issued a few weeks later after this terrible previous error had been corrected so that his name was mentioned at the forefront and his picture inserted. That is the story anyway that went around. Perhaps the minister

Mr. Crosbie.

could tell us whether it is the correct story or not? But apparently this Fur Trappers' Guide is a very ancient document. It describes how you should trap animals and how you treat the fur after they are trapped. It is very helpful for anyone interested in fur trapping, whom there are many in this Province. I believe the Minister of Welfare is one of them.

But this document was issued and there was quite a Kuffhuffle there a few months ago. It was stated that it was not authorized, that the minister had not authorized the publication of this document. Apparently, some official in his department just went ahead and printed the Fur Trappers' Guide and issued it to the public without the minister's consent, certainly, without his picture which was a bad oversight. That would not happen in the Minister of Welfare's department. We have seen the "News in View," the minister's picture is on every page and so it should be. So, there are two questions there. One is on the Fur Trappers' Guide and is it still now available from the department and what the story was on it and the other is, how many wildlife officers there are qualified..?

Mr. Chairman, I would think that the minister is either going to answer the question..

MR. CALLAHAN: The minister will answer the question, when the minister has the information.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly, well then the Chairman should wait before he passes the item.

MR. CALLAHAN: Sit down and wait for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not carried, Mr. Chairman. We are waiting for the minister to answer the questions, and he is looking up the information. It is not

Mr. Crosbie.

carried.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, we are trying to add up some posts here. I do not know what the hon. gentleman really wants to know. I do not know, if he wants to know how many professionals we have in the Wildlife Division or if he wants to know how many Wildlife Officers. Wildlife Officers are not necessarily professionals. So, that is why we have to split it up and try to answer his question differently from the manner in which it was prepared.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bit complicated, because some of the wildlife people who actually work in the Forestry Inventory Project, which is a wide-ranging multi-disciplinary project that involves not only what the name might indicate, forestry, but also other resources. There are seven in wildlife, as such, and three, I think the figure is, in the Capability Project in respect of wildlife.

Some of the posts, Mr. Chairman: there is a director and chief biologist, a small game biologist, a fur bearer biologist, extension biologist, laboratory technician and there are three of those for regional - there are three regional field technicians and regional enforcement supervisors, and we have seasonal assistance - twenty-seven seasonal officers for periods varying from four to twelve months. Also a number of clerks and field technicians and permanent enforcement officers who, of course, supervise the temporary ones. So far as the publication of documents is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious to the House that no document should be published purporting to be a document of the Government unless it has some kind of proof prior to its publication. This is a case where the document did not have the proof, as I said at the time, by the minister or the deputy minister or I think the director of the particular division. The publication was stopped, purely, internally, Mr. Chairman. There were no public statements.

Mr. Callahan.

The publication was stopped until the document could be checked by competent officials, not by me, by competent officials in the department, and when that was done, it was allowed again to continue distribution.

MR. WELLS: Were^{not} the officials who had done, ^{as}

MR. WELLS: it was done previously, competent?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, it was prepared by an official or officials of the department without the knowledge of the senior officers of the department. And, I think, hon. gentlemen, even hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that no document should be published in the name of the Government, unless the Government have approved its publication, and I mean the Government. I do not mean officials in any department of Government. Mr. Chairman, for that reason it was held up until the senior officials of the department could check its contents. As it turned out it was all right, because mainly it was a compendium of what had been published in other documents elsewhere. But, nonetheless it had the name of this Government on it and should not have been allowed to go to publication without proper authorization.

Mr. Chairman, the minister considered that, the minister considered a number of factors, one of them being that a young man responsible was rather new to this Province, I think, new to this country, I think/^{he}did not have an appreciation, as citizens of this Province and this country might have, of the seriousness of the matter. But, in addition to that, I did bring the matter to the Government, Mr. Chairman, and I have to say that I, even with the factors that I mentioned, was not very happy about this whole situation. The Government's decision was in the circumstances that no action should be taken. But, I say again, Sir, that it is not proper and it is not right for any publication to be issued under the name of the Government without the per se authorization of the Government. This was the situation in this case. Nobody knows what is between the covers of a book or a document, until it is checked. And the proper place for that to be checked is at a high level, in any department of the Government, before the publication takes place.

MR. WELLS: As a matter of interest,/^{did}the final wording of the publication that went out have the minister's picture on it?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not really know. I know it had no picture, I do not know if it had any -

MR. WELLS: I am just curious.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the minister's picture has anything to do with wildlife. What I would like to bring to the attention of the minister is the practice that is followed in other provinces of making a detailed assessment of the value of wildlife to the economy of the Province. I believe,

MR. CALLAHAN: That is nothing new.

MR. HICKMAN: that in most provinces where you have this detailed assessment, and we obviously do not have it here. There was a resolution passed quite recently by the Wildlife Association, or whatever the name is -

MR. WELLS: The Rod and Gun Club.

MR. HICKMAN: The Rod and Gun Club calling for this type of assessment, a valuation, I think, it has been placed on large animals or big animals, that is the technical phrase, worth approximately \$1,000 each to the area in which they are found. And in some provinces now have, as a matter of policy, undertaken a very careful assessment of the wildlife of their area, made a knowledgeable assessment as to what the wildlife is worth to the province, and taken monies that are collected by way of licensing or, however, the method of collecting, relating same to the valuation or the assessment of the wildlife, and have used this money, instead of allowing it to go into the general funds, the general cost of operating the department, have earmarked such monies to be used for conservation of wildlife in that particular province.

And, I am sure that the Minister will agree, that this Province, with the improvement in communications and transportation outside of Newfoundland, and as a result of some very good advertising done by the Tourist Department, that each year we can anticipate more and more hunters coming into the Province, apart altogether from the licensed hunters, as we open up more and more of the Province, we are making these areas which are

MR. HICKMAN: game sanctuaries, easily accessible to poachers or anyone else who wants to go in and have a crack at them.

The time has now arrived, in fact it may have passed, when there should be very substantial improvements and increases in the amount of money to be spent on conservation of wildlife in this Province. Because, if we do not do something soon, we are going to see a disappearance of some of the species that have been a source of attraction and constitute a part of the wildlife of Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAHAN: Which ones, can the hon. gentleman specify those.

MR. HICKMAN: In particular the grouse, and the partridge, the hare, not the arctic hare,

AN HON. MEMBER: The snowshoe hare.

MR. HICKMAN: The shoeshoe hare. I know along certain parts of the south coast these species, for all intense and purpose, at least if you can rely on the returns of the hunters, to all intense and purpose, to spare them. The cycle seems to be far more,

MR. CALLAHAN: We just had the best partridge cycle in about twenty-five years.

MR. HICKMAN: spread out than they were in the passed.

MR. CALLAHAN: Absolute over abundance.

MR. HICKMAN: Do I understand from the hon. minister that he does not agree that there should be an increase in the conservation policies, or an establishment of conservation policies for wildlife in this Province? Do I understand this is your position right now?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not take the hon. gentleman's position as being the only one.

MR. HICKMAN: I know it is not the only one. But you know anyone with half a brain at all, or a quarter of a brain knows,

MR. WELLS: We will reduce it down a bit more, to get the minister's.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, if he had a brain the size of a pea, Mr. Chairman,

MR. HICKMAN: surely you have to realize that now that the conservation policies may have been good in days of Commission of Government, when very little of Newfoundland was accessible to hunters, is no longer sound in this Province today. I have heard the hon. the member for Labrador West talk about the disappearance of the mealy mountain herd.

MR. CALLAHAN: A real expert on Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: Whether he is an expert on Newfoundland, I do not know, but he certainly seems to articulate the problems and the feelings of Labrador. And I do not know what the biological reason, if there is a biological reason for the disappearance of the mealy mountain herd. But the published reports indicate that it was wholesale slaughter in that area. And surely if there has been some conservation and regulations and enforcement of regulations and measures in that area, we would not be facing that situation today.

And so it happens, that the other nine provinces and the various states of the union are concentrating more and more on conservation.

MR. CALLAHAN: What do you mean by conservation now?

MR. HICKMAN: And the minister sits here in his seat, and says what we are doing is enough or alternately we should not have the conservation, you know.

MR. CALLAHAN: Which minister said that?

MR. HICKMAN: You.

MR. CALLAHAN: When?

MR. HICKMAN: Now, it was in the passed two or three minutes.

MR. CALLAHAN: I said nothing of the kind.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, can I assume then that the hon. minister -

MR. CALLAHAN: I said that the hon. gentleman -

MR. HICKMAN: Can I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister agrees that there has to be a substantial and massive increase in the monies to be spent on conservation? And do I understand, that it is his belief that there should

MR. HICKMAN: be a very intensive assessment of the wildlife of this Province? And if he accepts these two principles, then I would assume that he is the only one who can do it, or arrange it, that he will ask for an increase, a substantial increase in the vote. In other words, put your money, where your mouth is.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is all being done.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what the hon. the member for Burin has just been saying. We all know that, if the hon. minister is not devoted to conservation, he is devoted to obstruction and obscurism, when the hon. member was just speaking.

I think, that the hon. the member for Burin has put his finger on the serious problem, Mr. Chairman, in the wildlife in this Province, and that is with the advent of the skidoo, and the amphibtract and all these other vehicles that can now be used in the wintertime, that we are going to be in danger with the airplane too, but I think this is even a greater one. We are going to be in danger in the next four or five years of there being not a game animal left.

MR. CALLAHAN: How do you save that by conservation?

MR. CROSBIE: I have not told the minister yet how to solve it. I am coming to that, if the minister will restrain his patience -

MR. CALLAHAN: You cannot stop us by doing it by enforcement, how else would you propose to do it?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister will never learn, Mr. Chairman, he brought a Bill before this House, an absolute police-state bill, and he has not learned his lesson yet, he is even proposing, I suppose, to reintroduce -

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the hon. gentleman's belief.

MR. CROSBIE: And the problem is, Mr. Chairman, one thing I am not going to do today and that is, I am not going to lose my cool. I am not going to lose my cool today.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member have not even got a cool.

MR. CROSBIE: Even with the hon. minister I will keep my temper cool. So, Mr. Chairman, I will proceed quietly, impartially to make the point. With the skidoo and the amphibtract and all these other machines going right in

MR. CROSBIE: through the countryside, you can go anywhere in Newfoundland in the wintertime, easily on those machines, and chase animals and taking animals very easily, there is not going to be an animal left. Now the answer is not to give the minister the Gestapo powers or police-state powers, so that on any kind of suspicion at all, he can seize their crafts and machines and the rest of it.

MR. CALLAHAN: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: The answer would have to be some system of licensing these machines and controlling how they can go in the country, and even determine that there are certain areas they are not allowed to go in. There should be preserved certain areas where no tract vehicles^{are}/allowed in, except one that is owned by the Government, or with some wildlife officer, that is one way of doing it. But, in the wintertime from January 1st. to April 1st., in certain large areas of this Province, you will not be allowed to go on a tract vehicle, and the way to enforce it, is to use the Government aircraft because they can see the tracts from the sky easily, and this should be enforced by the use of Government aircraft. Now that is certainly one way. And, I think, that is what the Government is going to have to do. Large sections of the interior of the Province are just going to have to be put off limit, unless you got a permit from the department to go in there, during certain months of the year.

Now, what does the minister think of that suggestion, that is a nice sensible suggestion, is it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is very reasonable thinking.

MR. CROSBIE: That is better thinking, Mr. Chairman, than the hon. minister coming in with that atrocity of an amendment to the Wildlife Act, that he came in with here a few weeks ago.

MR. HICKMAN: Does the hon. member for St. John's West feel that wildlife officers should attend Liberal Nomination Conventions?

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course, they should.

MR. CROSBIE: Wildlife officers, I think they should. There is some control needed, some of the life of nominating gets too wild for the hon. gentleman. I mean democracy rears its ugly head. Now there is one good suggestion for the hon. the minister, forget the Gestapo, just put certain areas of the Province off limits, during the winter, to tract vehicles.

The hon. the Minister for Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Chairman, has again attempted to smear the hon. the member for Labrador West who is not in the House, by stating that he is not a born Newfoundlander.

MR. NEARY: I will prove it.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister said it again, a few minutes ago. That there is something wrong with the hon. member for Labrador West, because he was not born in Newfoundland, a contemptible statement. Absolutely contemptible. The hon. the member for Labrador West, it does not matter where he was born, if he lives here in Newfoundland now, he has just as much rights as any of the rest of us. Just as much right to be here as Doctor Valdmanis had, or anyone else who has come here.

MR. NEARY: Well, he is not an authority on wildlife.

MR. CROSBIE: He is an authority in Newfoundland and Labrador, he has lived in Labrador for the passed eight or ten years, more of an authority than the hon. gentleman. More experienced on Labrador than the hon. the member for Labrador South, or not the hon. the member for Labrador North, who has got a considerable experience here. So slurs about the hon. the member for Labrador West, because he was not born in Newfoundland, it is disquiting, Mr. Chairman, that such a cheap tactic can be used.

MR. NEARY: What has this got to do with wildlife?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman's wildlife that is what this has to do with. The hon. the member for Labrador West was acceptable to the Liberal Party as a candidate since 1966, and the hon. the Premier practically went on his knees to get him to run.

MR. NEARY: He got him his passport.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. And there was no talk then about your not born in Newfoundland. No, it was wip. a passport to Ottawa, so you are eligible

MR. CROSBIE: to run in the election. That was ^{how} it was in 1966.

Now, to come back to the other kind of wildlife, Mr. Chairman, we should have a cage with several of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. BARBOUR: Including me?

MR. CROSBIE: No, not the hon. the member, everybody in this House admires the hon. gentleman there. We all feel on this side, he should, and must be a member of the Cabinet before this session of the House ends.

MR. HICKMAN: Minister of Wildlife.

MR. CROSBIE: I think, Wildlife would be a good department for him.

So, anyway, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Burin has made a good point there, we hope that the minister with his usual frankness and straight forwardness, sincerity of purpose will comment on these suggestions that we made.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should rise from the session now, I might say most of the Cabinet have been invited to a luncheon today given by the Economic Council of Canada, and I think it is felt that we should go, so if the House would be agreeable, the committee might rise now until three. But, perhaps the committee will rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. WELLS: Even in cases, we admit the Cabinet must have their lunch. Nobody would disagree with that.

MR. HICKMAN: ^{Think} /what is going to happen this afternoon, when they will come back full of beer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Hodder) The motion is that I do now leave the Chair, until 3 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 97

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The Committee resumed at 3:00 P.M.

On Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again presently. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the next Order, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have, in the Speaker's gallery today, three distinguished visitors, two of whom are legislators from the State of Massachusetts, accompanied by Mr. Straus, the Consul General of the United States, who is well known to all of you. Mr. Chmura and Mr. McLean, two of these legislators are paying a visit to St. John's. And I know you would like me, on behalf of all of you, to extend to them a very cordial welcome to view the other legislators here and see how they conduct their business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall 811-01 carry?

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources): Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rose for lunch, the hon. member for Burin had made some remarks with respect to, as he put it, conservation of wildlife resources, and I had indicated to him very briefly, just as the Committee rose, that the definition of "conservation," in this instance was very important. Because it has to be very broad if it is to apply really to make very much sense in the context of what must be done in respect to wildlife. And essentially, there are three areas Mr. Chairman, of activity, namely, research, management and protection. Now the research aspect falls into two active programs, one of them being, through the forest inventory land capability program, which as the House will be aware, is an eight year, \$6 million long-term management research and planning program under agreement with the Government of Canada. And in that project there is a wildlife component. The obvious reason of course that the land and the forests are the essential habitat of wildlife resources in the designation of land areas and forest areas as to their importance to wildlife is part of that consideration. The research aspects spills over into the actual program of the wildlife division, in that certain

specialist biologists in that division have the responsibility for specific research on wildlife. There is the on-going and continuing management program which is the major responsibility of the wildlife division, and this involves such things as the designation of management areas, the establishment of quotas in respective hunting, the determination of seasons and all the other practical approaches to wildlife resources that would fall under the heading generally of management. And then of course, there is the aspect of protection and enforcement which, the House will be aware, is the general enforcement of the various laws and regulations that apply to wildlife from a protection point of view.

And I tell the House briefly of the present current situation in respect of the prime wildlife species in this Province. The moose population as of the present time falls somewhere between forty and 45,000 animals. It is a pretty constant population in the general sense throughout the Province, but in some specific areas, there are difficulties and these are reflected from time to time in the opening or closing or shortening of seasons in those particular areas. One area I think of is Zone Four on the great Northern Peninsula, where this past winter there were requests for a lengthening of the season because of the lack of hunting success. But indeed to lengthen the season, Mr. Chairman, would provide just the opposite effect to that which was desired, because while hunting success might have been increased in the present season, the herd in that area might well have been destroyed for future seasons. A similar request came from parts of the southwest coast, but the problem in particular areas Mr. Chairman, must be approached I think, from a pretty firm and rigid point of view, if the resource is to be saved and perpetuated in those particular areas. But generally across the Province, it is not at all a fact, as one hears from time to time, that the moose population is threatened, indeed it is either constant or growing, and there is no evidence of its falling off in the population figures that I have indicated between 40,000 and 45,000 — I think is a pretty indication that

The caribou population Mr. Chairman, is increasing very well. The population, as of the start of the coming season, is estimated on the basis of the expected calf crop this year to approximate 14,000 animals. On the management side, there have been introductions. I have just scribbled down nine particular areas that I recall, and there may be one or two others. There have been introductions on Fogo Island, on the Port-au-Port peninsula, on Grey Island, and the Horse Islands -- in the Burin area, Lamaline and Red Harbour, on the Bonavista peninsula near Elliston, on Random Island, north of Gander and on Gregory Plateau. These are areas where there are no caribou, prior to these introductions. There may have been years and years ago, populations in those places but, for one reason and another, they had died out. The species have been introduced in these areas, and the indications Mr. Chairman, and there is some credit to the residents of these areas in this, The indications are that the transplanted animals have taken hold and that the populations are increasing, and we are very gratified with that.

There has been moose introduction in the Roddickton area of the Great Northern Peninsula but it was a small group of animals and it has not been possible to this time to say how successful that introduction will be.

The rabbit population Mr. Chairman, about which we hear concerned voice from time to time, is higher now than for a good many years, and we are now at the peak of the ten year cycle, which indicates that from now on, certainly after this year, and certainly after next year, most certainly after next year, there will be some decline. But this is a cyclical thing, a biological cycle that really cannot be affected very much by any management program. There are, however, studies going on all the time in that regard. The ptarmigan population this year, as I indicated this morning, was at perhaps the highest point in some twenty-five years. This also runs in a ten year cycle, and we anticipate that for the next several years there will be a drop-off. But again Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of over-hunting or poaching or anything of that nature, it is a matter of a biological cycle, the population grows and falls dependent upon predacity, dependent upon the

supply of food and other factors. The other significant species I should mention is the beaver and the management trap-line program, that was instituted some years ago, appears to be working very well, and we see evidence of an increase in the population of that species.

There is one other I should mention Mr. Chairman, which is not indigenous to the Province but is important as an animal species to be protected, and that is the polar bear. The latest evidence is that the prime breeding ground for polar bear is in James Bay, Northern Ontario, and that the animals come down on the ice, there are some over land, but generally over ice down into the northern quarter of the Labrador coast. We are in the midst now of revising the regulations, and I think very shortly, we will declare a closed season on polar bears. I do not know for how long but the evidence is that it may have to be a rather lengthy ban on the hunting of this important representative species. There is a great deal of concern internationally that the Arctic polar bear population may be threatened by possible extinction and, whatever small part we can play in combating that situation, we intend to do by bringing in shortly the regulation which will close the season and prevent the taking of these animals.

There is just one other comment I would make Sir, and that is in relation to what was said here this morning about putting back, into the management and the conservation and protection of wildlife resources, the monies that are obtained in one way and another from that resource. And I would draw to the attention of hon. members that, over the past number of years, the amount of the vote, the expenditure vote on wildlife, has been not too much different from the actual income from licences and fines. The income runs somewhere about \$500,000 a year, and the expenditure vote as the '69 - 70 show Mr. Chairman, is \$483,400. So virtually all, or certainly the great bulk of the income from wildlife directly to this department, I am not talking about the value put on by the tourist board, because that involves expenditures on guides and caterers and hotels and travel and food,

and all the other things that hunters purchase, I am talking about the actual expenditure into the wildlife division, the revenue into the wildlife division, balanced off against the expenditure, and there is not really very much difference Mr. Chairman. Indeed I think the average over a number of years has been somewhere between eighty or eighty-five and one hundred percent of the actual revenue put back into the management, conservation and protection of this resource.

DR. JAMES McGRATH: Would the minister perhaps be able to give us some information as to the small herd of caribou that barely maintained itself for many years, between the Southern Shore and St. Mary's Bay? Is there any information on that herd which I understand has been given special attention for some years past?

MR. CALLAHAN: I think Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is referring to what we call the "Avalon herd," which has been protected in the Avalon wilderness. My information Mr. Chairman, is that the herd is doing extremely well under this management program. It will be known that there are a limited number of licences issued annually. This has been increased, I think, two or three years ago. It was at fifty, and I think last year it was seventy-five, and this strictly is the allowable annual kill. It is tied to the annual increment in the herd. There is a very close census done, and if there appeared to be any depletion in herd numbers and in new calves, then there certainly would be a reduction in the number of licences.

DR. McGRATH: Is there an estimate of the present numbers of that herd?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have seen an estimate and my recollection is about—I think about 700 animals Mr. Chairman, but I would have to double-check that.

DR. McGRATH: It is a tremendous increase over a few years ago.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right. It has been a very successful management operation.

could

MR. EARLE: I wonder if the minister could tell the House how the buffalo on Brunette Island are doing?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, in July of 1954, twenty-four buffalo from

Elk Island National Park in Alberta were brought to Brunette. The herd went down to I think seven animals, and since then we have had some luck. The herd has been increasing. There has been, I think, five or six calves, so it is back now to twelve or thirteen animals. And we think there is some chance now the experiment will work. For a time it looked as though it would not, and the temptation was very strong to artificially encourage its ability to survive. But this would have been wrong as the hon. gentleman will realize it would have meant the permanent feeding problem, and an artificial situation which would have had to be sustained. And this thing could only work if the animals themselves could naturally adapt. It looks as though they are now doing that.

MR. H. COLLINS: I have a few remarks I would like to make. But first of all I would like to make reference to the most recent report of the Tourist Development Division, which outlines to us, in no uncertain detail, the value of our wildlife in terms of hunting and our fishing and so on, the value of that in attracting tourist dollars to the Province. Mr. Chairman, last year 1968-69, we find that the estimated value of the travel industry, which is the tourist industry, amounted to an input in the economy of \$62.25 million. And that report goes on to show the amount which can be attributed to hunting, to fishing, transportation, gasoline sales, accommodation and so on and so forth. Now the figures which are mentioned for hunting is the area of \$4. million which means that hunting was responsible for the influx or the income of approximately \$4 million to the economy last year. But then Sir, the report goes on and attributes a certain amount to accommodation and so on and so forth, and I would suspect that if the truth were known, and it would be a very difficult statistic to come up with, that a great portion of the money spent in accommodation and in transportation and in gasoline sales and parks and campsites and miscellaneous, could very well be attributed to hunting.. to people coming in specifically to hunt moose and caribou and

and on. So the figure of \$4 million could be possibly eight or ten million dollars or maybe more than that. I mention this Mr. Chairman, to show that this is a very important resource, and when we look around Newfoundland today and examine what resources we have, we must of course consider the fishery, the cod fishery and so on from the sea. We must also consider the forest, and when we consider forest resources, we must also take into account the wildlife resources, because the two are so much reliant upon each other. Certainly wildlife is relying upon the forest. When we

Mr. Collins.

look at the resources, we must come to the conclusion that possibly one of our greatest resources is our wildlife and fishing in its attraction of tourist dollars to the Newfoundland Treasury.

Sir, I am not at all satisfied. I do not imagine that there are very many members in this hon. House who are satisfied that we are doing all that should be done in terms of protection for our wildlife - not only protection, but in terms of management and research which the minister made reference to a few moments ago. I am convinced, Sir, that much work remains to be done. We all will remember years ago, when we had a biologist here by the name of Dr. Bergeron. We also had a Dr. Dodds. I believe it was the name. Dr. Dodds was here years ago. Those people seem to be..

MR. CALLAHAN: Was he the kidney pill man or his brother.

MR. COLLINS: May be he would be just as well off, if he worked for Dodd's kidney pills, because he certainly did not have much affect on the Newfoundland Government's attitude to what they were going to do with wildlife. Finally he became frustrated, as Dr. Bergeron did, and had to leave the Province. Well, Sir, both those gentlemen were well qualified. They laid some well founded and sound and sensible and sain suggestions to this Government and the record, of course, shows that the Government did not accept their recommendations. For what reason, I do not know. But, we have been stumbling along in the dark, Mr. Chairman, this Government has for a goodly number of years, with no real defined policy in terms of management, research and perfection of our wildlife resources.

I would say that possibly one of the greatest needs right now is in the field of research and, of course, when we think of research we must necessarily think of personnel. We must think in terms of cash, and when we talk about personnel, we must also be concerned with the quality of personnel.

5756

MR. CALLAHAN: Do you tell me that we do not have quality personnel now?

MR. COLLINS: I think our personnel are doing a real good job, Mr. Chairman right now, but I am not satisfied that they are getting the recognition from the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources which they should get. I am not sure that they have adequate bodies in the field to do the work which should be done. I am not sure that the work which is being done is having much affect, because I believe a lot of it is falling on deaf ears and for that particular reason, may be it is just as well that it was not done, unless people in the department become more aware of the importance in this particular field.

When we talk about research, in a great many areas we can draw upon research which has been done in other countries and other provinces. Research which has been done in the United States in some areas and research which has been done in Canada, But in this particular case, in the wildlife resources of Newfoundland, we have to depend almost entirely upon research which we do ourselves. Because on the major problems, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion which we have to look at and which we have to look at very carefully is the balance of our wildlife in terms of - not only the balance between the different species in terms of food which is available but we also have to think of it in terms of the changing habitat, if you want to. Because there has been some progress made in Newfoundland in terms of industrialization, in terms of hydro-power development, in terms of road construction. And every time a road is pushed through the wilderness, which up to that time was almost the sole prerogative of the wildlife, Until such time as the roads were put through; the animals had no human beings to worry about and until hydro-power was developed and dams were erected and so on and so forth, moose and caribou, rabbits, partridge and the other species of life were to be found in that area. I am not sure, Sir, that there has been proper co-ordination between the Wildlife Division and the Department of Highways and the Department of Economic Development. In fact I am sure there has not been and I am sure that honest people, and there are several of them, many of them, a great number

Mr. Collins.

of them in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. The honest people there will admit that there has not been proper co-ordination of effort between those groups, and I believe, Sir, it is very essential, if we are to maintain a proper balance in terms of species of animals, food available for the changing needs of the animals, owing to the changes taking place in our country, unless all this is taken into account, then I am afraid that we might be going down a dead-end road, as it were.

There are a few other areas which, I know, some work is being done, but I am not sure that adequate work is being done. It is all very well for the minister to have his opinion. I have mine, and I suspect that possibly almost every member in this House has some opinion of what should be done. But here again, Sir, we cannot rely on that. We can argue all day. My opinion might be right and it might not. The ministers may be right or may be not. I believe that we have to ensure that we have capable people performing the research. I would be the first to say that the people we have in that particular branch in the Department now are doing real good service. Certainly it is a job that a great number of people would refuse to do at all, because it entails much hardship in men going out in the forest in the late Fall and early Spring catching caribou; in our ponds, rivers and so on and so forth and transferring them to other areas. Most of these men are dedicated men, but I suspect, Sir, that we do not have enough of them and certainly we are not providing them with the necessary funds, equipment and whatever to do the job which should be done.

Now the minister made some reference to licencing - not to licencing but to establishing quotas and seasons. I am not at all convinced that our open seasons are on the right dates. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, by a great

Mr. Collins.

number of people in the field, people who have had gained considerable experience or considerable knowledge from a point of view of practical experience, and there is a difference of opinion with many biologists as well. I am not sure that we do have the right open season periods for moose and caribou. I seem to recall last year that, when the season was open for caribou on the islands of the south coast, that stag caribou could be killed and I am sure that that was right, in what we call ⁱⁿ hunting business, the mating season. I do not know what ^{good} a stag caribou is in the mating season. It is fine for a trophy hunter, but Mr. Chairman, the meat is certainly of no use whatever, because ^{it is} inedible in terms of people who are killing animals for ^{their} own consumption. I would suspect also by having seasons ^{this} open on moose and caribou on the Island during the mating season [^] might have an adverse affect on the production next year.

I do not know, if the minister knows or not. I do not think he does, but I would certainly say that this is an area which needs to be examined very closely and from what I have read and what I have heard so on and so forth, it might be worthwhile considering opening the season in late August. I believe that the commission of Government years ago did have an opening season in late August or around the middle of September and by so doing the take in cows and bulls and so on could have occurred before the mating season would have started. It normally starts around the 15 September, 20 September or the 25 September. These are questions, I believe, which the minister and his staff should take into account and get some expert advice on this from some people or do the research which needs to be done to establish if we are getting the maximum return from the various valuable wildlife species which we have in this Province.

Sir, my colleague, the hon. member from Burin mentioned this morning the need for conservation and there is no argument with that at all. There is certainly a crying need for conservation. I am not sure we can do too much

5759

Mr. Collins

to correct the unfortunate habits of some of our little lads and older people in terms of poaching and killing more than is needed and so on and so forth, but I believe, Sir, we have to look to the future, and we have a responsibility to preserve our moose and caribou and rabbits and partridge and so on for the generations which will be following us and with that in mind, I think, possibly our efforts in terms of conservation should be directed to the young people coming up and, of course, the best way to get at those young people is in the school.

I know Rod and Gun Clubs across the Province are very much concerned about the conservation problem, and I would like to suggest to the minister that possibly he could see to it that there is better two-way communication, if you will, between the Rod and Gun Clubs across Newfoundland and his department. Also, I would suggest to him that it might be worth his while to discuss this problem - the conservation problem, with the Minister of Education and see if it is not possible to come up with some form of instruction which might be possible to introduce into our school system, because after all, Sir, education goes further today than the three "R's" which we seemed to think years ago, that this was the extent of the education requirement. I would strongly suggest to the minister that he get together with all three bodies, and I am sure that some sort of a program could be introduced in the school system to make our young people aware of the very valuable resources that we have and which we want to pass on to them and which hopefully they will regard and protect and do a better job than we are doing with it today.

Mr. Chairman, the short observation on predator control - I noticed the minister today never once mentioned any move toward taming the shrew. I am sure that all hon. members in this House are aware of the fact that the shrew which was introduced in the Province a few years ago, in the Deer Lake area, I believe - it was on the West coast...

MR. CALLAHAN: St. George's and Millertown.

MR. COLLINS: St. George's and Millertown. It was introduced, hopefully, to take

Mr. Collins.

care of the woolly aphid problem, and we found that this particular shrew attracted its attention to other types of insects and animals and did not do the job which the minister had meant for it to do. In the meantime, we also found that shrew has become^a very prominent little nuisance animal across Newfoundland; in fact, I think they are to be found all over the Province now and from reports which were emanating from central Newfoundland and western Newfoundland last year, certainly, they are a real nuisance. They do have a real nuisance value to rabbit hunters who unless they can get to their snare almost as quickly as the rabbit gets in the snare, they find that the shrew have beaten them to it and possibly ruined the rabbit.

Now, I would like the minister to indicate to the committee what plans he has to combat this problem which the shrew has created for us. I would, also, like to have his views on the introduction of other species of animals, whether the department has done any research in this particular field bearing in mind that we, again, would have to think of the balance of nature, whether we have the food supply and so on and so forth and what the introduced species - what affect it might have on species which are already thriving in Newfoundland.

Now, Sir, one other point which is of concern to a great many people who have interest in wildlife, and I suppose it is of concern to the department as well. What affect do those snow toboggans have on our wildlife. I have several reports, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if it is true or not, because people are reluctant to tell you too much. I have had reports where in many cases during the winter months, people travelling by toboggan, motorized toboggan have gone across different wildlife, before inaccessible areas, and have tracked down moose and caribou, moose in particular and have given chase to pregnant cows in February and March and very often we found that the calves had been lost. This, in my opinion, Sir, is a very serious matter, and as I have said, I am not sure that the minister is aware of it. If he is, I would like to know what he plans to do about it. It might be worthy to note

Mr. Collins.

here that we were told not too long ago that there was to be a Bill introduced here dealing with motorized toboggans. I have wondered why the minister did not introduce that particular Bill, before we came to his estimates, because this is a very important topic. I am sure a lot of hon. members here will want to debate it, and I would like to know what arrangements he is making to curtail, if we can, the operations of those people in the winter time, especially, where it can be a real hazard as far as wildlife is concerned.

We already discussed the very dangerous affects upon wildlife caused by people coming into the Province by airplanes, and I suspect that the minister has also received reports of people coming in from outside the Province. I do not know where they come from. I have an idea, but I will not say here. People coming in from outside the Province in the areas of Burgeo and that particular area where we have a fair number of caribou, moose and so on and so forth and evidently a lot of poaching is taking place. Perhaps, he might like to respond to that as well.

Perhaps, Sir, before I close, I might be permitted to make some reference to our fishing and all hon. members will have seen this past few days where there has been much talk and concern about the North Atlantic Salmon. While I appreciate that this falls within Federal jurisdiction, those salmon spawn in Newfoundland rivers through a large extent and are very, very worthwhile tourist attraction and a very worthwhile side line, if you want to, for Newfoundlanders as well. I am wondering what the minister's views might be in terms of the very serious problem of over-fishing on the high seas and what this Government's position is in this respect and what representations they have made to the Federal Minister of Fisheries in the interest of the salmon fishing in Newfoundland.

I would also suggest to him that in view of the fact last year the Federal Government saw fit that all the other problems, Mr. Chairman, we have

Mr. Collins.

with this salmon fishery -last year the Federal Government* saw fit to reduce their wardens on our inland rivers by fifty per cent, which to me, certainly makes no sense at all. I am wondering if any representation has been made to the Federal Government and whether there is any indication from them that there will be added wardens to the rivers this summer in an effort further to protect this very valuable resource.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Chairman, I have just one observation to make. I think the points which the hon. member for Gander has raised are very apropos, very relevant, but there is one observation that I would make and that is this:that this Government, so far, has not done anything about the recovery of hides of the moose or caribou. Now, I understand that that can be a small industry, and I know there is a ready market for such hides. It is very easily cured. I am sure that one could get, say, \$6 at a railhead or a shipment point and that is worthwhile to my point. I think that, perhaps, the guides would be interested in saving the hides and packing them with salt and it should, perhaps, be made mandatory by the Department of Wildlife, when issue licences - to save as many hides as possible. I just offer this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, for what it is worth.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Gander who has just spoken on some aspects of our wildlife and like most of the times that he has spoken in this session, he has been able to make some, in my views, valuable and worthwhile contributions - intelligent contributions to the subject under discussion.

I intend to speak, only, on one aspect of wildlife and that is one that my hon. friend referred to a few moments ago. The needs for education in our schools - not merely regarding wildlife which in itself is important, but in all aspects of our - all physcial aspects of this Province. I use to say some years ago that the average Newfoundland child in our schools knew more about the kangaroos of Australia or the giraffes of Africa than he knew about the

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

beavers or the muskrats of Newfoundland and this should not be. I suspect that the average Newfoundland student, even today, knows more about the redwoods of California than he knows about the white pine of Newfoundland and this should not be either.

But, I would not want to leave the impression and I know the hon. member for Gander would not want to leave the impression that nothing has been done in this field. While he was talking

MR. ROWE, F.W.: I started to note down the things that came to my mind that had been done of a very practical educational nature. I can speak with some intimacy of this matter because my first portfolio was in this department now under consideration, and I spent five years there. And during that time, among other things, we had three Royal Commissions studies made and these were very valuable studies with a tremendous amount of information garnet together, the first was on forestry under the Chairmanship of a Canadian Forester, the late General Kennedy, who had some of the outstanding experts of Canada with him on that commission, and one great Newfoundland expert in a practical sense, Mr. Roland Goodyear. And we took care to see to it that copies of that Commission's Report on Forestry were sent to all of our schools. Now, if they were not used, that of course is not our fault.

The same thing applied to the Royal Commissions Report on Agriculture, which again consisted of some of the outstanding experts on Agriculture in all Canada. And again, copies were circulated to the schools. And then in the matter of Wildlife, we invited the head of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States, probably the greatest wildlife biologist in the world, Dr. Ira Gabreils to come down and head up our Commission on that, in that field, and he produced a short, but very valuable report, again copies were circulated to our schools for use.

And then in the earlier days of this administration, we invited here to Newfoundland, three of the world's greatest experts, this may not be generally appreciated today by the younger element, we invited here three of the world's experts on ornithology, on bird life, Dr. Burlies and Dr. Peters still famous names from the Wildlife Service of the United States and the world's great illustrator of wildlife, Roger Tory Peterson who I believe is still President of the World Audubon Society, and is an acknowledged expert on birdlife in the world today. And they came down here, and they produced for us a Volume, which is called, "The Birds of Newfoundland" and which won the International Award for being the best

MR. ROWE, F.W. publication of its kind in the entire world, "The Birds of Newfoundland", and copies of that were circulated to all our schools, and I do not know if there are still some on hand or not in the Department of Resources, but I doubt if there are very many, I think it is out of print, and the book is probably now a collector's item, as is so often the case with Newfoundland publications.

And then in the field of geology we produced and circulated a number of publications in geology, we produced a geological map which attracted the attention of the geological world certainly, and copies of that were distributed to our schools, we produced this almost concurrently, a new general map which was the first map to be based entirely on aerial photography. A tremendous achievement, a map which was so accurate, a ten miles_{map} which was so accurate that a reasonably intelligent person stuck down in the middle of Newfoundland, if he kept that map in his hand, could probably find his way out to the coast. The first accurate map of Newfoundland ever made, not the first accurate map of our coastline, that was done by Captain James Cook two hundred years ago, the first accurate map of the interior of Newfoundland showing the full drainage system. It is only about fifteen or sixteen years old, and we produced that and again distributed it to our schools. And we got together samples of all the well known minerals of Newfoundland, put them in boxes with complimentary literature, and we distributed that to the schools of Newfoundland as well. And we started a project, which my colleague had brought to completion, and that was a small booklet, which is very dear, I might say, to me personally, a small book on the trees of Newfoundland, not on the flowers, not on the fauna, on that we have had the benefit of coming to Newfoundland here, the outstanding authority, and I realize I am using the superlatives but I use them very properly, the outstanding authority on the flora of Newfoundland, we have them coming down here now for twenty years, and I am referring to Dr. Ernest Rouleau who is the head of the great Botanical Institute of Montreal, under the University of Montreal, and he is today recognized as the world's authority on Newfoundland flora. And he has had a number

MR. ROWE, F.W. of publications which are very valuable, but unfortunately are far too technical and far too difficult a nature to be of any practical use for the students in our schools, useful in the University, but not in the schools.

MR. WELLS: What has this got to do with wildlife?

MR. ROWE, F.W. I am leading up to that very thing. I regret that I do not always adhere as he does at all times strickly to the matter under consideration. But, there is one aspect of our physical economy, of our natural economy, that has not been given the attention that I would like to see it given, and my hon. friend from Gander would like to see it given, as he pointed out just now, and I do not know why this has not been done, I do not think it has been done to this moment, and that is the production of a popular, and I use the word "popular" in its correct sense there, of a popular book on Newfoundland fauna, on the animal life of Newfoundland.

MR. WELLS: Perhaps that is what the minister can do in his retirement.

MR. ROWE, F.W. I cannot do that, no, I would not do that, I would like to write something about the tree, I happen to know something about trees, because I think I am the only man on earth, I think I am the only one on earth, who has on one acre of ground every tree that belongs to Newfoundland. I am not a scientist, I am not a botantist, but I do know a little about our Newfoundland trees and I would like in retirement to do something on that. But a little more seriously, there is a great need in our schools, and I recommend this to my colleague, perhaps he has it under control, I do not know, there is a great need for someone to produce a book on Newfoundland fauna, the animals of Newfoundland. Because the average Newfoundlander knows nothing about them, unless he happens to be an outport man who goes in and shoots the odd caribou or moose or catches a rabbit. But, certainly our children in our schools know nothing about it, and for that matter, until a year or two ago, they knew nothing about Newfoundland trees, they do now

MR. ROWE, F.W. because the department over which my friend presides, a couple of years ago issued a small book on Newfoundland trees, and it is written in popular style, and it can be easily comprehended by the average Grade IX student say.

And I strongly recommend to my hon. friend, and if there is any way we can co-operate with them, we will be very glad to do it, that some attention be given to the production of additional literature dealing with all aspects of our natural life, but particularly this deficiency which now exists the one with regard to the fauna of Newfoundland, the animal life of Newfoundland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. the member for Gander referred to the hunting of caribou that took place last year on Burnette Island, and probably will take place again this season or the year after, and the procedure in issuing licenses basically appeared to be quite fair in that all the applications that were received from the residents of the Burin Peninsula were taken and put in a hat and drawn. But, it did not quite come out the way it should have, because some of the smaller communities along the southcoast found themselves completely excluded insofar as the draw is concerned. And what I would recommend to the hon. minister is that when it is decided to open up Burnette again for the purpose of hunting caribou or any other game on that Island, that a certain number of licenses be allocated on a per capita basis to each town on the southcoast, and then you can draw out of a hat the applicant say from Grand Bank, and the applicant from Marystown, and the applicant from St. Alban's or MacCallum or Harbour Breton or whatever the area is. And this will eliminate any of the nasty criticism that emanated last year when certain towns found that not one license was issued to a resident of their municipality and thought that there was something wrong with the draw. But, actually there was not, it was just that mathematics worked out, it was more than , the simple fact is that if you have one town with 3,000 people, and another with 500, chances are that the person living in a town of 500 is not likely to

MR. HICKMAN: get caught in the draw. Anyway it is my suggestion if the hon. minister, I know he is immune to criticism, if he would like to do something to reduce it, the simple way to do that would be to allocate the number of licenses on a per capita basis to each municipality along the southcoast.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I do not want to delay the committee, since over lunch I dug out some information that I had, writings and speeches emanating from the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation. There were a couple of comments, I believe, are quite relevant to this particular item. And one deals with the habit of logging companies, and construction companies when they complete their cutting or construction in a particular area of Newfoundland, contrary to the law, simply walking away and abandoning the area to mother nature and leaving all sorts of traps and everything else for our wildlife. And in particular it was a finding of the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation, and I quote from it, that logging companies and construction companies are both required to remove any telephone wires connecting camps, when the camps are abandoned. Yet, in many areas this has not been done. Poles are left to rot, worse: still the wires dropped to the height of the throat of a running moose or caribou. This is similar to illegal snaring and it is without doubt the cruelest way to end the life of a large animal. Is not this a problem for proper Government inspection and Government control? And again, that same organization, Mr. Chairman, made, and they are doing very commendable work in this Province voluntary without any real financial assistance and they made this claim; our fish and wildlife are rapidly being destroyed by individuals who would never dream of stealing five cents intentionally, but who are unintentionally stealing our heritage. They do not realize that any number of trout caught, above the bag limit, hastens the day when it will be impossible to reach the bag limit. They forget about the moose and caribou that they have wounded, knowing, even before they shot, that it was impossible to make a clean kill and thereby constituting fun for target practice. Anyone over the age of sixteen can get a licence

MR. HICKMAN: to kill, and no one even inquires if he knows the elementary rules of safety. At a time when the Federal Government through the Department of Fisheries should be increasing protective measures on our rivers, they are introducing austerity programs cutting back on protection which invites poaching to the extent that in some places this season not one salmon reached the spawning ground. And the result of the deliberations of the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation was that a resolution was passed, this morning I made reference to it, but I could not recall the exact wording of the resolution, but the resolution that was passed is as follows, Mr. Chairman,

Whereas this Province is thought to be blessed with an abundance of wildlife and fish;

And whereas this same abundance of wildlife and fish is assumed to be a financial asset to the economy;

And whereas there are no statistics to support this assumption;

Be it resolved that the Government of this Province make an assessment of the monetary value of our wildlife and fish resources;

And be it also resolved that this assessment be made known to the general public in order to make the public more conscious of the value of our natural resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these resolutions and these statements and these findings were arrived at by very knowledgeable interested Newfoundlanders. Newfoundlanders who were quite concerned over the fact that our wildlife may be on the verge or may be facing very serious depletion. And as I mentioned this morning before this committee, it only stands to reason, as communications improve, and as we can get about this Province much easier and more efficiently, and as we find more and more types of modes of conveyance throughout our wild country, and throughout our wilderness that we are going to be faced with a very serious reduction in the wildlife of this Province, unless conservation measures are taken now. It is not much point in waiting and saying that the partridge come in cycles and we will

MR. HICKMAN: wait for another seven years or whatever the cycle is, to see if they will reappear again. Nor is it much consolation to conservationists if we say we will wait a few years to see what is going to happen to the caribou herd in Central Newfoundland. Because then we will find that we may have had the same sort of thing occur, as happened in the Mealy Mountain herd. Well, it seems that Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation, who I suggest to the hon. minister are very knowledgeable people, view this with far more concern than the hon. minister has shown to this committee, so far. And this is why I urge on this committee, and urge on the minister that there be very rigid and strick enforcement of any regulations that we now have. And that if we have not got enough, and if we have not been implementing conservation practices, and that we not rely on the conservation practices that served us in the fifties or the sixties, they are a waste of time now, because conditions have changed, and our wildlife can be reached more easily and destroyed more easily, and slaughter more easily than was the case say ten years ago. And ten years from now, the situation will be aggravate even that much more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried. Shall 02-01 carry? Carried. Shall 02 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: 02 Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us how he is going to affect the reduction, or is there going to be a reduction really, the actual amount spent on travelling in the year that ended March 31st. 1969, according to the Auditor General's Report, is \$82,933, and the estimate now for this year is \$64,000, a \$19,000 reduction. How are the wildlife officers to carry out their work with that much less capital?

MR. CALLAHAN: Very simple, Mr. Chairman, we hope to be able to cut down travel -

MR. CROSBIE: How? I mean the wildlife officers have to travel constantly do they not, that is their job, they are wildlife officers, they must be out all over the Province, all over Labrador, now it would cost them, and fewer of them, two years ago it cost \$82,933 that is what it actually cost. We do not have the figures for what it actually cost last year, but probably

MR. CROSBIE: at least as much, if not more. Now how are they going to travel a quarter less or a fifth less this year and still do their job, all the wildlife officers?

MR. CALLAHAN: The item revised for 69-70, Mr. Chairman, shows \$63,700, and the estimates provides for \$64,000, I do not know how close on the \$63,700 is, but it is fairly close. There is more travelling in this, than just the travelling of the enforcement officers, the travel of other persons for various reasons, extention people and others, it is just a general austerity as in some of the other cases, just a few hundred dollars.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman

Mr. Crosbie.

I do not know what the actual is for last year, but we do know that the actual for the year before was \$83,000, that is in round figures. That was the actual amount spent a year ago up to March 31, 1969.

Now, I suggest to the minister and this will not be proven one way or the other until the estimates come up next year that if we get the figures next year, the actual figures for this year that that item is going to be \$83,000 or \$84,000 at least so it is just an artificial cut. How can the officials of the Wildlife Division travel, save one-quarter on their travelling this year and still do their job? This year, in the estimates, it provides for forty-seven people in the Wildlife Division as compared to forty-two last year. There are seven extra officers, Grade IV, so one would certainly expect that this vote will be up. If the minister is satisfied, we will just have to wait until next year and see what actually is spent. I would be willing to bet any amount just about that this vote is going to turn out to be at least \$83,000 or \$84,000 next year.

MR. CALLAHAN: Is that all one can do, Mr. Chairman, is bet. When you try to bring in some reduction in expenditure, the directive goes to the officials to cut down whatever they can, without impairing the service. Now the estimate of the officials of the Wildlife Division is that they can reduce it. As I have said the revised estimates show \$63,700, the estimate for the year is \$64,000. I do not know how close the revised estimate is, but I would say that it is pretty close, because I have some idea of what the balances were in the votes at the end of the year.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this particular item, could the minister inform the committee how many of the forty-seven members which he proposed to have on the wildlife staff this year - how many will be administrative personnel and how many will be actual field personnel?

MR. CALLAHAN: Practically all are field, Mr. Chairman. I am just looking

Mr. Callahan .

down the list, but even the chief biologist, the chief wildlife biologist, Mr. Manuel who is certainly administrative, I suppose, spends seventy per cent of his time in the field.

MR. COLLINS: A very dedicated man and doing a grand job.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that in view of his earlier remarks, because I get the feelings sometimes that the only people who know anything in this Government are people who disagree with the policy and leave the service. Now, Mr. Bergeron, i.e., left because he did not like the idea of power development or the highway into Bay d'Espoir. That was his feelings, so he left. But I think we have very dedicated people, Mr. Chairman, and practically all of them, including the director Mr. Pike and the chief biologist Mr. Manuel, spend most of their time in the field and I think the same is true, indeed it is true of everybody but a few clerks and stenographers.

MR. COLLINS: What I said, Mr. Chairman, is that they have an impossible job, because they do not have the resources in terms of monetary or in terms of persons to do the jobs that they want to do. This is the big problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried. Shall 03-01 carry? Carried. Shall 03-02 carry? Carried. Shall 03 carry?

MR. CALLAHAN: '03: Development. This vote, Mr. Chairman, covers the research in management activities I referred to earlier. The funds paid across the field trips, used to engage certain temporary personnel for specific field projects, i.e., in the breakdown for the supervision of management, hunting areas, population count, productivity, assessment, carrying capacities, studies and population, composition studies of moose, pretty well the same with caribou, ptarmigan, rough grouse, hares, black bears, this amount covers various projects - research and management projects in respect of the various species of - significant species of wildlife. There are some, obviously, where not very much is done, because they are not of any interest

5774

Mr. Callahan.

in terms of harvest. There is work done on them, but the intensive work obviously is done on the species that are harvested where you have the possibility of a population depletion.

MR. WELLS: Does that come under this vote, too?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes. This vote, Mr. Chairman, is to cover research and management projects such as the ones that I have mentioned. For example a survey of beaver populations and trap-line management area systems, \$10,000. That might largely pay the salary of the man who does it. That is what it is for, and there is one man who specializes in that.

MR. WELLS: What is item 12 down below - fishing and hunting development?

MR. CALLAHAN: This is an old vote which has been there for a long time ..

MR. WELLS: Might it probably be forgotten?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it is something that is really done by Tourist Development, which I think should not be in there at all. Development in terms of publicity.

MR. COLLINS: Last year there was a goodly number of partridge - ptarmigans around Newfoundland and during the winter months, the department saw fit to open the season again, in other words two seasons. The reason given was that this was a top of the cycle, as it were, for partridge and since they were quite numerous..

MR. CALLAHAN: We would have lost them anyway.

MR. COLLINS: We would have lost them anyway. We would have lost sixty per cent or seventy per cent. Mr. Chairman, out of the man who goes in the woods with a gun, determine which bird was going to die anyway, you know, for instance, if you are going to lose seventy per cent and the Government decide to open the season, chances are the hunters might kill the thirty per cent which might have lived.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is greatly underestimating the intelligence of the Newfoundland bird hunter, you know.

5775

MR. COLLINS: I am not sure of this, because this is a distinct possibility. If seventy per cent were to die a natural death, the hunters could quite easily kill the remaining thirty per cent, and we would have no partridge left at all.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is a big lump in the hon. gentleman's cheek, and it must be his tongue.

MR. COLLINS: What was that? Are we on 06?

I presume, Mr. Chairman, this is the fishing lodge on the Gander river. I notice the vote is about half what it was last year. This is of concern to me, because I am sure it is of concern to the hon. member for Fogo, the Minister of Finance. Because there are ten or twelve people in his particular riding and I believe one or two in my riding as well who are employed there for a period of five, six or seven months during the summer. What is the Government's position there? Is the cabin going to be opened? Are the guides going to be employed this year or what is the position?

MR. CALLAHAN: The Gander fishing cabin will be used on demand as the need arises rather than kept open throughout the season, whether it is used or not and I realize that this will dislocate some people, but on the whole the people who provide for that cabin, except for the guides, and I think the cook are forest service people anyway who are normally doing forest service jobs. The thing is being reduced. I realize that this will mean some reduction in employment, but we think it is more suitable, more economic, more appropriate to use the thing as needed to be used rather than keep it open for three or four months, whether it is used during that total period or not.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, it seems rather valuable property like that lying idle. I wonder if I made an application to the minister, could I possibly get the cabin for a weekend or a week.

MR. CALLAHAN: I have mine in.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, table or can he give now or would he undertake to provide

Mr. Wells.

a list of the people who were entertained there last year or used it in the last fiscal year?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I have a list.

MR. WELLS: We want to see whether or not we are getting our monies worth. I think it is a good thing to have, and I can see the purpose of it, but I just want to see..

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know, if I have a list at the moment..

MR. WELLS: Well can he provide it later?

MR. CALLAHAN: Generally, the guests who go there are guests of the Government not of this department and I do not know if we keep an up-to-date list. I doubt if we do. In any event, I will look into it.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the minister going to get it.

MR. WELLS: Yes he is going to get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry? Carried.

MR. COLLINS: The minister did not respond to my question a little while ago of what plans he has to fight the shrew, to eliminate the shrew, if that is what is necessary.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that we have no means of taming the shrew. The shrew was introduced by the Federal Forestry Department in 1957 as one of a number of predators. I think there has been between twenty and thirty various species of predators introduced to attempt to combat certain insect species which have otherwise been resistant to any other means of depletion. The thing has spread. It is not dangerous, I agree with the hon. gentleman. It is a nuisance, but there is no danger involved. There is no health problem such as people have felt, but to my knowledge and the Federal people who ..

MR. WELLS: They become a nuisance..

MR. CALLAHAN: They become a nuisance, yes and anywhere they exist, which is in other provinces as well as this one.

Mr. Callahan.

It is about one inch, I think, and three-quarters long. It is not a very big animal, and there is no way, Mr. Chairman, that we know of, where the Federal foresters who do the research and who introduced it, know of eliminating that particular pest unless it be by a another predator and what that might be. I do really do not know, and that may be worst than the disease.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Shall 10 carry? Carried. Shall 11 carry? Carried. Shall 12 carry? Carried.

Shall 812-01 carry, 02-01 carry, 02 carry, 03 carry? Carried.

Shall 03-01 carry, 02 carry, 03 carry? Carried.

04

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is desirable to have a little bit of speed now, but protection against forest fires', is that the only area that ~~is~~ that the only expenditure anticipated for protection against forest fires? Well the aircraft, I realize, would be separate, but is there anything beyond that? The Government is withdrawing or it did two or three years ago withdraw from the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association, which was over the years, a three-way partnership with the Price, Bowaters and the Government. Recently there has been some severe criticisms from the remaining members of the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association about the Government's withdrawal from this, in their favour to support it. They feel that they have a valuable contribution to make toward the protection of the forest, not only from a fire-fighting point of view but the other aspects of protection to the forest that concern that association.

Is this the only effort the Government makes beyond the aircraft?
Is this the only financial contribution they make towards the protection of these vast natural resources? I realize that there are other areas, but..

MR. CALLAHAN: M r. Chairman, indeed, there are other votes, as we get further down,, as the hon. gentleman will notice, and there is the aircraft vote which

Mr. Callahan.

is shown under the Department of Supply and Services as of this fiscal year. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that somehow the idea appears to have gotten about that the Government are no longer involved with the forest protection.

What has happened, very simply, is this: the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association, which began, I think, in 1910 as the Newfoundland Fire Patrol and which became the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association in about 1935, was a joint venture operation between the forest industries, the major companies and the Government up until about ten years ago, in fire protection. All the fire protection was carried out by the N.F.P.A. who had speeder patrols, truck patrols and eventually got somehow into aircraft. But as of 1959, the Newfoundland Forest Service was created, arising out of a recommendation of the Royal Commission on Forestry, under Major General Kennedy. And the forest service since 1959, has been completely responsible for fire protection in the Province, except insofar as fires on company limits may be pursued by company forces, people working in the woods for the companies who, you know, are told to stop cutting wood and go fight the fire. Except for that, Mr. Chairman, all the forest protection costs against fire is borne by the Government, and I would say that something in excess of \$2 million a year, right now, comes out of the public treasury for that purpose.

MR. WELLS: How much?

MR. CALLAHAN: About \$2 million and that includes the aircraft.

MR. WELLS: Most of it then would include aircraft..

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, because the whole forest service, the whole fire fighting operation is based on aircraft. This is the principal base of forest fire fighting today and it is obviously the effective way to do it. The total Forest Service vote is about \$3.5 million, including aircraft and about something in the order of two-thirds of that goes to fire fighting. Now the N.F.P.A. since 1959, when it had a budget of something in the order of \$84,000 - \$84,000

Mr. Callahan.

that was with the Government and the paper companies in it, fighting fires. The N.F.P.A. since then has been spending around \$30,000 a year on publicity and education. The Government, on the other hand, have become completely responsible for forest fires, forest fire fighting, protection and suppression and are spending something in the order of four times that on the forest service and about three times the amount of ten years ago on actual fire fighting. What happened this year was simply this: we did not withdraw from the N.F.P.A. Our senior forestry people are still in N.F.P.A.

MR. WELLS: Did the Government make any financial contributions?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, we are still in it on the same basis as the Federal Forestry Service, the C.N.R., the national parks and other companies that are involved. The position, very simply is Mr. Chairman that it is twofold in the first instance, other groups interested in other particular conservation activities or other particular fields of conservation feel that if we are going as a Government to financially participate in the particular activity in respect of forests only, then we should also financially assist these other groups.

I do not believe and the Government do not believe that we should get involved in every group that comes along on a financial basis. That is one thing. It leads to the second point which is that we think that some responsibility properly belongs on the forest industry and properly is carried out by voluntary organizations.

MR. WELLS: There was a grant last year.

MR. CALLAHAN: The grant last year from the Government was roughly \$10,000.

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: We feel, Mr. Chairman, very simply that the forest industries should - they have done very well in this Province over the past seventy years - during the past sixty-five years. There will be others and there

Mr. Callahan.

are some diversified or some diversification is happening, and there will be other major interests as well. We think they have done well, and we think they should carry some part of the community responsibility for forest conservation, and we have told them. They are not very happy about it to the extent, indeed, that it was decided that the little Forest Queen Contest could only be held in Corner Brook and Grand Falls this year. We decided otherwise, and we arranged to have them in Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador, and we intend to do that.

MR. WELLS: It was done through the N.F.P.A. was it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: It was done through N.F.P.A., yes. But N.F.P.A. were the ones who decided not to have them, and we said that we would not participate in N.F.P. A., if N.F.P.A. wished to discriminate against Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador. So, we arranged to have the Forest Queen Contest in Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador and N.F.P.A. came right along and wanted to sponsor them after all. So, this is the story and this is what has happened, Mr. Chairman, but we do feel that there is a certain community responsibility which the industry should pick up, and it should not be so picayune, if that is the word, perhaps I should not use it, but I will say it. They should not be so picayune as to withdraw from that responsibility which is very small in terms of the responsibility that has been lifted from them in that the Government and the public, the Treasury has taken over the complete responsibility, one might say, for fire protection. You know, we think it is being a little small to take that attitude.

Now I have discussed this matter with the N.F.P.A., at least, the people outside the forest service, because the forest service people are still in it. I have invited them to come and discuss this matter with me so that we can work out an arrangement whereby we can continue to participate and assist them, because we do not want the thing to fail

Mr. Callahan.

and we do not want them to feel that the Government are not interested or involved and we do not want them to be cut off, but they are talking in terms and have been for two years of winding up N.F.P.A. as such and forming a branch of the Canadian Forestry Association and in the light of that, we have said, "fine, this might be a good place to end what is in a way an anachronism." Indeed, N.F.P.A. has no protection anymore. It is not a protection group and we have told them this, But there are some people who for many years have given good service to N.F.P.A. who feel that somehow they have been let down, and I appreciate that, but I think it is not realistic, and I think there has to be a broader approach on Government's part to preserve, conservation and, you know, simply one side of it; namely, forests, because N.F.P.A. has always been based on it - the context of the commercial use and extraction of forest resources.

This is what N.F.P.A. has been. It has been protection for the sake of industry, not protection for the sake of conservation. I think we have the

MR. CALLAHAN: line straight, and I think that very shortly we will be in a situation, in a position to take a much broader approach to the whole question of environment and the whole question of conservation, not being tied down to a single aspect of it, as we have been in an N.F.P.A., in a financial way.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would explain, there is a substantial reduction here, and there may be some answer for it, for the amount actually spent under this head in 1969, was \$161,000, and this amount is \$57,400-

MR. CALLAHAN: Which one is this?

MR. CROSBIE: We are on 03-04, Protection against Forest Fires, and the amount spent on that account for the year ending March 31 st. 1969 was \$161, 536. The amount in the estimates for this year is just one-third of that amount, which makes one wonder.

MR. CALLAHAN: I have to look up the notes, Mr. Chairman, 03-04 is it?

MR. CROSBIE: 812-03-04.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is only one real explanation that I see, but I think it is a valid one, Mr. Chairman, in 68-69 which covered the fire season in 1968, we had a fairly bad fire season, we had some very bad fires as I recall in Labrador, and we had some very bad fires on the Burin Peninsula, I think, that summer in Baine Harbour. A lot of activity in the 68 year, that was my first year in the department. I remember it well because I went on my vacation and everywhere I went there was a helicopter or an aircraft coming down, and somebody coming with orders to be signed for additional money. Last year the 69 season, we had I think the lowest acreage burned, how many years? Ten years. In any event, it was less than 20,000 acres and most of that was scrub, very little merchantable forest, and very easily to deal with. So that 68, we had a quite bad year, 69 we had a very light year. Now, if you go back to 1967, Mr. Chairman, you 5763 will see that the amount spend was \$670,000. The hon. gentleman raises his

MR. CALLAHAN: eyebrows at \$161,000. The year before that it was five times that, but that was the year of the very serious fires that lasted the whole season in Labrador. So it depends very much, there is no way of forecasting what will happen. In 1966-67 the expenditure was \$60,000, in 1965, it was \$64,000. So we are in that same general ballpark now, and there is no way, it is like trying to buy insurance, you provide what looks like an average for an normal year, and then you have to build on as it happens, as I say 1965-66, \$64,000, 1966-67, \$60,000, now 1969, it is \$67,000. We are better equipped with aircraft, we are mobile. From that point of view, that would normally cause a reduction or allow a reduction in this vote, which really is for things, such as food and rations, radios, gas and oil, freight and expressage, batteries, fire signs. I might also mention, Mr. Chairman, that there is repair and maintenance to buildings, and also vehicles in that, and in each of those cases, there have been reductions this year because these are occasional and not annual costs. I think, that vote probably indicates, as well as it is possible to indicate in advance, the hope at least for a normal fire season.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we are on these items, protection against fire forest and grant to forest protection associations, (which has been eliminated) and forestry conservation and development, it seems to me that these three items practically go together, or at least it is very difficult to separate them, one from the other, because they are hopefully designed to do the same thing, whether you are serving the forest by trying to protect forest fire, or whether you are conserving the forests by trying to control and eliminate indiscriminate cutting of wood, amounts to the same thing. The end result, if achieved, is the thing.

One thing, I believe, that has been concerning conservationists, and hopefully concerning the minister, is that with the modern mechanized logging methods that are now being used, that indiscriminate cutting in the woods seems to be the order of the day. And, I believe, that many parts of

MR HICKMAN: our forests are unnecessarily destroyed and depleted and that the department that is responsible (and this is the present department whose estimates we are now considering) is going to have to be a bit more rigid in enforcing the rules and regulations, and do not let this come to pass.

We do not have the same natural growth nor reforestation programs, whilst something is being done with it, and the period of growth is considerably longer than we would find in some neighbouring areas on the Eastern Seaboard.

I believe that we have seen, many of us, and I remember the hon. the Premier describing at one time, very vividly, how he flew over an area and thought that he was flying over a cesspool but discovered, to his horror, it was a part of Newfoundland where this mechanized logging operation had been going on, and nothing was left, after the particular contractor had finished his work.

I think what is concerning many people, and those who are engaged in the forest or who rely on our forest as a source of income, is the general practices that are being followed in mechanized cutting and logging, the lack of supervision, lack of enforcement of regulations and also the general state of our wooded crown lands, which are deplorable, to say the least. You can see throughout this Province hundreds of acres of land where the treetops are just strewn around and left there.

This causes two hazards: On hazard is that of forest fires, a natural source of fuel for forest fires. And certainly the natural growth of the area is retarded by allowing those treetops to be left around in the forest, after wood-cutting operations have been carried on.

The law, as I understand it, says that all treetops that can be used for pulp wood must be so used. And the question that is being asked by people who reside in the various areas of the Province where the forestry is of prime importance, why is not this being enforced? Why do we allow those treetops and pieces of trees and brush to remain in our forests to create a forest fire hazard and to stunt the natural regrowth of the area?

MR. HICKMAN: Again, Mr. Chairman, while I am on this question of conservation and control of the forests, I think, if we want a very good example of what can be done with proper control, the proper forestation and reforestation in the Province, we simply have to compare the Terra Nova National Park and the highway leading through the Terra Nova National Park and the trees on each side of that highway with the rest of the Trans-Canada Highway. When you go through the National Park, there is where you see forestation and control at its finest. There is where you see no access to gravel pits, this is where you will not find filthy garbage dumps all along the road, you will not find trees and stumps and bush and boughs all over the place.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Undoubtedly the cost is higher, of course there is a great deal of money involved, but in the park right along the way you will see that the area is properly sloped, you will see, I think they call them bush lanes, are concealed and gravel pits are nonexistent. But when you drive through the forest of the Burin Peninsula -

MR. WELLS: What forest?

MR. HICKMAN: The forest that the hon. the Minister of Public Works got lost in. But the problem with the hon. minister is that he cannot see the woods for the trees, I am not going to try to help him out of his dilemma. But, be that as it may, when you drive through these forests, and another example, is the Bay d'Espoir Road, along that Bay d'Espoir Highway, you will find trees just pushed to one side, bulldozed to one side, left there,

MR. WELLS: You can see that all along the Trans-Canada,

MR. HICKMAN: Except for the Terra Nova Park.

MR. WELLS: Right, except for the Terra Nova Park.

MR. HICKMAN: And true there is money involved, but surely if conservation is the order of the day, if you want to protect the forests against unnecessary forest fires, then you are being, I suggest, most unwise by not following the same pattern that is followed in our National Parks, of

MR. HICKMAN: protection and beautifying the landscape on each side of the highway.

It must be a bit of a shock to people coming into the Province, tourist who do not recognize the fine distinction between the Trans-Canada Highway and the part that goes through the National Park, to find that you go through twenty or thirty or forty miles of beautifully terrain and sloped highway with all sorts of conservations methods in vogue, with the trees properly limbed and none of the debris and garbage left around. And then suddenly you break out into the Provincial Highway, and there you will find an open invitation to forest fires, and an open invitation to pollution and an open invitation to all most anything you can dream of.

Mr. Chairman, I presume that somewhere hidden in this vote of forestry conservation and development that there must be some money to be used for this type of protection. And there must have been some thought, I would hope. Surely goodness, the minister of Mines is strong enough to say to the two paper companies, and to any logging contractors - if you go into an area and you have a permit to cut, this does not give you the right to walk away and to leave it in its rough state, with garbage and treetops and brush left around. Because, as sure as you are sitting there, Mr. Chairman, eventually someone is going to have to go back and fight a forest fire in that area. And certainly, you can forget the natural regrowth of forest in that area, if you leave that there. And this, I cannot rely on the world renom authorities that the hon. the Minister of Education keeps pulling out of the hat all the time, but if you would read any of the wildlife publications, you will find that in these publications, and you will find in the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation Resolution, and Minutes, an expression -

MR. CALLAHAN: That does not prove anything.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know, if it proves anything, but I suggest that these people, whilst they may not be the world's leading authority, and some day, you know, we are going to have someone come to this Province to do a study

MR. HICKMAN: who is not the world's leading authority. It will be a little bit of a washout, it will be a bit of a shock, and we are not used to it, we are being spoiled, we have never had anyone do a study yet who was not the world's leading authority. But the tragedy is, after these International experts and the world's leading authorities come in and do the study and we get these great studies, if they do not please the person for whom the study was done, they head right straight into the trash can.

MR. EARLE: They or their reports?

MR. HICKMAN: No, not the person who does the report, he goes back to more international fame, but the reports themselves.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do urge on the minister that we have regulations that, if properly enforced, can go a long ways in protecting our forests. I suggest to him that they are not being properly enforced right now, and I suggest-

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps, the hon. gentleman would like to have this printed as a brochure and we could distribute it in all the schools.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, this might be as good an idea as any.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman be willing?

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He could not claim royalties or anything.

MR. HICKMAN: I would not claim royalties, so long as it does -

MR. WELLS: Could it be even published in the Bulletin?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is too valuable to put it in the Bulletin.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not going into the Newfoundland Bulletin.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the paper should be very soft.

MR. HICKMAN: If you want to put it in the Burin Post, Mr. Chairman, by all means. But I do suggest to the Chairman, or to the Minister, that whilst he may have to cutback and whilst he may have to retrench in certain areas, it is not a very wise decision to decide to retrench in the field of forest protection and conservation.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we do not want the minister to get trenched mouth. So, he better be careful, he better be careful when he is retrenching.

Would the hon. minister care now or deign to reply to a question that I asked a couple of weeks ago, and that is the question as to whether Mr. John Monroe, the Acting Chief Forester, has resigned or the Chief Forester has resigned or not? And settle that issue, the minister knows whether he has or not. I would hope that he has not. In any event the question is asked. And could the minister tell us how many graduate foresters, people who have graduated in forestry classes, graduated foresters, does the department employ here in Newfoundland, and how many regional foresters are there at the moment? Not how many positions are there provided, how many regional foresters do we really have?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, one of the difficulties, and it is a difficulty today with professional people, is that everybody wants to go back to University every other year. But taking that into account, the professional staff of the Forest Service at the moment is fifteen. The hon. gentleman -

MR. CROSBIE: Is this taking in graduated foresters?

MR. CALLAHAN: This is what I am saying, professional staff. That is right, graduated professional staff.

MR. CROSBIE: Have eight or ten come on in just the last couple of weeks?

MR. CALLAHAN: No. It is true that Mr. Monroe has submitted his resignation to return to University. It is also true that Mr. Joe Lowe, Mr. J.J. Lowe, Mr. Joe Lowe, as the hon. gentleman referred to him this morning, has submitted his resignation -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because he loves the name Joe.

MR. CALLAHAN: That must be it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is infatuated by it. He is fascinated by it. He just loves it.

MR. CROSBIE: He has changed his name now to Frank.

MR. EARLE: It is a low Joe, not a high Joe.

MR. CROSBIE: He has changed his name to Frank now. As soon as he leaves the Government service, he is going on to Frank. He did not dare change it from Joe while he was in the Government service.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, as soon as he leaves the Government service, which I think he has done.

MR. CROSBIE: Who has now, Mr. Lowe, is it?

MR. CALLAHAN: He is on annual leave, but effectively he has resigned.

MR. CROSBIE: That is Mr. Lowe, is it?

MR. CALLAHAN: And, Mr. Chairman, in a very few days, I hope to be able to announce, because we have had some reorganization going on both in the Forest Service and in the Forest Inventory Project, I hope in a few days to be able to announce some appointments which will take into account these two resignations, Mr. Lowe resigned to the Acting Chief Forester, who transmitted notice of the resignation to the Deputy Minister, and in the correspondence that I have seen, there is no reason given for Mr. Lowe's resignation.

So far as Regional Foresters are concerned, Mr. Chairman, this also will come within the ambit of the announced changes I propose to make very shortly. Essentially there are four regions, Labrador, Western Newfoundland, Central Newfoundland and Eastern Newfoundland, and we have had acting regional foresters in three of these areas ^{for} some time, pending certain changes which we mean to make. And as I say, I hope to announce these very shortly.

In respect to the remarks of my hon. friend, the member for Burin, I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps he is listening outside - he is coming back. I will give him a chance to sit down.

The first thing that should be said, Mr. Chairman, as I already indicated, is that there is not a decrease in the vote for protection against forest fires nor is there a decrease in the vote for forest conservation and development.

The second thing that needs to be said, and I will try to be very brief because this could be a very lengthy dissertation and I propose not to make it that.

MR WELLS: Good.

MR CALLAHAN: On the whole matter of forest practice and forest management, this is an area where I suppose there is more disagreement than in any other single area of resource administration and use. Everything that the hon. gentleman said today I would have said two years ago.

MR WELLS: Why did you not?

MR CALLAHAN: I did and said it for a number of years and wrote it for a number of years

MR WELLS: There are a whole lot of other things the hon. minister did.

MR CALLAHAN: That is right.

MR CROSBIE: Yes. "Western Star".

MR CALLAHAN: That is right.

MR CROSBIE: "Newfoundland Bulletin".

MR CALLAHAN: For about twenty years, Mr. Chairman, I wrote a lot of things and one of the things I used to write was the kind of thing the hon. gentleman said today. But I would like him to know that he, as I used to be, is going on the basis that what is apparently the case and what in many respects is not the case - for example; it is not true, it is not proven but there is evidence and quite a bit of evidence being gathered to the contrary, that mechanical harvesting is a bad thing, that it is not by any means proven, whether on -

MR CROSBIE: That is wonderful.

MR. CALLAHAN: on an economic basis or on the basis..

MR. CROSBIE: It lets the air out of the worms does it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: Indeed Mr. Chairman, it is roughly comparable to plowing a field to plant a new crop. It opens up in our situation where we have so much over-burden, it opens up the ground, it mixes the mineral and the peat soil, and it gives seedlings a chance to get to the actual soil and regrows. So there is an example of what I am talking about. Clear-cutting, we are told is a terrible thing, and I believed it for a long time, but the best evidence I can get and the latest evidence I have seen is a paper by the head of the Federal Forest service in this Province, Dr. Carrol, of whom I suppose there is not a more respected Newfoundlander ...proves conclusively as far as I am concerned that clear-cutting is the only economic and the only sylvia culturally sound cutting practice there is in this particular part of the world. Now Dr. Carrol is an expert and I am not, and I am prepared to accept Dr. Carrol's judgement in this case.

Well Mr. Chairman, there are very many unknowns. There is a lot of research going on. Every day brings a new paper or a new report or a new idea, but I would say to the committee that one should not jump too quickly to accept some of the popular judgements or approaches that are put about as to the best way to go about either managing or using the forest resources. It is simply a wide-open field and a lot of research is required and a lot of time is required to prove what the research may indicate is the right thing to do. Now tomorrow there will be a group going to Ireland from this Province incorporating with officials from the Federal and Provincial Governments and of the forest industries. This is another part of the part of the on-going research program and I hope they will bring back some useable information. indeed I am sure they will, because this group will go to look at a situation wherein a commercial forest has been created on peatlands very similar to our own. The situation/^{is} more typical to our particular situation than any other.

MR. WELLS: Is that what is going on in the bog area near the intersection?

MR. CALLAHAN: There have been experiments conducted Mr. Chairman, on the Swedish pattern. It is now perhaps beginning to appear that that may not be the best pattern.

MR. WELLS: This looks like it is an ordinary farm.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well that is what it is intended to be. It is intended to be tree farming, but the question is the best method, the age of the seedlings to be used, how they should be planted, whether it should be simply broadcast seeding over a wide area... whether it should be planting by hand of two or three or four year old plants where they should be very small and very young plants in tubes...there are many methods and many approaches.

MR. WELLS: What was done out there at that intersection?

MR. CALLAHAN: That was done by plowing and by planting of very young shoots to my recollection. This is one of many projects, and incidentally this vote Mr. Chairman, provides for that very sort of thing to be continued at Mount Pearl, and I am not sure where else. In any event that vote is part of an on-going experimental program. That is all it is. There has never been a commercial size operation. But then on the other hand Mr. Chairman, it has not been really necessary for this reason, that if all we were worried about doing is replacing the trees that are cut down, our regeneration rate in our forests is as high as we could possibly expect it to be even if we did it artificially. The difficulty arises with the density of the trees., which means perhaps you do not get a good growth factor, the difficulty of thinning and the expense of it, and problems of that nature. And we talk about forest fires. The best wood we have in this Island is the spruce, which is grown in burned over areas, because the burn takes off the overburden, allows the seeds to drop, and the spruce can get down and regenerate, and our best spruce areas are areas that have been burned. Not burnt too many times, as the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. CROSBIE: Brigus Barrens.

MR. CALLAHAN: I have just mentioned the Avalon Peninsula. It has been burned

over and over again, but where there has been burn and there has been control burning conducted in this Province for this purpose. That is where you get your best fruits. So this is not by any means a black and white situation Mr. Chairman. And I would caution any member of the Committee from taking too definite a position on it until there is much more information available. The one thing that I agree with that the hon. gentleman from Burin, perhaps two things. One is that I think there has to be more control over, certainly, small operations, because the small operations are difficult to control. They are hard to find sometimes. And also in some cases over large operations, in respect of disposal of slash and that kind of thing. But I think the big operations are going to get away from that now because of the new integrated operation in tree length cutting. The other thing of course is the condition along the Trans Canada Highway particularly. This is a very expensive proposition, something I think everyone would like to see cleaned up...would like to see the trees thinned as they are in the National Park...would like to see the grass growing along the sides, but the National Park budget I think is something in the order of \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year, and quite a lot of it is spent on this particular kind of work. And that will give some indication of what it would cost along the rest of the Province or the rest of the Trans-Canada to carry out the same kind of program there. It is a very expensive matter and while it would certainly improve the view, I do not know if the time will ever come when we will ever be able to afford it. But just in closing I would say that the situation with regard to forest management (and we hope that very soon the Royal Commission will be able to present its report) we think that the whole area of forest management is one where a lot more information and research is required and it also will have to be done on a broader base in conjunction with the approach to the management of the total resource inventory.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject, I think it is quite obvious that there is an alarming situation in the forestry branch of the minister's department. The minister confirms this afternoon that

the chief forester Mr. John Monroe has resigned. He confirms that the project director of the Forest Inventory Land Capability Study has resigned, Mr. Joe Lowe. Both of these top officials are resigning now. There must be some reason, and I believe that the reason is obvious that they are not satisfied with the treatment that has been given the Forestry branch of the Department at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER: And what is that supposed to mean?

MR. CROSBIE: That is supposed to mean just what I said. That their resignation indicates their concern about the way the Forestry branch of the department is now being administered by the hon. minister. The situation is serious also for other reasons. I understand there is one regional forester in this Province. The minister has mentioned four or five regions, but at least up to three or four weeks ago -- yes four regions, but only one regional forester, that three of those regions had no regional forester in the region. So there are four regions but one regional forester.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have had acting foresters.

MR. CROSBIE: That means that there are three still required. It is not much point in having regions without a regional forester. I further understand Mr. Chairman, that there are actually five or six (this was up to three or four weeks ago) five or six graduate foresters in the minister's department, that is graduates of University courses in forestry. Whereas New Brunswick has fifty-one I believe it is.. In the Province of New Brunswick they have fifty-one graduate foresters..

MR. CALLAHAN: They also have a school of Forestry.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care what the reason. I know they have a school of Forestry.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well come on now, be reasonable.

MR. CROSBIE: But that is not the reason they have fifty-one graduate foresters. The reason is that they provide fifty-one positions and they pay for fifty-one graduate foresters. They could have ten Universities there. We could have ten forestry schools here in Newfoundland, but the minister still would only have five or six graduate foresters, if he only had positions for five or six,

and did not pay high enough salaries, and did not listen to them when he had them. So the fact that New Brunswick has one - has a school of Forestry, is no reason why New Brunswick has fifty-one graduate foresters. It shows that New Brunswick is concerned about its forests, and has an active program of forestry management, and looking after the forest resource, whereas Newfoundland does not. New Brunswick, fifty-one graduate foresters - Newfoundland five or six.

MR. COLLINS: The minister cannot see the woods for the trees.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister cannot even see the trees. The trees are all gone anyway. They are given to this one or that one. Let us not have any bunkum that New Brunswick has fifty-one graduate foresters in government service, because they have a University there. What next! Nonsense! Five or six. Ten percent. We have ten percent of the number of foresters, getting warmed up for welfare.

Here we have in this Island where the forests are one of our main resources Mr. Chairman, and this Government has one regional forester, five or six graduate foresters. Its chief forester resigned, and the chief of this Forest Inventory Land Capability Study resigns. And the minister acts as though there was no crisis of confidence or crisis of any kind in his department. There obviously is a crisis in that division of his department. And the minister can paper it over any way he likes.

MR. CALLAHAN: I am not papering it over. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. He has a pipeline from the dissidents.

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, there are dissidents are there? The minister says now there are dissidents in his department.

MR. CALLAHAN: Sure there are. Obviously there are.

MR. CROSBIE: Well that is an admission.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is what the hon. gentleman is telling us.

MR. CROSBIE: Apparently there is dissension and dissidents in the minister's department.

MR. CALLAHAN: I admit that quite freely, that there are one or two people

who do not like the approach that is being taken, and I can tell the hon. gentleman about that, as I said, in a few days. I am not going to do it today.

MR. CROSBIE: But here are the minister's Estimates. Is not this the time to tell us all about the dissension and dissidents and new approach? One would think that this was the time to do it.

MR. CALLAHAN: But it is not ready yet.

MR. CROSBIE: The House will be closed before the Hon. minister is ready.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a promise? Is that a promise?

MR. CROSBIE: Well the hon. gentlemen opposite are the ones keeping this going. Did you listen to the hon. Minister of Education speak for fifteen or twenty minutes on things that had no relation to Forestry on what should be in the text books and so on. Just listen. I challenge the hon. minister, get a stop watch and we will record the time spent talking on every member of the House. And we will total it up each day, and see who is doing the talking. The House is being delayed by the obfuscation of the minister and his colleagues. The House is not being delayed anyway Mr. Chairman. If we spent Mr. Chairman, six months on these Estimates it would only be approaching what they do in Canada at Ottawa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think any hon. member objects to time being spent on the Estimates.

MR. CROSBIE: I thank the hon. Chairman for that. Now there is nothing that could be more important than the Forest Inventory Land Capability Study. It is paid ninety percent by Ottawa. It is comprised of aircraft photography and ground checks and mapping of Newfoundland and Labrador. And the minister said a few weeks ago, that they have finished the ground work in Newfoundland, and they are now doing it in Labrador. There are fifty-five or sixty people employed on it. It is a \$5 million project for an eight year period -- has a few more years to run. Why has the project director of the whole program resigned in the middle of carrying it out? The Minister has not given us the reason for his resignation.

MR. CALLAHAN: He did not give the Minister any reason for his resignation. As a matter of fact he did not resign to the minister, he resigned to the acting chief forester.

MR. CROSBIE: Well whoever he resigned to, he has resigned, and so has the chief forester. Dr. Stuart Peters resigned several years ago. He was a man very knowledgeable in the forests of Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. Dr. Peters was never chief forester.

MR. CROSBIE: No, but he was deputy minister, and a very knowledgeable man in the forests and Resources generally.

MR. CALLAHAN: He did not resign from Resources.

MR. CROSBIE: And then he went to another department and then he resigned. He was chairman of the traitors. And I heard that expression one time. There was Mr. Ed. Ralph. Would the minister tell us if Mr. Ed Ralph is coming back? He left temporarily to further his University education. And I think the story was then that Mr. Ed Ralph was coming back to go with the Government. What is the position on Mr. Ed Ralph? He was certainly chief forester, and now Mr. John Monroe has resigned, and the minister has said he has resigned to go studying somewhere. A queer time to resign to go studying when the University year is just about over. However. There is a crisis in the Forestry branch of the minister's department and this is the time for the minister to tell us about it, and what his plans are and how he is hoping to paper over the cracks. Has he got the three regional foresters that we lack, one out of four? Is he going to get another fifteen or twenty graduate foresters? We notice in his Estimates that there is provision for quite a few new positions this year. Forestry is going up from seventy-three people in Forestry to 119. That is forty-six more people.

MR. CALLAHAN: That shows a little bit of concern

MR. CROSBIE: That shows the minister is just jumping around blindly smacking in people that he does not even know if they are graduate foresters. How many of the new people are going to be graduate foresters? How many graduate foresters

does the minister have employed now. How many does he have on the book to come here? He has not told us any of that, and I would be certainly interested to hear it. And why did the minister wait so long to answer questions asked weeks ago as to whether Mr. Monroe and Mr. Lowe had resigned?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I have just been talking with the deputy minister and have gotten some information that I did not have previously. I did not realize he had. Namely the approval of certain positions by the Treasury Board. So the delay which I had anticipated for three or four more days is not necessary, and I now tell the hon. gentleman that we have three new regional foresters, who are Mr. Richard Carrol at Gander, Mr. Sterling Hoddinott in Labrador, and Mr. Harry Goodland in Corner Brook.

Now Mr. Chairman, none of these people is a professional in the sense of a graduate forester, but I will tell the Committee this, that Mr. Goodland to my knowledge has had I think, twenty-three years experience in the forest service. He knows his region. He knows the people in his region, and I fully anticipate that Mr. Goodland will run that region as it should be run from any and every point of view. Mr. Carroll has been acting regional forester in Gander since last summer when Mr. Martin Broeren was brought to St. John's to take over other duties. Mr. Broeren incidentally subsequently resigned as well, I think to go back to University..well anyway he went to British Columbia, I am not sure if he went to University or not. But the point is Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Carroll came to St. John's to replace Mr. Broeren as director of Forest Operations I think at the time. So Mr. Carroll who also is a long-time employee, but I think again, not a graduate forester as yet. I think he has four years of University and with another year, will have a degree. He has a lot of experience and is a very fine man. Mr. Carroll is appointed regional forester for central Newfoundland. And Mr. Sterling Hoddinott who has come from the ranks from I think an assistant ranger five or six years ago, to one of the most competent foresters we have in this Province today, will be the regional forester for Labrador. So that will take care of the three forestry positions, and this indicates Mr. Chairman, the Committee should

know, a change of policy in this respect. And I stress this because of the hon. gentleman's comments and his great stress on graduate foresters. I have every respect Mr. Chairman, for graduate foresters, and every respect for University degrees and everything that they imply. But we have been getting young men coming into this Province from anywhere and everywhere. People who have never seen the Province before and I do not hold that against them, except that I should say this: To put a new, young graduate in charge of a region, put them in over men such as Mr. Goodland or Mr. Carroll or Mr. Hoddinott, who have been there running that region for a number of years, has been in some respects demoralizing to say the least. And we have found very often that these young men want to get some experience in the field, write a thesis and go back to University and get a Masters. So the result has been continuous upset and upheaval. So what we have decided Mr. Chairman, is a matter of policy, is to establish the senior men now in the regions, not barring the way to graduate foresters at any time if the post becomes vacant and graduate foresters with experience are available, and to centralize and consolidate our professional expertise in the headquarters. And then if the regional foresters^{who} have the background and have the knowledge and have the long-term experience in the region need at any time professional graduate assistants, it simply will be a matter of them picking up the phone, calling the chief forester and saying, "will you please send out a professional or graduate, we need some specific advice." I also want to announce these appointments Mr. Chairman, to be the Director of the Forest Inventory Land Capability Project, Mr. Beanlands, who has been with the project now I think, about four years, in a very senior position, and he replaces Mr. Lowe. I also announce the appointment as assistant-director, which is a post that did not exist previously, Mr. H. Piirvie. Mr. Piirvie is an expert, a technocrat I suppose, is an expert in computer programming in storage and retrieval of resource management data. And he was made available to us by secondment at my request to the

Federal Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, to be assistant director of the project because from now on Mr. Chairman, one of the major jobs to be done will be the programming of the information in the eight year, \$6 million Capability Project, the programming of that information for storage and retrieval. So he will be the man directly responsible for the computer side of the program. I also announce the appointment of Mr. J. A. Doyle, as director of Forest Operations, and the appointment of Mr. David T. Sharpe, as management forester, and this is the first time there will have been such a post in the service, as management forester responsible for forestation projects and for recommending forestation policy. And I further announce Sir, the re-appointment I suppose, of Mr. J. A. Brennan as director of Forest Management. Mr. Brennan has just returned from the University of New Brunswick, where he has been improving himself, improving his qualification for the past year.

MR. CROSBIE: Well Mr. Chairman, it took quite a bit of urging to get the minister to make all these announcements that he had just made.

MR. CALLAHAN: No urging at all. The crisis is over now is it?

MR. CROSBIE: We are grateful. We are grateful to the minister for giving us these...no, no the crisis is not over now at all. What the minister is saying is confirm the crisis that existed, and still exist. That is all that the minister's announcement has done.

MR. CALLAHAN: No crisis at all, except in the hon. member's brain.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister, who is so anxious to speak now when somebody else is on their feet, does not want to speak too much when he is given a chance to answer questions, but he wants to speak when someone else is on their feet, has not said who the new chief forester will be. Or when Mr. Monroe's resignation becomes effective and what date, nor what the position is of Mr. Ed Ralph, who left two years ago to go do further study, and was coming back to his department. He has not mentioned any of that. Now as to the qualification of the gentleman whose appointments he has announced, I have no idea what they are. One assumes that they are men who are capable of doing their jobs. And I certainly know nothing to the contrary. But when the minister

says how he has made a policy decision, that Newfoundland just about does not need graduate foresters, that we can rely on men with good common sense like the Minister of Welfare, or a gentleman like the Minister of Welfare. Good common sense, remember the Minister of Welfare said he was one of that type. When the minister said that, that we do not need graduate foresters, well you have to wonder what is the Province of New Brunswick doing? Why do they have fifty-one graduate foresters in their Forestry Department? Do they have this constant upset and upheaval? The minister said there was a constant upset and upheaval with these graduate foresters. I have no intention of carrying on Mr. Chairman, while there is rudeness of this type in the Chamber. There is the Premier with his back turned to me speaking to the minister who I am trying to address along with other members of the House. Unpardonable rudeness! And ignorance!

MR. CROSBIE: It is not carried Mr. Chairman, I am waiting for the Premier to cease his conversation with the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): The hon. member for St. John's West is speaking to the House through the Chair and has no right to stand on his feet unless he is

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, could I have a ruling on the situation where right in front of me there is the minister whose estimates we are discussing and the Premier are having a conversation. Is there any ruling on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know of no ruling that prevents members of the House from speaking

MR. CROSBIE: There is a rule in Beausheue that loud conversations are very disturbing

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can understand the hon. members position, the fact of the matter is that the hon. member is addressing the House through the Chair and is not speaking directly to the minister.

MR. CROSBIE: Very good Mr. Chairman, I will carry on if that is the position. We are used to it in this House. We have seen example after example.

SOME HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please

MR. CROSBIE: I am going to carry on Mr. Chairman, I am carrying on, but I am looking across at several apes, several monkeys, see no evil, hear no evil and do no evil

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please. If the hon. member is not prepared to carry on with the item I will have to ask him to resume his seat

MR. CROSBIE: New Brunswick, the Province of New Brunswick has fifty-one graduate foresters. Newfoundland has five or six. and the minister made a new policy, he says, the minister, "we do not want graduate foresters we want just the men of practical experience." Why not? "Because of the constant upset and upheaval here in Newfoundland with graduate foresters leaving to go back to the university." Now what utter tripe, there is no constant upset and upheaval in New Brunswick with them all streaming back to

university. The upset and upheaval here is that they are all leaving the minister's department because they cannot stand the way they are being treated, or its being administered. That is the upset and upheaval. That is why they are heading back, are flooding back, streaming back to take studies here, there and everywhere. Not the reason the minister gives.

The minister will not even enlighten us to what has happened to people like Mr. Ed. Ralph who went off for study purposes. Is he coming back with the minister? Or is he one of those who does not want to come back with the minister, he is going to keep going until his has a doctorate on his doctorate? What is the position with Mr. Ed. Ralph?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is pretty funny

MR. CROSBIE: There is a serious crisis Mr. Chairman in the Minister's department as he has confirmed today. Newfoundland has one-fifth, no, one-tenth the number of graduate foresters New Brunswick does. The minister wants to make a virtue of necessity, the minister cannot attract graduate foresters to his department. He must make a virtue of necessity and say that we have a policy now to use men only with experience who come up through the ranks.

MR. CALLAHAN: Who said that?

MR. CROSBIE: That is what the minister said and what the minister implied.

MR. CALLAHAN: Oh come off it, come off it, come off it.

MR. CROSBIE: And he said we would have a few graduates in the central headquarters so that they can phone up for expert advice. That in effect is what the minister said.

MR. CALLAHAN: Nobody said that, nobody said that

MR. CROSBIE: There is no need for the minister to deny it, we all heard it here a few minutes ago.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman did not hear what everybody else heard

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman did not hear what I was saying a few minutes ago, the hon. gentleman was so rude that he was talking to someone else when I was speaking here. So, do not interrupt my argument.

MR. CALLAHAN: Big sook, yeah that figures

MR. CROSBIE: Has the hon. Minister anything else to say, any other brilliant observations, like follow the leader, big sook. That was an original one. I thought that was originated a few weeks ago but has been dropped since. Perhaps the hon. minister has forgotten it. What about something about a haircut? What about haircut?

MR. CALLAHAN: Just put in cold storage, just put in cold storage.

MR. CROSBIE: Honest John is all right. Right? Anything else over there now? Any other catcalls, any more names anyone wants to call out. What about the great leader, is he not going to try anything?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Did a doctor examine the hon. gentleman lately?

MR. CROSBIE: Is not the great leader going to shout out some epitaph, some great insult. The minister has made a mess of his department, the minister's political obituary we are going to be reading after the next election and the Premier's will be the biggest one. The most florrid one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first one will be St. John's East, that will be the first one.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman has a good candidate there that he did not want to have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, let us finish the item

MR. CROSBIE: I am prepared to carry on with my remarks, and I am concluding my remarks Mr. Chairman if I am given the chance, I am concluding my remarks by saying that the minister is slowly but surely destroying the forestry branch of his department and we have seen that here this afternoon.

MR. CALLAHAN: Building it up, building it up

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 21 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: What is this for Mr. Chairman?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is a grant to the Maritime Lumber Bureau Mr. Chairman,

MR. CROSBIE: I can read that

MR. CALLAHAN: Does the hon. gentleman want the answer?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: He wants the answer

MR. CROSBIE: Right

MR. CALLAHAN: The Maritime Lumber Bureau Mr. Chairman, some years ago were requested by the Government to establish, and they did establish an office in Gander for the purpose of enabling the grading of lumber produced in this Province which now contains their stamp. Anyone who had bought any lumber will see a stamp on it, M.L.B., Maritime Lumber Bureau and this certifies the material to be first class and more importantly, enables it to be accepted by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the construction of home and buildings under the National Housing Act.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before you carry 23, I would like for the minister to tell the committee where he proposes to do this work on forest access roads, and also, he might tell the committee what his plans are in terms of repairing the forest access roads which were built in the first place by the paper companies which are found in the moose management areas and whether it is his intention to make the necessary repairs especially in the Terra Nova and Gander Lake area to permit the hunters to get into those areas this year.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, this estimate simply provides for maintenance and snow clearing. This is not for construction of roads, it is for maintenance and snow clearing of existing access roads which are used in connection with small logging operations and have been built by the department over the past ten or fifteen years. Somebody mentioned earlier and I briefly referred to the problem of abandoned woods access roads. This is a very serious problem. We try as best we can to chase around the country after the companies who build these roads, of course once they are built they become public and then the companies stop their operations and being public roads they then fall on one or another department of Government. It is a very expensive proposition to keep them up.

We have had some negotiations with the companies because we think they have some or should have some interests and have perhaps some responsibility in maybe a joint program of that nature, but we have come to

no conclusions. This is simply for snow clearing and for small maintenance jobs on small operations.

MR. CROSBIE: Why is there no vote this year forest insect control?

MR. CALLAHAN: Because we do not expect to control the insects.

MR. CROSBIE: Not even a token vote

MR. CALLAHAN: We do not expect to have a program

MR. CROSBIE: You do not expect any insect trouble this year.

MR. CALLAHAN: No serious ones

MR. CROSBIE: Is it not the practice to have a token vote in case you do have some trouble?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is what it is, a token vote \$100.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but for the next item there is no vote at all

MR. CALLAHAN: I am sorry, I was looking at the wrong one

MR. CROSBIE: Forest insect control

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. gentleman brought that to my attention

MR. CROSBIE: I am always glad to help

MR. CALLAHAN: Perhaps one of my colleagues would move that a token vote be provided and perhaps if it is order we could lessen 23, forest access road by \$100. to provide the token.

SOME HON. MEMBER: I move

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you, thank you

MR. CHAIRMAN (Noel): It is moved that 23 be reduced to read \$24,400. and 26 be increased to read \$100. Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay," carried. Shall 26 as amended carry?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry 26, will the minister indicate to the committee whether the whole affected area is now being covered by the spray program? Also could he tell us what steps are being taken to harvest the wood in the affected areas. Perhaps he might also indicate the estimated number of cords of wood affected. Whether it is possible for the paper companies to harvest that wood before it spoils and in the event that it is harvested can the companies use this wood in the time in which they would have

to use it before the wood becomes spoiled. Perhaps he might also indicate to the committee whether he has made any recompense to a farmer in central Newfoundland who lost all his bees last year because of this spraying program.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that was a long question. I do not know if I can make all the points but very briefly let me say that there was no significant loss of any kind last year due to hemlock looper infestation. This is what the spray program was all about. At the peak of the development of the insect, clean the insect out. Effectiveness is as high as 98 per cent theyby saving all the stands that were infested that were sprayed. There were some small pockets not sprayed because it would not have been economical to harvest them anymore than it would have been to spray because, as I say they were small patches well removed from the major spray areas.

We were not too concerned about those because the thing while at the peak last year would have done its greatest damage last year if not checked now declines because, last year was the peak. The amount of damage that could be done to the small patch areas would be very small in relation to the areas, their accessibility and therefore their economic importance and of course the very high cost that would have been involved in spraying them. So, the losses last year realisitically were just about nil.

In respect of other areas damaged in earlier years Price (Nfld) Ltd. have programmed their operations in such a way as to recover all looper infested wood. Bowaters have programmed theirs to the extent that virtually all will be recovered. There are some small areas beyond Hughes Brook and Bay of Islands and I think beyond Barachois Brook out at St. Georges which they just will not be able to reach because the cost of building roads and whatever to get to these very small patch areas would be far in excess of the value of the wood they could take out. I would say the recovery on the earlier infested areas would be very high, perhaps 93 to 95 percent.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the minister did not answer the question about the bees which were lost in central Newfoundland last year because of the spraying. A friend of mine, a farmer, I am sure the Deputy Minister is aware of this turned his three or four thousand bees loose this day, buzzed them off, or told them to buzz off, he told them to return about three or four in the afternoon. In the meantime the minister's workers who were spraying the forest decided that it was a good day to spray and they sent the aircraft aloft and caught the bees with their pants down as it were. When three o'clock came and four o'clock came and the farmer decided to call the bees back again, none came. He lost three thousand, four thousand whatever it was. Has the minister made any recompense to this particular farmer to replace those bees?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am aware of the problem Mr. Chairman, indeed the gentleman has been in from Gander to see us and I am hesitant to make any further statement because I do not know what the legal position might be or what liability

SOME HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CALLAHAN: Well that is our inclination but we do not

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the first I heard of it

MR. CALLAHAN: Our information is that Mr. Chairman, we do not know what

MR. COLLINS: A terrible situation he lost a lot of money

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is no joke is it?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it is no joke

MR. COLLINS: He lost a lot of honey, it is no joke

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will pay for the bees and the honey both

MR. CALLAHAN: It could be quite a heavy loss. The story Mr. Chairman

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we destroyed his bees let us pay for them

MR. CALLAHAN: Apparently he saw the plane, saw the spray falling and then realized that he might have problems. We are aware of it, we are dealing with it and we asked him to make a claim.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, on 07-02, there is a substantial increase this year. I wonder if the minister could give us some indication of what this

increase of \$250,000. over the revised figure for last year (I do not know what the actual was for last year, but the revised as shown is \$100,000.) could he tell us what this \$350,000. is for, or where these access roads are likely to be built.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes Mr. Chairman, the \$350,000. includes \$250,000. recovery in respect of access roads built both in the Stephenville Area, in the Barachois area I think, Certainly the Stephenville Area and the Hawkes Bay area.

MR. WELLS: What does he mean by recovery?

MR. CALLAHAN: Recovery, St. Barbe north area recovery in respect of roads built to facilitate the Newfoundland Forest Products new operations. The roads were built as part of this operation by the companies. We have audited statements of cost, we have checked the roads built on the ground and we are dealing now with claims against the maximum amount provided.

MR. WELLS: In fact this is to repay for roads that are....

MR. CALLAHAN: \$250,000. is to pay for roads that were built under the agreement in the year passed on a recovery basis.

MR. WELLS: I see

MR. CALLAHAN: On a recovery basis

MR. WELLS: On a recovery basis

MR. CALLAHAN: We cannot pay for roads until they are built obviously.

MR. WELLS: I noticed there is under the next item of capital, forest access roads which is normally Canada's contribution to building forest access road, that there is nothing there, nothing in the item this year. Has the Government of Canada abandoned this program altogether, or is that just this year's situation?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the new program

MR. CALLAHAN: Has not been finalized yet, actually I think there should have been a token in there too and perhaps one of my friends on this side will move it. The hon. Minister of Public Works. But we are dealing under the DREE program on various aspects as my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Development has already said of resources development. We hope that one part of that program will in fact be access roads. Roads to resources, a new program.

MR. WELLS: Has the Government been in any way involved with construction of roads in the Labrador area where Mr. Doyle is harvesting the timber for export? They have not. Has the Government supervised his harvesting in that area? Is it true as has been suggested, that in fact what is going on is high grading of the area for direct shipment out, that none of the wood is being used locally in any form of process? Where is it being harvested from, different segments of the limit, some at the greatest distance away and some closest, or is it all being harvested in the closest area?

MR. CALLAHAN: I think the situation is very simply Mr. Chairman is they have had to get access to cut their way in through the -

MR. WELLS: In other words they are high grading

MR. CALLAHAN: No they are not high grading

MR. WELLS: Of course they are high grading

MR. CALLAHAN: They are clear cutting

MR. WELLS: They are cutting the closest wood, all the closest wood

MR. CALLAHAN: Well how do you get to forest stands unless you get access in through it?

MR. WELLS: You cut a road

MR. CALLAHAN: And they have cut very little along that way and they are getting now to their.....

MR. WELLS: They have cut several thousand cords

MR. CALLAHAN: They are getting now Mr. Chairman to their main, into the midst of their main area of supply.

MR. WELLS: How many cords have been shipped so far?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know Mr. Chairman

MR. WELLS: Several hundred thousand?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know Mr. Chairman, I could not get that information I would not say, but I can get that information and in the meantime the thing has been kept under close surveillance by our people because mechanized logging in Labrador is a new thing. It will be the basis of much more concern because we want to be sure that mechanized logging in Labrador is done as it should be done. Again there is no experience. Now this project at this point in time is providing experience not only to the operators, but also to the federal service who are concerned with it, interested in it, and to our own people. I think we have to get some experience there and learn what the difficulties and what the problems and what the implications are or else we will not be able to deal with any large scale logging in Labrador sensibly.

MR. WELLS: But they have all been cutting close to the shipping point this year.

MR. CALLAHAN: They have been cutting towards their main stand

MR. WELLS: Yes

SOME HON. MEMBER: They have one thousand jobs there I believe

MR. CALLAHAN: I understand there are over 200 people working right now, and I would not sneeze at 200 jobs.

MR. CROSBIE: In connection with 07-02 Mr. Chairman, forest access roads. Is this

MR. CALLAHAN: That is carried

MR. CROSBIE: I believe the chairman, will do me the courtesy of allowing me to speak on this

MR. CALLAHAN: It is carried

MR. CROSBIE: I was getting on my feet as he said it was carried. Is this a relatively new policy, the forest access roads?

MR. CALLAHAN: No

MR. CROSBIE: Has the Government been building these say for ten years? 5812

MR. CALLAHAN: Well fourteen years at least

MR. CROSBIE: Is the Government building one now in the Roddickton area?
A forest access road?

MR. CALLAHAN: We may be, we are building. Last year we built them in thirty different places all over the Province.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I know that in the Roddickton area there may have been one built last year, for there there have been requests for one to be built before that, and it was Government policy then not to build forest access roads.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not so. Who was the request from?

MR. CROSBIE: From Canada Bay Lumber presumably

MR. CALLAHAN: No Mr. Chairman, Canada Bay Lumber Company came looking for assistance on a project and indeed, we worked, for a good many months to try to put the project together, together. As it turned out the company was not interested in financing, or in our financing access roads, they were interested in operating capital. I believe the amount of money involved at the time was \$100,000. I am not sure whether it was \$40,000. for access roads or \$60,000. It was \$40,000 for equipment or \$60,000. for equipment?

In any event, what they wanted us to do was not put the money in the roads, but put the money in equipment with which they would build the road and then use the equipment afterwards, And we just were not in the position, nor would policy permit considering (you know, what we do with access road money) to actually fund the operation on a working capital basis. What we do is put the money directly into the road and this enables as I have said; enabled last year thirty operations involving nearly three thousand men, and this is what we prefer to do.

MR. WELLS: A wise investment

MR. CROSBIE: I certainly agree with this policy.

MR. CALLAHAN: But not to put into working capital

MR. CROSBIE: I am talking about forest access roads now. It may be necessary come sometime to have a policy to assist saw-mill operations with capital loans.

MR. CALLAHAN: Or any operation

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, if the operation is one that meets the standard and is worth doing.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, well this is what.....

MR. CROSBIE: I agree with the policy, but now, in connection with Roddickton there is of course wood being cut in Roddickton now by George Humby. What is the Government.....

MR. CALLAHAN: The Government is assisting that on access roads

MR. CROSBIE: The Government's connection with Mr. Humby is just that you are constructing access roads in the Roddickton area. You have not given him any loans or guaranteed any loans for him?

MR. CALLAHAN: Not to my knowledge

MR. CROSBIE: Well the minister would have to know as a member of the Cabinet or as minister of the department.

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not recall any guarantees. I know that there is access roads assistance, Now I am not sure of the details I will have to get them. Generally this is the best assistance we can give because, all the money goes into enabling the project.

MR. CROSBIE: You would give financial assistance for the operator to build the road, or does the minister's department build the road?

MR. CALLAHAN: Very often that is the most practical way to do it, because the operator may have equipment. If he already has equipment, it may be very practical for him to actually build the road. At least he can do it economically.

MR. CROSBIE: So then the minister would, the minister's department would give a grant

MR. CALLAHAN: No we do not give a grant. What we do is, we go out and we look at the terrain, and we decide with the operator what the cost of the road is going to be to get to a certain stand or quantity of timber. He agrees with us if he builds that road according to the agreement we reimburse him for it.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, so you reimburse him for it. Now you did just about thirty areas last year, how many areas would you have had requests from, and how

does the Minister decide among the various applicants? The minister may have requests perhaps from eighty areas - how does he decide on the thirty?

MR CALLAHAN: I think we dealt with virtually every significant one last year. There might have been a few small ones, you know, did not measure up in terms of what they would have produced, the pay-off in jobs and what ever. We take them on that basis; how many jobs, the size of the requests, how many people will go to work there, how much wood will be produced.

MR CROSBIE: The persons who make the requests, is that considered?

MR CALLAHAN: I would not say.

MR CROSBIE: Or the company?

MR CALLAHAN: No.

MR CROSBIE: Or the political leanings?

MR CALLAHAN: No.

MR CROSBIE: I am glad to hear it.

MR CALLAHAN: There is one job, I will not mention the name but there is one gentleman in Central Newfoundland that, you know, could not be in any way, shape or form considered any friend of the Administration, who was assisted last year.

MR CROSBIE: I am glad to hear that is the policy.

Now in connection with forest access roads, what is the position vis-à-vis the proposed third mill development at Come-By-Chance? Has the Government, have the Minister's Department agreed to construct roads for the Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company so that all their wood they would have to log would be within one mile of the road built by the Government?

MR CALLAHAN: No.

MR CROSBIE: The minister does not know of any such agreement as that? If there is one anyway, he has no knowledge of it?

MR CALLAHAN: That is right. I am quite sure there is not one.

MR CROSBIE: Good. And none of this money, in any event, is for that purpose.

On motion Item 08-01, as amended to read \$100, carried:

5815

MR CALLAHAN: Appropriations-in Aid from Ottawa, under DREE:

This is why this vote is provided. But somebody neglected to put in the total - we do not know yet what the amount will be. Can we get it, Mr. Chairman, from 09-04 perhaps? No, that is not appropriate is it?

MR CROSBIE: You do not need Appropriation-in Aid to show anyway, sure.

There is only the token.

MR CALLAHAN: Do we need a token?

MR WELLS: Put in the token. What difference does it make?

MR CROSBIE: Yes but it is likely to have to be reduced. Yes, you do not have to vote an appropriation-in-aid.

But in the DREE Programme that the Minister of Community and Social Development outlined to the House there recently, there are amounts in that for forest access roads. Now where are they going to show in our estimates? Under the Department of Community and Social Development? We will get a break down there? I have twenty-six names.

MR CALLAHAN: There is a lump sum in the estimates, but that is where it should be.

MR CROSBIE: You have not checked your hon. colleague's estimates?

MR CHAIRMAN: There is no amendment to 08-01. It is not required.

Shall 09-03 carry?

MR EARLE: Mr. Chairman, what does this cover? Repairs and Maintenance - what exactly is repaired? It is transferred from other departments. I know this but why is the amount only one-third this year of last year's?

MR CROSBIE: But it is one-quarter of 1969. There was \$20,624 spent on this in 1969. So this year it is just one-quarter.

MR CALLAHAN: I guess we are going to have to stretch along, Mr. Chairman.

MR CROSBIE: Another unrealistic item.

On motion Items 09-03, 09-04 , 813-01 carried .

MR EARLE: Mr. Chairman, Waste Material Dumping Sites, I never have been quite clear as to who controls these things. It seems to me that the experience I have had in trying to get some arrangements made in different

settlements. I have been shoved around from the hon. minister's department to the Department of Health and to the Department of Community and Social Development and Municipal Affairs. It goes all over the place. So far I have never been successful in getting a dumping site set up. There is always a health inspector going to have a look at it, in the first place, and he turns up with a report on that. Then somebody else says it is not his responsibility, and so it goes on. But would the Minister mind informing us just how this thing works, how these dumping sites are set up. Does a town or village have to be incorporated in order to get assistance of this kind, or is it available to all or any settlements? What are the regulations, what are the requirements, just how does it work?

MR CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the legislation involving the waste materials Act, as hon. members will know, today I gave notice of a Bill to consolidate and make some changes in the Act.

As the thing stands, generally speaking, this applies to unincorporated areas, where a committee is enabled, by the legislation, to be set up, being, you know, the Waste Materials Committee or whatever it happens to be. The committee then, having been set up, and having been authorized so to do, obtains an approved area, approved by the Department of Health, approved by the Forest Service and anybody else concerned. They are in charge of it, and the regulations are posted and a sign goes up, which says, you know - "Dumping only at certain hours, no dumping anywhere, and dumping only under regulations..." This is the way it is supposed to work. And out of this fund we help the committee; give them a few dollars for maybe fencing the dump areas or something like that.

MR EARLE: Inaudible.

MR CALLAHAN: I am not certain, Mr. Chairman, whether it is in the legislation or the regulations. But I would again say that the legislation is about to be changed, and it might not really be very material to carry it much further at this point. When we get the legislation in, I think perhaps we will be much better informed.

MR EARLE: Does the hon. minister's department control the condition of the dumps and see things are carried out properly?

MR CALLAHAN: Well that is supposed to be the function of the committee, Mr. Chairman. But, unfortunately, the committee has not in some places worked very well. So that one of the things the legislation will try to do is to overcome that problem by providing for the enfranchisement of perhaps truckers or people in particular areas to have the exclusive right to carry on a waste materials collection service, for a fee and what not. Somehow we have to control this. I think when the legislation comes in we will be in a better position to discuss it in detail.

On motion carried: 814-01, carried, 814-02-01, carried, 814-02-02 carried, 814-03-01, carried - 814-03-02 carried, 814-03-03 , 814-03-04 , 813-03-05 carried:

MR CROSBIE: Why is the vote here somewhat less this year, 813-04-09?

MR CALLAHAN: I will just check the notes I have here. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the difference is, except this, and I think the deputy minister may be here in a minute or so. Last year - this, by the way, is what is known as control surveys, in other words' some years ago the Government got out of doing land surveying as such and this is now done commercially by the Newfoundland Land Surveyors. The Government are now in the business of control surveys which set the points from which the land surveyors take off. This is the master control survey and I think my impression is and I would have to double check to be sure, that this amount is the balance of a grant from the Atlantic Development Board, the former Atlantic Development Board of which we spent a portion last year.

I am just looking at the notes and the notes indicate \$440,000. last year as to the revised estimates plus the \$150,000. would be roughly \$600,000. and I think that is quite close to, approximates the amount of the grant which was in fact \$600,000. My impression is that that is the balance of a grant that we had last year.

Now, under again the DREE

MR. WELLS: Why do we have a grant for surveys?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not the survey guidelines, it is control surveying of the Province. In other words, outside, as I said before in the House, you get away from the sea, from the seashore you do not know where you are in this Province, you are guessing. So the need is there to do what are known as control surveys and put down markers you know, from which the land surveyors can take off. This is something that could take fifty years and \$100 million to do. Nobody knows, but it is in that order of magnitude of expenditure.

The Atlantic Development Board realizing the need for control surveys and for accurate surveying in the Atlantic Provinces, the Atlantic region for development purposes of all kinds decided to provide grants to the Provinces for this kind of work. Our grant was \$600,000. and my suspicion is that this \$150,000. is the balance of the grant made one time to us by A.D.B. I might add to that that we hope that this program will be continued under the DREE program.

Does the item carry? Carried.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in reference to 03-10 there is an appropriation in (a) there to equal this amount of \$100,000. which is mentioned for acquisition of private land. Could the minister indicate to the committee what he is purchasing and for what purpose.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is a curious vote. Really, as the committee will notice it is an appropriation-in-aid for \$100,000. below and this is simply a mechanism to provide for an accounting arrangement under which the Government can obtain land from large private landowners such as Bowaters for example. Lands are needed for municipal or industrial or other uses and can be obtained without cost to the treasury and without embarrassment to company shareholders. This is the reciprocal checks arrangement that Bowaters use in Corner Brook for example, where they have land, they sell it to the city for \$100,000. the city gets the contribution from Bowaters for \$100,000. the city does not really pay, it gets the land

so Bowaters can show their tax people \$100,000. contribution. This is the same kind of arrangement. Purely.....

MR. COLLINS: I wish they would make the same arrangement- - -

MR. CALLAHAN: It is just a mechanism to provide for the acquisition of lands by the Government at no cost.

MR. COLLINS: Would the hon. minister take it upon himself to see if he can get a similar arrangement in Glenwood where Bowaters own a considerable amount of land, an obstruction to the development of the town, and the town cannot afford to buy it.

MR. CALLAHAN: If the town will make some approach to the Government perhaps we can, I do not know if we can or not, but if we can we will certainly try.

MR. EARLE: On this one Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Earle.

very, very substantial increase in the amount. It is practically doubled. There is quite an increase in staff. The number of staff to be seventy this year as against forty-eight last year, and I notice that they are all, more or less, in the higher brackets of pay. This is under Agriculture. Why? What is the reason for the tremendous increase and why are so many more highly paid officials being taken on.

MR. CALLAHAN: We are into agriculture now, are we?

MR. EARLE: Yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I must say, it does not indicate that there is a great increase but then..

MR. CROSBIE: Page 111, it says \$373,500. Page 39, only shows \$273,500 for last year. There is a big difference according to page 39.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, I am just looking at the note, Mr. Chairman, where it indicates that the estimate includes provision for temporary staff who have been continuously employed but paid from open vote. So, I would think that and that is fifteen persons and it goes on to say that fifteen other departmental employees such as blueberry fieldmen, mechanics, etc. So, it looks, as if there are some thirty people formerly paid from open vote who are now included in the general salary..

MR. EARLE: Temporaries are being made permanent.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right. Some people have been there for thirty years, temporary employees, open vote people.

MR. EARLE: If there have been there for thirty years, why have they not been made permanent?

MR. CALLAHAN: Because they were seasonal. They worked at odd jobs. It is possible for a man to have - this is an anachronism, I know. There are three or four of them who might work for three or four months for one division and three or four months for another - always going separately and getting another job from the supervisor on the spot. This is regularized now, and this, I think,

Mr. Callahan.

would show the total, except for this that there are some permanent posts eliminated there. There are two reasons: (1) under Treasury Board regulations, they have not been filled in excess for a year; and (2) we are doing some re-organizing in agriculture as well as in forestry.

MR. EARLE: A temporary employee - was he paid for so many months and then laid off and is this reversing the process so that he is now permanent on a yearly salary?

MR. CALLAHAN: As I say the note does not go into it to that extent, Mr. Chairman, but I would think that some of these people have become permanent employees - at least, some of them have become permanent employees, because the description of the job indicates that they are permanent, but others apparently are not, because their jobs are seasonal. I am thinking now of four farm labourers or two attendants - people who work during the farming season. They were previously paid from open vote, but now they are shown in the salary votes, whether they are permanent or not.

MR. EARLE: This was always a bit of a dodge, I think, when I was associated with this. When posts were cancelled out and Treasury Board felt that these posts could not be filled or they were eliminated, the usual maneuver of a department was that some of their temporary people came on as permanent and, therefore, they were replaced in this way. I am wondering, if this is just a bit of a cover-up in that respect?

MR. CALLAHAN: We have some long time officials in agriculture. They know the ropes better than that.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on the general heading of Agriculture - I realize that we have only ten minutes left, so I will not be very long. A couple of comments, I would like to make following the procedure that has been established - comment on the detailed items, generally at the beginning of a particular heading.

I will be only five minutes. There are just a couple of things I would

Mr. Hickman.

like to refer to. I do believe that there has been too great an emphasis in the Department of Agriculture on what I call "the hens and pigs policy."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hens and hogs.

MR. HICKMAN: Hens and hogs - the hens and hogs policy of the Government. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it has not been on an undiscriminatory basis by any stretch of the imagination. It may have provided some good to some people, but there are other branches of farming and other areas of farming that in my opinion have been neglected to the benefit of the hens and hogs policy.

Now before I get into that, there is one question I would like to have answered by the hon. minister. On December 2, 1969 at Salt Pond in the presence of the three members from the south coast, there was an announcement that the community pasture would be established in the Point May, Dantzic area come Spring. Now, we have seen no..

MR. CALLAHAN: I am not supposed to know where that is, remember.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize that, but I did tell the hon. minister - the hon. minister thought Dantzic Point was something to do with the corridor between East and West Germany. Since he has been straightened out, he knows that it is on the Burin Peninsula. May I suggest to this committee that there has been no activity to carry out this announced decision of December 2, 1969.

MR. CALLAHAN: You do not usually do it, when the snow is on the ground.

MR. HICKMAN: Can the hon. minister give the committee the assurance that the community pasture will go there this year?

MR. CALLAHAN: Carry on.

MR. HICKMAN: I am just waiting for a yes or a no.

MR. CALLAHAN: Carry on.

MR. HICKMAN: A yes or no, you can do that. But apart altogether from the hens and hogs policy, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that in this Province, we have certain areas such as Cormack, Winterland and the Codroy Valley, Goulds and Lethbridge in the Corner Brook area, where farmers are making and can make

Mr. Hickman.

a good living and can make a better living. One of the problems, I believe - two of the reasons - it is so easy to say that they are not doing this and something should be done without trying to take the time to figure out what can be done. One, I believe is that the farm loan board policy which was probably suitable to the times, demands and needs of ten or fifteen years ago is still operating on that same basis. It operates, as I understand it, on a revolving credit basis and X number of funds are provided to the farms loan board as a revolving credit, but that revolving credit, I suggest to the committee, is not sufficient at this time. Because the Mg needs now, if our farmers are going to be successful, is for large farms, and they run into several problems, and I would hope that the hon. minister would agree that just because it is coming from me, it is not that unreasonable. One of the problems is in the Codroy Valley.

MR. CALLAHAN: Why should the hon. minister think that?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, you do not seem to go along with safety measures in the mines of St. Lawrence, and you do not seem to go along with conservation. In the Codroy Valley, we find, Mr. Chairman, many abandoned farms - abandoned in the sense - they are still in the state of semi-cultivation. The owners leave the Province. They will not sell, and the farms just lie there dormant, adjoining viable farms or farms which could become more viable if this land could be acquired.

Now, I know it is a dangerous policy and sometimes it is open to abuse, as we have seen under the Undeveloped Minerals Act, the abuses that have taken place under that Act. But at the same time, I ..

AN HON. MEMBER: And what they propose to do.

MR. HICKMAN: And what is proposed to do, but I believe, if it is in a municipal county area, you can take care of the situation very easily by vacant land tax.

Mr. Hickman.

But we do not have a council.

MR. WELLS: We should.

MR. HICKMAN: May be we should, but the fact that you have to accept the position that as of today, we do not have the county system in the Codroy Valley. Consequently, you cannot impose a vacant land tax..

MR. CALLAHAN: Or anywhere else.

MR. HICKMAN: In many areas, absentee land lords are induced to sell abandoned farms. May be the time has come for Government to consider the desirability of having an undeveloped farms Act, whereby, if the Minister of Agriculture can be satisfied that a farmer who is now operating can have a more viable operation if he can acquire the adjoining abandoned farm - not that you simply take it from the farmer who has moved out of the Codroy Valley but you take it and you adequately compensate him for it, but you are not allowed to sit there forever and a day while the area becomes more and more uncultivated. I believe that if the demand - the proof that large farms in Newfoundland can be viable - one of the reasons why we have not got farms as large as they should be is because of the inability to acquire abandoned farms. This is worthy of some consideration.

Again, Mr. Chairman, something that is beginning to crop up in the areas adjoining urban developments is that farm land attracts land developers. Generally speaking, it is good land and it is land that you can run your water and sewer services through without too much difficulty and I suspect that the minister has been under pressure already to have zoning decisions and regulations changed to permit the development of farm land. We have not that much farm land in Newfoundland and certainly we have not that much that is cleared in a productive state at this time. There can be nothing more tragic, from an agricultural point of view, than to allow land developers to move into these areas, buy the farm - sure it may be attractive to the farmer to get a big sum

Mr. Hickman.

of money for his land and then turn that land over and develop it into a residential area. This sort of thing, I am sure, I know, is beginning to creep into the urban areas of this Province and the pressures are on to allow the development of farm lands for non-agricultural purposes. Again you might say that this is a great interference with the liberty of the subject. If you are going to have zoning regulations say in metropolitan St. John's, which extends for many miles beyond this city, and you have your green belts and you have your farm belts - they were put there for a reason. They were not put there to wait until the city grows out to reach that farm and then have someone sell it and have land developers make a great deal of money and then destroy this productive area. I would like to hear the minister sometime, during the discussion of these estimates, to indicate three things: one, whether we are going to have a community pasture as announced on December 2, 1969 in the Dantzic Point area; secondly,

MR. CALLAHAN: It was not announced.

MR. HICKMAN: Pardon.

MR. CALLAHAN: It was not announced.

MR. HICKMAN: December 2nd.

On motion that the committee rise, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6 p.m. I do leave the Chair until 8 p.m.

5827



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 92

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall O15-01 carry?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, the general heading of this is Agricultural Services, Salary vote for Agricultural Services. We simply --- the department's agricultural policy or the Government's agricultural policy has received some very severe criticism from some knowledgeable people, people who are directly concerned and interested in it. It might properly be called the "ham and eggs" policy, because that is primarily what we produce, and it seems to be the main direction of the Government's interest in agriculture, and it does not seem to go much beyond that. But some very serious charges and claims have been made that have not been answered by the Government, or there has been no comment upon. They have not been made in the House. They have been made outside the House by the former deputy minister. These charges are extremely serious. He was dismissed for improper reasons because he wanted to know too much about what was going on in the field of agriculture, and what certain monies were being spent for, and he detailed most of these, and they are pretty serious charges -- particularly with respect to verifying the existence of all the equipment listed in the inventory for which \$50,000 was paid to Newfoundland Farm Products. No, the firm to which the money was paid, Newfoundland Poultry Producers Association, is the firm to which the money was paid. Mr. Murray claimed and there has been no comment on it from the Government and one might have expected at least a denial. At least I have not seen or heard of any. These charges that he made were pretty serious, and they are a pretty serious combination of the Government's approach and the role that it is playing in poultry supervision and in the marketing of poultry products. He claimed that he was kicked out of his job because he asked for assurance that the \$50,000 worth of equipment that the Government was buying from Newfoundland Poultry Producers Limited, was there, to be assured of it, and that an inventory be taken. I do not know whether this

is right or not. I have no idea whether there is one iota of truth in what he says or not. But the matter received widespread public attention, and one would expect the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources to respond to it, or to give some indication as to whether or not it was true. Much of his criticism was directed directly at the Premier, and he indicated or led the public to believe, at least, that there was possibly some wrong doing because the Premier personally is involved in the poultry business and was a shareholder in one of the companies that was involved in Newfoundland Poultry Producers Limited, one of the major shareholders or the majority shareholder. Then on top of that, the Auditor General's report on Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation severely, well it does not criticize, but it points out the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation had an operating loss for the year ended March 31, 1969 of \$269,000, which is pretty substantial. And he goes on to note that the above statement does not include certain expenses paid directly by the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources on behalf of the Corporation. The abattoirs continue to operate. There have been questions placed on the Order Paper that have not been answered concerning the abattoir and its operations, its employees and the costs and so on. Question (315) has not been answered. Question (403), with respect to the Farm Development Loan Board, has not been answered. None of these answers have been given. It might lead one to believe, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps there might be something to what Mr. Murray said after all. And this Sir, is where the Government gets itself in difficulty, and where criticisms, even though they are totally unjustified -- where you can understand them being made when the Government sits mute and does not answer these questions, or does not explain fully what the situation is. I think Sir, that the minister, on behalf of the Government, has a lot to answer for, for the Agriculture policy or the lack of agriculture policy. It seems to be directed in the main at producing poultry products, eggs in particular, and hog products, pork

products. This seems to be pretty nearly our entire effort in agriculture. Now I realize that it is not a simple problem, and it is not a problem to which there is a sure and certain solution. But on the surface there has been little effort made, one would gather from what one sees around. There has been little or no effort made to give any incentive whatsoever to farmers who would like to get involved in production of root crops. Little or no encouragement has been given. There is very little root crop production. One finds it extremely difficult to understand, Mr. Chairman, how we in this Province can eat the vast amount of potatoes that we do eat, and import them all from P.E.I. and pay the freight on them, import them, pay the freight, and still not be able to compete locally on the potato market. If we can produce eggs competitively and make this Province self-sufficient, as far as eggs as concerned, why can we not do it in potatoes? Albeit our season may be two or three or even four, (although I do not think it is that much), weeks behind P.E.I, it is certainly two or three weeks behind P.E.I. A couple of weeks. It is at least a couple of weeks and maybe three weeks behind the Ontario producers. But Mr. Chairman, in December what difference does that make? Whether they came out of the ground the first of August or the middle of August, what difference does that make in December and all throughout the rest of the year? It is just that you do not get to the market first, when premium prices are being paid. This is true. We would not get there when premium prices are being paid. But most people would pay some sort of a premium anyway for fresh local potatoes when they were available. I do not know what the Government can point to, that it has done to give any initiative in this area at all, or to give any real encouragement to people prepared to go into this undertaking, whether they have discussed it with farmers or not. Our whole attention seems to have been diverted or directed at pigs and hens. There is nothing wrong with making us self-sufficient in terms of poultry products or pork products. But it seems there does not seem to be any explanation. And there is a fair amount of land Mr. Chairman, a fairly substantial amount of land lying vacant and capable of being productive land, in the whole of the Codroy Valley. In the whole

Humber Valley area and up through Cormack, and in through and around Howley. The day of the small family farm is over, and I think we might just as well face that. The day of the small family farm being an economic, productive unit is over. We have to have larger scale production, so that we can produce competitively with Mainland producers in order to obtain any portion of the market. In this field the Government Mr. Chairman, has been most lax. It has confined itself to hens and hogs, and it appears not to have an entirely enviable record there, at least one that is not without tarnish. The minister may be the member for St. Barbe North, but he lives in St. John's and maybe he calls it poultry but we call it hens. The record there, Mr. Chairman, is not entirely without tarnish, or not entirely free of claim to have been tarnished, with no response from the Government. I do not propose to repeat any of the serious charges that Mr. Murray has made, but suffice ~~is~~ to say that there have been questions on the Order Paper, which have not been answered, with respect to Newfoundland Farm Products and Provincial Poultry Producers Limited, and that entire transaction. So that they have not been answered. They have not been answered; with the minister stating that he had no knowledge of it, or it was the personal private matters of somebody else. Now that is what the minister considers ^{as} answering it. If that ^{is} what he considers answering, I can assure him that the people of this Province do not consider that to be an appropriate or a proper answer. So that the questions have not been answered, and it only gives rise to further suspicion

MR. CALLAHAN: You could ask questions about the hon. gentleman's Law Firm, it is the same thing.

MR. WELLS: That is none of the hon. gentleman's business.

MR. CALLAHAN: I am just saying, it is the same thing.

MR. WELLS: It is no such thing. Public money is being spent. If and when the minister puts public money into my Law firm, then he can ask about it. Until then he keeps his mouth shut about my Law firm.

MR. CALLAHAN: Public money is not being spent.

MR. WELLS: Public money is being spent. The Auditor General has reported it as being spent.

MR. CALLAHAN: On what?

MR. WELLS: \$50,000 to buy equipment from -

MR. CALLAHAN: Some years ago -

MR. WELLS: I do not care when it was.

MR. CALLAHAN: Are we going to be talking about this fifty years from now?

MR. WELLS: Until it is answered, yes we will talk about it. It has not been answered. The serious charges that Mr. Murray have made have not been answered. And the minister sits there and makes slurs about how much my mortgage is on my house, or how much money my Law firm makes. How low and nasty can a person get?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is the same thing. We are talking about private people, private companies.

MR. WELLS: We are no such thing, talking about private companies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members ought not to carry on private discussions across the floor of the House.

MR. WELLS: I was speaking to the Chair Mr. Chairman. About the nastiness of the hon. minister.

MR. CALLAHAN: Time that people get nasty around here. It has been all one-sided. It has all been on the other side for the past four months.

MR. WELLS: When I am finished the minister can have his say. And I wish he would say something. I can assure him that the people of this Province are anxious to hear whether or not what Mr. Murray says is true. If there is an element of truth in it.

MR. CALLAHAN: Are the public interested in what Mr. Murray had to say, or Mr. Murray and the hon. gentleman.

MR. WELLS: They are quite interested in what he had to say and the claims that he made. And the minister is responsible for it. He is answerable to this House for it.

MR. CALLAHAN: For what Mr. Murray writes in the Paper?

MR. WELLS: No. He is answerable to this House for what the Government

pays out, the expenditure of public money on agricultural services and purposes. And this is what Mr. Murray as a deputy minister or former deputy minister is speaking of. And these things have not been answered. I would like Mr. Chairman, before this vote is passed, to hear the minister clarify this situation, and I would like also to hear him give some encouragement to the farmers of this Province, to the few that are left. And there are very few now that are not in poultry and hog production. To the farmers of this Province, and I would like to see or get some indication in this House that the Government at long last might be prepared to consider some form of encouragement for the production of root crops. Or some explanation as to why it is impossible or why it is not worth bothering with, because they have not been bothering with it. The Government has not bothered with it for years and years. If half the effort were directed or a quarter of the effort were directed along these lines, that are directed along other lines, that in many cases have been a waste of time, our farmers and our people as a whole might be considered to be better off.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, on this particular vote on Agriculture, I would just like to make a few remarks. First of all, may I say at the outset what I do not know about Agriculture could fill many, many books. I do not claim in any way to be any kind of an expert in this field at all. But there seems to me to be a few obvious things which are apparent to anyone. Something has happened in Newfoundland, I do not know what it is. I do not know where to put my finger on it, but what used to be a common practice all over the country, that people were more or less self-sufficient and looked after themselves, particularly with their gardens and their crops and their cows and poultry and so on, has just about disappeared. You can go to all the small places around the country and if you asked for an egg which was not brought in from St. John's or somewhere, or you asked for a glass of fresh milk, or you asked for some locally killed meat, they would not know what

you were talking about. The first thing you would get is probably a tin of Kam, or you would get some eggs which are stale because they have been on the way so long. Or you would get the eternal canned milk. Personally not liking canned milk, I think it is one of the greatest hazards in the country, because here, in the consumption of tin milk in Newfoundland, we must be miles and miles ahead of any other Province in Canada. I should think this is the bonanza for the salesmen of canned milk. But yet, even in my area which is Fortune Bay and is not under any stretch of the imagination an agricultural section of Newfoundland, there are places down there where there is excellent arable land. I have been in many settlements

5884

MR. EARLE: and from time to time I look at what was,once upon a time, very good fields and vegetable gardens and places where,obviously,the people took care of their own needs. Today they will not turn a sod. They will not even bother to grow a flower. They will not grow a radish,hardly. All of the local products are just non-existent. They are not produced in any way. The younger generation growing up have no intention,whatever, of trying to help themselves exist. Now what is the cause of it? It may not be the agricultural policy of the hon. minister's particular department, but somewhere along the line,between the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Agriculture, we have missed the boat.

MR. NEARY: Why do you think we put out this little booklet?

MR. EARLE: This little book,with all respect to the minister,is so childish. It is not funny. I have just finished reading this little book. If this is the best he can produce, he should write a few letters to his -

MR. NEARY: The hon. member,when he was Minister of Welfare,did not think of it.

MR. EARLE: No, I would be ashamed to bring it out, upon my word. If I had thought of this, if I had produced something as incredible as this, I think I would have handed in my resignation long ago. If this is all the Minister of Welfare can think about, produce something like this, I suggest to the members that read it and look at it. It is pitiful.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is living in the past, in the ancient times.

MR. EARLE: Perhaps the hon. member is living in the past, but there was nothing too much wrong with people who were independent and self-sufficient and looked after themselves. As today,somewhere along the line in the last twenty years, the Government has so neglected people,in some way or other, that they have forgotten their own means of looking after themselves. The answer to it is certainly a combination of Government handouts, of Government freedom. There is everything for the asking. And there is no need for anybody to work and look after themselves anymore. There is certainly no

need to do such a niggardly thing as to get down on your hands and knees and try to dig up a garden, that is forgotten.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same thing exists on Prince Edward Island.

MR. EARLE: The same things do not exist on Prince Edward Island. I have travelled through Prince Edward Island as often as the hon. member, and at least, there you can get some good home-grown food, in all sections of the country, but in Newfoundland you cannot. Now we are talking on agriculture and I am not fool enough to think that small subsistent farms are the answer, because today agriculture is big business. I will let the hon. member have his say in a moment. All right.

MR. CANNING: I will ask the hon. member this. He gives a reason for this lack of gardening, and mentioned Government handouts. But I am sure he is aware that in Fortune Bay and Placentia Bay (we will just take those two bays) you know fairly well, and I know the other one in its entirety. You will go into settlements where the people are independent, where there are no handouts, and the people have given this up. I would like the answer to that - why have they given it up? I do not have it. You cannot blame the Government for handouts in independent places where they are well off.

MR. EARLE: I do not think I got the hon. member's question, but I think if I interpreted it right, it is this. That in some places where the people are financially independent, they have still given this up. Well possibly, there is an excuse and you can forgive a person who is well off not going through the drudgery of preparing his own food and so on. But the person who is not well off and has to run to the Government for handouts all the time, there is no excuse for such people. There is no reason why they should not be turned to help themselves. I do not think the hon. member's question is any answer at all to the problem. The fact that people are well off.. Well it is the same answer Mr. Chairman, as if the hon. member asked me why I did not grow potatoes, turnips and carrots, because I do not need to grow potatoes, turnips and carrots. I have an income.

And people with incomes are better off providing for those who do not have incomes by buying from them. But people who have no income and people who should be helping themselves are the ones I am talking about.

MR. NEARY: That is exactly what this little book is all about.

MR. EARLE: This little book does not say enough to be even worth looking at. However -

MR. NEARY: Not to the hon. member, because he does not need it.

MR. EARLE: Not to the hon. member or a good many other hon. members. There is no real help in this thing. This is silliness about how to shop and all that nonsense. It is puerile, pitiful. It is childish.

MR. NEARY: That is the merchant prince speaking.

MR. EARLE: Merchant prince my eye! I know the food business inside and out. And I know that what an hon. gentleman could save in one hand, with doing what is suggested here, could be put away in another by buying foolishly in another direction. However. He is trying to distract me from what I am saying about the agricultural policy. But all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that, somewhere along the line, there has been a definite slip-up in this Province. We cannot get away from the fact that people expect their food to be provided for them in cans, bottles, jars and what have you, whereas a great percentage of it could be readily produced in the area ⁱⁿ which they exist. Now somehow, either the combination of the hon. minister's Department of Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture, this should be revived. The Ministers of Welfare in the past, speaking as one of them, had several good suggestions, and several attempts, but there was always the same old question, that for these worthwhile projects they were apt to suggest, there is no money available. Because money, too often in the past, has been flittered away on other things which are far less important. And to try to sell something important to the Government is worth something more than any human being could do. He has to sell something trivial, and that will be bought. However, just to get back to it for a moment, I repeat myself: The ideal, subsistent, farming is not certainly anything new from

my way of thinking. And it is possibly not the answer. It is only a partial answer. I know that agriculture today is big business and has to be done on a reasonably large scale. But here again is a puzzling situation in Newfoundland. You will generally find that the few really prosperous farmers in Newfoundland are men who themselves have created their own little industry around them. They show initiative. They show great ability and they show wonderful tenacity to a very difficult industry, and they generally are not the type that come running to Government for any handout. I know several very good farmers who make an excellent living. Why it cannot be repeated in a hundred or five hundred or a thousand more cases, I do not know. It must be, I suppose, that we do not have the people with the sort of initiative and effort that it takes to produce good farmers. But be that as it may, I should think this is one of the prime objectives of the Department of Agriculture, to try to instill in people who have a liking for farming and to help them in such a way that they can help themselves. Now this comes back to my original remarks, that this has not been accomplished. The Budget for the whole department here apparently is about \$2 million. No, it is not that. It is \$1,600,000. And it is not a great deal to be spent in this Province on agriculture. I do not think if we spent \$20 million a year we could ever make Newfoundland a really large agricultural Province. The climate and everything else does not really lend itself, to any great extent, to a big agricultural development. But certainly we could be doing a lot more than we are doing, and I think possibly part of the answer is that we have been concentrating upon a few things ⁱⁿ which particular people show interest, and that is poultry and in porks. Whereas, all of the other things, which would tend to lend people to help themselves, have been neglected to a certain extent, are certainly not emphasized. I think briefly the agricultural policy of the country is something like the economic development policy of the country. The thing has been, all along, that these small settlements and small places have no future. This has been the thinking. There is really no future there for them. The quicker people get out of it and get organized

and get the centralized communities and so on, the better for the public. I disagree with that, one hundred percent, because I do not think that is the answer. But I do think that people in Newfoundland can still live a very happy, healthy and enviable existence if they are encouraged in some way to help themselves. It has been the answer in many, many European countries, and many other parts of the world. And I think possibly the only thing that will ever cure this, in Newfoundland, is that if it becomes so tough for people to get handouts that they will eventually come back to helping themselves. But agriculture certainly is a wide-open field for that, because what is being done in the Province at the present time..

MR. NEARY: Read the booklet.

MR. EARLE: I read the book once already. I got nothing out of it. I promise the hon. minister I will read it five times, and if I still do not get anything out of it, then I will come back and report that to the House. Has the hon. member seen this one? This is the latest compilation. I am delighted to say it is not called a White Paper. It is a pity it is not. I mean this really should be the Minister of Welfare's White Paper. But we are treated to White Papers and Green Papers and Grey Papers and all that, but this certainly does not dignify itself with anything of that nature. However. The hon. member has a district very much like my own, and he is aware of what I am saying as I am myself. He knows as well as I do -- you are not going to cut off the people, particularly are you not going to cut off the children. I was Minister of Welfare and I know you cannot make young children suffer for their parents' idleness. But there must be means of encouraging these people to help themselves.

MR. CANNING: Encourage the people to^{go} back into their gardens? What are they? Tell us what they are.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Instead of lining up in the supermarkets and buying potatoes, can we not grow them in our gardens?

MR. NEARY: What is it we have to do?

MR. EARLE: I suggest to the hon. member he is - the hon. member is sitting

next to the Minister of Welfare, now they might discuss this booklet and perhaps they would get some ideas between them. I think the hon. member is the oldest sitting member in the House (I mean as far as membership is concerned). I think he has been here long enough, most certainly, to think up some ways of helping his younger compatriot there to get some good ideas.

MR. NEARY: But tell us what we have to cut off? What is it we have to cut off? What handouts?

MR. EARLE: The hon. minister is asking me what to cut off?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what handouts? What handouts do we have to restrict or cut out?

MR. EARLE: I am not talking about any handouts as such, because I am not asking you to cut out anything. But what I am saying is that the hon. minister, through the servants in his department, can check up much more thoroughly some of the things that are going on.

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. member do it when he was minister?

MR. EARLE: He tried very much indeed and he got a lot of it underway..

MR. NEARY: The hon. member did not produce one new idea while he was in that department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I will just finish. I must be allowed to retaliate on that because the hon. member thought up some very good ideas which the present minister is now taking credit for. However, this is by the way.

MR. NEARY: Not an idea came out of the hon. member while he was there, only negative thinking.

MR. EARLE: That was a matter of opinion. We are speaking on agriculture, and perhaps the hon. minister would be much better advised to go out and try to grow a few turnips himself. He would certainly make a much better job than he is doing in this House. Anyhow, my few remarks on agriculture are basically this, that somewhere along the line, through the Department of Agriculture and through the Department of Welfare, we have missed the boat.

Our people, as far as taking care of themselves, are degenerating, and it is certainly our own fault that they do so, because we are supposed to show leadership. Now it is through the Department of Agriculture and self-help through the Department of Welfare, which the hon. minister -

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. member is agreeing with me.

MR. EARLE: They might be able to do something. But I think it will be a long, frosty Friday before this ever produces anything worth talking about.

MR. NEARY: Well why do you think we just changed the name of the department -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was not going to say anything about this. It is a little tough to suffer all day as we have done today, but I suppose it would be a mistake to let this debate go by without at least saying a few words about it. The hon. gentleman, who just spoke, began by saying he knew nothing about agriculture, and then took twenty minutes to prove it. We would have accepted his word. If he just stood up and said, he knew nothing about agriculture and just sat down. But he did not need to spend twenty minutes proving it. Of course he knows nothing about agriculture, or he may know little, and what little he knows is wrong. So it is better if he did know nothing. The hon. gentleman does not ^{know} anything about it. He just knows nothing. The hon. gentleman who preceded him - the hon. gentleman who just preceded him speaking, also knows nothing about it. Talking about the beautiful land around Newfoundland, and why we are not blossoming and blooming as a farming province. Now the fact of the matter is, that a hundred years ago, when our population was about one fifth of what it is now, less than a fifth, yes about one fifth of what it is now, we were producing four and five times more farm produce than we are producing now. With one-fifth of the population we were producing five times more farm produce than we are producing now. And our people were that much poorer. It was a pure peasant economy. We were just a bunch of peasants, not happy peasants. We were just a bunch of poor peasants in Newfoundland, and when we did, we produced more pork and more poultry and more eggs, and more

potatoes and more turnips and more cabbage, five times more than we are doing now. Five times. The animal population - I wrote the report on agriculture for National Convention. I have a copy of it now. And in it I give a history of agriculture. I happen to know something about agriculture in more ways than one, theoretically and practically. I know all the ways there are to lose money in agriculture, and that is a good many ways. That is a good many ways. The number of ways is almost beyond counting, and every farmer in Newfoundland has found out all those ways. And very few if any farmers have ever found the ways to make money at agriculture in Newfoundland. Now if you look at agriculture in the United States today, or in Canada, in any Province of Canada, you find that agriculture is shrinking. Not only is it shrinking, it has been shrinking steadily. In the United States at the turn of the present century, this present century, sixty years ago, seventy years ago, seventy percent of the whole population of America lived on farms. Seventy percent of that vast nation lived on farms. And that dropped to sixty and to fifty percent and to forty and to thirty. And now it is less than twenty percent. Less than twenty persons in a hundred in America today live on farms. Now look at Canada, and in the same period/^{it} is almost mathematically identical. There is not a difference of one percent between Canada and the United States in these seventy years, in the way people have left off farming and crowded into the cities. This has gone on all up and down this Continent. It has gone on all up and down the United Kingdom, and it has gone on all up and down the Continent of Europe. The shrinkage of farming! Shrinking in acreage! Shrinking in numbers of persons engaged in it! And a vast increase in the size of individual farms! And to talk about Newfoundland giving up - Newfoundlanders giving up hope of getting a job at Churchill Falls and going raising spuds - giving up their hope of a job, any kind of a job, anywhere, at a dollar and a quarter an hour up, from that up. The chance that they will give up that to go raising potatoes and cabbage and turnips is ludicrous. It is too silly. It is so silly that you cannot get women. If you go off working, your wife perhaps/^{left} behind will do the gardening, but they will not do the fish

Mr. Smallwood.

the fish. The women have given up working on the flakes. The women have given up working at the stage head. You do not find women gutting fish and heading fish now. You do not find them washing out fish now. You do not find them putting it out and spreading it and piling it in fagots on the flakes now. You do not find it. It does not happen. It is done. It is similarly dead that the women are going to do the gardening. It is dead! It is dead! It is dead! It is gone!

Now, if a man has to go in the bush logging, if he has to work on the roads, if he has to get a job at Churchill Falls or at Wabush or at Labrador City or anywhere else, have home and go off and get work and that is a staggering proportion of our workers that have to go away from home, have home. They do not get jobs home. There are no jobs there to get. In Bay Roberts, in Spaniards Bay, in Clarke's Beach, in Harbour Grace, in Carbonear, in Placentia, all over the Province, in hundreds of places, there are no jobs. The jobs are to be found, if they are to be found anywhere, somewhere other than where men are living. They would have to go away for work. When that happened, it was the death of home farming. That was the end of it. It died then. When men fished every year - by the way, there use to be 30,000 fishermen. How many are there now? How many fishermen are there now in Newfoundland? If you count everything, if you count the few lobster men who do a bit of lobstering for a few weeks in the Spring and may be a little salmon fishing that is it. You count them all. Count every fishermen in the whole Province today and you will stagger it at 10,000. There use to be 30,000. When the population of Newfoundland was half of what it is today, there were 30,000 fishermen and those fishermen would do their gardens before the fishery began, because they remained home. They were inshore fishermen. They were sedentary fishermen who did not leave their native home, their seaport, their home port. They fished all year. They never left it.

In the town of Bonavista where there were between 800 and 900 men who went fishing, there were hundreds of those men who had scarcely seen the sky except over the town of Bonavista and the water immediately adjacent and they

Mr. Smallwood.

did their gardens in the Spring. It was as regular as clock work. It was as regular as going to church on Sunday. The time of the year came when every man in Bonavista, every man and every woman and their children were out doing what they called the gardens, setting what they called their garden fruit, which was their name for potatoes, turnips, cabbage, a few carrots, a few parsnips and a few beets.- every man, every family in Bonavista, because when that was done, they went fishing. It was then time to go fishing and in the Fall, they dug up the potatoes. So, they lived home, they did that. How go to Bonavista. How many men are fishing in Bonavista today? Two hundred and fifty out of eight to nine hundred men. Where are the other men? Where are the other men? The other men had gone seeking working all over the Province and Labrador - the Island of Newfoundland and Labrador. Talk to them about gardening, it is just plain silly.

MR. WELLS: Nobody.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Be quite! Who is talking about the hon. gentleman. He thinks too much of himself. He has too much vanity. He has too much arrogance.

Mr. Chairman, the life of the people of Newfoundland has changed. Well can you tell me any part of North America where it has not changed? Has it changed in Nova Scotia? In Nova Scotia you can scarcely get a man to go fishing. Who mans the Nova Scotia fishing vessels?- Newfoundlanders. Who mans the fish plants in Nova Scotia?- Newfoundlanders. What farming is happening now in Nova Scotia? It is ^adying thing. It is dying on its feet. You have untold hundreds of abandoned farms in Nova Scotia. The entire Island of Cape Breton is an abandoned farming area. You can drive from one end of Nova Scotia to the other and the same in New Brunswick, and you will see tens of thousands of acres of abandoned farm land, growing up now with small trees.

It is the same in Prince Edward Island. Farming has become a completely dead loss in Prince Edward Island so much so that the big new plan consists

Mr. Smallwood.

largely of buying the farms and pensioning off the farmers. That is what their main plan is in Prince Edward Island Then we hear this arrant nonsense about our people going farming and growing spuds - of all the arrant nonsense.

MR. WELLS: The Premier did not listen or he would have heard differently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have listened too much to the hon. gentleman. He has me addled. He has all of us addled. His utter arrogance just sickens people - just sickens people. Arrogance on one side and ignorance next door.

Mr. Chairman, it is no use. It is just no use. It is no use walking ahead with your head turned over your shoulder looking at the back and yearning for the good old days. That is a waste of time. Our people are not going at that. Now face it and stop talking about it. They are not going at it. Do you think we are going to talk them into it? Do you think a few speeches here are going to get our people back growing spuds? No action will do it - no propaganda will do it - no speeches will do it - no action will do it. What our people want in Newfoundland are jobs, and if they do not get them, they are going to leave Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not what the hon. Minister of Welfare suggests....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah, be quiet over there. It sounds like a great chorus. Stop and here a bit of sense from someone who has thought about it, someone who has really thought about it. I was born with farming in my very blood - generations of farmers back of me - generations of them, born on the farms, reared on farms in Prince Edward Island. For 300 years, almost, over 200 years anyway, farming in my very blood and I am proud of it. I know a little bit about farming. I also know a little about Newfoundland. I also know a little about Newfoundland's history. I know a little about the Newfoundland people, and I know a little bit about the history of the Newfoundland people, the social and economic history and the way they have made their living, and the way they have lived. It has been a life's hobby of mine to study that. I have written

Mr. Smallwood.

books on it. I ought to know something about it, and I say this; you are wasting your time and wasting your breath to think, to moan, and bewail the fact that our people today are not growing their own vegetables. That died and the finishing touch was put to that, when Confederation came.

Mr. Chairman, before Confederation, you could travel around this Island and, in every settlement you visited, you could go into the local shop or two or three of them or whatever shops there were and you would find in an entire shop as much canned goods (mostly, it was canned pineapple and canned milk and some bully beef) you would find in a shop as much canned goods, in any average shop in the outports, as you would now find, as you would now find in one corner of that shop. One of the most startling things that ever happened in Newfoundland, sociologically, (It ought to be noted. It was one of the remarkable facts of Confederation) is that shops that were empty, shelves that were empty were the next day or within a week or within a month groaning under the weight of the goods that were brought in, as a result of Confederation.

Our people, with the new money that poured into their pockets, began buying the goods. Now in doing that, Mr. Chairman, they were only doing what had been done before them in other parts of North America. It is just as unreasonable to expect - I will put it another way. It is just as unlikely that our people in Newfoundland will grow their own home vegetables for their own personal and family use as it is that they will do it in Ontario. It is just as unlikely. The distance between Ontario and Newfoundland has shrunk. The distance between St. John's and New York or Chicago has shrunk - this whole continent has become a small place. It is one big community, one big, small community. Do not think for one minute that side by side with this modern development you have, right or

Mr. Smallwood.

wrong development, I am not saying. I say modern development, that you have now in North America, that side by side with that you are going to find a startling contrast. You are going to leave the continent and come here and find happy peasants. What arrant nonsense. Every instinct in us in Newfoundland is to be like the rest of North America - every instinct in us, whether rightly or wrongly. I am not defending it, I am only describing it. And to think that in that kind of a developing and an expanding outlook and this rising tide of expectations, this common-place, and universal demand that we will be as other people in North America, in the teeth of that, you are going to get old-fashioned peasants, economy farming. That is as dead as the great auk and it is just utter nonsense to be talking about it and bewailing it. Describe it, note it as a historic fact, but do not bewail it. It is a waste of time. In Canada today, what is one of the main problems of the entire nation? One of the main problems is the fact that there are, perhaps, 500,000 farms that have to be abandoned. It is known as "rural slums." Rural slums, we know all about rural slums here in Newfoundland, do we not? We know an awful lot about rural slums. A rural slum is a ramshackled farm, where the family, with the hardest of labour, cannot possibly scratch out a decent living - a living that will satisfy them, a living that will compare anyway favourably with the living they can get even in the town of St. John's, let alone Toronto, let alone Montréal, let alone Winnipeg, let alone any of the fine big cities of Canada.

Even here in St. John's, you can get a better living, you can live better, the families will live better, even paying rent, than the peasant existence that most farming will produce for our people here on this Island. Now does this mean that we should forget farming and abolish the Department

Mr. Smallwood.

of Agriculture? Is this the lesson to be drawn from what I am saying? Is it? Well the hon. gentleman is not a very profound thinker, perhaps he is just an orator, just an orator and that is all - just an orator. We know he is an outstanding orator. He proved himself a great orator. I am not sarcastic. I have already complimented the hon. gentleman sincerely. He has proved himself an orator, but not necessarily. stop! stop interrupting! stop this running commentary! stop! There is only one allowed to speak at a time. Not only an orator, but a wit - a witty orator or an oratorical wit. Anyway a combination of oratory and wit. Now has he had enough?

I say this, Mr. Chairman, one thing, whether he intended it or not, but he has succeeded in diverting me, because the thought that I was trying to develop - the theme I was trying to develop now has escaped me. Yes, I have it. In Canada, generally, right across the nation - let me give you an example, Mr. Chairman. I am told that the Government of Canada has to pay out, I forget how many hundreds of millions of dollars it is each year to subsidize milk. It is plural. It is hundreds of millions of dollars a year, the Government of Canada pays out to subsidize milk farmers, dairy farmers. That is to say, pay them cash each year to make up the difference between what they get for their milk or cheese or their milk or cream and what it costs them to produce it, to get the difference paid to them as a gift, as a cash gift.

There is a suggestion that the Government of Canada should buy every dairy farm in Canada that needs the subsidy, that needs it. Now, they all get it. Every dairy farmer gets it, but they do not all need it, to buy the farms of all the dairy farmers who get the subsidy because they need to get it to buy up those farms and close them out and use the subsidy for two years running to buy out all the farms and close them down. Then that would be about two-thirds of the dairy farms of Canada - two-thirds that get it, because they need to get it, who would be bought out and closed

Mr. Smallwood.

down leaving one-third of the existing dairy farmers who would not need a subsidy, because they would be making oodles of money as it is. They would promptly increase in size, produce milk, cheese and other dairy products more economically than ever and the Government of Canada saves these hundreds of millions of dollars.

All across Canada and all down through the United States, you have this business of farms^a losing game, a losing proposition. The tobacco farms, the wheat farms, they are now paying the wheat farmers in Canada to stop growing wheat. They are subsidizing the wheat they do not grow. It is something like Robert Benchley, the American wit, not as witty as the Leader of the Opposition, fairly witty, Robert Benchley wrote a letter to the Secretary for Agriculture in the American Government, at the time that the American Government were subsidizing the farmers to ^{under} kill every third pig, to plow every third furrow, to try, in some way, to control the output of farm produce and try in that way to stabilize the price. He wrote a letter to the Secretary of the interior and he said - he applied for the subsidy. Now he was a city dweller, a well-known journalist, a wit and writer and had never, I suppose, even walked on a farm let alone produce any pigs or poultry or farm produce of any kind, but he wrote and asked for the subsidy for the hogs that he had not grown, for the vegetables he had not grown, for the furrows he had not ploughed or that he had not grown anything on. He asked for the subsidy.

In Canada today, the Government of Canada is paying wheat farmers not to grow wheat and we have here, in this House, people bemoaning the fact that we are not an agricultural Province, that we actually import potatoes.

Mr. Chairman, the potato farmers came to see me once, and asked me, if I could protect them against imported potatoes. Well there has to be free trade between provinces, under Confederation - free trade or at least

Mr. Smallwood,

goods have to pass freely from one province to another, not necessarily free trade, because many ways have been found to circumvent that. For instance, we do not allow beer into this Province from any other province, except to be sold at a price five cents a bottle above the price of local beer. That is a form of tariff protection but it is not actually tariff protection. There are many, many other devices that provinces have adopted to discourage free trade, but goods must pass freely. You may put imposts on them. You may put discouragement on them, but goods may pass freely. So, when they came in and said to me, "will you protect us against imported potatoes?" I knew we could not just put an embargo on potatoes. I will tell you what I did. I said, "all right, I will do what I can to help." They said, "if we could only have protection until our crop comes out of the ground; so we can sell the crop as soon as it comes out of the ground. Then let in all the outside potatoes from the rest of Canada that you like, all that you would like to let in." I said, "I will see what I can do." Well, I did. It was this: I got my secretary to phone around to every importer of potatoes in St. John's; Canada Packers, Swift Canadian, Wilson, and all the others that were importing potatoes and invited them to my office. They came in my office, and I told them that the Government of Newfoundland had made a very important decision, and I hoped that they would concur in that decision and help us to enforce it.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): And they looked expectant and I told them what the decision was. I said, "we are determined, we have made up our minds that we are going to protect Newfoundland's fine, wholesome soil against possible canker or other potato diseases that might be brought in from the mainland."

One of them spoke up brightly and said, "oh you do not need to do that Mr. Premier." I said, "No?" "No" he said, "these potatoes are all inspected before they come in." I said, "I do not know, no, you are quite wrong." He said, "Yes, oh yes, every bag of potatoes has a certificate on it, saying it has been inspected and is free of disease." I said, "No, you are quite wrong, we do no such thing." He said, "Not you, the Government of Canada." "Oh," I said, "Who cares what the Government of Canada do? We are concerned with our soil here in Newfoundland. Any bag of potatoes is going to be inspected by our inspector. Unfortunately we have only one inspector but he is going to open up every bag of potatoes, until the middle of November. Every bag of potatoes will be opened and he has to inspect each individual potato. Then the potatoes go back in the bag and he puts his certificate on it and we guarantee with only one inspector that by the spring of next year he should be able to inspect all those potatoes. My reason for calling you in is to tell you that you might consider whether it would be good business for you to bring in any potatoes."

There was not a potato brought in that year, into Newfoundland. Not a single bag of potatoes was brought into Newfoundland that year because I meant what I said. I do not know how long I could have made it stick, but we made it stick that year. I doubt if we could have done it a second year and in Prince Edward Island it became a tradition. They still talk about the year that Joey stopped P.E.I. potatoes from coming in.

Mr. Chairman, to talk about our little patches of land where a man if he sets ten barrels of seed feels like the king ranch with its million acres, with its quarter million head of cattle, he feels at least like the owner of the king ranch if he plants ten barrels of seed potatoes. He thinks he is growing enough potatoes to feed mankind. In a place like that, with that kind of farming, where thirty, forty acres is considered a big farm 100 acres

is unbelievable, you cannot conceive of a farm of 100 acres. In a Province like this we are going to compete with Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick in the production of potatoes? How silly can we get? How silly can we get? Or the production of any other farm produce! Now, does this mean that we abandon agriculture? No it does not. Does it mean that we abolish the Department of Agriculture? It certainly does not. Do we need a Minister of Agriculture? We do. Do we need a Deputy Minister? We do. Do we need a chief of this and a chief of that and a chief of the other division in the Department of Agriculture? We do, but not to grow "spuds."

We can, Fifteen years ago I said Newfoundland can become self-supporting in eggs. I said it, I said it publicly, I said it loudly, I said it clamorously, and I insisted on it, that Newfoundland could become self-supporting in eggs. At that time, fifteen years ago, we were consuming about five million dozen eggs a year. About five million dozen and producing about half of one million ourselves. All the rest came in from Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and New Brunswick, mainly Nova Scotia. Today we are consuming twelve million dozen eggs a year and we are producing twelve million dozen eggs a year, infact, we are producing more. We are not only self-supporting, but on occasion we actually export eggs. We exported eggs in the last year or two, many a time to Montreal and down into the United States. What was the state? Georgia.

Newfoundland, which fifteen years ago, out of five million dozen eggs it consumed to produce half of one million, is now exporting eggs. So, when I said we could be self-supporting in the production of eggs I was right. Now I go further and I say that we can be self-supporting in the production of broilers, of broilers. There is no need for one single broiler to be imported into this Province, not one, and they are imported in unto hundreds of thousands. Hundreds of thousands of broilers are brought in to this Province. Slowly we are building up a broiler industry. I say here tonight, that the time will come, before many years, when Newfoundland will be self-supporting in the production of broilers and do not be too surprised if we did not start exporting broilers.

Now, I said here, four or five years ago when I brought in a scheme for pork production, that Newfoundland could become self-supporting in the pork. At that time the Minister of Agriculture was my hon. friend the present Minister of Labour and he may remember now I do not, he may remember the volume or the value of the pork that we were importing at that time, five or six years ago. I think it was something of the order of twenty-five million pounds of pork products. That would be pretty close to it. This would be hams and bacons, salt pork, smoked hams, boiled hams. It is now around twenty-six million pounds. I said that Newfoundland could become self-supporting. Remember this Mr. Chairman, that if Newfoundland were to become self-supporting in pork products it would be, not only equal, it would be better than equal to an industry employing one thousand men.

Now the oil refinery at Come by Chance will employ 425 men. A paper mill at Come by Chance, direct, inside the walls, under a roof will employ another four or five hundred men. Unfortunately paper mills are becoming so automated that they employ fewer and fewer men just as there are fewer and fewer men in the bush producing the pulp wood. So there you have a great oil refinery, and a great paper mill, 600 tons a day that between them would not employ 1000 men inside their walls. 1000 men. If you could become self-supporting in pork in this Province you would have 1000 men, and those 1000 men would be better off for Newfoundland they would be better for our Newfoundland economy than the same number working in a factory or a couple of factories, because in the couple of factories you have to provide housing, you would have to provide new schools, you would have to provide all kinds of infrastructure, all kinds of public services and you would have to spend a good many millions of dollars to build entirely new communities to serve the 1000 men that worked in those factories.

If you have 1000 men producing Newfoundland's needs in pork, they already have their homes, they already have their schools, now they are idle or partly idle, now they are earning nothing or very little, then they

would earning a good living. So 1000 men satisfying Newfoundland's needs in pork would be better than 1000 men in the new factory or two or three factories combined. We can do it, we are now doing it. We are doing it now, we are not self-supporting but we are producing pork. Three years ago or was it four years ago in the whole of Canada from coast to coast, in Canada the Province that came first in the production of grade A carcasses was Newfoundland.

What do you say to that? Of all the experienced hog raisers in P.E.I., Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and especially Ontario, and the west, the west where the feed grains grow, right across Canada the one Province that led the nation in the percentage, the proportion of its hog production that was grade A, that graded out grade A, (you see every one is graded because the Government of Canada was paying a premium for grade A) Newfoundland came first.

We have seen in the recent, in the last twenty-four months the springing up of a number of hog farms in Newfoundland, owned by intelligent farmers who had already proved to be successful in the production of eggs or the production of broilers, in other words successful farmers who had already come up the hard way and made a success of other form of agriculture or at least of live stock and now turned to hogs and have since made a brilliant success of it.

We will be self-supporting in pork in this Province. Now are there other things we could do in agriculture? If we could only find a way to winter-feed sheep we could rapidly become again what we were, the third biggest Province in Canada in its sheep population. Now we are a bad third, there are only two ahead of us in all Canada of the ten Provinces. Number one was Ontario, she was number one and Alberta was number two and Newfoundland was number three in the number of sheep she had. Now it was bad because we had only something of the order of 100,000 sheep in our Province. We are not that now we have slipped down. We can become number three and number two in Canada in the size of her sheep herd. We could become that if one problem were solved. If we could solve one problem. The problem is this, that we have the best wild grazing

in Canada. There is no Province in Canada where you can turn sheep or cattle loose and they can graze on Crown lands, publicly owned lands, where the grazing is so good, where they come back in the fall butter-fat from the native grasses, our own Newfoundland native grasses, our wild white clover and our other grasses that grow naturally, wild in this Province. It is extremely nutritious, cattle come back butter-fat. Horses go out for the summer and come back in the fall butter-fat. Sheep come back butter-fat, any animals that graze on grass in Newfoundland, when the summer is over, come back as fat as butter. Like butter rolls, that is how fat they come back.

The problem is, what do you do when they come back? How do you feed them in the winter? Where do you get the winter keep? How do you feed them in the winter for six, seven long months of the year? Solve that. That is no easy problem to solve but solve it and we can become an immensely important sheep Province in Canada, maybe the second of the biggest in population and maybe coming pretty close to being number one.

Now the same thing applies to beef cattle. Beef cattle - I have seen them go out thin after the winter, you feed them through the winter, you give them brewers grains, you give them a little protein supplement, you give them a little grain and you feed them dry hay or you may have green ensilage to give them and you scratch them along as best you can through the winter and they have come through the winter not in the best of shape. They go out on the wild grazing and they come back in the fall, it would do your heart good to see them, but then the winter starts again. What do you do to feed them in the winter? Solve that, find a way to solve that. For awhile we thought the draining of bogs would do it, maybe production of grass on thousands of acres of bog-land would be the answer; the trouble was that the cost of reclaiming the bog-land, of lowering the water table, was too great. When you do lower the water table in bog-land you can get hay up to here.

Magnificent you get, but the cost of getting the bog-land prepared to produce that result is exorbitant and we have had to slow down in it even with the financial help that the Government of Canada decided to give us and did give us. Solve that and we can be a sheep country and we can be a cattle country but, without solving that, we can be a poultry country, we are, we have become that successfully. We can become a broiler country we are beginning to become that right now and we can certainly be a hog country and we have begun to do it.

Talking about growing potatoes, talk about growing "spuds" growing root crops in Newfoundland in competition with six and eight and nine hundred and thousand and twelve hundred acre farms, where everything is done mechanically, where they turn out as much in a month as we do in a year, it is absurd. Mr. Chairman, you can take every bit of cultivated bit of land we have in this Province, take it all, take the whole lot of it, the half-acre garden, and the one-acre garden, and the three-acre farm, and the ten-acre farm and Bowater's big farm, put it all together in Newfoundland and do you know what you have, you have not even a corner of Prince Edward Island, in cultivated land.

Fly over Prince Edward Island in a plane and you will see more cultivated land, more smiling fields, more beautiful farms, in any two miles of it, than we have on this entire island of Newfoundland. And we are going to compete with that? We are going to compete with mechanized farming? We are going to compete with men who have farming in their blood, we as part-time peasant farmers are going to compete with that with our little postage stamp farms? It is absurd, it is ridiculous, it is a waste of time and a waste of breath but this does not mean that we have to abandon all hope of having some agriculture. We have agriculture, we are completely self-supporting now in eggs. The only hope is in two directions, to go on increasing our egg production. One direction is for our own people to be more prosperous and eat more eggs, that is one direction. If you look at D.B.S. figures, I have not looked at them for several years, but D.B.S., Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures for the Government of Canada, showed that across Canada the average consumption of

eggs per family, or per capita right across the nation was about there. (I forget the figure) In a year the average family would consume this much eggs, so many dozen a year. In Newfoundland it was down here, not because our people do not like eggs, but they could not afford eggs because they could not afford food, because they could not afford to live in the way they would like to live. Our standard of living is lower in Newfoundland, therefore, our consumption of beef is down, our consumption of milk is down, our consumption of eggs is down. We do not eat as much, we do not live as well, we do not have the purchasing power, we do not have the income, there is not that much affluence here in Newfoundland.

But, as there are more jobs, as there is more employment, as wages go up, as income goes up, as we become a bit more affluent year by year by year, with a set-back now and then, as we have had for the past two years, but in the long run the trend is up. Our standard of living is going up and as it goes up there will be more eggs consumed, therefore, there will be more eggs produced. That is one way and the other is to export them.

That we can export them is proved, we were doing it. Maybe Mr. Chairman, you sat down in a hotel in New York and for breakfast you had eggs that came from Newfoundland. You do not know where they came from. We have shipped eggs to Montreal, we have shipped eggs down to Georgia and if we can do it once we can do it again. So in these two directions the sale of eggs will increase and therefore the production will increase.

Broilers we have just started: I know one place that turns out the stock in 40,000 day-old chicks at a time. 40,000 chicks going in at one time. Nine weeks later out come 40,000 broilers. They are replaced 5857 with another 40,000 day-old chicks that came out hospital clean so that no infection left from the 40,000 adult pullets or broilers will be carried over to the little day-old chicks, the new crop coming in hospital clean, 40,000 more. Nine weeks later they go out, that is 80,000, in

come another 40,000 and you get something between 100,000 and 200,000 broilers every year on that one farm, and that is only one of a number. It is beginning now, I say, I will live to see Newfoundland completely self-supporting in broilers. Does anybody know the figure? What is the poundage of broilers a year consumed in Newfoundland today? How many million pounds?

MR. CALLAHAN: Twelve million pounds

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twelve million pounds of broiler meat consumed, and produced so far not even nearly a million is it?

MR. CALLAHAN: We hit the million last year

MR. SMALLWOOD: We hit the million last year. All right, that is a red-letter day, that was a red-letter year last year, consuming twelve million pounds of broiler we hit the first million pounds of our own production. If we can produce one million can we not produce twelve? Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anybody know why not? Why not twelve men - now it cannot be done in a day or a year. But we are on the way, and we will be self-supporting broilers. We are on the way to be self-supporting in hogs, in pork, and we will be self-supporting and these all between them can employ two or three thousand people. And we have done an awful lot of things in Newfoundland to get employment for a few thousand men. We will go a long way in Newfoundland, such is our fate and such is our prospect, such is our destiny, that we will go a long way. We have always been willing in Newfoundland. The Government has always been willing to go a long way to get jobs numbering thousands, and we think we are on the way now, in the production of eggs, broilers and pork. What about turkeys? What about turkeys Mr. Chairman? We do not consume as much turkey as they do in other provinces per family. They are not so hard to raise. They used to be terribly hard to raise, before the days of proper medication, before the enormous amount of research that has been done on turkeys. Turkeys were very difficult to raise. It was a hazardous business trying to raise turkeys. Is it hazardous today? It is not. I have it from an expert. It is not hazardous today. You can raise turkeys, and you will see the day when Newfoundland will be completely self-supporting in turkeys and geese. Three million pounds of turkeys a year. There is no reason, no real reason why we should not produce every pound of it. So when you ask, "have this Government no faith in agriculture," I say, "wrong, we have." If you ask; "do you intend to do away with the Department of Agriculture?" I answer, "no we do not." If you ask then, "what is a Department of Agriculture for?" My answer is, "to continue doing an evermore, and evermore efficiently, what it has been doing, namely to encourage and to assist in the development of these viable, these profitable, these potentially successful branches of agriculture." And not, not, not try to wail and moan about the loss of our ancient peasant farming that went on in this Province. God in Heaven! I have seen it. I have gone around the bays of Newfoundland for the last thirty years. In fact longer than that - since I was a boy, I

started going out. I went out to Kelligrews, to Upper Gullies, as a little boy, I had an uncle, Jim Scott, in Upper Gullies. I used to stay with him for the summer, and I would get out in the garden and help him with his gardening. I have been all over this Island, and I have seen the kind of gardening that was done in an age when our people were as poor as mice. When if they did not grow a few spuds for the winter, and a bit of cabbage - and how many hon. members I wonder have seen the struggle of our people in Newfoundland in the outports - to save a bit of the cabbage. How many have seen the struggle, the different ways to trying to save a bit of cabbage beyond the first frost? Pickling it, making a sort of a sauerkraut out of it, a sort of imitation sauerkraut. Pitting it, putting it out and covering it up with sods and letting it freeze solid as a rock and get it out in the Spring, putting it in what they hoped would be frost-proof cellars in the homes - the root cellars outside, every kind of way - and who had cabbage in the outports after Christmas? Who had cabbage? What cabbage would you ever see? Only the pickled cabbage. The sauerkraut. How many times as a boy did I learn that trick from my grandfather? They would cut the heads of cabbage, cut in fine pieces, dump it in the pork barrel, and my job was to stamp it with a stick, and the lower end of the stick, a sort of mallet. My job was to keep pressing it down so he could pour more in, and press it down so that by the time the barrel was full, you would have perhaps, enough cabbage to carry you through the winter. In the case of my grandfather, he was not a peasant. I am not boasting of the fact that he was not a peasant. I am just stating the fact. He was not a peasant. He was a rich merchant on Water Street. A boot and shoe manufacturer, and he was born on a farm. And here in St. John's, he had a farm between LeMarchant Road and Coronation Street. He had the whole square in between these four streets, and he straddled them out, and that is where I first learned farming, when I was six or seven or eight years of age, out with my own grandfather. So whether it is peasant farming, or hobby-farming, as

he did. I have been connected with it all my life and I want to see no more of it. I do not want to see anymore of it. Not for Newfoundlanders. Yes and the kelp and the few buckets of guts they would spill up. I heard the Minister of Labour in the National Convention, in a great and classic speech talking about Newfoundland culture. He was talking, snarlingly, of Newfoundland culture, and the pine clad hills. And he was making the point that what we wanted in Newfoundland just then was three square meals a day. In fact - and a tight roof on his house. In fact that was the theme of his speech. Three square meals a day and a tight roof over his head, and he said if that is culture, that is the culture we want. And then he went on to describe it, and he came to the woman down on the beach out in Cape St. George or out in that area - I saw a woman down on the beach gathering up guts from kelp in a brim bag, and struggle up the bank with it slung over her back. Would that be some of our Newfoundland culture, he asked? Oh yes, our culture, our prosperous farming, our happy peasants and they lived and starved. And some of them did not starve and some of them did not live too badly, and some of them even managed to save a dollar, and some of them even sent their sons to college. And today, you have in Newfoundland today, the sons of the poor people, the grandsons of very poor men in Newfoundland, who are lawyers and doctors and college professors, who were given their education out of the starvation and the privation and the sacrifice of very poor men. I know that. I know that is so. These are the exceptions that prove the rule. What is the rule? What is the common thing? The common thing was, the vast majority of our people were poor, very poor peasants. That is what they were. Let us not fool ourselves about it. We do not have to be ashamed of it. I do not think any people have to be ashamed of their poverty. As George Bernard Shaw said once; "the only wrong with the poor is their poverty." Except for their poverty they are just fine. You do not look down on God's creatures because they are poor. And you do not look down on all ancestors here in Newfoundland because they were poor. They were poor. And all the more credit to them that they

have been able to produce a little Island and the little country and the little Province that we have here. All the more credit to them. But do not ask them to go back. Do not waste your time or your breath asking them to go back into peasant farming. They will not do it. You are wasting your breath. They are not going to do it anyway. Maybe they should. Maybe they should not. But whether they they should or should not, they are not going to. There is not a chance that they will do it. Now I will admit this. Come a great depression. Come another world shattering depression such as we had beginning in 1929, and going on almost until 1939, almost ten years, until the Second World War broke out and brought it to a very quick end, if you have a depression like that, you will send men back to the little patches. You will send men back to growing a few potatoes then, yes. But short of a great depression, do not think for one moment you are going to have the Newfoundland people go back to peasant farming. And if you are going to have farming, in Newfoundland, it has to be on a business like basis. It has to be a viable thing. It has to be on as the hon. member for Humber East so truly said: (One of the few sensible things he has said in the present session. It is not bad, out of say a thousand statements there is one sensible one) that farming today has got to be on I think it was he, or maybe it was the hon. gentleman from Fortune Bay who after all, has got a little business experience. It is not just a young callow lawyer being still wet behind the ears. At least the hon. gentleman has knocked about a bit. He knows a little bit. He has had some experience. He was born an ourharbour man and raised in the outharbours in the pre-Confederation days, and he knows something about what life has been in the outports, and he knows enough, and he also agreed with me that subsistence or, as I call, happy or unhappy peasant farming, that is not the answer. He agrees and I agree with him. We agree with each other, if on nothing else, we agree on that. So let us hear no more talk, this bewailing, this moaning, this groaning and moaning over the disappearance of this very, very poor time that is in the past, and I hope will always stay in the past.

MR. BARBOUR: I have forty-three communities in my district. And Sir,

only four communities where any farming or any raising of cattle is done. Namely, Musgravetown, Morley's Siding, Lethbridge and the Eastport peninsula. First Sir, very little in Bloomfield - it is mostly lumbering there Sir and logging. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Premier. Very few people are going to go farming, but Sir, nevertheless, a new era a new dawn has come on the people of Musgravetown and Eastport peninsula. First let me say that Bonavista South can boast of having the largest growing vegetable farm in Newfoundland. Bonavista South can boast of having the largest warehouse in Newfoundland. Thanks to the assistance of the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, I have seen so high as 25,000 sacks of potatoes in this warehouse.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where. Where is that?

MR. BARBOUR: In Lethbridge Sir. The warehouse there between Lethbridge and Bloomfield.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman left out Sandringham.

MR. BARBOUR: No. Sandringham is in the district of the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Eastport?

MR. BARBOUR: Eastport is in my district, Bonavista South. I am coming to Eastport now. Mr. Chairman, in Eastport the people, the farmers, not many of them, perhaps ten or fifteen altogether. Men working on the farms are growing strawberries, tomatoes, lettuce, and of course potatoes and turnips and cabbage. The Government has assisted them in draining boglands. There are also considerable amounts of hay being grown in Eastport and the people there are so conscious minded so far as local industry is concerned, they have set up what is known as the Eastport Peninsula Newsletter. And they say, people working for progress the key for the future. They have central committees and local committees. And they get together in their little town halls because you see we have three community councils, and the people from the four communities, Salvage, Sandy Cove, Eastport, Happy Adventure - they get together in the little community hall, the little town

hall as we call it, and they argue and they plan. And they are satisfied that some of them at least, can make a living from farming. Now in Morley's Siding Mr. Chairman, in Morley's Siding.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many people on welfare in Eastport?

MR. BARBOUR: It is unknown. Never has been any welfare there, unless it is somebody who may be sick. Because you see since Confederation if you are old. What I am trying to say is this. They are getting Social Security right? They are getting their old age pension. So they do not go on Welfare. The only people who go on Welfare, but it is no one (unless there is somebody is sick) there is no one in Sandy Cove, unless there is somebody sick. And there is certainly no one in Happy Adventure. In Happy Adventure, the people are so industrious. We have what is known there as a lobster vat. It is a building on the land, the salt water is pumped into this building, and I have seen so high as at least from 1,000 to 1,200 to 1,500 lobsters in this vat. How do they sell them? The tourists in the Terra Nova National Park, because you see, Mr. Chairman, since Confederation, it is only three hours from here and you are in Eastport. Thanks to Confederation, because now we have a paved road all the way from St. John's until you strike Sandringham, practically pavement all the way. So the people coming to Happy Adventure and they buy the lobsters, and they boil them, or they are boiled for them, and they really enjoy this delicate food. Now then, getting back to the farming. In Morley's Siding, just imagine, Morley's Siding. One hundred head of cattle, only eight or ten houses there altogether. They tell me when I was down there a little while ago that they intend to increase-- now I will admit there are not many people in Newfoundland can make a decent living out of farming, because like the hon. the Premier said, in the town of Bonavista -- No, pardon me, they are all P.C. men but those who are not P.C. they go away and they get jobs upon the Great Lakes, or in the lumbering woods, or at Churchill. But up in the Arm as it is called - the Goose Bay Arm, as the Premier has

referred to it, there is considerable farming done in the four or five communities that I have mentioned. And the people are so concerned Mr. Chairman, they are so concerned over this. They are so concerned over it. At the crack of dawn in the morning until sunset — you can see them in the summertime and in the spring toiling along, because they are anxious to get a living. They do not want to depend on the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there a Mr. Reid there?

MR. BARBOUR: No, it is not Mr. Reid, but there is Mr. Lethbridge, Mr. Russell. There is Mr. Young and there is Mr. Humby. There is Mr. Squire. There are others but I just cannot remember their names now. Last summer

MR. EARLE: All these were Liberals?

MR. BARBOUR: Oh, every one of them. Yes, every one of them. Every time I go before the people in that area, my vote increases. In fact, I am off the subject now Mr. Chairman. I hope you will pardon me. But when I hear that word "Liberal" it goes through my body like a streak of electricity shooting me. I am not very tall, but I am all Liberal from here down.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every part of the hon. gentleman is Liberal. Every part of him.

MR. SMALLWOOD.

Every part of the hon. gentleman is Liberal - every part.

MR. BARBOUR: It was in 1956 that I saw the light and it was in 1959 that I brought back the bacon. I remember, when the hon. the Premier invited me to join his party, The Laurier Club, then, was on LeMarchant Road, and my hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself were invited to join the party and the Premier said to us, "now tomorrow night there is going to be a rally in the Laurier Club on LeMarchant Road, and I want you there." When the Premier introduced me, "you know," he said, "I do not know what happened Ross. He went astray, because all the Barbours were Liberals." He said, "while the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return.

Mr. Chairman, after I finished my speech, the Premier came and he took my hand and he said, "if you talk that kind of politics in Bonavista South, you will bring home the bacon." I brought home the bacon - four to one, and I had two opponents.

I just want to say that, in my district, farming now seems to be on the upward trend in places like Eastport, in places like Sandy Cove, in places like Morley Siding, Musgrave Town, Lethbridge, Winter Brook, and even Jamestown, too.

Mr. Chairman, was the Premier referring to Jamestown?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Jamestown.

MR. BARBOUR: I would like to say - that is exactly right and the Liberals, too.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say - I could not let the item pass without having something to say, because I would be letting my people down, because they are hard-working farmers, and they are making a living, and they are more determined this year than ever. They grow more tomatoes, more strawberries, more hay, more potatoes, more turnip, more cabbage, more lettuce, more parsnip, etc. Oh! yes, they grow lots of beet. They boil

MR. BARBOUR.

them and the aroma, the appetizing smell that comes from them is just right out of this world.

Mr. Chairman, I know I have wandered a little bit, but you know, sometimes you get carried away when you feel that way and I felt that way tonight. So, I just want to say this. I want to congratulate the minister. I want to congratulate him for the attention, for the satisfaction, he is giving the people and by the way the Premier was talking about hog-farms. Colin Bull, in Eastport, is now starting a hog farm. So, we are getting a little bit of everything. He is a good man. He is a Liberal, too. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, about an hour and a half or so ago, I stood up to speak, and I wondered why we had not paid any attention to root crops in this Province and the Government has not. The Premier confirmed this. The minister seemed to indicate that we were, while I was speaking, but the Premier has no time for it. Anybody who even thinks about it, in his opinion, is absurd, ludicrous or silly or a not yet dry behind the ears lawyer, whatever that has to do with it. We sat here tonight and listened to him do his utmost to totally ignore the question that was raised, and he did it. He achieved total ignorance of the question that was raised. Why? Because the Government has such an awful record as far as development of farming is concerned. They have done practically nothing.

The Premier would have us believe, if you were to be persuaded by what he said there tonight, he has not time for the opinions of anybody else - no time at all. His own views are so divinely inspired that nobody else can think a straight thought, and he said, "it was I, who predicted that we would be self-sufficient in eggs. I said that fifteen years ago. I said it and we are." Are we, because he said it? What is it? What are we to have in this Province, something like they have in China? The thoughts of

Mr. Wells.

Chairman Mou, and nothing else is right. What are we going to have? The thoughts of Chairman Joe forever and be bound by it? I, for one, do not propose to be bound by it. I am quite prepared to listen to him and give him full credit for everything he says, but when he stands up here and says, "do not plant potatoes, forget about potatoes, go into eggs and hogs and turkey"- utter nonsense. He is so consumed by the divine status that he ascribes to his own opinions and views so he has not time for the opinions of others. None at all! That kind of a man, the opinions are not worth listening to, if he will not accord to somebody else the right to have their thoughts heard or aired without the kind of outrage that he stood up and got on with here tonight. He totally ignored what I did say, and then when I attempted to tell him what I did say, he told me I did not say it. Who does he think he is? What does he think he is? I stood here, Mr. Chairman, and the first thing that I said was that the day of the family farm is gone, and everybody knows that. It did not go all that long ago. When I was a small boy growing up, we always had hens. Most of the time we had a pig. Most of the time we grew our own vegetables. Most of the time, we had a cow and had our own milk - always. But that is gone. That is not seen around anymore. Of course, the day of the small family farm is gone. The day of the five or ten or twenty acre is gone. You cannot produce on it and expect to compete. That is precisely what I said.

Yet, he stands up and condemns me as being silly and stupid for wanting to go back to family farms, the little tiny farms, for wanting to grow potatoes. I do not know who he thinks is going to believe the nonsense or accept it just because he said it. Does that change what I said, because he said I said something else? Who or what is he? I do not ascribe to him

5808

Mr. Wells.

any divinity. I give him the dignity and respect he deserves, but he is no divine being. I am not being sacrilegious. It is the Premier who claims the divine status - not me. I am not gone mad on the thoughts of Chairman Joe, and I do not knuckle under and change my views just because Chairman Joe said it.

Mr. Chairman, what the Premier has said about growing potatoes or his total ignorance of even considering it, he has totally ignored it and the Government have totally ignored it. They are not even going to consider it. They are gone into ham and eggs, hogs and hens - not even going to consider it, and he said, "there is no property here." There is a man sitting up in the gallery up there who can tell you where there is property to farm and grow potatoes, turnips and carrots and all of our other needs, but you cannot do it economically on a little five or ten acre patch. Now what has the Government done to encourage people to develop 200 or 500 or a 1,000 or a 10,000 acre farms- nothing. It all goes to Shaheen - \$155 million lump, or it all goes in poultry, to a select few, and we become self-sufficient in poultry, with subsidy, besides the direct expenditure. The Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation lost \$269,000 in the year that ended 31st March.

It does not make it so, because he said so. That does not mean that that is the case. Why cannot we be self-sufficient in potatoes? There has been no indication of why we cannot. Of course, all of us are not going to be out farming a patch the size of this room. Of course, we are not going to be. But you set up 500 or a 1,000 or 2,000 or a 10,000 acre farm or encourage it or provide the means whereby it can be done and see how quickly we can become self-sufficient - a lot more quickly than we could become self-sufficient in eggs or pork or turkey or broilers or silica. The Government's record is one of total failure in agriculture except for the select few who are involved in poultry production and poultry products, eggs and what not. That is all. That is the only place where they have achieved

Mr. Wells.

anything and it has done nothing for the vast majority of the people who were involved in farming before. Of course our people do not want to go back to eating and scraping a living out of the soil - just barely subsisting on a bit of fish that they can catch in the Spring and a few crops they can grow or a few animals they can raise - nobody has suggested that. Yet the Premier will stand in this House and he will drag all of this out about how poor our people were and how nice it is to get jobs. Nobody disagrees with that. But that is his whole argument. When there is no argument on the question raised, or the issue raised, how does he answer. He attacks the person. That is step number one. If there is no direct reason for doing that, bring in whatever else you can to cloud the issue so it will be forgotten - so that the real reason will be forgotten. Patriotism. Help our people. We do not want to see our people poor. Somebody in this House a few days ago said that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. I do not know whether the hon. the Premier is a scoundrel or not. I am not prepared to pass an opinion on it.

It is certainly the sure and certain refuge of anybody who has no other logical sound, reasonable argument on the issue. Drag out patriotism. That is always good to obscure things and cover it up. In my honest opinion, the minister's record in agriculture is so good that I would be quite prepared to send him back to being a copy boy with a newspaper. That is how good I think his record in agriculture has been. I would certainly justify it. The minister does not like it, and neither should he. He seems to be. He seems to be quite bothered by it. Why, Mr. Chairman, why can we not be self-sufficient in potatoes?

Mr. Wells.

What is so difficult about growing potatoes? What is so difficult about it? Lack of land, what utter nonsense and the whole of the Codroy Valley lies empty and not being used - the whole of the Humber Valley just because there are a few trees on some of it that can be cut down. Most of Canada, except for the Prairies was like that, in the early days. Right! It was cleared. Sure! Why cannot we clear it today with our modern means?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not the early days.

MR. WELLS: It is not the early days, but it can still be done, and there is land available. The land that is available is not being used. So, if we do not produce all we need, let us produce half of what we need. What is wrong with that? No, the thoughts of Chairman Joe say, poultry, eggs and ham, and we black out everything else. and, because he says it, that is the way it is going to be? That day is fast coming to a close too. That day is fast coming to a close. That is the way it may have been, but that is going to change very soon, and it cannot change soon enough for the good of the people of this Province. Anybody who would stand here and say what the Premier has said tonight, totally ignore this. I know that myself and so do most of the people in this Province and so does the man who is up there in the gallery, who is a farmer, know that he cannot economically farm a small patch of land. You have to do it properly on a business-like basis, if you are going to compete. Why cannot that be done? Where is all the pig and poultry farming?

AN HON. MEMBER: On the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. WELLS: Right on the Avalon Peninsula; primarily. The rest of the Province again ignored, the farmers in Western Newfoundland, which at one time was a flourishing, farming area. There is an excellent farm, that I believe, at the moment, is owned by the Anglican Church out near Stephenville Crossing -

Whites' Farm. The men from whom it gets its name farmed that for years. Cabbage, I think, was their big crop - cabbage and hay. They farmed that for years, very, very successfully. And that lies waste, empty, and we say "no land" - and the whole of the Codroy Valley lies predominantly empty, being ignored, and all the way up through toward St George's, through Robinsons and Jeffrey's and McKay's and Carterville, where the people, for years and years and years, got their living by farming, and did practically nothing else except a relatively minor amount of fishing for part of the year, in that area.

And we are to ignore it because there is no land. The Government has done nothing about it, and they cannot justify their failure in this respect. They cannot justify. They are putting on a set of blinkers and seeing nothing but clucking hens and hogs, that is all.

That has been the government's sole effort in agriculture. And the Premier says the Minister has done such a good job. Nonsense! He has not done such a good job. Sir, if we cannot produce one hundred per cent of what we need in potatoes or turnips or cabbage, let us produce as large a percentage of it as we can. And there is ample land to have economic farm areas. There is certainly as much land available for it in Newfoundland as there is in that squat little province of P.E.I. There is certainly as much of it available here as there is in Prince Edward Island. Now why can we not do something about it? Because the individual who owns the farm has not the capital to do anything about it. That is why nothing has been done. He has not the means available to him. Neither did the people who got involved in poultry nor hogs, in the first instance. But the government subsidized them and the government built the abattoir and the government put in the hog breeding stations and is still running it at expense to the Treasury of this Province.

Well, why can they not do something for the root crop farmer too? And to say that we cannot do it - well, I find it difficult to describe

what it is. Just because the Premier wants it that way, we in this Province have to be satisfied with the thoughts of Chairman Joe? I say no, Mr. Chairman, we do not have to sit down and take it. We can tell him what he can do with it and tell him the changes that we want.

I have talked to farmers too, plenty of them, people who were in farms and who would like to be involved in farming and could see real opportunity there to do something, but they have not themselves sufficient land, while others lie vacant. They have not the means, the capital available to them, nor can they get it because the only direction in which the government is spending any money or giving any help is hogs and hens. It is true, so you have to be hogs or hens or you will get nothing. It is true!

So we build a warehouse or a shed or something somewhere for the farmer who does, but what have we done, what has the government done toward encouraging the farmer to develop an economic size farm and help him with capital to get this done? They have done

MR. WELLS: absolutely nothing, and the premier attempts to cover this up by saying there is nothing that can be done. We cannot do it. We have to leave it to little P.E.I. Sure it is true that the major part of this plan, the DREE plan in P.E.I. involved the gathering together of smaller farms in the larger units. And quite sensibly! That is what I said before I sat down. The day of the small farm is gone. We have to get them in larger economic unit. Our Government has totally ignored it, and has done nothing whatsoever about it. And they stand here and try and tell us the minister is doing such a good job. Maybe we should send them out to clean out the hens houses - they might do a better job out here. That is right Mr. Chairman, and we have to sit here and listen to this when some hon. member makes a suggestion, or asks a question, why has nothing been done? If there was a good logical reason tell us. Do not sit there and abuse the members of this House who express their opinions, because I said fifteen years ago we are going to be self-sufficient in poultry. Is that any reason why we direct all our attention towards poultry and nothing else? There is no justification for it. It may be the reason for it. But it is no proper justification, and I still maintain what I said Mr. Chairman, before; the Government has failed miserably in agriculture and this has been their one big failure, because they have directed their attention in a couple of particular areas. There is still no answer. No answer at all as to the claims and charges made by Mr. Murray, the former deputy minister, as to why he was kicked out, in his words, of the Department of Agriculture because he asked questions about the goings on between the Newfoundland Farm Products, and the Newfoundland Poultry Producers Association, and the payment of \$50,000 of public funds for certain equipment. And he has claimed that a company owned by the Premier had a primary interest in this, and he wanted the inventory checked and it was not there. There was no check of the inventory, and it could not be established. These are the remarks that I made. Nothing was answered. The Premier stands up and makes great

claims and pulls out the flag of patriotism and obscures whatever he can. And says, "the member is nothing but a not-yet dry-behind-the-ears lawyer." That is some argument. Maybe it is true, but it is no argument, none at all. It doesn't answer any of the questions. They maybe the thoughts of chairman Joe, but they are not yet the be-all and end-all in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point. Two points. The first point is that not less than ninety-five percent, not less than ninety-five percent of all the cultivated land in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, not less than ninety-five percent of all the cultivated land in those six farming provinces, was cleared before the year 1900. Not less than ninety-five percent of all the cultivated land in those six provinces was cleared, was re-claimed from the forest, cleared and put under cultivation before the year 1900. And a lot of it was done before the year 1800. In short, it was done mainly by hand. It was done before the day of the bulldozer or the tractor, whether the trawler type or the rubbertire type. It was done not mechanically, but by hand. They would have a block and tackle, and they would tackle in an ox to haul the stumps out of the ground. But as much was done by hand as by ox, and the overwhelmingly bulk of the farm land of Canada was brought into cultivation before the beginning of this present century. It was done by families, by family labour. It was done by pioneers who settled and cleared an acre of land, cutting down the trees leaving the stumps in the ground, hauling the trees off and the boughs, and seeding between the stumps. And when the stumps were five or six or seven years old, and had begun to rot and yield up their grass upon the soil, and could be hauled out, were then hauled out. And so acre after acre with tremendous family labour, over a period of a whole century and more, the smiling fields of those provinces were created, in a slow age, before the motor car, before mechanized equipment, by hand or by ox, and sometimes by horse. This is how it was done. When people had a low standard of living when there was precious little else to do in those provinces, except go farming. When the

land, I do not mean to say that the acreage is not here. Of course it is here. I say it is not cleared. It is not reclaimed from nature. The rocks are not picked off. The trees are not cut off it. The stumps are not taken out of it. The land has not been reclaimed from nature. It is still now as God made it, or nature made it, untold millions of years ago. And the time to have cleared it was fifty years, and a hundred, and a hundred and fifty years ago, when they were clearing it, where it is cleared today, in the United States and Canada. Not now, not today. You cannot clear land today. You cannot clear a thousand acres of land today - you can clear it. It is physically possible. It is mechanically possible, but it is economic madness. It is economic lunacy. It is economic idiocy. The money you would spend to clear and cultivate a thousand acres of land for root cropping, not for grass growing now, but for root cropping, to put land in good condition for root cropping, a thousand acres of land will cost so much money that you would spend the rest of your natural life and you could not earn the interest back on the money it cost to do it. That is the argument. That is the main obstacle. That is what is in the way in Newfoundland of large scale farming. To clear an acre of what do you call the land? Mineral land. Costs what? About now? To clear an acre of mineralized land, and I say mineralized, to distinguish it from bogland, the ordinary land we have in Newfoundland, to cultivate, to reclaim, to clear and set ready for cultivation, an acre of land, will cost at least \$300. Now then, that means only to take the trees and stumps off it and the rocks, and the rocks in nearly all our land, you never get off. You can go over the piece of ground, you can pick the rocks off by hand and no other way has ever yet been found to do it, at least in Newfoundland with the number of rocks we have in Newfoundland, and the rocky and stony nature of our soil. No mechanized way has yet been found to do it. So you go over it by hand and you pick the rocks up, so there is hardly a stone to be seen. Next Spring, there are more than ever, or just as many, and you pick them over again, and there is not a rock to be seen. The following Spring the same thing. And winter, year after year after year, for ten or twelve years or longer, you have to pick the rocks off, because the frost

only choices they had, in the main, were to work for a farmer or become a farmer themselves, by getting a piece of land and clearing it. Getting a piece of Crown land given to them, or sold very cheaply by the Government, so they could go farming. Now, in Newfoundland I would say that, tonight, seventy-five percent of all the cultivated land there is on this Island tonight. was cleared since 1900. And I would say that half the cultivated land we have on this Island tonight has been cleared in the last forty years, mostly by mechanized means. That is the difference. When our people in Newfoundland for long centuries were busy night and day cultivating the North Atlantic ocean, and working a lot harder at it than the farm families were in those Canadian Provinces clearing land, our people were clearing the Atlantic Ocean, fishing. The only difference being that after a hundred years, or two hundred years of clearing and cultivating land, up across Canada, you get smiling fields and meadows. And on the North Atlantic there is no difference, five hundred years after you began, than the day before you began. You can cultivate the Atlantic Ocean forever and with no results. The ocean is exactly the same. In Newfoundland, when they were clearing land in a slow, leisurely age, with low standards of living and nothing else to do. across Canada, here in Newfoundland we were not clearing land. Here in Newfoundland we were trying to cultivate the Atlantic Ocean, with what results we all know. Poverty! Poverty! Destitution! The lowest standard of living in North America. No part of the North American continent with a lower standard of living, on the average, than the average standard of living we had here, after whole centuries of trying to cultivate the Atlantic Ocean. Now what is the result of all that? The result of all that is twofold. First, on the Mainland, they cultivated so much land that loads of it is being abandoned. In Newfoundland, we never cultivated half or a quarter enough land. Now it is too late. What is to stop a man having an acre, a thousand acre farm, we are asked. A 5,000 acre farm. Why cannot a man plant potatoes in Newfoundland on a 10,000 acre farm? The answer is there is not enough land. There are millions of acres of land, and when I say there is not enough

keeps heaving them up and bringing them up to the surface. So you have to do. Take the trees off, take the stumps off, and pick the rocks off. \$300 an acre. \$300. Then you have to lime that earth because it is very acid, very acid, you have to lime it. You have to fertilize it, and there is not enough to put chemical fertilizer on it. You have to put humus into it, because practically all our soil must have humus put into it. This means stable manure, or it means kelp, or it means something from the ocean, or it means fish guts.

MR. WELLS: Or bog.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No, bog will not do it. Bog will not do it. Bog has not got the amount of humus that is needed, that when it is added to our mineral soil, it will give the mineral soil enough humus. There is not enough humus in bog when added to mineral soil to suffice. And if you use bog you have to use that much more limestone, because bog is very acid indeed, much more acid than all our soil. Now all our soil from the Eastern half of the North American Continent is acid. You can draw a line from about the border between Quebec and Ontario. Draw that line straight down through the Gulf of Mexico, and anything east of that line is acid, and the more easterly you come, the more acid it is, until you arrive in Newfoundland, where it is more acid than anywhere else perhaps in North America. So you have to give it a heavy dressing of limestone, and you give it a dressing of fertilizer and you ought to give it a dressing of manure. And you have to fence it. Now you have done that, and you have seeded or planted your acre, how long will it be before you can get back the money you put in, and pay interest on the money you put in it? How long will it take? It will take longer than most lives. Longer than most men are prepared to give to it. They reach middle age. They reach old age, and they still do not have their money back, and their children will never get it back either. If that land had been cleared a hundred years, seventy years ago, seventy-five or eighty years ago - even down to the outbreak of the first World War, 1914. even up until then, if the land had been cleared, not on any scale, but

perhaps it would have been written off long ago, and there would be no cash investment that you would have to pay any interest on. Now one other point: The other point is the availability of credit. The Government of Canada provides credit to farmers in Newfoundland. I know a farmer who went to the Canadian Farm Credit Bureau, is that the proper name of it? The Farm Credit Corporation of the Government of Canada, whose Atlantic Provinces manager was here in St. John's for a fortnight, and went back only a few days ago. I know a farmer who went to that Corporation of the Canadian Government, and borrowed from them \$60,000, and with that \$60,000 established a farming enterprise. Not root cropping though— and he is gradually paying off the loan. He is meeting his running expenses, paying his labour, and slowly paying off the loan, but he is not doing it out of root cropping. So that, the fact of the matter is, that any farmer, in Newfoundland, has the same opportunity exactly, no better, no bigger, no worse, no smaller, exactly the same opportunity as any farmer in Eastern Canada, to go to the Government of Canada and borrow money. Borrow credit, get credit! Now in addition to what is lent, what is given as loans, both Governments do things for farmers by way of gift. I do not know how the minister of Agriculture has been able to restrain himself here tonight from reeling off a list of the things that this Government in this Province does and has done for farmers. He has been accused, and this Government has been accused here, a-half a dozen time tonight, of doing nothing for the farmers. Of doing nothing for the farmers, of doing nothing for the farmers. We have been told at least a half dozen times. The Leader of the Opposition has said it. Tonight he has said it. This Government has done nothing for the farmers. He has said it many times. Here tonight and other times he has said it, and I would hope that before the debate is over in the next few days while this department's Estimates are being debated, I would hope that the minister would favour the Committee with just a bare list - just a bare list of the things that the Government have done and do and are willing

to do for farmers. Is it so quickly forgotten that in addition to the Canadian Farm Credit Corporation that lends money to farmers in Newfoundland, is willing to lend money, has lent great many thousands of dollars to farmers in Newfoundland - is that all forgotten? That the Newfoundland Government has lent many, many thousands of dollars as well, that we have had for years, a Farm Development Loan Board. I do not know how much they have lent but they have lent some. They have lent money to various forms of agriculture in this Province, and in many directions we have done things for the farmers including root crop farmers. I do not know how much we have done in the last year or two or three in what was that heading called Standardization of Farming. Standardization of marketing and farming. How much a year did we pay out for donkey's years? How much a year did we pay out under that heading? A quarter of a million? Over a quarter of a million dollars for that one item. Year in and year out! Say the last ten years, two-and-half to three million dollars, paid out free as a gift to farmers, to root crop farmers. That is only one item. And there are many items. And how any conscientious public man, how any conscientious public man elected to represent the people in this House and have a seat in this House - how any public man, conscientious, can say that, that this Government has done nothing for the farmers, is more than I understand. I can understand them say they have not done enough. I can understand that. I would agree with it. It is a good argument. It is a decent thing to say. What you have done is not enough. You have done this, you have done that, you have done the other, but it is not enough. But to say that you have done nothing for the farmers is hardly to be expected from a conscientious public man. It is not enlightening the people. It is not enlightening anyone. It is squirting like a squid squirting black juice out to hide itself, to obscure the truth, to say anything like that. Because it is not true, and how the minister has been able to, I know that he probably does not want to protract the debate, because there are hundreds of items to come yet in his

department for consideration, for debate, and perhaps he does not want to protract the debate, but I do not see how he can sit silent and be accused, or see the Government accused of doing nothing. The hon. gentleman can make his smart alecky remarks. He can do that.

MR. MURPHY: I want to get in the act in this House the same as everybody else to get my name in the paper, calling names and abusing. I do not know what else goes on in here the past two or three months. Let me get headlines for a change. This is what is being reported out of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is largely right on that. But without -- is he so anxious to get his name in the headlines, that he begrudges -

MR. MURPHY: Why, people are asking me if I am in here or not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, let them ask.

MR. MURPHY: People just do not talk sense in this House anymore.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I would not go quite so far to say what the hon. gentleman is saying, and inferentially what he is doing is criticizing, not the newspaper men in this House who come here to this House -- what he is criticizing is newspapers, radio and television all over the world. No, the hon. gentleman is criticizing the fact -- he is complaining of the fact that not having abused anyone or called anyone any names, he does not get on the radio or in the newspapers. Well that is a criticism of the reporters and in criticizing the reporters for that, what he is criticizing is reporting all around the world, all around the world, so far as radios are concerned. You have - the longest newscast you have is five or six or eight minutes is it not? Very brief. And all the world is covered in that, and what happens in this House never gets more than a minute and a half or two minutes altogether, and you are not going to get a report off tonight -- if some reporter is listening, and some catchy phrase is uttered, like ham and eggs -- this Government are only interested in ham and egg agriculture. Now that will get it. But would that be a fair report - would the citizens of Newfoundland who hear that report on the radio and no more, that is all they hear about tonight's debate -- would they be well informed about the debate tonight?

Is that good coverage? The same all the time. It is the same, it is the same - every sitting of the House, no matter what happens, what gets reported is some catchy phrase, and the public listening are therefore deceived and deluded. But not intentionally deceived, but it is by the distortion, by the suppression, by the omission, by the reporting only of the catchy phrase or an insulting remark - there is an absolute distortion. It is an unintentional distortion, but nonetheless, a distortion of the business that goes on in this House. Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, have any doubt about this? That the average person in Newfoundland knowing little more of what goes on here in this House than what he hears on the radio, is convinced that we are up here insulting each other every time we open our mouths, that no one ever speaks except to insult someone. The Opposition are hurling charges at the Government. They are blasting the Government, and the Government are blasting the Opposition. We are up here all the time blasting each other. Does not the hon. gentleman agree that this is what the general public must believe. This is what they hear. It is about all they do hear. The general public must believe. It is about all they do hear of what goes on in the House.

MR. MURPHY: Well this Session - not every time, but I would say almost without exception, pretty well every debate took place in this House consisted --

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right - but that is not all that has gone on. But that is what is reported.

MR. MURPHY: You report the majority of what goes on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Take the speeches that have been made here tonight, from eight o'clock to ten thirty. Two and a half hours of speaking by three or four hon. members. Now, no

5862

MR. SMALLWOOD: No two of these hon. members agree with each other.

There are five speakers here tonight, five. We made a total of perhaps

MR. MURPHY: Only three spoke yet, or four

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five

MR. MURPHY: Five was it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five speakers have spoken here tonight and between them they have made about eight speeches. Now, would the hon. gentleman, never mind any partisanship-

MR. MURPHY: There is no partisanship in me and if there was -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Okay, a Newfoundlander, a man.

MR. MURPHY: Right a man

MR. SMALLWOOD: A gentleman and a man, would he say that there is very much chance of the various essential points of argument that came out here tonight will be reported over the radio?

MR. MURPHY: I have no idea

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now the hon. gentleman has an idea and he has a good idea and he has a realistic, and we all have the same idea. We know that it will not be reported.

MR. WELLS: It is not possible in ten minutes

MR. MURPHY: No

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not possible in ten minutes, in a ten minute news-cast about two minutes will be devoted to the House tonight at the maximum. Probably it will be one half of one minute. That is probably what reporting will be done on tonight's sitting, one half of one minute and that will be mainly; the Government have ignored agriculture. The only thing they are interested in is ham and egg farming and the hon. member for Humber East made reviled, serious charges against the Government and against the Premier. Now that is tonight events.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will they report.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: No argument, no argument, no argument, and all the various points that were brought out will not be reported because they are not

snazy enough, they are not jazzy enough, they are not catchy enough. They do not arrest attention, and besides look how much work you would have to do if you had to write it.

MR. MURPHY: If they had to report the Premier's speeches the last couple of weeks they would want an hour and a-half full time. The Premier's speech I would say is about an hour and a-half out of two hours now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So!

MR. MURPHY: So!

MR. SMALLWOOD: So!

MR. MURPHY: So!

MR. SMALLWOOD: So!

MR. MURPHY: So!

MR. SMALLWOOD: So!

MR. MURPHY: We call the debate a monologue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A monologue?

MR. MURPHY: Just about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am making one of eight speeches here tonight. Monologue?

MR. MURPHY: I do not know who made the other speeches.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman does not? Maybe he was half asleep most of the time, maybe he has been awake only while I was speaking. Maybe the only one he has heard is this speaker.

MR. MURPHY: No, I heard the hon. member for Humber West, the hon. member for Fortune Bay, and Bonavista South that is three and the hon. Premier is four

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the hon. gentleman's immediate colleague on his right.

MR. WELLS: He has not spoken yet

MR. MURPHY: Yes that is the member for Fortune Bay, same chap

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not speak?

MR. MURPHY: He spoke, and the hon. member for Humber West, Bonavista South and the Hon. Premier

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were five

MR. EARLE: On the past three or four items the.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: I just wanted to make those two points Mr. Chairman, first to

sum up about the clearing of land. It is useless - now we have cleared, howmany thousands of acres have we cleared, this Government? We have spent - I do not know, millions of dollars.

MR. MURPHY: What kind of land was this may I ask, grazing land or.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no, no, land for cultivation

MR. WELLS: Cleared?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Clearing land

MR. MURPHY: I know, you can clear it, but it no good just to clear it for the sake of clearing it

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did not clear it for the sake of clearing it. We cleared it for people who applied to have it cleared so they could go farming.

MR. MURPHY: That is what I wanted to know, thank you very much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what I am talking about. We did not go out at random and start clearing land. What we did was, this man wanted twenty acres of land cleared, we went and cleared it. This man wanted ten acres cleared, we cleared it. Another man wanted fifty acres cleared, we went and cleared it. We cleared it for hundreds. Literally we cleared land for hundreds of men who wanted to use the land for farming and this ran into thousands of acres of land. We spent millions of dollars doing it.

MR. MURPHY: Is there a charge for that by the way or is that.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: We charged a small part of what it cost. We charged, oh I remember at one point, the first scheme we had I think we charged twenty five dollars was it?

MR. CALLAHAN: We do it the other way round now, we give them the hundred dollars

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we let them clear it themselves, hire their own equipment and we pay for it, but we used to have our own equipment not hire it, we owned it, we employed the men, we went out, we cleared the land and charged the owner, the man for whom we cleared it, I think, twenty-five dollars an acre.

MR. CALIAHAN: Now we pay him \$125.00.

MR. MURPHY: \$125.00 a man

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. So it is not true to say that we have not been willing to clear land, we have cleared thousands of acres. It is not true to say that there is not a lot of land in Newfoundland to clear, there are millions of acres that could be cleared. But it is true to say that it is too expensive to do it. Now we did think having cleared, having a lot of experience clearing mineralized or mineral land, that when it came to bog land we might save a lot of money, that it might be a lot cheaper to lower the water table in bog land than to clear mineral land and get it ready for cultivation.

Take an acre of mineral land: You have to take the trees off, you have to pick the rocks off and so on. An acre of bog land, what you have to do is lower the water table. Just lower the water table. You cannot drain it, it will not drain. The water will not drain out of our bogs, it will not drain. You can cut parallel trenches five feet apart and it will drain for about a half foot into the ditch here, and the other half on that side into the ditch there, but in between not a thimble full of water will drain out of it. You cannot drain the bogs. What you can do is lower the water table by pulverizing the surface, six, eight ten inches of it, rip it up and pulverize it and aerate it, let the air down through it, and the sun, and it will evaporate the water. The water table can be lowered that way. That is the only way you can, and when you have done it you have magnificent soil provided you give it a very, very heavy dressing of limestone because, it is wonderfully acid. Then you have to give it fertilizer as well.

Now, we did hope the cost of clearing an acre of bog land, getting it ready for cultivation would be a lot cheaper than the cost of clearing an acre of mineralized land, but, it is not so, it is not so. Maybe just do one acre of this and one acre of that, the acre of bog land reclamation will be cheaper than the acre of mineral land. But on a scale, no, we spent millions on it, the Government of Canada helped us with more millions to do it and we have clear I do not know how many of thousands of acres,

not many of bog lands and the bog lands grow anything. You would think that in a bog you would not grow potatoes, but the finest potatoes that were ever grown in Newfoundland were grown on the Salmonier bogs. You would think that they would be bags of water. They are the driest and powderiest potatoes that were ever grown in Newfoundland and do not forget it, in Ireland which is the home of potatoes the very home of potatoes, Ireland, an enormous proportion of the potatoes over there are grown in the bog lands. Ireland has even more bog land and a higher proportion of the surface of Ireland is made up of bog land than we have even here in Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: That is why they call us bog-trotters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bog-trotters, that is exactly right and a tremendous amount of their vegetation is grown in bog and in Newfoundland our bog lands produce magnificent crops and magnificent hay but it is too expensive. It costs too much.

Look at Sam Ruby. The hon. gentleman has been in on the Ruby Line, in on the Dixie Line, all right, as a boy, a hundred, five hundred times I went in there. You go on in the Petty Harbour Road, you turn down the Ruby Line, you turn left and you go down the Dixie Line to the Dixie Gullies and every inch of that way you are passing the farm of old Samuel Ruby the father of all the Rubys. How did he get his land cleared? Does the-hon. gentleman know? Well I will tell the hon. gentleman how Sam Ruby got his land cleared. Every deserter that ever deserted a ship for thirty or forty years in St. John's, it went around like an underground railway and like an underground secret, if you wanted to desert and hide go in to Sam Ruby's, and he would have them in there, eight, ten, twelve and fifteen deserters at a time, He would put them to work clearing land and that is how he got his land cleared.

Other got land cleared with their own families, still others hired a man at about seventy cents a day or, fifty cents a day and found. The land that was cleared, that is how it was cleared, all across Canada, all across the United States. Today you hire a man to go clearing land and what do you pay them? By the time you get five acres, ten acres, fifty

acres of land cleared away for cultivation you cannot live long enough to get your money back.

MR. MURPHY: Not with modern machinery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, you cannot live long enough to get your money back. Many, many men have tried it, scores of men have tried it and the farms are now abandoned. It would be an interesting thing for my hon. friend the minister to do, to get a map done or an account drawn up of all the land the Government have cleared or paid to get cleared since Confederation and get an account of that land now. How much of that land has been abandoned? How much of that land is still under cultivation? This would be an eye opener.

MR. MURPHY: And the reasons for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They could not make it pay.

MR. MURPHY: No that is not all of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is - well now there would be cases of death, there would be cases of sickness, there would be cases - well I will tell the hon. gentleman of a case: One of the hardest working farmers that Newfoundland ever produced, and one of the most intelligent, was a man who worked like a dog. He was working twenty years ago, and about eight or nine years ago he gave up farming and he started a dance hall, a motel, a hotel, a restaurant, a gas station and he is on the corner, the junction of two very busy roads one of them being the Trans-Canada Highway and that man today is one of the most substantial business men we have in Eastern Newfoundland.

All his farm land is just gone, gone, gone into disusage, he does not use it any more. There is not a blade of grass seeded there is not a bushel of potatoes growing on it, nothing. Farm after farm is being abandoned because men could not make enough money at it. Now mind you, the money they could make at it fifty years ago would have been a small fortune. Today what you can make at it compared with what you can make if you can get a job is trifling, it is pitiful. Men will not stay at it, they will not do it, they are not content to do it. Can you blame them?

What can the Government do about that? What can the Government do about that? How can we make farming pay? How can we do it? How can we make farming in Newfoundland competitive with farming in P.E.I., and Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario? How do we go about doing it here on this island, this old rock, how do we make farming competitive? I am talking root crop farming. It cannot be done.

MR. MURPHY: Not if he can get another job Mr. Premier. This is the point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It cannot be made competitive any how. It cannot be made competitive any how, whether the farmer who is trying to do it can get a job and give it up or not. If he stays at it he cannot be competitive. He cannot compete.

MR. WELLS: Why cannot the man with the 2,000 acre farm here compete with the man with the 2,000 acre farm in P.E.I. if he has the equipment and machinery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no man in Newfoundland today with 1,000 acre farm let alone a 2,000 acre farm. There is no man in Newfoundland today with a farm that has 500 acres cleared. There is no man in Newfoundland today that owns a farm with more than 300 acres and there is not three of them in the whole Province. Now if you want to include Bowaters, they have cleared and cultivated, mostly down to hay, mostly in grass, they have cultivated perhaps what, 600 acres? Hammons farm, and today outside it would be 600 would it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: Something over 400 acres.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Something over 400, the great Bowaters. So can a farm in Newfoundland with 2,000 acres compete with a farm in Nova Scotia of 2,000 acres? Possibly so, but first you have to have the farm of 2,000 acres. You have to have a farm which has not cost you so much you - that has not forced you to borrow so much money to put it there that the interest on the debt does not eat it up, does not chew it up, does not swallow it up. If you make a farm today in Newfoundland of 2,000 acres and put it in good shape and fence it and lime it and fertilize and roll it and seed it, you do that, 2000 acres, and try to compete with a farm of 2,000 acres

that was built before the year 1900, that has no debt on it, because, it was done the hard way, the cheap way, the slow way, taking maybe fifty years to get it up to 2,000 acres, you compare the two and one can beat the other blind.

The new one that cost so much to put there has to compete and it cannot.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but the yield is there

MR. SMALLWOOD: The yield is there, but the interest on the debt, the principal cost of that farm, if it is a new farm, to cultivate it, to erect the buildings on it, to erect a home on it, to fence it, to buy the farm machinery, to buy a pick-up and so on, all that when it is finished has cost so much to put there that at five per cent, six per cent, seven per cent, eight per cent interest, or whatever it is the rate of interest the interest on it alone is more than the farm can produce.

MR. MURPHY: Does every small farmer have to buy this, the point is, all this machinery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The small farm cannot compete at all

MR. MURPHY: But, cannot ten small farms use the same machinery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you had ten small farms of say 100 acres or 150 acres each and that is a small farm, believe me that is a small farm, 100 or 150 acres. What we call farm in Newfoundland are postage stamps. The great farms, the great names, the great names, the Rubys and all the others in at Kilbride, what are the names? The Walshs, the Rubys, the MacDonalds, what are the names? Come on, the Lesters, all these farmers in there, the Chafes, right, all those farms, what is the size of those farms? Does anybody here in the House know what they would run, average, how many acres of cleared land including grass land, to grow grass which they would dry to feed the cattle during the winter. Including the grass land, including the grazing land, and the cultivated land for crops, put it all together what is the size of the average farm?

MR. CALLAHAN: Less than 100 acres

MR. SMALLWOOD: Less than 100 acres. That is not a farm.

MR. MURPHY: How many of these in Kilbride?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh there used to be twenty or thirty I think.

MR. MURPHY: Well, there are three thousand acres in Kilbride eh?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is right. All right, this means they could do what in fact they have done because, a baling machine, a hay mower, can mow the hay of virtually all of those and a baling machine and go in and bale the hay for most of them and there is a lot of that done. There is quite a bit of that done, using machinery in common but even that does not meet the bill because, these farmers have not been able to make it pay.

You take the dairy men. Take the milk men, we brought down a commission from Ottawa to examine the dairy industry here. It galled me, it really galled me, I was disgusted to think that we could not produce milk in this Province economically so that the milk would not be too expensive to the consumer and yet would fetch enough price that the farmer who produced the milk could at least rear a family in decency. We had an investigation made. Impossible, cannot compete, that is why they were bringing milk in here. Milk was coming in here and competing. Milk was coming in from New Brunswick. Milk was being flown in by air and competing with the local dairy men. We want to know why. The reason is, one of the main reasons is that each farm was too small to support the number of cattle they had and the number of cattle they had was too small to produce enough milk and the amount of milk they had was too little to produce enough money to make the thing pay.

Each farm needed to be two or three times as big with two or three times as many head of cattle to produce two or three times as much milk. Furthermore, the quality of the cattle had to be stepped up so that the per animal production of milk would be increased. If you provide living space for a cow, and you give that cow so much feed, the next door cow may occupy the same amount of space, the same amount of feed and turn out half the milk as this one. Which one does it pay you to keep? The one with the high production. So, there were too many cows with low production

there were not enough cows, there was not enough hay grown, we had to import hay, import hay? Baled? George Neal for the last half century (I do not know if he still does it or not) was importing hay. Ship loads of hay, baled, brought in for our dairy farmers. How in God's name could a dairy man compete when he had to buy his hay, brought in with heavy freights on it, brought in from the mainland?

MR. MURPHY: There is little value to the milk, we only value that at forty cents a quart, and you pay seven dollars and fifty cents for a quart of scotch.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That ought to get a headline.

MR. MURPHY: That is right, that is a good one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a good one for a headline, but it does not add much to the enlightenment of this subject does it?

MR. MURPHY: NO but, if milk was sold by the Board of Liquor Control we might sell more of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that the Board of Liquor should go in and subsidize the dairy men.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Take some of the profits from liquor and beer and pass it over to the dairy men to bring down the cost of milk.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that is right, but not to the dairy men, to the people of the Province so that they can buy the milk.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All that the Government hooks off beer and liquor it spends it, the Government spends it, every nickle of it and it is spent on the people of Newfoundland. So, every dollar that the people contribute in profits, or in prices for beer and liquor the Government gets a big slice of that and it goes into the treasury. We spend it on education, and we spend it on hundreds or a thousand other things. We do not hoard it up we spend it on good things including agriculture, including some of the things that are being debated in this debate this morning, this afternoon, tonight and the next week or so. I do not know how long it will take, I suppose we should finish this debate by say Friday of next week.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We should finish this department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. MURPHY: We will get out by the day of the races I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we have time to pass two or three pages of it, between now and eleven o'clock, and I take it we are all eager to do that. We do not want to make any more speeches.

MR. MURPHY: No, all the speeches are very short and to the point -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Short. Say about fifteen or twenty minutes each, that is right.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long, because there has been so much said here tonight on agriculture, that I think some of us must be developing club root. It is the same old story we have heard year after year after year. When I got up to speak originally and claimed complete ignorance on agriculture, this is perhaps being a little bit too modest, because I am not the type of person that claims to know all. I am not like some people in this House, that are an expert on everything. So I am rather inclined to be a little modest about these things.

MR. EARLE: Why did the hon. gentleman say that when he was here? Do not say it in his absence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the time I was knee high to a grasshopper, as the expression is, I helped on a very large farm outside St. John's. In those days Altadena Farm, where Pleasantville is now, and these boxcart loads of rocks that the hon. the Premier talks about, my back was sore for many, many days, lifting these rocks in boxcarts and carting them off. Also that was one of the first large producers of poultry in this Province. Later the hon. gentleman

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was that Leonard Earle? Well he was a real pioneer.

MR. EARLE: The old gentleman Leonard Earle, who originated there got out of the fish business and started a farm on Kenna's Hill, the top of Kenna's Hill. It is all built up in a housing development now. You would not recognize it.

MR. WELLS: Is that the same one who went to Pasedena?

MR. EARLE: That old gent at the age of fifty-six went to the Humber Valley, about the time that the land settlement was starting out there, or shortly before it. And he had a thousand acres. And I went out there and lived with him in a tar-papered shack and helped him when he was just clearing down the trees and starting to develop that farm. And I listened to farming from morning until break of dawn almost until the sun went down at night. He was a farmer. He was a farmer of the type that took a great joy in that he could get more pleasure out of straight row turnips than he would get out ^{of} \$1,000 in the bank. He loved the land. He loved everything he saw and everything he developed. He had a natural affinity for it. Later in life as he could not do the heavy work, he developed some of the largest strawberries that were grown in Newfoundland. He had thousands upon thousands of gallons of beautiful strawberries. He used to send them to me every year, several quarts, and I used to visit him periodically up until the time he died, approximately two years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was over ninety was he not?

MR. EARLE: No, he was eighty-six years old.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was one of the greatest Newfoundlanders I think we have produced in this Island in this present century, Leonard Earle. Was he related to the hon. gentleman?

MR. EARLE: He was my Uncle. That old gentleman was a natural farmer. He loved the land. He loved farming. And as I say at the age of fifty-six, he was a pioneer that went out and opened up a thousand acres of raw acreage, right from the woods.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And good land too.

MR. EARLE: And good land. In that area, the Premier mentioned that in certain sections of Newfoundland there was no soil. In that particular area you go down thirty feet and not strike a rock as big as your fist. I have seen it. The foundations for buildings and so on out there. It is

a sandy loan soil, where there is absolutely no rock. It is perfect, and in any case there again he experimented in large scale poultry farming in strawberries and pig raising. And speaking of pigs, this is one of the origin of pig raising. He had hogs and pigs on that farm the size of which I did not credit. They were huge and extended tail - they must have been ten feet long. I do not know what they were, but they were simply tremendous animals. And he was one of the pioneers also in pork. But this is all by the way, to clear the point that I did have some little background in farming, and did know something of farming when I got up to speak. And what I was saying which was so completely declouded by the hon. the Premier afterwards, by going over this whole picture. He mentioned that there was something like black squid juice coming from somewhere. This whole thing tonight has been so declouded in the discussion, that the whole point has been lost. If it had not been for our hon. friend the member for Bonavista South, we would have been completely at sea. He was speaking so much like what I was getting at here, I merely called out and said the hon. gentleman belongs over here. Because what he was saying and what the people in his district were doing was the very thing that I said that should be duplicated all around the Province where it is possible to do it. Now I was not talking about any man quitting a job at Churchill Falls or any other good paying occupation to come back to Newfoundland to dig potatoes or set turnips or do some meager vegetable garden farming. This is ridiculous. It is so ridiculous. It should not have even been said tonight. No man is going to do that, although mind you, I do wonder, that after the construction at Churchill Falls is finished, and these fellows come back after being used to their huge salaries and so on down there. And there will not be many men employed after construction is finished, because it will only be a power station perhaps employing 200 people, not 3,000. When these men have to come back, what are they going to turn to? They have left their boats and they have left their little garden and their farm. And there is

going to be a great day of reckoning, unless there is something in to which they can step. Now the Premier also mentioned that all across Canada and North America, farms were being abandoned, and men were crowding into the cities. So they were leaving agriculture and there were thousands upon tens of thousands of abandoned farm makers all over Canada. This is true. But the situation in Newfoundland is almost completely the reverse of that. To begin with, we have not the land in Newfoundland, the Premier has already said this. We have not the land, and the people are not leaving their occupations to find another job in some place where there is a manufacturing job or something of that sort available. The difference in the people leaving the Ontario farms and the other farms across Canada is that they are going into the cities where there are jobs available for them. Unfortunately many of ours are leaving the Province and going into Ontario also to find jobs. But what I am talking about is the unemployed which sometimes reaches a peak of 20,000 in this Island. These particular men - many of them never find a job. Many of them try - they break their hearts. They write to me, hundreds of letters. I try and try and try to get them jobs. But these men very often can not get a job anywhere. And yet because of the lack of encouragement, they are sitting around and wondering what to do with themselves. And yet, right under their very noses there is good arable ground that their fathers and their forefathers developed throughout the years. Now what I am saying - this is vacant, this is empty, and you can see where furrows were once upon a time. These fellows - I am not saying to the hon. Minister of Welfare, that you should take away what little they are getting. Heaven knows they are getting little enough. But how they could improve their lot - how these people could improve their own circumstances - this is what I am trying to get at. If they could be encouraged to use some of that land and spend their spare time trying to help themselves. This is the sort of development that I would like to see take place. I am not talking about Newfoundlanders returning to peasant society. Because I

mentioned the past, and I mentioned the things that went on in the past, I do not mean that we should return to that. Heaven forbid if we ever do. I saw enough of it. I was in the fish business and living in the outports and saw these people suffer, and knew they suffered. But in spite of that, even in those days, when they were hard at work from dawn to dusk, and by looking after number one and their families, they were in many cases, far happier than they are today, although they are drawing cash wages. There is a certain independence and a form of character that developed in these people which is perishing. And this is the thing which is worrying me about Newfoundland today. It is the initiative which is being killed. It is the people that need to be helped to help themselves. The people that need to be given the encouragement, and I shiver in this House as I have done on several occasions in this Session, when it has been said to be a crime to encourage the people to think that they can exist in places where they are. They can exist properly. I know area upon area around this Province that with ever so little in self-help and some other little thing to give them just some form of livelihood, they could be happier than they ever will be in Toronto, or even in St. John's or in Marystown, or in Harbour Grace, or somewhere else. They have lovely homes. They have the gardens and the fresh air, and I think it is more of a crime, a far greater crime on the population of Newfoundland, to build up their dreams in the things which are promised, and they hope vainly for them, that they are going to live like their counterparts on the Mainland. They are going to have good steady jobs with income, and these jobs fade out like the dawn.

MR. NEARY: How can the hon. member talk like that -

MR. EARLE: They fade out like the dawn. Let me finish what I am saying, and these chaps go down to disillusionment, disgust with the Government and disgust with their own problems. This is where we are killing our own people. It is the vain promises that we have built up, the things which cannot be

accomplished. Now I am not against promises, if there is an end to the rainbow. Certainly people need to be encouraged. People need to have some incentive, they need to think that there is a future, but do not give them vain hopes for Heaven's sake - for political sake. For the sake of politics and just to get elected, we all ought to walk out of this House if that was what we were doing. And I honestly feel Mr. Chairman, that in the field of agriculture, which we have been discussing tonight, there is not the need of going back to peasant economy. There is not the need of treating our people as serfs or thinking that they should go back to this hard back-breaking labour we hear about. But there is a need of developing in the people this resurgence of self-independence and self-help. And whether there is work to be done and where there is land to be developed, and where there is the availability of good crops to feed their children healthily, and to build up their own constitutions and their own way of living - this I think, is where we can do something for our people, and I will just finish up by saying Mr. Chairman, that what is needed under this particular vote of Agriculture, is the close co-operation of the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and his associates in the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Services. The hon. Minister of Social Services said that when I was in the department I did nothing. I can produce evidence of many things that I did in that department. Not the least of which was a suggestion that the very thing I am talking about tonight be tried in several areas around the country. Now I did not produce a book on it. I did not produce a book at all. I did not waste my time writing books, but I talked to my deputy ministers and the officials of my department until the cows came home, and suggested to them that they form a program for Government, that we get ahead and try to build some of these little places. I had one place in mind in particular. The place itself, through no fault of the people, but with false hopes which they had been given, has gone downhill to the point that you cannot recognize the character of the people in these places.

It is disgraceful. It is frightful that our Newfoundlanders should come to such a level, and I suggested to my officials, "for goodness sake, take a few places like that, send your people in to do a survey, let us know what can be done in that place, and let us get up off our big fat rear ends and try to help these people." And this was the kind, I thought sensible suggestion that I was making. It just fell on deaf ears. At the same time, for what that experiment would have cost, I have seen hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted on frivolity in this Government, which is one of the reasons I am no longer part of it.

Now Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say on Agriculture, but I want to make the records clear, and I hope the press are listening, that I did not suggest turning our people back to the old, old days. Nor did I suggest that they become peasants. Nor did I suggest that small postage size farms could ever be the existence of our people. All that is so foolish, it is rubbish. But what I do suggest Mr. Chairman, that under this vote of Agriculture, ^{with} the proper thought and co-operation, an awful lot can be done for an awful lot of our people in Newfoundland, who are presently doing nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I move Mr. Speaker, that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 10:30 A.M. and that the House do now adjourn.