



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 93

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

MR. CHALKER: Last week I gave a written answer to question asked by the hon. member for Humber East in connection with the cost of the Janeway Apartments Complex at Pleasantville. I have been informed by my staff that a mistake had been made in answering the question and quite a legitimate one too. They advised me this morning that the building cost, plus architects fees, are the basis for unit cost computations. In this case the building cost was two million three hundred and six thousand dollars. The architects fees \$165,000 making a total of \$2,471,000. The area is one hundred thousand two hundred and ninety square feet, which makes the unit cost \$24.70 per square foot. I must apologize to the hon. House Sir for giving this information incorrectly but it was just an ordinary mistake that was made by the computing system in our department.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the answer given in the question as to the number of square feet is 49,450 and now the minister says the actual area space is 100,290, what is the explanation for the difference?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I go on now with something else that I did not think would be necessary. The floor plans because of the large size of the building itself shows only half the floor. In the original computation of the area a mistake was made in not multiplying the result of the area take off by two to get the area of the floor. Hence the area originally given has 49,000 square feet should have been 99,000 square feet. A more accurate check, and I think this will answer my hon. friend's question. The more accurate check on the actual area have increased this slightly to a hundred thousand two hundred and ninety square feet. This error is regretted. The three floors of the three buildings were involved and the result in error distorted the unit cost substantially.

Presenting Petitions:

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from some of the farmers in the Rattling Brook - King's Point area. I might say Mr. Speaker, that essentially the area from Rattling Brook down to Harry's Harbour taking in Rattling Brook King's Point, Jackson's Cove, Silverdale, Nick's Nose Cove;

Langdon's Cove, and Harry's Harbour is essentially the only farming area in Green Bay with the exception of a small area up around the Trans-Canada near the main road leading into Springdale. The prayer of this petition Sir, is for the construction or improvement of a road from the highway leading from King's Point down to Harry's Harbour over to a place on the point. This road originally was constructed by the farmers themselves without any help whatsoever from the Government and without any help from the Department of Agriculture. But the road of course was never properly constructed and it is now in such a condition that the farmers are finding it difficult to properly work their land. I strongly support the prayer of this petition and ask that it be received by the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, question No. 522, on the Order Paper of May 26, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. There is no municipal water and sewer system at Musgrave Harbour, they do not have a system there. Therefore of course the Musgrave Harbour Academy had no water system. There was no water system that they could join, there being no water system in Musgrave Harbour. When the department of Municipal Affairs was made aware of the situation at the school, the inadequate sanitary facilities, at the school the Academy, the department made grants available to the council to the Town Council of Musgrave Harbour to enable them to pay the cost of removing night soil daily from the school. Then the department also arranged with the Town Council to install water and sewer lines to serve the Academy. This is not a water and sewer system for the whole community but just to the school itself. They estimate that this will take about six weeks to complete.

(3) Does not arise.

MR. W. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 403 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West on the Order Paper April 13, The board endeavours where possible to take farm land as security and in such cases of course no insurance is carried. In cases where equipment is

taken as security insurance is carried. With the exception of two loans where in the first instance the amount owed is very small then the second instance where the first insurance policy had lapsed and the borrower had been requested to reinsure. That is in two particular cases.

(2) The Board felt there was no possible opportunity to make recovery because
(a) of termination of farming operations

(b) illness, the board feels this outstanding balance should be written off.

The balance was not indicated in the question it is not indicated in the Auditor General's report and it is not indicated in the answer. So I am not sure what the balance is but for the reasons given the board feels this balance should be written off in this case.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CURTIS: Motion 6.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the House much longer on this issue. God knows it has enough discussion over the past I think something like two months. But just following out of some remarks made by the hon. Premier with reference to the great development in connection with the National Park, I might say we sincerely hope that this does all come about. I would just like to refer to some statements made in the House of Commons as reported in the Evening Telegram of May 28, 1970., by Mr. Jack Marshall, Progressive Conservative member for the District of Humber-St. George's St. Barbe. And I just quote from this article: "There can be no agreement signed on proposals in the Newfoundland White Paper on the Bonne Bay Park nor the Northern Peninsula developments within one month." This is dated May 28, as promised by Premier Smallwood. Jack Marshall, P.C., Commons Member for Humber - St. George's St. Barbe, was told by a department of Regional Economic Expansion committee, meeting here on Wednesday. Information came after Mr. Marshall had asked two questions on the matter in the House and pursued DREE Minister Jean Marchand and Deputy Minister Tom Kent on the subject in committee. Mr. Marchand rose in the House to ask Russell Honey, Parliamentary Secretary to Indian Affairs and Northern Development Minister Jean Chretien, of the Department; if the department had been presented with the Newfoundland White Paper proposals? He was told that the department was aware of the

paper's existence but was still strictly concerned with the Bonne Bay National Park Plan and not with a supplementary development. Mr. Honey said the only information he had on the signing of the agreement was what he had seen from Newfoundland in the news media. At present he said he was not aware that additional presentations had been made. Mr. Marshall said he was met with only a smile and chuckle from other members when he asked the supplementary question this time to Jean Marchand. He asked Mr. Marchand if his department was aware of the White Paper's integrated development plan and other facilities. In the committee meeting that followed the West Coast Newfoundland member pursued the matter and the deputy minister answered for Mr. Marchand. The department is only aware of the park proposal made to the Northern Affairs Department, Mr. Kent said. 'It is known that other proposals exist but nothing can be expected to be done about them in the future. It is impossible,' Mr. Kent said, 'for an agreement to be signed within a month. The plans which appear to be involved are too far reaching and involve too many other departments,' he said. Premier Smallwood and Resources Minister W.R. Callahan both said earlier in the month that Ottawa is ready to accept most of the White Paper proposals. And an agreement would be signed by the end of June. Mr. Marshall said that it is obvious that no agreement is ready to be signed."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman, I want to remind him of a statement I made here the other day that I had never said or given the slightest suggestion of an agreement being signed within a month. But that I had suggested the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the White Paper proposals, not the signing of any agreements. I rose to a point of privilege here the hon. gentleman surely accepts that.

MR. MURPHY: I do Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of it but still at this moment there is still some doubt, where the accepting of a proposal and the signing of an agreement both basically mean the same thing. I mean we are going to accept this proposal within a month, but signing just becomes automatic I think. I think that we have got to be fair in this and say alright I accept your proposal. I am going to buy your house, I am going to pay you

x dollars say, but the signing will take place well tomorrow, next week or the week after. But all I can say is, on this, that I certainly hope that the whole development will come through. I think everybody in the House does and there is no doubt in the world about our feelings on the matter. But I would not like to have the impression that this thing is sewed up, this whole development, and that the park agreement I think could be signed almost immediately and I would urge this House and the Government in particular to let us get on with the job and get the National Park and if we are so sure that this thing is accepted and being accepted by the Federal Government let us get on with the park now immediately and then the others will follow in due course. That is the only words I have to add, Sir, because I think that every other phase is being discussed I was not at the famous meeting in Rocky Harbour or any other matter pertaining to it, I think there are a lot of matters that have been injected into this that have no bearing on the National Park because I remember back three, four or five years before the statement was made in this House, that we had to vote to get a second National Park in Newfoundland and I think the great boast was in the House then that possibly we would be one of the very few provinces that did have a second national park. So I think the national Park is what we want, let us get on with the job, get the park proposals signed up and then, if the Government is so sure that the others will follow, then they will follow in due course.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker there is not a great deal that I can add to this debate because it is one section of the country with which I am least familiar although I have been down there on several occasions, in winter and in summer. Apart from all of the considerations on which we have been quarrelling across the House on this particular issue it strikes me that there is one outstanding part which would have a great influence on the thinking of anybody that considered the development of that area. I remember when the hon. minister for Public Works was my colleague, on the other side of the House, he rightly, as member for one of the districts in that area, took great exception to the fact that I was making a few rather sarcastic remarks at one time about the area. This was based on the fact that having driven down through there at that time, for the first time, seeing a road sign in Deer Lake which indicated

June 3 1970 Tape 1095 page 6.

that there were 300 miles of road from there to St. Anthony, It made me see red because I immediately had to mentally compare it with my district and the area of the country that I serve because (300 miles) we could not get thirty miles of road at that time. The comparison was so ridiculous, now the justification might well be there, in the fact that the large settlements like St. Anthony and so on, at the end of the road, and these had to be reached by some means or other but there is large territory that had to be gone through in order to get to these destinations. But in my opinion there are other sections of the country which have equally important developments in them where no such effort has been made to give the people the sort of connections that they are entitled to just as much as the people on that part of the coast. Now, I do not begrudge, Mr. Speaker, I do not begrudge the people of the West Coast, the North West Coast particularly, anything that they are able to obtain. They are apparently hard working industrious people and deserve all the help that they can get. And frankly I hope that they get the National Park and get the airports and the roads paved and all the rest that is asked for in this particular debate. But at the same time we must not overlook the Province as a whole. I think the fact that this sort of pressure has been put on Ottawa for a particular area, and it is not at the request of the people in that area. The people apparently would be quite well satisfied, would be very happy if they would get something of a relatively modest nature in the way of a good National Park.

Now here again I feel that we can support the Government in so far as the park itself should have more amenities, should have better facilities perhaps than any other National Park, because National Parks across Canada have all been upgraded over the years and we should go for the very most that we can obtain for that park itself. But to try to spread the programme to cover such things as a completely paved road all the way down the shore and therefore it is a part of these other facilities which are asked for. It seems to me to be completely ridiculous; and if I were anyone considering it in Ottawa I would laugh at the whole idea. I would laugh it out of shop. Now rightly the people of that coast should get these facilities that are being asked for or kind of being bludgeoned out of the Federal Government by the use

of the argument of the park. But this is not the place for them to get it this is not the method.

The whole DREE programme, we are given to understand, is to provide this type of assistance and most certainly under the normal DREE programme other such things as public works and fisheries and so on. Within these votes there should be all the pressure that the Government can exert on Ottawa to get the assistance that they require, but not camouflage it by saying we will not give you a park or will not allow you to develop a park unless you come along with all these what I consider outrageous demands which they are making under that pretext. I do not think it is the right tactic. I am quite sure that if I were approached in such a manner, it is like a salesman going to a firm, a buyer, and saying, "look you can only have this commodity if you buy another scarce commodity which you cannot get anywhere else." And it is the sort of horse trading tactics which from government to government is certainly unnecessary, should be unnecessary and should be completely abhorrent to the people who have been approached.

Now this of course will be misinterpreted to say that I do not desire these facilities for that coast. This is not correct under any stretch of imagination. I must repeat that the people in that area are deserving of every facility that they can possibly get as much as any other person or people in Newfoundland. But this is not the way to go at it. And at the same time, by so doing, to hold up the development of a park is also depriving them of what they might get with quite a reasonable approach. So they are the losers in two ways. They are being put off on the final accomplishment for the things that we all desire for them and they are being put off on the immediate accomplishment of something which would be most desirable in the area. So I cannot for the life of me understand the justification for these tactics in this particular case. It is one thing that Newfoundland has plenty of and needs to be developed in many sections of the province not just that area alone. We have historical sites and we have beauty and we have tourist attractions. We hear of the Bonne Bay Park area and it is without doubt a most beautiful section of the country, it is outstandingly beautiful,

June 3 1970 Tape 1095 page 8.

but there are many other sections of the country, I can name a dozen of them that if not equally as good are very close to it and some in certain ways surpass it. Therefore, in justice to all Newfoundlanders, if there is only so much gravy to be spread it should be spread fairly, evenly. And I am afraid that a tactic of this nature and this sort of an approach to a problem such as the Bonne Bay Park will preclude these services for other sections of the country. Now, I hope and sincerely hope -

5907

MR. EARLE: I sincerely hope that the people in that area do get all the facilities that the Government planned for them but this must necessarily be a long range plan, it must take place over many, many years. It should rightfully be done under the new program of DREE, but to complicate this and delay it and to frustrate it, and to annoy the Federal Government people by going after it in this way to my mind is accomplishing absolutely nothing and will not get the desired end.

I would like to see the same sort of effort being made in a different manner for all sections of the Province. Any member who represents a district in this House can point out to the Government many things that need to be done in any section that he represents. This generally should be spread as much as possible to do as much for our people in as many areas as possible but not go after it whole-hog in one direct drive, just because the Government has the bit in its teeth and will not back away from this proposition. Let us get the park, let us get a decent park, the best we can possibly get with all the facilities we can get, but for heaven's sake do not just use the park as an excuse to develop the whole north-west coast. Let us do the development of the north-west coast in an orderly, sensible manner and let us get for those people an equal share of what they are entitled to as well as all other section of the country.

The area down there is beautiful beyond doubt, but there are long, long stretches of coastline with the road running along the coast which is desolate, bleak area. Driving down there on a windy day with the wind from the west, you are very often smothered with sand coming in off the beaches. Settlements are very sparse all along the way, with only little settlements here to there all the way down until you get down to the larger areas.

This particular environment is not peculiar to that part of Newfoundland. There are many other section of Newfoundland, particularly along the south coast where settlements are sparsely located and they cry out and need the connections to be brought into the general contact with their fellow Newfoundlanders and fellow Canadians as much as any other part of Newfoundland. I feel that the Government should not be concentrating at

this particular time on one specific area and get so worked up and all hot and bothered about it, on what is in a sense an outrageous scale where they will very shortly or almost immediately have to return to Ottawa and say, " this is required somewhere else, that is required somewhere else, and this must be done." The great danger is that, by approaching it in this manner and trying to force the issue under a national partnership, that many other sections of the country may suffer, and in fact, the people of the north-west coast may suffer because the authorities in Ottawa could very well say, " this is completely childish, we are going to withdraw from it completely."

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I will finish the debate if nobody else would like to have something to say. I would like to thank all hon. gentlemen who took part in this debate. I think it was very interesting and I cannot say that I disagree with almost anything they say because, I think we were carried away a little bit from the debate. I want to say very little about the white paper if it is possible to stay away from it. I would just like to say that the meat of this resolution was that this House regrets the failure of the Government of Newfoundland to proceed expeditiously with the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay National Park.

Now this is all we were concerned with in this resolution Mr. Speaker, I think that if I had known that it would take almost three months to go through the House I would have felt like withdrawing it as the Premier suggested because, yes, and the hon. Minister of Public Works suggested it, and the hon. minister and anybody else who suggested it Sir. I am not disputing that. Three months is almost too long to spend on anything, especially when you are getting only a few hours each Wednesday. I will right here say that I would like to thank all these gentlemen who took part in this debate. It is not just a local issue any more, I think it has become quite national as far as Newfoundland is concerned. I know back home, and in Bonne Bay itself it is quite a realistic thing, they would like to go ahead with it.

I suppose actually getting very mercenary about it, they would

like to see some jobs created almost immediately. They know, and I think they feel rightly that there is \$2 million in Ottawa waiting to be used. They have gone ahead with many of their own plans which I think are wonderful. This little pamphlet the people of Bonne Bay put out, what they say about Bonne Bay, just like Switzerland or Norway or Nevada, do not miss it, next time I will take my camera, my canoe, my climbing boots, my fishing tackle, my flower book, my paints, rock hammer, sail boat and scuba gear and stay all summer. Inside Mr. Speaker, I think you will see a map there of the whole area, Trout River, Bonne Bay, Woody Point, Norris Point, right on down through past Rocky Harbour. I think they have some beautiful pictures there, giant lady slipper orchids, pictures of Trout River Pond which many of the hon. members know about, pictures going down through table land gulch which is an amazing sight, it is almost like another world.

These are thing the hon. gentlemen know, most of them have seen them at one time or another in the Bonne Bay area. I think actually Sir, staying away as much as possible we would like to get that national park as soon as possible. I think that really I have never heard of the like of Bonne Bay having so many welfare officers and I think that is due actually with very, very low employment there at the present time. We are not anxious actually to, or we are not actually inclined to say that we do not want a paved road, I think that all these hon. gentlemen will remember that just a few years ago the hon. member for St. Barbe North and White Bay North and myself made a public statement saying that it was one of our top priorities actually to get a paved road right down the whole coast. I cannot see anything wrong with that, there is nothing wrong with it. There is nothing wrong with airports if they want to build them, there is nothing wrong with taking over the ferry service or developing the fisheries or the mining or the forestry. That is all good, in fact, it is wonderful if we can get it for the coast, but like my hon. friend from Fortune has said, there are other places in Newfoundland I know when I say this, that do not have roads, do not have anything actually and we do not want it all right away. We would like to make a start, this is the first thing, we would like to make a start

on the national park.

The national park will give employment. My hon. friend from Bonavista South has quoted many figures there. As much as seventy-seven people in a summer, he has as high as eighty I think in the winter time. Now these are figures Mr. Speaker, that

MR. BARBOUR: Ninety-eight

MR. MYRDEN: Sixty-eight the hon. member says

MR. BARBOUR: Ninety-eight

MR. MYRDEN: Seventy-four and thirty-seven, I have the figures there, seasonal and permanent. This is a small industry in my district Mr. Speaker, I think the only real industry we have is the fish plant and that is only seasonal, that is about two to three hundred people when they are working. We have now in Hawkes Bay other industry, but, Sir, this would be a big industry in our district and being very mercenary about it, we need it very badly. These people are anxious to work, they are great workers, they would go anywhere where they can get work and I know, I can understand the hon. member from Fortune when he says he was really surprised to know that there was 300 miles down through the St. Barbe Coast.

Well Sir, I must give the hon. member who preceded me and preceded the former member to, and that is the hon. member from St. Barbe North and I think rightly so, I think the people appreciate that. They know what he has done for that district and I believe honestly and sincerely that he is well known and well thought of in his own district. I know that, but, I am not interested right now Sir, in all the developments they talked of in the white paper. We are interested right now, this time of the year in fact, in getting most of our people to work. I cannot see, and I cannot understand the reasoning really when there is money available, you know, just for instance, in the purpose of the national parks issue here they have; the parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada, for their benefit, education and enjoyment subject to the provisions of this Act and regulations, and such parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Now I agree to a certain extent that wilderness parks do not have much

to offer, but we must also realize that ninety per cent of the people using these parks do so with trailers, camper trailers, tents and they enjoy the outdoors. We are not going to have much more left of the outdoors if we continue on, it is impossible. As far as I am concerned, I mean I would like to see a swimming pool, I would like to see a golf course but that is not necessary right at the present time. I would like to see more of a start on the national park. I would enjoy it, I would enjoy probably a game of golf, I do some golfing but, there is not one out of a hundred in Newfoundland golfs.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the visitors coming in?

MR. MYRDEN: The visitors Mr. Speaker, are mostly, and I say mostly from the island of Newfoundland. I do not think that he can dispute that. Most of the visitors in the national park in Terra Nova are from.....

MR. CALLAHAN: Ninety per cent of our park visitors in any year now are residents

MR. MYRDEN: Right absolutely, no but we do not.....

MR. CROSBIE: They play golf at home, they do not come to Newfoundland to play golf

MR. MYRDEN: To play golf, or they do not fifty or sixty miles on the Trans Canada to play a game of golf, they can stop in Corner Brook right there by the Trans Canada to play a game of golf, they can do the same thing in Grand Falls.

MR. CALLAHAN: They should be provided anyway.

MR. MYRDEN: We should provide all attractions, there is nothing, nobody disputing that if and when it becomes possible. We are anxious now to make a start on it.

MR. CALLAHAN: So are we

MR. MYRDEN: You see Mr. Speaker, as far as we are

MR. CROSBIE: You do not appear to be

MR. MYRDEN: You see Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned there is \$2 million in Ottawa and from the figures we.....

MR. CROSBIE: How much is here, how much is in our estimates?

MR. MYRDEN: Nothing, not a cent

MR. CROSBIE: Not a cent?

MR. MYRDEN: Not a cent. Now I would also like to say - talk about the highroads program: The highroads program was given in this House a few weeks ago, not one highroad Mr. Speaker, not one upgrading, anything in the St. Barbe South District. There is one mention and that is on bridges but there are more roads in St. Barbe South than the main road. There are many, many sections there that need upgrading. There has not been one bit of program, I know the minister has said that he will be waiting for the national park and this is what we are hoping for. Actually I hope that the minister is right, that he will not have to spend that type of money if we get the national park money.

It seems very, very strange that the whole of Newfoundland should get a roads program all of a sudden and not one cent being spent in the St. Barbe South district.

I do not want to as I said before go into the white paper issue, but we have a few things to wind this up with. I agree with most of the arguments about the roads and the airport, but I wonder if the minister has any knowledge when he talks about airports that there is an airstrip right now on the edge of the proposed national park. It was not mentioned in the white paper but

MR. CALLAHAN: Down by River Pond

MR. MYRDEN: No, no, down by Portland Creek. It was built there by a private company and it has - there has been a four engined aircraft landed there:

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MYRDEN: Yes that is right

MR. CALLAHAN: We used it last summer

MR. MYRDEN: Yes, and it is quite usable now so that would cut out at least one airport, and that is right on the edge of the proposed national park.

MR. CALLAHAN: This is not to the national park, this is for quick access across the straits.

MR. MYRDEN: Well this is fine

MR. CALLAHAN: In fact it should go much further north

MR. CROSBIE: There is nothing wrong with this airport

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not an airport it is an airstrip.

MR. MYRDEN: It is an airstrip

MR. CALLAHAN: It is for light planes

MR. MYRDEN: Well it is right on the edge, an airstrip, it is very, very solid and right down to rock-bottom actually. I would like to say Mr. Speaker, to go ^{on} with this debate that many people all over Newfoundland have expressed their concern over it. They I think are most anxious to see something done. I quote Sir, from some of the editorials " argument over the initial size of the Gross Morne National Park is almost superfluous since the area to which Government agrees is substantial." But the white paper over-did things. Its contents were overwritten and its tone was that of an ultimatum. That is not the way to get things done."

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please! I have to advise the hon. member that he must not read from newspapers commenting on any subject that is before the House. Now he can paraphrase it and give it as his own.

MR. MYRDEN: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling. It is my opinion actually (and I suppose maybe this could be right) actually it goes on to say that it has been made into a political football.

MR. CALLAHAN: By whom?

MR. MYRDEN: A political football.

MR. CALLAHAN: Made into by whom?

MR. MYRDEN: A political football Mr. Speaker, whether the minister feels that he is taking part in it that is all right, but I am not saying whom right here, maybe we are all to blame. Maybe it has all gotten out of hand and actually it has been swallowed up by the white paper proposals. The political football Sir, has extended right from the Newfoundland Government to Ottawa. To ourselves too, we will include that. It is a shame because I do not think that these people should be suffering for the thing that have gone on in this House especially during the last few

weeks.

I feel that they are quite sincere when they say that they have something to offer. I know they have Mr. Speaker, because, with their efforts on this pamphlet they have started a tourist industry themselves. They want to create something on the edge of that park that the people will be proud of and I want to say right here Sir, that as far as I am concerned I hope like the Premier said, that within the next two weeks there will be some statements from this House concerning the national park.

According to Mr. Marshall in Ottawa, here only lately in fact, he has said that the park agreement maybe early in June.

MR. CALLAHAN: Um, he is waffling now

MR. MYRDEN: Early in June Mr. Speaker, and this is the man Mr. Speaker who I think deserves a lot of credit whether he is from another party or not. That does not make any difference, he is a very fine gentleman and I think he is sincere when he gets up there in Ottawa and tries to understand what is going on.

MR. CALLAHAN: He is starting to see the light now

MR. MYRDEN: He says that as far as he is concerned there seems to be no hope that there will be anything done within a month or so on this white paper. I hope he is right, I hope we can get it, but he stated even more Sir, that he feels that something may be done in June. I think the hon. minister has stated publicly that something may happen before July on this national park issue. I hope he is right.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is why I say the hon. gentleman in Ottawa is seeing the light now.

MR. MYRDEN: I hope he is right, I hope he can because this is all that the people in Bonne Bay and the people of Newfoundland want to see. They want a start.

MR. WELLS: That does not include the airport and all that though

MR. MYRDEN: That does not include the airports, it does not include the rest of it, but I hope I can be wrong there too. As the Premier says

I may never want to run down there because I may be ashamed of it, but I will never be ashamed of that because I would never be ashamed to ask for a paved road right down the coast. We asked for it, years ago.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the roosters in Rocky Harbour?

MR. MYRDEN: Well, I am not going to get in any controversy over that

MR. CALLAHAN: The roosters have to have something to crow about

MR. MYRDEN: I would like to say Mr. Speaker, right here

MR. CALLAHAN: And the hon. gentleman will not feel like crowing

MR. CROSBIE: Cock-a-doodle-do

MR. CALLAHAN: He will go hide his head somewhere

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude this debate because I promised an hon. gentleman over there it would not be too long. I would like to say this in closing,

MR. MYRDEN: that if anything possible can be done over the next few weeks to make a start on this National Park, I am sure that I will be the first in the House to stand up and congratulate the minister. We have had many differences but I do not think they have been that bad. I hope I can. I hope I can see these people go to work, because that is all I am interested in. Not whether it is going to be a personal triumph for me or for the minister or anybody else. I think we should use common sense in this, and I think we should realize that the lives of people down there in St. Barbe South would be made a heck of a lot better if they went to work. They want to go to work Sir, and they want to see some money spent in the area. I hope, Sir, that the minister will be able to make a statement concerning the Park, and we will all be glad to see it. Thank you Sir!

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the Resolution please say "aye," contrary "nay," in my opinion the "nays" have it.

ON DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the Motion please stand:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the Resolution please rise:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Labour, the hon. the Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Barbour, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. the Minister of Supply, Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion lost.

On Motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

5917

Shall 805-01 carry?

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few observations to make on the debate which was in progress last evening. The hon. the member for Humber East made much of people listening to the thoughts of chairman Joe. And I am sure that equal attention perhaps is given to the thoughts of chairman Clyde. Mr. Chairman, my feeling is that there are two kinds of zealots, and you get them on both sides of the House. One kind knows what it is talking about

MR. WELLS: I thank the hon. member for that.

MR. WORNELL: And the other kind thinks it knows what it is talking about. There is also another observation I would like to make, and this is in respect to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a man whom I find to be a very fair and capable debater, and he certainly has a commendable and enjoyable wit. So when he was probably decrying the fact that he was not getting his due share of time, I felt like saying to him, "what you are Sir, speak so loudly that you do not have to say it anyway."

Now to get back to the arguments raised by the hon. the

MR. SMALLWOOD: In spite of that shirt -

MR. WORNELL: Well he has a good Irish wit but he is departing now from the Emerald green -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has gone north instead of south.

MR. WORNELL: Yes. I think the hon. the Premier will probably notice that he is taking a lesson from some of his compatriots and near-compatriots. This is a tie which was donated to the cause. A very nice one. I notice that the hon. member had one on yesterday over there, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, or was it the member for Gander? I noticed him sporting one, so I thought that I would be able to use mine as well. But to get back to the arguments, Mr. Chairman, I always try to make some sense, try to be reasonable, try to be logical. The hon. member for Humber East really castigated the Government last night, in not doing anything.

for the farmers. If he had said that the Government is not doing enough for the existing farmers, that is the farmers that would make a viable industry out of their farm, then perhaps he may have been near the truth, if he had said that. But I will say this; that if you had all the money available for farmers, I would say that it would be used perhaps as a vehicle by the Opposition to further castigate the Government. Because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it would lead to more squandermania. I am sure that people would come into this Government and put up all kinds of schemes, and they might think that they would be able to build a farm perhaps on the top of Gros Morne. They would get bulldozers, they would have the Government send out bulldozers, and they would clear land. And eventually they would find that it would be all for naught. Loves labour lost. Because Sir, I do not think there is enough good arable land in Newfoundland for this Government, or any Government to worry its head too much about. I believe - I know Newfoundland - I travelled every part of this country and I am not going to let any hon. gentleman take my experience from me. The only bit of good land that I have seen is on the West Coast, and perhaps on the Avalon Peninsula. There is Central Newfoundland. There is some good land there too. And down in the District of the Hon. Member for Bonavista South yes! But let us be reasonable gentlemen, let us be reasonable

MR. SMALLWOOD: And some river bottoms at the heads of some of the bays.

MR. WORNELL: Some waddies I think they call them, the deltas or - No Mr. Chairman, I think that we have to be realistic. We have an Industrial Incentive Act in Ottawa, at the moment under the Department of Regional and Economic Development. How many people are taking advantage of that Act? And the advantages that are available under that Act? Not too many. Now I know that that perhaps does not cover farming, but it covers the processing of farm products. I am almost positive. It is a resource-based industry that would be covered by that Industrial Incentive Act, and what is more resource-based than say the processing of poultry, the processing

of farm products, the tinning of beets, the bottling of beets, the tinning of turnip tops. That should be a resource-based industry, and I believe that anyone who wanted to could probably get assistance from the Industrial Incentive Act, from the Department of Regional Expansion.

Now another point Mr. Chairman is this: Supposing we started a modern farm out on the top of Gros Morne. In the first instance you would have to buy all the expensive farm machinery, and that covers a lot of money Mr. Chairman. It was only last week, perhaps last Sunday night, that I was looking at a documentary where two farmers were interviewed, I think it was by Charles Templeman. One farmer was really into it in a big way. He was a big entrepreneur. And the question was asked, well how much money do you have invested in this farm equipment? Oh well, I have \$150,000 in this, and I have \$40,000 in that, and so it went until he was up to almost \$300,000 in farm equipment. So in the next scene, they showed a run-down farm, a farm which had been inherited by these two brothers. They seem to be bachelors, although that may not be right. But the old fellow was asked, how much he made. "Ah," he said; "if I had to live off what I get out of this farm, I would starve. If I did not put away a few dollars in the good years, and invest them wisely, I would starve." Now that man did not invest in new machinery. He was saying that the only way he could keep it going at all was by buying used machinery. And then the question of skilled labour comes up. Now I have heard farmers from over around the Kilbride area tell radio announcers, radio interviewers, that they just cannot get their sons to work the farm. The sons, he said, do not want to get up four o'clock in the morning and go out and chase the cows any longer. They want to stay up until four o'clock in the morning drinking beer or dancing, or something like that, and go to bed at four.

MR. MURPHY: Or chase the girls.

MR. WORNELL: Now, these are facts Mr. Chairman. These are facts. We have to face these facts, and the hon. the Premier was right, when he said that

regardless of how nostalgic our sympathies are, we cannot go back to the old days. It is progress - supposing we are marching into a straight jacket of oblivion -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not even necessary progress, but it certainly is change.

MR. WORNELL: It is a change Mr. Chairman, it is a change. But this is something which the reasonable man must admit. It is all right to score debating points, but in this Chamber we are supposed to use the debating time that we have to elicit or draw forth whatever truth we can out of a question. And I am sure that the hon. gentlemen over there know how difficult it is to draw forth the truth in all cases. Now I have mentioned the terrific cost of farm buildings, farms, silos, machinery, fencing and so on. And I would say Mr. Chairman, that even if the Government provided all these things free, it would still be impossible to make a viable industry in farming in certain sections of this country. Because you are not going to get the right type of men to operate these farms, I raised that question before. I raised the question of having small industries in every settlement around this Island. It is conceivable but it is not practical. It is like Christianity. It is conceivable but it is not practical in all cases.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think that is a good illustration.

MR. WORNELL: The hon. the Premier has his views and I will have mine Mr. Chairman. Even with the best farmlands available - and even with the most modern machinery, farmers are finding it very difficult Sir, to make a reasonable profit. Now these are the points I had. These are the notes that I made. I will speak of Bay d'Espoir. I thought that Bay d'Espoir - I remember the first time I ever visited Bay d'Espoir, 1945. I said, what a beautiful spot for farming. Well actually its whole economy was based on the land. Now Bay d'Espoir is twenty or thirty miles inland from the

outline coastal areas. They did not know anything about fishing. They used to build boats up there because they had a good lumber yard and a good boat-building yard there, the Roberts brothers. But the main industry Sir, was logging, and they had their own subsistent farming, but just to show you how a person can get the wrong impression when he is not qualified to assess the economic importance or the economic liability, or the economic potentiality of certain place, I said what a beautiful spot for farming. Okay! I was just an observer like any other hon. gentleman - probably in those days I thought I knew it all - as you get older you then realize how little you know. So, when I became the member for that district, I went into it a little more thoroughly and looked at the ground, looked at the terrain. And I said, by gosh you cannot spread out here, the hills are too sloping. Very little farm potential did Bay d'Espoir have. I saw the hills but I did not realize - so all right. I got the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources - at that time I think it was the hon. Max Lane. I got him interested. I believe he sent someone down. They had a little farm potential, but not too much. So last year I got the present hon. minister interested in it, and he sent the field worker - Mr. Scott I think his name was, down to Bay d'Espoir, and they made a thorough survey. My recollection of it is that there was only one area, and that was about ten miles in from Milltown, ten miles north of Milltown, one area - where you could really start a farm on a commercial basis. Now that was about in by Bernard's Brook - Right away Mr. Chairman, I knew then that the difficulties that one encounters in trying to start anything. You see I had heard about this American who started a farm there in Bishop's Falls, or around Bishop's Falls. And I figured, well all right, if that fellow can do it, why can not someone down in Bay d'Espoir do it? I knew that Bay d'Espoir was crying out for an industry of that type. It is almost impossible - but anyway the only thing that we can do, as I see it, is to make available the information that we have in the Department of Natural Resources and Agriculture - make available this information, and also make available the information regarding any aid, any grants that we can give

people who are interested in starting farms. And let the people of their own initiative start these things. I do not see that the Government is supposed to have the answer to all the economic ills of this Province. It is absolutely crazy to expect it.

Now Mr. Chairman, another point I was going to make. Yesterday I threw out a suggestion for the preservation and saving of the hides of caribou and moose. Not one hon. gentleman took me up on that, not one hon. gentleman said, well that is a good idea. There must be a small industry there up to say \$100,000. It could be. Here it is right before their noses. And another thing is canning. I am sure that you could start little canning industries in various parts of this Province. One has to think of I think it was Mr. Evely, down in Comfort Cove, and he is making a viable thing of canning turnip tops and well as other things. And I believe the hon. gentleman over there will certainly agree, that you could have turnip tops grown in almost anyone's back yard. So I feel that if you had a territory with enough people, say a population of about 5,000 people, and got as many as possible interested in growing turnip tops, right there at that particular season is the basis for a small industry. That is just

Mr. Wornell.

turnip tops. Now, if you have a small canning industry, there are many things: you could can beets, potatoes, can carrots. I suppose there is no reason why you could not can turnips. - So, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should all get our heads together..

MR. MURPHY: With reference to canning. What happened to our local canning plant? Is that still in operation? I am just wondering, I think, the..

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. gentleman reminded me because I intended to mention that yesterday. I remember, around the 1930's, Campbells soups came here. Campbells soups came here and they opened up a canning factory over by Mudge's, you remember, where Bowrings use to keep their ships on the Southside. Now, that went out of business. For what reason, I do not know. There was also a canning factory started at Petries Point by Connors, that was the late Senator Connors.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. McClean.

MR. WORNELL: Oh, McClean, I am sorry. I thank the hon. the Premier for setting the record straight. I thought it was Connors.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is another thing, you see, that has been tried. They were canning, I believe, small herring at Petries Point. Now why that folded, I do not know. It must have been because they did not make profit and no business is going to continue, Mr. Chairman, on losses..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Lack of supply...

MR. WORNELL: This is still a valid reason why the plant closed up. So, when we are here debating issues, I think, what we should try to do Mr. Chairman, is to collect all the ideas that we can of the forty-two members who are here and cut out this vilification and name calling back and forth. Let us get our heads together and try and do something for Newfoundland. Thank you very much.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect of what the hon. member has been saying about attempting to do something agriculturally in various areas of the Province, it might be useful for the House to know that last year on Bell Island, on an experimental basis, with the request of my colleague the member and the Bell Island Association, we stationed a student on Bell Island to try a small experiment. We assisted about 100 people, one student in agriculture. One of our subsidized students. We assisted about 100 people in ploughing and with advice. They purchased their own seed, their own fertilizer, their own lime. They planted their own crops and out of the 100 who were interested at the moment, 60 or 70 carried on, and on the basis of our small investment of \$4,000 to \$5,000, they turned out something between \$25,000 and \$30,000 worth of crops. We consider that to have been a very successful experiment. So, there is some field, Mr. Chairman, for that kind of thing and indeed the word has gotten around and this summer we propose to put five students in the field: one on Bell Island, because the number of people interested has doubled from 100 last year to 200 this year. We have had requests and proposals put up by the Bay d'Espoir Development Committee. I think my hon. friend from Hermitage has just referred to that. Also, by the Port au Port Development Association, by the St. Brides and Cape Shore Development Group or the Placentia Bay area, including Branch and also by a group from St. Mary's, St. Mary's Bay.

We propose to enlarge the experiment this year and to put five students in the field, because we do believe that there is a field for self-help, providing, and this is where I depart from what my hon. friend from Fortune Bay said last night. There is a field for self-help. It is feasible provided, I suppose, really three things: provided some basic assistance, provided the willingness of the people to put in some hard work themselves and provided that they are prepared to do that under direction. For an individual to set out, to provide himself with his needs from a small plot of ground without any help, without any direction, without any advice, I think is practically

Mr. Callahan.

unworkable before it starts. It is dead before it starts. But on a co-operative basis, through a development committee, through an agricultural society such as the case on Bell Island last year, where they put the proposal together and decided what their objectives were, decided what their needs were, and they came with a sound, co-operative approach to the thing to us. It was possible for us to give them some really minimal help, in a sense, because they did most of the work, and it was possible for them to have a good result and they, in fact, did. They saved themselves a lot of money, I think and provided themselves with some necessary activity in this case and got, I think, a great deal of satisfaction out of it.

This year, with a limited amount of money available, we will supply students in the five areas that I have mentioned. We will establish demonstration plots to illustrate the use of insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, new varieties of vegetables, cultural practices in vegetable, hay and pasture production. The students will work under the direction of the fieldman for the particular area and the program will be carried out as I have said in extremely close co-operation and really through the development association in each case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a far cry from either commercial agriculture or the old type market or subsistence kitchen, garden variety. I think it is possible to do something in a limited way, essentially, as an extension program along the lines I have just described, but I think it, in no way, should be taken to mean that this will be the basis or can be the basis for a commercial, agricultural industry. It is a means of providing to people, almost a hobby, a useful hobby, a self-help facility by which they can save some money and as I have said, usefully use their time, if they have time available to them and at the same time, perhaps, save some

Mr. Callahan.

money. It is not to be taken as anything that can be the basis for a commercial, agricultural venture.

Mr. Chairman, last evening, I tried to rise on two or three occasions during the discussion of this section of my estimates. I am afraid that each time the spirit moved me, it apparently moved your Honour to look the other way, and I did not get a chance to say then some things that, perhaps, should have been said in the context of last night's debate.

I think I must disabuse the committee of any idea or suggestion that the Government, through its agricultural policy, are paying attention only to one or two specific areas, the two that have been mentioned; namely, poultry and hogs. Nothing, Mr. Chairman, could be further from the truth and the estimates bear it out, and I draw the attention of the committee to these estimates, in the whole. We will be going through and looking at individual items, but I will ask the committee now to bear in mind, as we go through the whole picture, as it was presented last night which was not a true picture and as I will present it now. So, we can see it in the round and we will see that the case put forward last night bears, in fact, Mr. Chairman, no relation to the true situation.

The hon. the member for Humber East built or attempted to build a case on two essential points: (1) a series of what I might call, imbittered, even scurrilous letters to the newspapers, attacks, personal attacks and attacks on policy, attacks on everybody and anybody. That was the first thing; and (2)..

MR. WELLS: Made those attacks..

MR. CALLAHAN: But that was one of the bases for the argument and the hon. gentleman raised it two or three times during the evening and demanded answers and demanded replies. And (2) his quite unfounded and unsupported contention to which I have just drawn reference; namely, the contention that the Government are interested only in the poultry and hog raising aspects of agriculture in this Province, and I intend to deal with both

Mr. Callahan.

points, I think to the satisfaction of the committee, in showing the committee that in neither case was the hon. gentleman on good ground.

Now in respect of the first, Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I do intend to be unkind to the gentleman to whom he referred as the author of some of these letters to the newspapers. I think that poor man's situation is mirrored in his writings. Let me only say that, as the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, he did initiate the arrangement with Newfoundland Poultry Producers Limited to purchase their equipment and the correspondence is in the files of the department, Mr. Chairman. There is no suggestion in that correspondence of anything improper, no suggestion of any problems. It was simply a matter of the Government deciding, as a matter of policy, in order to facilitate aspects of agriculture in this Province, to provide public facilities which rather than be tied up by limited companies, by private operators, would be available generally to the people participating in the agriculture industry. So, the Government owning property at Pleasantville, which had been leased to this company, and the Government wishing to obtain this property back in order to make it a public facility rather than a private one, had to make some settlement with the then occupiers of that property.

So, the offer was made to that company to purchase their installed and operating equipment at its depreciated cost and it is as simple as that, Mr. Chairman - no impropriety, no skulduggery. It is as simple as that, Mr. Chairman. It is a simple matter of reimbursing the owners of the equipment for the equipment as it had been installed in that public property. Then following that the opening up of the property and the equipment to any poultry producer to use, as the member of a newly formed co-operative.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have hundreds of co-operatives in this Province, indeed more than twenty per cent of the entire population of this Province in one way or another are connected with co-operatives, whether

Mr. Callahan.

it is producer co-ops or consumer co-ops or credit unions or whatever they may happen to be and the cardinal rule of a co-operative is that any member of the public who qualifies by putting down his initial share capital and abiding by the regulations or agreeing to abide by the regulations and the by-laws of the co-operative, which he does by implication, when he puts down his initial share capital and agrees to provide any additional capital that he may have to subscribe over a period of time, by doing that, any citizen may become a member of a co-operative and no citizen may be barred from becoming a member of a co-operative on any ground that conflicts with that position. The rights and responsibilities apply equally to any person who wishes to join. Co-operatives are completely open and, Mr. Chairman, there should be and there is no restriction or no barrier that can be placed against a person who wishes to join a co-operative that has not been placed against anyone who already is a member. Co-operatives are open to anyone as I say who qualifies by virtue of agreeing to the regulations, by-laws, as they are laid down.

In this case, as we are doing right across this Province, we are trying to persuade farmers, people in the agriculture industry, in the same way, as I have indicated already in respect of these small experimental operations that we have undertaken. Certainly the best chance, and I think the only chance of having any agriculture in this Province is by virtue of co-operation, of supply management and of first class merchandise. If we do not have efficient co-operative operation and co-operative supply management or marketing and first class efficient merchandising, our agriculture will simply not compete.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is that the Government took back the property which it had inherited from the U.S.A.F. at Pleasantville, compensated the operating limited company of the time for its equipment - the Government could have gone and purchased other

Mr. Callahan.

equipment at much higher costs, which could have been rather silly, useless, a waste of money - compensated the company on the basis of the audit value of the equipment, depreciated, and turned the facility into a public one and this was followed by the re-organization of the company into a co-operative which is completely open to any^{poultry} producer who wishes to join.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman raised a question of the so-called missing equipment or the equipment that was not there or the inventory that was not produced or not done.

MR. WELLS: That was Mr. Murray's claim not mine.

MR. CALLAHAN: I realize that, Mr. Chairman. I have said that already. This is the second point that was raised from the letter that the hon. gentleman read last night.

MR. WELLS: It has been spread all over the newspapers in the last six months.

MR. CALLAHAN: I realize that and let me say that, you know, life is too short. I have not the time and I do not intend to reply to every crackpot thing that is written in a letter to the newspapers. You know, I would do nothing else.

MR. WELLS: I agree with that.

MR. CALLAHAN : Well, the hon. gentleman

MR. WELLS: But it is hardly crackpot...

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman, last night, asked why there had been no replies, and I am telling him now, Mr. Chairman, that there have been all manners of things written and published and, no doubt, will continue to be all manners of things written and published and whether they are true, false or indifferent, perhaps, is difficult for the editors of newspapers to determine, but the fact is that they do get published and the fact. also is, Mr. Chairman, that nobody has time to keep up with this

Mr. Callahan.

stuff and to be continually trying to compete with it, and I do not intend to try. By virtue of the fact that the hon. gentleman raised the point in this House last night, I am now replying to it. I am replying more to him than to the letters. I do not intend to try and reply to the letters.

Mr. Chairman, in respect of that particular matter, the inventory or lack of it, wire baskets and other utensils, I want to say two things: the first thing is that the instruction was, indeed, given to a former manager who by the way has been quoted as also feeling that there were things which should not have happened. It is part of

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources): a group. The former manager as I understand it from the records was instructed to make the inventory, but no inventory was made. At the point at which the first letter to the editor appeared in the newspapers, an instruction was issued through the deputy minister, to the Farm Products Corporation, to go back and to carefully examine the entire situation as regards to that inventory. So an inventory was made Mr. Chairman, and it was balanced in the light of new purchases or obsolete equipment and all the rest of it, and in fact, and I make this statement now, and I hope I will not have to make it again— In fact, not only was the value of the purchase verified, not only was the equipment in fact there, Mr. Chairman, but after the balancing, adjusting had been done to allow for new equipment purchase, new equipment obtained, there was in fact slightly more in the way of those particular assets than had in fact been agreed in the purchase. So rather than not get value for the money spent in respect to that particular item, there actually was slightly more value than was required to be provided for the amount of money spent.

And I would add to that Mr. Chairman, that in the first instance in any event -

MR. CROSBIE: Affidavit supplies or what?

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman wants affidavits Mr. Chairman - I gather he is doubting what I have just said. He doesn't accept what I have just said. If affidavits need to be prepared, we will have them prepared, but I can go back prior to that Mr. Chairman, and tell this House that the purchase, as I have said already, was on the basis of the audited value of the entire equipment in that building with the depreciation applied. Now there is an audited statement, there is an audited account, and if that is not enough, I do not know what is.

MR. WELLS: Is there an audited inventory?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the auditor took account of the property in the building with the best advice of the officials of the Government as to its value, and that is what we have paid for.

MR. WELLS: But was it the property as listed in the books of the company, or was there an -

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I have just said while the hon. gentleman was out, that we have gone back and I am prepared to assure the House, and I do assure the House, that on the basis of the normal inventory done I agree somewhat later, but done as it should have been done by a former manager, who subsequently departed the scene, on the basis of the inventory done, something slightly in excess of the required value was received for the money that had been paid.

MR. WELLS: This should have been said when these letters were in the paper.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I have just told the hon. gentleman that there had been dozens of such letters. I have been confronted by the gentleman who has authored some of them. As a matter of fact by three gentlemen who have authored some of them on two or three public occasions. One of them was before the Standing Committee on agriculture of the House of Commons, last year down in the Hotel Newfoundland, on I think a Wednesday evening. And I was told at that time there were going to be action - there were going to be charges brought, and they were going to land in court, and there were going to ^{be} writs taken out and there were going to be all kinds of things. I had another consultation at the University about two months ago on the same thing. And the whole tenor of the remarks made there, in a public place, to me, as I have said already, was intemperate, embittered, and scurrilous. And I told that gentleman there publicly in that place Mr. Chairman, what I thought of him. So I have answered these charges several times in public. I have never seen any record of my having replied to them.

MR. WELLS: Never anywhere have I seen any .

MR. CALLAHAN: Well I am simply informing the House, the Committee Mr. Chairman,

that I have been confronted in public with the press there by some of these charges, various charges at various times. Now I have said what I had to say in this Committee and in this House and I do not intend Mr. Chairman, to get into it again.

Now Mr. Chairman, I have said that the Government feel that the only way we can have any success is through formal co-operation. Now we realize Mr. Chairman, that the farmers in this Province, in much the same way, I suppose, as farmers in other provinces, but perhaps more so because as the hon. the hon. the Premier pointed out last night, that commercial agriculture has come to be in this Province at a time when costs and expenses and credit and everything else come at a much higher cost than they did, say, fifty years ago when other provinces perhaps were growing agriculture. So we have come into commercial agriculture in many respects at the roughest possible time. And we realize Mr. Chairman, it is not possible for farmers to supply themselves easily if at all, with all the things that are needed to have a first class modern viable agricultural industry, whether it be big or small. And it must almost necessarily be big. So the policy for several years very simply has been that if farmers will come together - if they will indeed co-operate, form themselves into producer organizations -

MR. CROSBIE: They only need six, is it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: Six or seven I think Mr. Chairman. We will enable them by the provision of facilities to operate on a viable and efficient basis. So in addition to providing the public egg-grading facilities at Pleasantville, we have provided similar facilities at Bishop's Falls. We have purchased the equipment for similar facilities on the West Coast. And in addition to egg-grading facilities, we have provided for the Eastern Farmers Co-op, vegetable processing facilities at Pleasantville, and for the Central Farmers Co-op., vegetable processing facilities at Bishop's Falls, and we intend to provide similar facilities for the Western Farmers Co-op., at Corner Brook.

and certainly in the Corner Brook area.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the Codroy area? The Codroy Valley.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, we do not intend, nor can we afford indeed, to provide processing facilities everywhere. They must be central complexes, because even as they are, they will not be used anywhere near, as they are established, anywhere near capacity. They will need to be subsidized in their operation for periods of time, but we feel and we hope and our studies indicate that, over a relatively short period of time, they should be able to operate without subsidies, or at least on the basis of decreasing assistance. And at the moment we think two or three years is sufficient to get them into operation on a viable basis.

MR. CROSBIE: Why Corner Brook? Why not say Stephenville Crossing or somewhere down there?

MR. CALLAHAN: Because Corner Brook Mr. Chairman, is the principal market area, and it is also the principal distributing area - the principal distributing point on the West Coast, and in addition to that, Corner Brook is a DREE special area. There is to be an industrial park in Corner Brook. There is to be an arterial road which will connect both with the highway and the port for all the various reasons, all the economic reasons, and all the reasons of transportation, central location. There are many reasons for deciding to go into Corner Brook, and Corner Brook is where we have decided to go. We could Mr. Chairman, if we had lots of money and lots of people and lots of producers and, ^a good market say in the Deer Lake area, and another in the Stephenville area, and another in the Codroy area, and another in Robinsons. We had those situations all over the Province. We could be in a position where we would have to supply these facilities in many places. But as it is, with the population as it is, the distribution of population as it is - the economics of the situation, for many many reasons Mr. Chairman, we have to operate obviously on the basis of centralized facilities. And this is why Bishop's Falls was chosen. This is why Corner

Brook, the Corner Brook area, I am not sure where in Corner Brook as yet - we hope in the new industrial park in the Maple Valley area. This is why Corner Brook is the obvious place for a third processing facility.

In addition to eggs and vegetables Mr. Chairman, we also, if we are to make a success of the hog industry, and to take full advantage of what we have been doing with the swine station in the supply of hogs from that facility, if we are to enable farmers in Central and Western Newfoundland satisfactorily to participate, because there are some in each area now participating, but with some difficulties

MR. CROSBIE: Some are not allowed -

MR. CALLAHAN: No Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of some not being allowed to. It is a question of transportation costs. We have - we are producing Mr. Chairman, at this swine breeding station, animals which are in certain critical respects disease-free. And we supply them to farmers on the basis, and this is the policy as it has been, and as it is at the moment - on the basis that these animals will be returned for slaughter to the Provincial abattoir which is Federally approved and inspected, and where the proper pathological work can be done on the carcasses and on certain vital organs to ensure that there is no breakdown, that there is no deterioration - to ensure that the disease-free standard is being maintained.

MR. CROSBIE: What about custom-killing?

MR. CALLAHAN: Custom-killing is a vastly different proposition from what I am talking about Mr. Chairman, not only that, custom-killing, in a sense, would work completely against what we are trying to do in creating a disease-free, very high grade pork product.

MR. WELLS: Does the abattoir buy the grown pig -

MR. CALLAHAN: The abattoir, in effect, buys them back Mr. Chairman, and sells them and repays the farmers at a price which floats according to the Toronto market price.

MR. WELLS: In effect the provincial abattoir is the only purchaser of pork products -

MR. CALLAHAN: The only purchaser of pork products of animals supplied to farmers under agreement from the swine station.

MR. WELLS: That is what I said. The only purchaser for hogs that have been previously supplied by the hog purchasers.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right. That is part of the agreement, and the reason as I have said, is that it is the only Federal Government approved inspected facility where we have the additional facilities for the pathological work that must be done.

MR. WELLS: So the persons in Western Newfoundland who buy the disease-free piglets or whatever they are when they are small - they must bring them back -

MR. CALLAHAN: There has been a bit of a wrinkle in that in this sense - that we have been satisfied with one or two slaughter-houses have been pretty good. They more or less have been up to standard.

MR. WELLS: Where are these?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am thinking of one in particular at Summerside on the West Coast. And while it is not possible to have, at the moment to have animals slaughtered in the slaughter houses certified, as the animals down here would be certified, we have been trying to get to that. And we have asked for the certification of certain slaughter houses. There are fees involved and there have been some problems involved, and I do not think we have been able to achieve it yet. I think there were several places that we wanted approved.

MR. WELLS: Has the Government considered an abattoir say somewhere like Deer Lake or Stephenville Crossing, or some central location west of Deer Lake?

MR. CALLAHAN: No. What we would hope to do, and this is what I am leading to Mr. Chairman, what we tried was in an interim way and we expected to arrive at this, but it did not happen at the same time that other things

happened. In other words, some farmers in Central and Western Newfoundland, wanted to get animals under the SPA quota, and rather than frustrate them, we decided that in advance of any facilities out there, or any massive transportation subsidies, or at least any massive amounts of money to be used for transportation subsidies, we would try to get certain slaughter houses certified. So that two things are going on parallel lines.

The matter of getting the slaughter houses certified slowed down somewhat - and the lack of veterenarians.

MR. WELLS: Are they of a quality that need to be certified?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, we think so. Particularly some of the ones that we have built, ~~two~~ recently in recent years. They are small, but they are very good. Public Health are in it too, but not in relation to animals as animals. But in any event we got a bit behind in trying to make these arrangements, and in the meantime we did let some farmers have some animals in the hope that the other thing will be ready in time. And this did not happen and this has created a problem for one or two farmers as the hon. gentleman may know.

So Mr. Chairman, what we hope to do is in addition to the vegetable and the egg-grading - the vegetable processing and egg-grading sides of these complexes is also to put some slaughtering facilities in that same complex, and not separate it from it for the obvious reason that it is more economical to have it there. The same management, the same administration - part of the same complex. And I think we will have to do that perhaps rather quickly, again providing funds. We do have in the Estimates, in these Estimates Mr. Chairman, as the House approves, some starter funds for the facilities on the West Coast. We hoped to have it last year, but we had to finish off the one in Central Newfoundland for the beginnings of a complex at Corner Brook. It might be on a quite smaller scale or somewhat smaller scale, but really we have now, and we have had for about a year, a very competent agricultural engineer - something we never had before. And we are

looking at the prospect of some kind of modular design building that could easily be added to it.

But the point is Mr. Chairman, that these facilities are being provided near the principal market and distributing centers around the Island, entirely at public cost. They are being turned over to the Newfoundland Co-op services for co-operative operation at a nominal fee. We are providing assistance.

MR. CROSBIE: Who are "they" by the way?

MR. CALLAHAN: Newfoundland Co-op Services Mr. Chairman, are the grandfather organization of the Co-op movement in the Province. They are the top co-ordinating body to which are elected - at the annual meeting events - directors representing all the co-ops in the province.

MR. CROSBIE: They have no relationship with the Government?

MR. CALLAHAN: No relationship whatever with the Government, except in this respect Mr. Chairman, that we continue to give them an annual grant which will appear in the Estimates - we have in this past year to help them with their organization, loaned them two of our senior co-op men who are long-term employees, to assist in various aspects of their operations. And we are assisting them to a degree, not providing the working capital, but assisting them to obtaining working capital in respect of the complexes already in existence at St. John's and at Bishop's Falls, and I have no doubt we will do the same in respect of Corner Brook. We also give them assistance for at least the first couple of years on their overhead and running expenses.

So all these things Mr. Chairman, are done in the hope and expectation that farmers will indeed come together and work together, and we think they will. But the essential objection and the only objection that we hear really, is from persons such as the writer of the letter of the hon. gentleman referred to last night and two or three others, who continue to tell the public we are independent farmers, and we are being done in by this foul Government, who

are insisting other farmers do this and this and this. And the simple answer to them is, that if they want that same assistance Mr. Chairman, they are quite free to join. They cannot be prevented from joining, that they have the right to join on the same basis as other farmers who are now in these co-operatives. So there is not very much to argue about in that. But these are some of the things that we hear. This is the kind of thing that is casting shadows on what we think and what we are convinced and what I hope this House, this Committee now will be convinced, is a good approach to this problem, of trying to put the agricultural industry we have, which I suppose is the smallest in Canada, but then we are the smallest or next to smallest province in Canada. But I hope the Committee will agree that this approach, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the only one that can put agriculture in Newfoundland on a sound viable efficient basis. And this is what we are trying to do. We are not discriminating against anyone. We are saying to the so-called independent farmers, if you want these particular benefits, the only way you can get them is in concert with others like yourself. So please come in if this is what you want. But if that is not what you want, and you want to stay out, please do not knock what we are trying to do. Please do not say that it is fraudulent or that it is discriminatory, or that it is unfair.

Now Mr. Chairman, I want to make some reference to remarks that were made here last night, and to carry on in a sense briefly as to where the hon. the Premier left off. Because I have some feeling from things that have been said here - things I have heard on the radio and on television last night, that the position or approach or philosophy, as announced by the leader of the Government last night, has not been very well understood. Let me say this Mr. Chairman, that very recently the Canadian Agricultural Task Force, which worked for three years, about three years, under the head of MacDonald College of McGill University, presented its report to the Government of Canada, last Fall. And that report was just made public about a week ago. And there are many things in that report - there are many recommendations in the report, frankly Mr. Chairman, there are so many, and so many implications to the findings and recommendations that I think it is going to take some time to sift it out

MR. CALLAHAN: And indeed the federal minister already has said that it might take another agricultural congress and all that that implies, eight or nine hundred or one thousand people from all over Canada spending days sitting down looking at and reading and trying to assimilate and understand papers done by committees which would take the task force report and break it down again as was done a year ago on its preliminary proposal. We are not alone when we say that we do not completely know yet what the effects will be.

One of the things the task force said Mr. Chairman, and I think we can accept them as an authority, is that while twenty per cent of the population of Canada, in this year, today, are involved in agriculture, are part of the agriculture community in this country, twenty per cent of the people of Canada, one-fifth, four million or so, that by 1990 the percentage will be down to four per cent. From twenty per cent now, down to four per cent twenty years from now.

Now, as we said last night, there will be people who will wail, moan, groan, who will regret it, who will feel that they better quickly stop the world and get off, and would if they could but the fact, Mr. Chairman, is, that this is the trend not only in this Province but in this country and all over North America, for all the reasons that were spelled out last night. The trend is, and what it is leading to is, that within twenty years instead of one-fifth or twenty per cent of the population of Canada being bound up, involved economically and in their lives with agriculture, in twenty years time it will be only four people out of every hundred in this country and the population of course will have grown considerably at the end of those twenty years.

So Mr. Chairman, it is not unrealistic, it is not disloyal, it is not any slur on agriculture, it is not derogative, it is not unsympathetic to agriculture to look at the facts as they are and to say that this is in fact the trend. Nobody has said, Mr. Chairman, do not plant potatoes.

Nobody said that all the farmers of Newfoundland who are (some of them right now) planting potatoes should not plant any potatoes, that they should stop. Nobody has said that we cannot grow root crops.

MR. CROSBIE: What are you doing to help it, that is the question?

MR. CALLAHAN: I will get to that Mr. Chairman very shortly

MR. CROSBIE: Good man!

MR. CALLAHAN: Nobody has said do not grow potatoes, that we cannot grow potatoes. Nobody has said do not plant root crops or that we cannot grow root crops, because the Government know better I think than anyone what we are doing in those respects. We have said essentially, Mr. Chairman, that the old idea, of everybody with a potato patch behind his house, is not going to be revived and secondly, unless.....

MR. CROSBIE: Everyone agrees on that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Unless you have an efficient and I might say well financed, well equipped agriculture industry with good, efficient marketing and merchandising you cannot survive. One of our basic problems, Mr. Chairman, up until now, and it will persist, is that as far as potatoes are concerned we are sitting cheek by jowl with the largest, the biggest potato-producing industry in Canada, in the Provinces of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

They can produce cheaper than we can produce because of sheer volume. They produce huge surpluses which they have up till now been able to dump in here at their whim and it is pretty difficult in that context Mr. Chairman for us to survive. This does not mean as I said, and I repeat, it does not mean that we cannot do anything in respect of potatoes or other crops or indeed of anything else. I will say this, there is a growing philosophy across this country, there is a philosophy which is running more and more through policies of the Government of Canada which filter right down to farm credit corporations and other agencies, what is known Mr. Chairman as the principle of comparative advantage which says in effect that if New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on a cost benefit basis, on the basis of sheer economics can produce potatoes, more, better, cheaper than we can produce them, then we should not be producing them.

They say the same thing about eggs, the same thing about milk and the same thing about beet, the same thing about sheep, the same thing about anything.

MR. CROSBIE: Would the minister permit a question? Is that not the same theory as the Gordon Commission ten or fifteen years ago. We can all make a better living in Ontario, so we all move to Ontario is it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: I cannot disagree with the hon. gentleman's suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is, but what bothers me, and what I feel, and what we have said time and time again at Federal-Provincial conferences, at the agriculture congress, at Federal-Provincial meetings, at meetings here, at private meetings, in correspondence, and everywhere that we get the chance to say it, to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons, we maintain and we continue to maintain Mr. Chairman that applied strictly across the board as the economists, the technologists, the technocrats, the computers wish to apply it, the principle of comparative advantage runs diametrically up against the whole principle of Confederation, the whole principle of equalization, the whole principle that a youngster born in the city of Ontario should have really no greater opportunity than a youngster born in Flatrock, or, to put it the other way round, the child born in Flatrock should have as good a chance as the child in Ontario.

We think it does, we think that there are limits to this thing Mr. Chairman, just as there are limits to what Mr. Gordon proposed, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, which from an academic point of view, from a high economic point of view, no doubt, and I think everyone will agree, was quite accurate - a quite accurate assessment of our problem in this country. Are we going to wind up Mr. Chairman with all the people living in the centre and nobody on the extremity. I suppose we could have lots of national parks in that event and that is all we would have.

We have attempted, with some success I think, and I hope with more success, to on the one hand persuade, show the economists that they are right until you inject the human factor and then we have attempted to build on that and say that there are areas in agriculture where we can be

extremely successful, where the comparative advantage is in our favour. This I think is what the hon. the Premier was saying last night Mr. Chairman, that there are areas where we have proof that we can excel. There are things we can do better in agriculture in this Province than you can do them in other Provinces - in other parts of Canada. We can have not only in one year Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago, but four or five years running the best pork products, the best output of pork products in terms of quality in this whole country of Canada.

That we have gotten into a position where we can export and successfully compete in eggs, that there is very much we can do in the revitalization of the sheep industry. There are things Mr. Chairman, that we can do extremely well. Now there is something that we can do that we may not do extremely well, but which we are not going to cut off tomorrow and say, "okay, we agree all the potatoes will be produced in Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick." We right now only produce at the most thirty per cent of our requirements of potatoes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty per cent?

MR. CALLAHAN: About thirty per cent, somewhat less than thirty per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: How does that compare over the years?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well I would think it is much lower if you look at the other years Mr. Chairman from the point of view of market value, but from an agricultural - a commercial agricultural point of view, and this is what we are considering really, our potato production is about thirty per cent of what we consume and it is worth about \$1 million a year. Now the attitude I think that we take on this very simply is that, if we can produce \$1 million worth of potatoes for our own consumption, that is \$1 million we do not have to export out of the Province to pay for somebody else's potatoes. If we can increase that we should.

The question that arises Mr. Chairman is at what cost? If it comes to the point that even with the \$1 million recirculating in our own Province, it is costing us more to have our own potatoes, then we have arrived at the knub of the problem. I do not think it will happen in quite that way, I think it will be the same kind of slow attrition that is

happening elsewhere in the country unless, unless we get into the efficient, viable kind of situation I have mentioned and we can cut costs, we can still put a good product on the market that can compete, and unless we have coordination with the other Provinces and some understanding some basis of understanding so that we can control this dumping factor - because there should be some compensation for that.

This Mr. Chairman, was one of the principal reasons for the proclamation very recently of the natural farm products Natural Products Marketing Act and the appointment of the farm - the Newfoundland Farm Products Marketing Board. That board not only will serve as an overseer of supply management schemes in this Province, it also will board-mate with other boards in other Provinces and with the new national marketing council to see that we do have some protection against dumping from other places.

The House might be interested, I have mentioned potatoes Mr. Chairman, about one half million sacks last year of \$1 million, turnips about the same, half million sacks \$1 million, cabbage 8,000 tons, \$1 million, other vegetables about 500,000 sacks \$1 million. 100,000 pounds of wool \$60,000. 11 million dozen eggs \$5.5 million, 2 million pounds of beef worth \$1 million. Poultry meats, two and one half million pounds worth three quarters of a million. One half million pounds of lamb worth one quarter of a million dollars. 3 million pounds of pork worth \$1 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Have the hon. minister got the figures showing the numbers of persons getting a living out of those classifications?

MR. CALLAHAN: Not a breakdown Mr. Chairman, but generally I can give the figure. Just to conclude this, whole milk, one and one half million gallons worth \$1,725,000., blueberries, 2 million pounds at twenty-five cents a pound one half million dollars. 15,000 mink pelts worth \$200,000., and that is around Mr. Chairman, roughly \$15 million.

Now that production gives a full or part-time livelihood to some 3,500 people in this Province. I say full or part-time because, actually I think the full time figure would be closer to 2,000 people. Now we

in our context Mr. Chairman, we only have one half million people in this Province

MR. CROSBIE: I am trying to list the number of people, how many did you say?

MR. CALLAHAN: 3,500 full and part-time, 2,000 full-time. We are only the equivalent, population wise, of a medium size North American city. As the Premier said somewhere recently, we could drop down in the suburbs of Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver and they would not know until the next morning, until they heard it on the Open-Line Show or somebody told the Newfoundland Government.

We are not very big, and 2,000 persons in this industry full-time or a 3,500 person industry full and part-time which I think would work out to something over 2,500 full-time jobs is not to be sneezed at. If we are doing it on the basis of keeping in this Province the \$15 million which otherwise would be going elsewhere, then I think we are getting a double benefit. So that is somewhat Mr. Chairman, the story.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has the minister asked - would the minister yield a moment. Would it not be a good idea if he were to ask the - my staff - Mr. Power and his staff to make a study of the multiplier effect of 2,500 jobs in agriculture, how many others would as a consequence be enabled to make a living because there is a multiplier effect in agriculture. I doubt if it would be one for one, but it might be half of one to one or even quarter of one to one. If it were quarter of one you add another 600 or 700 persons who are making a living and this runs all through our society. Every job means another job or half a job, or quarter of a job or even two jobs or three, depending on the multiplier in a particular classification.

This should make a fascinating study.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, indeed we have some general figures and we are right now actually, working through the Agricultural Economics Council is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Canadian Agriculture Economics Research Council of

Canada.

MR. CALLAHAN: The Canadian Agriculture Economics Research Council of Canada right now Mr. Chairman are doing a study for us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But they - the - - - - they will apply formula and the yardsticks of a national character whereas our own people have done it in dozens of occupations and they were thoroughly familiar with the local criteria, the local yardsticks.

MR. CALLAHAN: I will be pleased to avail of the assistance.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have them check the others.

MR. CALLAHAN: Of the economic development people Mr. Chairman, and let me say this too, that in - I do not want to get into detail at this time, but in a very massive submission to DREE, we have had to have this general kind of information and we now have to and are getting specific information in order to support this submission we made there. It may be that some of this is being done, but I certainly will as a matter of interest refer this to our economic and research branch people.

I am told incidentally Mr. Chairman, that the generally accepted multiplier, the average accepted multiplier in agriculture is about 2.4. Whether that applies

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is what?

MR. CALLAHAN: 2.4

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two and one half to one

MR. CALLAHAN: Roughly two and one half to one. 2.41. But that is national and involves equipment manufacturers, fertilizer companies

MR. CROSBIE: Dairy farmers

MR. CALLAHAN: All kinds of things. It is not reliable obviously in our case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two and one half to one. It would be that nationally yes. In the United States it would probably be a little higher.

MR. CALLAHAN: It probably would, although on the Prairies Mr. Chairman, where you have the delivery of wheat this would go right down into the railways, the shipping complexes.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in the U.S. too

MR. CALLAHAN: And in the U.S. as well, but in Canada, I think that would probably be vastly inflatable.

Mr. Chairman, I had begun to say that we are not telling our farmers in this Province to get out of root crops, indeed we are doing just the opposite. By building these agricultural complexes, very large elements of which will concern themselves with which ^{we} will handle vegetables, will process vegetables, we in fact are saying just the opposite to what was suggested

Mr. Callahan.

here last night by my hon. friend from Humber East. We are saying to farmers, in this Province, do produce. Produce all you can. That is where the tale hangs. But that is what we are saying. Produce all you can, and we will give you, free of charge, these facilities whereby you could put a better product on the market for the consumer. So, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we are trying to discourage root cropping at a time when we, in fact, are spending very large amounts of the public funds to put in complexes to process root crops is to say the least a little silly.

Mr. Chairman, we have first class root crop farmers in Newfoundland today. You can go right across the Island. The gentleman who was in the gallery last night, I do not see him now, Mr. Legge, from Robinsons, is one of them, he and his brother. We have them in the Humber Valley - the Atkinsons and others. You go up into Cormack. I was up there the other day - the people like the Upwards, Pearce Upward and his son or down into Bishop's Falls, in the new Woodale area. People like Bill Harnett or Tom Brown in Lethbridge who by the way, Mr. Chairman, has the biggest single acreage under crops in the Province. Then you come east and you get down into Lethbridge, as I have just mentioned and then you come on east, and you get down into the St. John's area, the Avalon Peninsula - the MacDonalds, the Lesters and others who were mentioned here last night.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about them, when we talk about the day of subsistence agriculture being done. These are people who still are growing. We are producing, but Mr. Chairman, there are also people who are finding it tough. I doubt very much that without the assistance programs that exist, (and I will get to them now, because I have been asked about them again this morning) none of these farmers, the best farmers we have in this Province, the ones I have just mentioned, the Legges, the Upwards, the Atkinsons, the Browns, the Harnetts, the MacDonalds and the Lesters - none

Mr. Callahan,

of them could exist without the assistance programs that are provided, and in terms of what we are doing - these people, Mr. Chairman, are in mixed farming, I should say that. Some of them are in dairy farming, as well as root crops. Some of them have some livestock, as well as, root crops, but they are based on root crops. They are based on large areas of land, and the expense that goes with it, the problems that go with it and as I say, they could not exist without the generous assistance programs that we have, which I should say, we would like to make if we could do it even more generous.

Now to refer again, Mr. Chairman, to the question of whether we are concerned at all about root crop farming, we say this: that out of the estimates, which we are now considering for the division of Agriculture, and if we add in, which is not shown in these votes, an amount of money in the Community and Social Development Vote for community pastures, we add the two amounts together and we get somewhere in the area of about \$1.4 million, you will find, Mr. Chairman, that nearly \$1.2 million is devoted to activities, programs, assistance of all kinds that is directed specifically and solely towards the assistance of root crop farming in this Province. The only significant amount of money that is there in the votes at all that is not directed to that end is the \$250,000 allocated for hog breeding. That is the only significant amount. There are other small amounts. But what it comes down to, Mr. Chairman, is that eighty-five per cent or ninety per cent of the total vote of the division of Agriculture, as now presented in the House, and it is not too far out of line with last year's estimates, is directed towards crop farming and has nothing whatever to do with either poultry or with hogs. I am sorry that the hon. the member for Humber East is not in his seat, because this was his tour de force last night. This was his principal argument that there is no concern for a root crop farm.

As I say again, Mr. Chairman, eighty-five to ninety per cent of the

Mr. Callahan.

budget of the division of Agriculture of the estimates of the division of Agriculture, directly and indirectly, provide for root crop farming and the committee will see that, as we go through the estimates and this is why I have already asked the committee, and I now ask the committee again to bear this in mind, in the round, in the whole, as we go through the individual items. I am talking, Mr. Chairman, about everything from agricultural education, where we, in this program over a number of years, sent I think 109 students, agricultural students of to university and paid for everyone of them - 109 students in relation to our, again I say it, small agriculture industry, I think is a lot of students. We have paid their entire expenses. I think we paid their travel, their books, their tuition, their living allowances, board - we pay it all Mr. Chairman, How many of these people, I wonder, would come back and be involved in hog production or egg production - how many of the 109? I would say not a half dozen, Mr. Chairman. Virtually, everyone of the students has come back and gone into agricultural pursuits other than poultry and hog production. So that is another indication, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman was quite wrong last night. He simply did not know what we was talking about. I will tell the hon. gentleman again or has he been listening? Will he tell the farmers what he has heard? Will he go out and tell the farmers the kind of thing we heard from him last night?

MR. WELLS: I listen to the farmers. I do not tell them, because I do not know anything about farming. I listen.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can recognize facts, when they are presented to him. At least, I hope he can.

Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen on the other side are a curious lot. They only accept the answers they want to accept. If the answers that they get are not what they anticipate or hope for or pray for, then, Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Callahan.

the answer to the facts are wrong. The answers are wrong. There is no truth in them, and they are just unacceptable. Well this is, I suppose, nothing new for an opposition, but it is new for an opposition to reject everything - everything that is provided to them in the way of information that does not completely suit their predisposition as to what they will accept.

MR. CROSBIE: We were just about to congratulate the minister of his...

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that I said what I said, because congratulations from the hon. gentleman would amount, somehow, I do not think realistically, but somehow to some small tiny degree - the last thing I want is congratulations from the hon. gentleman.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, the vast bulk, eighty-five per cent, at least, of the vote this year, as last year, for the division of Agriculture has nothing whatever, absolutely nothing whatever to do with either poultry or hog production and in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, as I have just said, 109 students, agricultural students were sent to an agricultural college of whom less than one-half dozen, certainly less than one-half dozen have come back and become involved in hog or egg production. So the hon. gentleman is quite wrong on that.

MR. WELLS: Give us the figures.

MR. CALLAHAN: In terms of land clearing, which is our biggest, single expense, Mr. Chairman, it should be no surprise to the committee that hog raising and poultry production do not use land except the land which the buildings are on. As far as land clearing is concerned, it is completely unnecessary.

MR. WELLS: Land clearing is the biggest expense?

MR. CALLAHAN: Land clearing is the biggest, single expense we have Mr. Chairman. When we talk about land clearing, we are not simply talking about the

Mr. Callahan.

amount of money, the subsidy paid to farmers in bonuses. We are talking about pasture lands brought into production and maintained. We are talking about bog lands which form part of them and in these votes, we have \$100,000, \$65,000 and, I think, \$100,000.

MR. CROSBIE: \$265,000.

MR. CALLAHAN: So there is \$300,000, just about in that alone and that, Mr. Chairman, does not include the subsidy on limestone. It does not include other land fertility programs. It does not include agricultural surveys. It does not include equipment demonstrations. It does not include our purchase and supply to farmers, at either reduced costs or no cost, of specialized equipment, which they could not afford themselves. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the hon. gentlemen, simply, do not know what they are talking about.

MR. CROSBIE: Ninety per cent. It is not ninety per cent.

MR. WELLS: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. CROSBIE: Not anywhere near it.

MR. WELLS: Before he sits down so we can have this thing cleared. Page (40) of the estimates. The land clearing, the most that there is for root crops, the most is \$142,000. It is under Item 815-05: Maintenance of Equipment, Transportation of Equipment, Fuel and Oil, Wages and Travelling, Subsidized Land Clearing - \$142,100. Up above in Development, 815-04: Blueberry, Fur Farms, Pasture Lands for Animals - \$55,000. Boglands, \$100,000. I do not know what they are doing with them or where they are being used or if there is any root cropping in them or not. The most that there is is \$142,000, possibly, plus a portion of the \$100,000 under boglands. Hog breeding alone - hog breeding alone, apart from all the other subsidies and everything else, hog breeding alone is \$249,000. Now how can..

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman again is only listening or is only hearing what he wants to hear. I just got through saying, but I have not said

Mr. Callahan.

Mr. Chairman, that eighty-five per cent of the funds are devoted to root cropping. I did not say that.

MR. CROSBIE: You implied it.

MR. CALLAHAN: I said, very clearly, Mr. Chairman, twice and now this is the third time. The hon. gentleman claimed last night that all we were concerned about was poultry and hogs and I am saying, and I have just said twice and I will say it again, that every farmer in this Province, I suppose, without exception who has livestock also has root crops. It is mixed farming all the way except in some cases in respect of poultry and perhaps hogs. But most farmers have mixed farming operations. They depend upon our community pastures to pasture their cattle or their animals for a large portion of the year while their own lands are free to grow grass or perhaps even to grow crops. The point is that we are talking about farmers engaged in root crops who have other activities, mixed farming activities and without the assistance of root crops could not exist, Mr. Chairman, because take that out of their operations and the rest of it could not hold itself up. You cannot take root crops out and say that so and so is not getting any help with his cattle or take his cattle out and say that he is only getting help with his root crops. It is mixed farming, Mr. Chairman. We do not have predominant farming operations in this Province.

MR. WELLS: Is it true that 3,000 acres^{probably} will supply all the potatoes the Province needs?

MR. CALLAHAN: It all depends on what one means by probably worth.

MR. WELLS: Well economic size farms and so on.

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know. You would have to have 3,000 acres. You would have to provide for rotation. You would have to have first class ideal conditions. You would have to have the equipment and, of course, you would put out of production every small farmer who now is drawing...

MR. WELLS: I am not talking about one farm. I am not talking about one farm. I am talking about eighty, fifty acre farms.

MR. CALLAHAN: It, perhaps, could be done on 6,000 acres in ideal conditions with everything that I have mentioned available but the difficulty of that is that you would close out every farmer who is growing potatoes.

MR. WELLS: No! No! enlarge the existing ones.

MR. CALLAHAN: But they are all over the Province.

MR. WELLS: Sure, enlarge them. How many are there?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well that is another situation. Then it becomes uneconomic. This is the problem we went through last night.

MR. CROSBIE: No sensible answers.

MR. CALLAHAN: This is the problem we went into last night where the land is not available in sufficiently large quantities for the farmers to have a viable operation.

MR. WELLS: A farmer tells me that he can make an economic go of it on fifteen acres, now suppose he has fifty? He says that it would be wonderful.

MR. CROSBIE: Has the minister finished his remarks.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I am not.

MR. CROSBIE: Can somebody else talk this afternoon, or is the minister going to keep it up the whole afternoon.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I have not too much longer to go.

It now being 1 p.m. the committee recessed until 3p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 94

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The Committee of Supply resumed at 3:00 P.M.

MR. NOEL: Before the committee resumes I am sure hon. members would like me to express a word of welcome to the wives and directors of the University Extension Services of Canada who are in the Speaker's Gallery. These ladies are visitors to our shores. They come from points between Nova Scotia and Calgary. I am sure hon. members would like me to express a word of welcome on their behalf. And also to Rev. Jespersen from Fogo. You are very welcome!

MR. CALLAHAN: As the song goes, and so it is to conclude and to finish. I would like to add a few points to what I was saying this morning when the committee rose, by way of completing a general review of the policies the operation of the division of Agriculture. As the committee rose, Mr. Chairman, I had just indicated the size of the agriculture industry in relation to the population. The employment factors involved therein, generally speaking, the value of the industry to the Province, pointing out what we must do in the first instance, as the hon. the Premier put it last night, to lay stress upon the things we can do well, the things in which we have the best chance of success. But that is not to say that we stop everything else, that we discourage everything else, because we do have opportunities for success, perhaps at a somewhat lesser degree, relatively speaking in other areas.

I also Mr. Chairman had indicated that, contrary to some things that were said here last night, on the other side of the House, contrary to the impression that was given, that the Government are concerned only with one or two particular aspects of agriculture, That the great bulk of the estimates, of the votes, the monies provided to the division this year, as last year and the year before, and I would think next and the year after that, and the year after that, will be devoted to the sectors of the commercial agriculture industry other than the poultry sector and the hog sector of the industry. That is true in these estimates as it was last year and as it will be certainly next year.

I have said that if it were not for the various assistance programs (and this is not unique, of course Mr. Chairman, in this Province. It is done across Canada. It is done in every country that has agriculture) if it were not for these assistance programs of various kinds, from assistance to students to

all the other on-going assistance programs. These other sectors of agriculture, other than the ones to which reference particularly was made, last night, could not in fact survive. Indeed the only sector of agriculture in this Province today does not get assistance, except in so far as it has the use of public grading facilities, packaging facilities, and the facilities that are necessary to provide for co-operative supply management. The only sector that does not get assistance in the usual way is the poultry industry. And I would think that very soon, in relative terms, the hog industry will be next on the list. It will not get assistance because it has the best chance of quickly becoming viable. It is in the other areas, in root crops and mixed farming, Mr. Chairman, that the assistance is necessary and will go on into the foreseeable future.

Now what kind of assistance are we talking about? We are talking, Sir, about the students that I mentioned this morning, 109 students, to date, whose entire agriculture education has been provided for, paid for, out of public funds. We are talking about various grants to organizations, societies. We are talking about the testing and re-testing programs for bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis, for compensation for the purchase of reactors, for the operation of marketing facilities in St. John's and at Bishops Falls, slaughterhouses, community storage, land fertility schemes, supply of agricultural limestone. The farmers buy at \$2.00 a ton but it costs the department to purchase anywhere from nine to eighteen dollars a ton. For the improvement of livestock, for bonuses on pure bred sires. For subsidized veterinary services which the farmers pay a token amount, for land preparation, for land clearing. There is no where in Canada today, Mr. Chairman, we have heard about the difficulty of obtaining land for agricultural purposes.---There is no where in this country, perhaps no where in the world, I do not know, certainly in Canada there is no where where land is made available as freely and as easily, for agricultural purposes, as it is in this Province. And not only is the land made available virtually free of charge but in addition to that, once we provide the land, we provide assistance for the clearing of the land. We not only give the land, Mr. Chairman, we pick up a very large part of the land

clearing cost. In addition to the bonuses for land clearing, there are bonuses for farm roads, there is provision made for access, for the improvement of old fields, the excavation of farm storage and, as I have said in this House before, the most important I think single beneficial program, in terms of its size, in terms of its impact there, is the community pasture policy of this department, whereby vast areas of pastureland (and we will have nearly 70,000 acres, I think, fenced, under that program by the end of this season) whereby these lands are made available on a regional basis for our farmers so that they can pasture their animals in security, with protection, with veterinary attention, without hesitation, without concern, they can put their animals on these pastures, leave them there for six or seven months of the year and in the meantime their own grass crop, of course, is saved and may be used for winter feed. I will not at all get into the problems that has been solved for many, many communities, Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the fact that the animals can be taken off community roads, taken off open pasture near communities and put in enclosed pasture, saving a lot of problems, a lot of heartaches for the communities and of course, at the same time saving extremely heavy losses, as there used to be for farmers, through animals being killed on the roads.

Now all these programs, Mr. Chairman, aim to assist, do assist the bulk of our farmers, the great number of them. The fact that I mentioned this morning, for the reason I mentioned this morning namely, that the great number of our farmers are in mixed farming and each of the components of their operations, whether it be root crops and livestock, or root crops and dairy or root crops and poultry or whatever. Each of the components, obviously, is necessary to a viable operation. And where there are viable operations, generally, they are based on a mixed activity, and what we do in respect of one or more of the activities, in which a normal farming operation may be engaged, of course, helps the others and help ^{keep} /the particular farmer viable.

So Mr. Chairman, what we come down to is we have what visitors to this House, from great farming provinces, may consider quite small, and it is small, by comparison, yet by our standards important. We have an industry which does employ some 3500 people, which does produce \$15, \$16 million annually, value of

T

products and which thereby keeps these dollars revolving in this Province, giving a viable livelihood to our people rather than the dollars being exported some where else. And Mr. Chairman, it is not so, (and I gave the committee the figures this morning) to say, it is not true to say, that the root crop or the mixed farming segment is unimportant. It is equally untrue to say that we are not concerned with it. The programs that I have just enumerated, taking up the great bulk of the estimates of the division, I think indicate that very very much emphasis is placed on that general sector of agriculture in this Province.

There is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, I told the committee yesterday we were in the process of re-organizing the forest service. We are also in the process of re-organizing the division of agriculture. And tentatively we see the new division, the new look of the division in this light that it will be composed of components dealing with land development, crop production, with animal health, with livestock, with marketing and food technology, with cooperatives, of course, add very importantly with extension. We hope to get into the department specialists in these various areas and rather than have the expansion of one area which can expand quickly held back because the same officials are dealing with an expanding area and with one which is perhaps static, that kind of situation, which is what this point in time we more or less have; these various sectors by being compartmentalized should be able to develop more freely, be able to show more progress and more beneficial progress as time goes on. We are obtaining advice I mentioned this morning. We are getting the advice of the Agricultural Economics Council of Canada. We are getting assistance from the government's own planners, from the Treasury Board and from various other areas, Mr. Chairman, and we think that the reorganization which we are attempting to bring about will, in fact, be beneficial and will, in fact, contribute to the growth of what is now an important industry and what has, we think, the potential of becoming much, much more important industry in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on the minister's remarks concerning subsistence farming and home gardening, I want to pay tribute to the minister and the

deputy minister of Agriculture for the assistance and help that they have given the Bell Island Association in carrying out a self-help programme on Bell Island. As the minister indicated, Mr. Chairman, last year, well in 1968, in December 1968, I called a public meeting on Bell Island and arising out of that public meeting the Bell Island Association was formed, the executive, the chairman, president and the executive were democratically elected and then they immediately proceeded to devote their energies to finding ways and means to try to develop self-help programs for unemployed miners and people receiving social assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a long speech and I guarantee that I will not put anybody to sleep in this House. We have been meeting now for almost, well for somewhere between four and five months. There has been an awful waste of time in the House, in this session, Mr. Chairman, I think we could have done the work that we have done in the last four or five months we could have done it in four or five days. So I am not going to make a long speech but I just want to tell the minister how much at least that I consider, or how important I consider to be his program of subsistence farming and home gardening.

Last year on Bell Island, Mr. Chairman, they started off with less than a hundred members involved in home gardening and subsistence farming and animal husbandry and so forth. This year there are 260 members in the association, 200 of which are doing home gardening and subsistence farming, the other sixty are involved in fishing of one kind or another, salmon fishing, lobster fishing, and cod fishing and so forth.

Now recently hon members of this House have seen a little booklet titled "Stretch Your Dollar Hints", and last night, Mr. Chairman, in this House my predecessor, the hon. member for Fortune Bay poked a little fun at this booklet. Now, Mr. Chairman, this booklet in my opinion, provides some good, solid information on the growing of vegetables, soil types, fertilizers, tools, seeds, soil cultivation, garden layouts etc., tips on shopping and food storage, budgetting, livestock raising, and even Mr. Chairman, it gives directions on the building of a simple and inexpensive greenhouse.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Fortune Bay did not think that this was such a good idea. He had his chance, when he was minister of the

Department of Welfare, in those ancient times that I hate to refer to. When he was minister down in the department, in the Charles Dickens days, I do not think that he produced one new fresh idea. So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the changing of the name of the department to the department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, one of the things that we are trying to do is to develop programs to get people to help themselves, to improve the morale of the clients of our department, Mr. Chairman, and at the same time, maybe save the taxpayers some money. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman, who poked fun at this booklet last night, that the only part of that booklet that I wrote was the foreword. The rest of it, if the hon. gentleman has taken the time to read it, the rest of it was compiled on my suggestion by the Director of Training and Research in my Department, who sought the assistance of Mrs. Bernice Walsh of the consumers broadcast with the CBC, who is an expert in her own field, Miss Olga Anderson, nutritionist with the department of Health, Miss Anna Templeman, supervisor of craft training, department of Education, and Mr. M. Stapleton, horticulturist, department of Mines and Resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when my hon. friend pokes fun at this book, these are the people he is poking fun at and not at me. It was merely my idea. I had all the information assembled in one spot and put together in this little booklet. But he can poke all the fun he likes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can poke all the fun he likes at this little booklet but I think it is going to do some good. I can read as well as the hon. member. So you see Mr. Chairman while they poke fun, while they poke fun at, I tell you Mr. Chairman the whole trouble with the members on the opposite side of the House is that they hate to see this government get close to the people. They bitterly resent that. When this government does something to get close to the people, the only way then, that they can counteract it, is to poke fun at it. Poke fun at it Mr. Chairman. These are not my words, everything in that booklet, everything in that booklet, apart from the foreword, was compiled by an expert in their field. My only contribution, Mr. Chairman, was the foreword. The rest

June 3 1970 Tape 1102 page 7.

was contributed. The hon. member can poke all the fun he likes at the booklet, Mr. Chairman, but it is not me he is poking fun at he is poking fun at the people who helped us compile this little booklet-

5962

MR. NEARY: This is participatory democracy - two way communications. Now Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert in budgeting. I am not an expert in greenhouses or berrypicking

MR. CROSBIE: Mushrooms -

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that Mr. Chairman - the hon. gentleman is going to get his turn if he will just wait. And Mr. Chairman, when we do develop our mushroom farm on Bell Island we know where to get the manure. We have had enough of it in this session of the House.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources for developing these self-help programs and I hope he will keep up the good work. Because it certainly has made a major contribution to improving the morale of the unemployed miners on Bell Island. Now Mr. Chairman, coming to the mushrooms. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John's West thinks that the idea of having a mushroom farm on Bell Island is very funny. He thinks it is very funny. If the hon. member was living on Bell Island and looking for an industry, he might not think it so funny. And Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the hon. member for St. John's West, that principals of Canada's largest growers and processors of mushrooms, will be visiting Bell Island on Monday coming.

Now Mr. Chairman, would these two men come down from Ontario if they thought that growing mushrooms on Bell Island was funny? If they thought it was a joke? Do you think these two gentlemen Mr. Chairman, who represent the biggest mushroom farm in Canada, the Ontario Mushroom Company, would come to Newfoundland to inspect No. 4 mine Mr. Chairman? And look at some of the buildings on the surface to assist the potential for the establishment of the mushroom industry? Would these gentlemen Sir, who are experts in their field - would they come down to Bell Island to take a look at these facilities if they thought it was funny? The hon. member thinks it is funny. Mr. Chairman, let me say this - I say this Mr. Chairman without - I do not wish to arouse hopes in the hearts of the people of Bell Island, because they have had enough disappointment. But if the hon. member is:

genuinely interested in the welfare of the people of this Province and Bell Island, he would get behind this sort of thing.

Now there is the hon. member again Mr. Chairman. This was electioneering when I mentioned this the other day - electioneering - getting close to the people Mr. Chairman - is that electioneering? The hon. gentleman has been in his ivory tower for so long - he does not know what getting close to the people means. Now Mr. Chairman, there has been a dome around Government departments long enough, and I think it is about time we got close to the people, and this is exactly what my department is trying to do. The hon. member does not appreciate that. He had his ivory tower, but that day has gone Mr. Chairman.

Now Mr. Chairman, getting back to the mushroom farm, and I hope that the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources will pay attention to what I am going to say -

MR. WELLS: Is the minister really serious or is he joking?

MR. NEARY: There you go Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Humber East who does not have to get out and work for a living with his hands - he thinks it is funny too. Mr. Chairman, I worked with industry for twenty-one years Mr. Chairman, and I will tell you this, that there is nothing as frustrating as coming into this House and seeing so much time wasted by members sitting on the opposite benches - four or five months Mr. Chairman. We could have the work done in four or five days. If this is democracy at work Mr. Chairman, this is the last refuge Mr. Chairman - this is democracy they call it. Democracy! They do not know what democracy is Sir.

Now Mr. Chairman, talking about the mushrooms. I personally feel that on Bell Island we have the physical surroundings, and that we have an adequate supply of male and female workers. But Mr. Chairman, our major problem as far as the mushroom farm is concerned is fertilizer. Mr. Chairman, there is a way it can be done, and this is why I say, I would not want to build up false hopes in the hearts of the people on Bell Island, because they have been disappointed many times in the past. There is a possibility

that they can improvise and as the Deputy Minister of Agriculture knows, and he and I have talked about this and he is sending one of his experts to Bell Island on Monday with these two men from Ontario - that you can improvise. The only thing is Mr. Chairman, that it may be too expensive and it may kill the industry, so therefore, I would not want to arouse false hopes.

Mr. Chairman, I might point this out to the hon. minister too, that the visitors that are coming have a practically unlimited capacity to process mushrooms, and they have guaranteed us, Sir, of a market for all the mushrooms that can be produced on Bell Island. So Mr. Chairman, instead of the hon. member for St. John's West and the hon. member for Humber East, and the hon. member for Fortune Bay, poking fun at this sort of thing - why do they not offer something positive themselves? Why do they not get over this negative thinking they have Mr. Chairman? And offer something positive? If they know of something we could put on Bell Island, let them stand in their places in this House and tell me about it. And I would be glad to look into it Mr. Chairman, instead of poking fun at it. The hon. member admits that he does not know. So that is all I want to say on this topic Mr. Chairman. I want to commend the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources for his interest in home gardening and subsistent farming. And I also want to thank my other hon. colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development, who has assisted the Bell Island Association to the extent that they now have a full-time field worker employed on Bell Island. Does the hon. member think that is funny?

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be so corny -

MR. NEARY: And Mr. Chairman, my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources last year, as he rightly pointed out this morning, sent an agricultural student to Bell Island, Mr. Calvin Sparkes. This year Mr. Sparkes is there again doing a tremendous job - helping the people to try to help themselves, and as this little booklet says, Mr. Chairman,

to stretch their social assistance dollar.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, no one wants to poke fun at the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. One does not need to poke it, he is just funny himself. No need to poke the fun. The minister should not be so full of cheap little political dodges, and then nobody would be poking fun at him. I will come to one of your cheap political dodges, because you reminded me of this ridiculous statement of yours the other day, that every recreation center in the Province should be opened up for people on welfare, when the minister knew it was not possible or practical unless the Government put up all the money for it. That is the kind of cheap political dodge I mentioned.

Now Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentioned the mushroom industry and the fact that it needed a lot of manure. There is a letter in the paper today from a gentleman who says, "Mr. Premier your big-mouth minister has done one thing, he has proved that an old saying is all truth - castles fall and dunghills rise." The dunghills are rising, Mr. Minister - that is where you can get your manure that you are worried about. Spinning in the graves it is called. No one is poking fun at the minister's mushroom industry, although it does sound a bit dubious and a bit doubtful. If the minister can get a mushroom industry for Bell Island, fine - it will employ five or ten people or however many - but the minister must admit that it sounds quite improbable. Now if the minister does come up with the industry we will all congratulate him, for his perseverance in the face of all his kidding. Mushrooms from the mushmouth! Now I was going to mention that booklet but I am afraid the minister is too touchy today - we are not going to have any fun with the minister. He is very, very touchy, so I will just speak about agriculture, and I will not mention the minister unless he gets a bit wild. We will put him under wildlife. I was going to congratulate the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources today, but there is no need to. His colleagues in the Cabinet are going to get up and congratulate

him, and then when they speak, his colleagues will get up and congratulate him, so there is no point in my doing it. But if I congratulate him, he will not have to worry. I will mean it - but despite a reluctance I say that I found some of his remarks this morning interesting. Usually I do not find any of his remarks interesting. But this morning I found some of them interesting.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with one point the hon. Minister of Welfare made, and he makes it every time he gets up in his usual ridiculous way. He said this House has been meeting three or four months and he stretches it out to five months, and it could all be done in three or four days. Yes, if we sat here and let the Government do everything it wanted, and tell us nothing, the House could be open and shut in seven days. That is not what a House of Assembly is for. This item in the Estimates was started to be debated last night at eight o'clock, and it was debated three hours last night, two this morning and forty minutes this afternoon. And for two-thirds or three quarters of that time, members on the Government side spoke. The Premier, the minister and others. So three and two is five, and we are now about six hours - of which the Government spoke four or five hours. So do not give us that nonsense about the time of ^{the} House is being wasted. If there is any waste being done here, it is members on the Government side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: Agricultural Services is the topic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. An hon. member is entitled to speak as long as he wishes and it is out of order for any hon. member to comment on how long another hon. member spoke.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am replying to the minister's statement that we are wasting the time of the House. Fine, if that is over with, as long as I am able to reply.

MR. NEARY: I am entitled to my rights?

MR. CROSBIE: If the minister is entitled to say it, I am entitled to reply. I am going to get the same treatment in this House as the minister, or there will be some fuss. All right. Just remember that.

Now Mr. Chairman, back to agriculture. We will leave wildlife and go to agriculture. I believe that the points made by the earlier speakers have not been effectively refuted by the minister, and that his department concentrates on ham and eggs and I will not go into that all again. What I want to go into is getting the cost of the ham and egg policy. But if the minister would enlighten us, just what it is costing us for example, in connection with Provincial Poultry Producers Limited. I think that is the name - Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited. The Government has a policy of helping subsidize presumably the production of eggs in Newfoundland, 12,000,000 dozen. The Government has this Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. It is subsidizing the whole egg business. You can call it the marketing, it does not matter. You are subsidizing men who are producing eggs in Newfoundland - helping them sell them - helping them make certain of them - the ones that are in this Co-operative.

Now Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation is a Crown Corporation. The financial statement for the end of December 1969, submitted by the Auditor General, shows an operating loss for that year of \$269,909. Now that operating loss has to be paid by the Government. The Government had paid \$232,000 of it by the end of March 1969. The operating loss is \$269,000. Now that operating loss is caused through the relationship of Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation through its business in poultry and pork - the ham and eggs policy of the Government. That is \$269,000 from Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is gravely wrong. I went into that in great detail this morning and he missed the whole point.

MR. CROSBIE: I say I am not quite wrong. This Corporation financed by the Government has a \$269,000 loss, and the Government has to meet it.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not a loss.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not a loss? The Auditor General is wrong?

MR. CALLAHAN: The Auditor General is quite wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: And the Corporation is wrong for presenting their accounts like this.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not a loss. It is an operating cost.

MR. CROSBIE: It is an operating loss. They sell goods - they get certain monies for what they sell. They have their selling expenses, travelling expenses and so on and so on. That is their expenses. That gives them an operating loss.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not a loss.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister can save his breath, he will never convince me it is not a loss. Now that is \$269,000 - Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation down at Pleasantville.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not correct either you see. The hon. gentleman keeps saying "down at Pleasantville," and that is wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: Their main center of operation is Pleasantville. That is Pleasantville. If the minister wants me to go on with my remarks, or does he want to go on interrupting?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not want the hon. gentleman to go on with a lot of stuff that is not so.

MR. CROSBIE: Just let the hon. gentleman make his remarks. We have just listened to the minister for an hour and a half. Now if I am uninterrupted I will be finished in fifteen or twenty minutes. But if I am interrupted I might go two or three hours. Now which does the minister want? Does he want to keep interrupting? Now that is the balance sheet of Newfoundland Farm Products - \$269,000 loss. In answer to a question asked on the Order Paper (156) in connection with Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited. Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited is a group of poultry producers. There has to be five of them to be a co-operative. The Act was amended two or three years ago to bring the legal requirement to form a co-operative down, so you did not have to have a minimum of nine. You had to have a minimum of five. Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited is Russwood Poultry Limited, Hillcrest Farms Limited, and some other producers. What did the minister say? This Co-operative occupies

3,646 square feet of space in buildings owned by the Government located at Pleasantville, and is not charged any rent ^{per} square foot a year for that space. Now that is a subsidy is it not? This is a private poultry co-operative, and it is getting space in a Crown building without being charged any rent, so that is a subsidy. In addition to the rent free space, they have a use of certain equipment, including egg-graders, refrigeration space and other facilities. That is not charged for - it is not rented to them. So that is a subsidy. In addition, the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, the Crown Company - the Crown Corporation pays the light bill and the heating bill for the place. That is \$1,618 last year. So the Provincial Poultry Co-operative, a private group, does not have to pay heat, does not have to pay light - does not have to pay light. It is all paid for by the Government, or by a Crown agency. And the Government renovated a building that Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited is in. That is correct is it not? \$20,000 the minister said was spent renovating that space. That is all subsidy. And Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation markets all their production.

MR. CALLAHAN: No it does not.

MR. CROSBIE: Helps them market all their production.

MR. CALLAHAN: It does not have anything to do with their production or the marketing of it -

MR. CROSBIE: It just subsidizes their operation. It pays bills. Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation does nothing but subsidize egg producers and hog producers. That is all it does.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways. Either that it is a subsidy or it is an operating loss. I say it is not an operating loss.

MR. CROSBIE: Well it is a subsidy.

MR. CALLAHAN: All right, so it is a subsidy -

MR. CROSBIE: Is that what the hon. minister is getting on to? It is the same thing. It is exactly the same thing. If the minister wants an entire answer to the question read - let him read it himself. I am saying that what he is calling now, a subsidy - the minister makes a great point - that this is not

an operating loss of \$269,000. Now he says it is a subsidy. What absolute tripe. It is an amount of money paid out by the Government - to subsidize the poultry producers.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not an operating loss, and it is not paid only to poultry producers.

MR. CROSBIE: I can only gaze and wonder. Who does the minister think he is fooling with those semantics. It is not an operating loss. Who cares if it is an operating - it is money the taxpayers of Newfoundland are paying out to subsidize poultry producers.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now we are getting on the right track -

MR. CROSBIE: Not to subsidize consumers - to subsidize poultry producers - and hog producers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think that hon. members ought not to interfere while another hon. member is speaking. We are developing now into a conversation between two members which is the not the purpose of this House. And I must ask the hon. minister to remain silent while the hon. member for St. John's is speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. There are two operations according to this balance sheet and Newfoundland Farm Products - poultry - sales \$226,000. Pork sales - \$594,000. Total \$120,000. Gross loss \$159,000. That is even before you take off administrative expenses, and then you get operating loss, \$269,000 which the people of Newfoundland must meet.

Now the hon. minister made a great point about the selfish, independent producers who will not join Provincial Poultry Co-operative, like Kengrove Farm and others. There are some who will not join these co-called co-operatives Mr. Chairman, and the minister suggested they are selfish, independent operators. Why should they join Provincial Poultry Co-operatives and turn their marketing over to that co-operative, if they cannot trust the way it is being operated? Why should they? If they join Provincial Poultry Co-operative, Mr. Chairman, ^{be} their production is going to be marketed by Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, or by Provincial Poultry Co-operative, which is the same thing, because it is

controlled by the same people. This is what they are afraid of - whether it is so or not. We all know the situation.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman thinks he knows the situation.

MR. CROSBIE: I know what these independent operators are afraid of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Did I not just say that the hon. minister should remain silent while the hon. member for St. John's West is on his feet. The hon. member for St. John's West is framing his speech in the form question, that does not give anybody the right to reply at this time.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what they are worried about Mr. Chairman. It is easy enough to say that these independent operators can join this co-operative - they are all free to join, but they feel that they are delivering themselves - that things will be out of their control if they do that. That they are going to be delivered in the hands of their competitors, and who would blame them, for trying to stay out of it if they can.

Mr. Crosbie.

The minister has not touched by the way on his marketing board. The minister is supposed to be setting up a marketing board. Are they going to be forced, Mr. Chairman, to operate through a marketing board anyway? Is it true that the director of marketing of Provincial Poultry Co-operative was, for a time, a man who was working for the Government also and paid by the Government. Would the minister answer that, if he answers later on? Is not the Province's former director of marketing now the co-operative full time manager? The minister has no idea.

Would the minister agree that the national consumption of eggs is one and a half hens per person? Would he confirm that so that we would require 750,000 hens here in Newfoundland; whereas, we only have a maximum of 400,000 hens now. We would like to hear from the minister on that. We have not got enough hens according to these figures. What does the minister say about that? Is the minister going to institute an egg marketing board? What was this marketing board that the minister announced or appointed shortly, several weeks ago? Is this to control all the production or marketing of eggs in Newfoundland? Would the minister enlighten us on that? What is the relationship, Mr. Chairman, of the abattoir at Pleasantville to Newfoundland Farm Products? I do not want to ask questions that the minister does not want to note. If the minister is going to speak again, I would like to know what the relationship is of the abattoir to Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation? Does it operate the abattoir? What is the relationship there? I assume that this loss of \$269,000 applies to the abattoir also.

While the minister is dealing with that, if he deals with it, which I very much doubt, because the minister does not usually answer questions unless they are unasked ones, could he deal with Question 305 that has been on the Order Paper now for some several months, which asks, in connection with the abattoir, how many persons are employed by the Government or any

Mr. Crosbie.

Government agency there, what their names are and their annual salaries and whether or not the abattoir employes any consultants or others, not falling within that category? It was answered and tabled - it must have been done when I was not in the House. I have only not been in the House once. The minister better check. I do not think that that has been answered. If it has been answered, I would apologize. According to my records, it is not answered. Question 315 is not answered, and it is not a very complicated question.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is answered and tabled, because the names are tabled.

MR. CROSBIE: Question 315? I will check that out.

MR. CALLAHAN: Will the hon. gentleman now apologize?

MR. CROSBIE: No. When the hon. gentleman checks it out and finds the answer...

MR. CALLAHAN: When he is satisfied that it is what he wants, he will apologize.

MR. CROSBIE: I am satisfied that it is, in fact, tabled out in the office and I will apologize to the minister.

What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is just what is the abattoir operation costing the Government of Newfoundland, at Pleasantville? How does it tie in with Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation and just what is the cost to the Government and to the people of Newfoundland, the cost of subsidization of the poultry producers and hog producers of the Province? What are these costs? We know that there are certain headings in the estimates, but these costs are ⁱⁿ more than one of these headings in the estimates. What is the cost to the taxpayers of Newfoundland to drive the production of eggs here in Newfoundland up to 14 million dozen a year? What is that cost for the last eight or ten years? What is it costing now to develop the hog industry?

Mr. Crosbie.

There are low cost loans to the people who raise hogs, number one, with interest rates at, I think, three per cent, subsidized by the Government. So, what are these costs, that the minister has been talking about but not clarifying, of establishing these two industries? Why should any independent producers, Mr. Chairman, be put in any position where they are forced to join co-operatives, which they do not want to join, because they do not want to have any control taken away from themselves and handed over to their competitors. Why should one operation be subsidized by calling ^{it} a co-operative, while another operation is not subsidized, because the people involved will not join a so-called co-operative? A co-operative of body corporates is hardly my view, Mr. Chairman, of a co-operative. I have always thought a co-operative was an organization of men or women who got together as producers or consumers, in their dozens or hundreds, to amalgamate their efforts to improve their power of purchasing or selling power. A co-operative of bodies corporate, of five or six corporations, whether they are in the hog business or poultry business or any business, is not, to my mind, a co-operative. How can that be called a co-operative in the ordinary sense of the word? It is not, as though, there were five or six small individual farmers or ten or twelve or a hundred in Provincial Poultry Co-operative. That is not the case. There are six, ten or more corporations? That is what is involved in that co-operative.

It is not a co-operative in any commonly accepted sense of the word. So, what is the cost to this Province - the true cost in connection with this poultry co-operative, in connection with the hog industry and Newfoundland Farm Products? These are the questions that the minister should clarify.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to dwell too long on the heading. I certainly hope we can get down to the individual items so we can discuss these. But after listening to the hon. Premier last night,

Mr. Murphy.

for quite a length of time and the hon. minister today and particularly the hon. Premier last night, where he more or less ruled out anybody who would try to join it, It was crazy and a waste of time and what not, I felt rather upset, because, personally, I feel that there is still some room here in our Province for people to grow the ordinary root crops, potatoes so on and so forth. But to get the impression, and I think that this is what has been happening to a lot of our basic industries, such as agriculture and fishery. Since this Government has been in power, we have been hearing about the great industrial development and we are to become a great Ruhr Valley or a Pittsburg rather than just a Province that we should be, where we must use what God gave us to sustain ourselves.

With reference to the Newfoundland Farm Products, I have the paper here before me, and I was going to ask some questions. The hon. member for St. John's West has already asked some, But when we heard last night, about poultry and eggs and pork, we were given the impression that they were great industries that were really viable and all kinds of money being made from it. I see here and as the hon. member again was mentioned that there was a deficit of a gross loss, actually, on operations of \$159,000 last year. The sales were \$226,000 and the cost was \$290,000 on poultry. Pork yielded \$594,000 and the cost was \$688,000 and that did not include administrative costs so on and so forth. I would like - I cannot find this - the reason I am discussing this here, is because I cannot find it under any heading going down through. I would like the hon. minister, when he does speak again, I hope it will not be for another couple of weeks and that he will tell us what operating grants of \$210,000 - I cannot find it anywhere in the estimates. The statement also says and this is by the Auditor General - the above statement does not include certain expenses paid directly by the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources on behalf of the corporation and possibly, we might get some

Mr. Murphy.

information from the hon. minister as to just what these certain expenses are. There are a couple of items here that I would like to question. One is cartage of \$4,531 and another one is the rent of vehicles \$13,100. That is something like \$17,500 for cartage and rent of vehicles.

There are other miscellaneous items here, of course, that make it up, like bad debts, telephone, heat, light and so on. That is all included in this statement here, but there are other expenses that are not included in this and there is no heading, as I have said, for Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. But I feel that we are entitled to some explanation of all this, when we hear about the pigs and the hens and the great industry it is and we cannot afford - I listen to some of our farmers - anybody who listens to Land and Sea on C B C on Sunday afternoon and particularly when you get Mr. MacDonald. About three weeks ago, Mr. Reid from Lethbridge who also is operating farm...

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. MURPHY: I am sorry - Mr. Brown. Here are some of the problems they have and the great competition they have to deal with, because of the importation, of course, of fertilizers and many other things that go into making their operation viable and also so many smaller farms, family farms that are going to waste as mentioned in the book, and there was one item there, and I am not trying to ridicule, again, the Minister of Welfare, but I was reading through it and it says that it is far more convenient to have you garden near your house for rearing vegetables. I think that is a very profound statement, because if your garden is near your house, and I think, most gardens are attached to your house - I believe it is a statement that perhaps does not add too much to the small person on Welfare, because I know that they do not own huge gardens fifty or sixty miles away and the cost of transporting these gardens near the houses, I do not think, would be too practical, if we are going to follow out the hon.

Mr. Murphy.

minister's statement. If he said, your own front garden, which most people have adjoining their homes, and I do not see how the people in my district down here on Casey Street or Lime Street or anywhere else are going to go into this great extensive business, but there is one thing that strikes me pretty forcibly and that is the consumption of tomatoes in this Province - tomatoes that are imported and why with the great volume of electricity that is running out of our ears at this time and costing practically nothing, why we cannot go into some development or some assistance to our farmers or..

MR. HICKEY: You mean a hot house?

MR. MURPHY: A hot house.

MR. HICKEY: Right here.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I know, but the air in here is not too good.

But tomatoes, as I say, Mr. Chairman, would be a tremendous industry. I know that there are local tomatoes grown and they are really beautiful, but the amount of imports must be tremendous and why we are not using some of this great electricity that we thought so much of, so cheaply, would be used all year round for tomato growing and potatoes, as we know, when we have many thousands, as the Premier referred to in Nova Scotia - why so much farming - why a lot of the farms are not being tended at this time and to compare it with Newfoundland, where Nova Scotia unemployed, is something in the area of five to six per cent and ours is something over twenty per cent, and great numbers on welfare line up at supermarkets and pay the highest prices for their vegetables - I do not see why we do not get out and encourage the people. I am talking now of the rural areas, not urban, of course, to get back into their small garden patches in root crops and so on and so forth. I think that would conserve a lot of money that is being spent in supermarkets. We could grow many, many thousands of barrels of potatoes, I am sure. I am ^{not} talking now of the beautiful farms you see on Prince Edward Island or, perhaps in New Brunswick, but let us use what we have. We have plenty of land, not a huge

Mr. Murphy.

acres, but there are many, many thousands of acres of land, I suppose, that were used over the years by people living in our outports to grow their own vegetables and so on. With the beginning of the base work and so on, a lot of these people, naturally, left farming, (it was a hard life to try to maintain themselves) to go into more lucrative positions, and back in the old days, in the 1950's, when the fishermen were told to haul up their boats and come ashore and work. It was all right at that time, the jobs were there, but I think, Mr. Chairman, we must face facts. These jobs are not available. I can remember back in the 1950's, when the great announcement was made, at the opening of the great machine plant at Octagon Pond, to employ some 6,000 people, and the greatest worry of Government at that time was where they were going to get the necessary bodies to fill the jobs and it was feared that we would have to import them from other provinces.

Well, we cannot live on pipe dreams, and we cannot live on promises so I think we must face facts, if our people are to survive. We know the work is hard. But when we look around our rural areas and see the huge fences, if you like, or walls that are built of rock and these rocks, we know and stones came out of the ground that was being cleared by hand and pick axe and crowbar and so on and so forth, I do not think our people are afraid of hard work. I believe all they want is some encouragement and when I said that the Government do nothing, of course, do nothing is a term in this Province. It is a term that a lot of people use and it does not actually mean what it says, because a gentleman was talking to me the other day and he told me that he bought a house for half nothing and he sold it for \$3,000. I tried to figure the mathematics of it, and I just could not figure out how much he made on the deal, because nothing is nothing and he paid half of nothing for it.

When we say nothing, we mean; literally very little is being done to encourage farming either on a fairly large scale or on what we call the

Mr. Murphy.

home plot scheme. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that when we get down to the various grants and the votes for the different departments that we will get the information as to just what actual money is being granted.

I would certainly like to get full information on this Newfoundland Farm Products and particularly this operating grant of \$210,000, who is being subsidized and are we subsidizing the producer in this case or are we subsidizing the consumer? We do not know just where these things go. According to the hon. member for Burin ; they are paying big prices for pork and poultry in Burin. Am I right on that?

So, Mr. Chairman, there is not too much else I would - I beg your pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Refuse to eat subsidized pork.

MR. MURPHY: Refuse to eat subsidized pork, there you are - nothing but the full price. So, when the minister does, I think, he is going to have a few words to sort of get us on the road to getting down to the headings. Perhaps, he would explain this and for his information it is on exhibit (2) of this report on Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. I do not know about the poultry. I have been looking up, but I think that is a private co-op, and I do not think it shows in our estimates, so I do not know just what the affect of Government is on it. There are quite a number of articles in the papers recently. This is one, on May 2nd - "egg men worried about surplus chickens coming home to roost." So, possibly, the hon. member for St. John's West who brought this up - there were a couple of private operators who refused to go in, because they figured that the great lines of the industry, the incorporated companies, that the hon. member referred to, would put the squeeze on them and limit them to so much production, whether this is fact or fiction, I do not know.

When we get into the meat of the estimates, possibly, the hon. minister can explain some of these items to us. There is one other matter, and that is again - I think Mr. MacDonald made a statement today in reply to what the

Mr. Murphy.

hon. minister and the Premier said about farming not being viable here. They still think that a great many of our fellow countrymen can still scratch some kind of a living out of root crops and it

MR. MURPHY: May be scratching a living but I think perhaps it will be a step above getting handouts from the Government in the form of welfare.

MR. CALLAHAN: To have to get them to scratch a living is not very much different except that one is more productive than the other.

MR. MURPHY: That is the idea production.....

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman did not get the idea that they are getting handouts from the Government in order to be able to get.....

MR. MURPHY: Well they will get handouts but I think it would make them more self-respecting in working and I refer now to these persons who have to accept relief and we are not criticizing the hon. minister, he is quite sympathetic towards them and I think he is doing his best with the limited means he has. I would have given these people enough money to properly feed themselves and bring their children up and dress them properly, but I feel that if we could supplement them with something like this bit of farming here and God knows, you travel through this Province of ours out side of St. John's and there are hundreds and thousands of places that are just going to waste and that could be utilized.

I remember in the old days, I do not know if it is still operating, my own sister was the first settler in Markland when the Commission of Government started the land settlement scheme. My sister and her family were one of the first families to move in there. It was heartbreaking work I remember they had to dig a well and that took something like five to six months just getting down, he would dig and she would haul the clay out in buckets to bring it to the surface. But this is all a part of our livelihood, we are on this island and we must scratch for a living. We are not on the mainland perhaps where things would come much easier for us, we are isolated and I think we have to face the facts. I do not think Mr. Chairman that we can any/more tell the people that they could live at the same rate as the people in central Canada, Ontario, the other Provinces. I think we have a couple of strikes against us anyway when we start to do anything. I do not know how many bags or barrels of potatoes come in here from Prince Edward Island, we must be one of their best customers and anybody who has

visited the beautiful Codroy Valley in recent years, which was always supposed to be the bread basket of our Province, I know I was greatly disappointed because ^{of} the competition. They were coming over in huge trucks across the gulf and selling from door to door and so on and so forth. Do we need to subsidize these people to keep them in business so that they can earn a living or do we just say. " look, give it up and accept your welfare cheque every week or every two weeks?"

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not why they quit in the Codroy Valley.

MR. MURPHY: That is not why they quit in the Codroy Valley, possibly not but it might be one of the causes of quitting because Confederation was the greatest blessing under God, or the second greatest blessing as the Premier says, but I think it created a lot of problems for a lot of people. Our local industries and so on and so forth, they are not now reviving the issue but we did not take the necessary steps, I do not think, to apply some cure to help our people to be more or less self-sustaining.

I feel Mr. Chairman, that this agriculture - there is some future in it for us, perhaps not the maximum, perhaps not three-quarters of what we could get out of it, but I am sure there must be some per centage in farming, in growing our own products. I know in this Province we consume a tremendous quantity of potatoes, turnips, cabbage. These are basics and there is no reason why they cannot increase or aim to increase through some small help. I am very happy to hear the hon. minister say that we have some of our students in the field now. I do not know if we have at Memorial, I brought it up last year, any agricultural college. I think most of our boys went to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the same way with forestry but.....

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the regional college for the Atlantic region

MR. MURPHY: Nova Scotia? So Mr. Chairman, as I say, this vote I think is very important and let us get at it and find out just where the monies are being spent and ⁱⁿ our opinion if they are being spent wisely or not. We can only discuss it I think - it is all right to debate issues. If we are wrong, we have to admit we are wrong. If we are right, well then I

is
think it up to us to guide the Government Departments on some other thoughts. I do not think ... the right ideas belong exclusively to those in power. I think other people would, with a fair amount of intelligence could perhaps add something to what is happening in the Province. This party I believe quite sincerely will not be in power for ever, and anybody that is planning to, on the other side, I know must be working on plans, and I know they are, to perhaps go more extensively into farming and rural development which I think is a very, very important matter at this time.

The hon. member for Bonavista South told us yesterday - I forget the reason for asking the question because I knew the answer to it, down in Eastport area - these areas there is very little welfare because most of the people in that area have their farmland, they are being encouraged there and are taking the initiative. Possibly we might go to some other areas, we have Winterland in the area of the hon. member for Burin. I think that is fairly prosperous and we have

MR. BARBOUR: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: I am talking about the area not actually referring to the district. But there are many other areas, and the Lethbridge area down there, that is a very viable area

MR. BARBOUR: And Musgravetown and Bloomfield

MR. MURPHY: Musgravetown, there must be some future but I think we have to get out and encourage small lot owners to get in there and let us help them out to the best of our ability. If he is on welfare he can subsidize himself to some extent with his own vegetables and I am sure that he would not be penalized by the welfare department if he did go out and do that. I do not think they would say: "Look, you grew \$100. worth of potatoes so as a consequence we are going to cut your cheque off \$100.." I think the Department of Welfare would really clap that man on the back and say: "I wish we had thousands more like you."

Mr. Chairman, when we get down to the individual votes, possibly we could have some further discussion on these.

MR. CROSBIE: Before that, on a point of privilege Mr. Chairman, the hon. the minister wanted me to apologize for not realizing that the minister had answered question number 315. I have here Wednesday of May 6th. page 3536, the minister is answering questions, and he said: "Question 315, on the Order Paper of April 8th. in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. I thought I had Mr. Speaker, the complete list of the employees of the abattoir but I do not seem to have it, but I will obtain it and table it." It was not tabled that day and it has not been tabled any day since. So the question, Mr. Chairman, is not answered and I therefore feel that I have nothing to apologize about. The question is not yet answered.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, to that point of privilege, I am quite sure the hon. gentleman said 305, at least I said to him, " 305," and he nodded

MR. CROSBIE: I said 315, I corrected him.

MR. CALLAHAN: I asked my friend in the back to check, but I do have a carbon copy of that list here, I do not have the original which leads me to believe that it was tabled later. Subsequently, if it was not I, in any event, table it now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, while I was out in the common room I was able to listen to some of the debate, not all of it, and while I listened I heard a statement made to the effect that the Government are subsidizing the poultry industry, and, subsidizing the hog raising industry. That was a true allegation. The Government are indeed subsidizing the poultry industry and the hog industry as well, also the fishing industry and the mining industry and other industries -- the Government of this Province, the Government of every Province in Canada and the Government of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, there would be no fishery in Newfoundland today, it would not exist it would have perished many, many decades ago, it would have perished one hundred years ago but for the subsidies that were given to it by the Government of Newfoundland, before and since Confederation.

The fish merchants of this island always received help from the Government, either directly or indirectly but received it from the Government. For most of our history, up to the coming of Confederation, the fishermen of Newfoundland, in return for the fish they produced and delivered to the merchants, were paid in two ways. They were paid by the merchants in part and paid by the Government for the rest, in the form of dole.

The Government of Newfoundland for long decades paid the fishermen part of the money that the merchants ought to have paid them and did not. The price that the merchants paid for fish in Newfoundland was scarcely ever enough to enable the fishermen and their families to survive, to survive, to continue living and so the Government paid the fishermen what the merchants failed to pay them.

This was a direct subsidy paid to the merchants. If the Government had not done it there would have been no fishery for one hundred years, up to the coming of Confederation. Since the coming of Confederation the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, both of them, have been subsidizing the fisheries of this Province. We have between us subsidized the fisheries to the extent of a great many millions of dollars. The two Governments, the Government of Canada more than the Government of Newfoundland for the very good reason that the Government of Canada have more money to do it with than we have and they have put out scores of millions of dollars to subsidize the fisheries of this Province and the fisheries of other Provinces as well.

Of course in subsidizing the fisheries of Canada, the Government of Canada are only doing what they have always done for agriculture. I would venture to say that if the Government of Canada have paid out a couple of hundred millions of dollars to subsidize the fisheries, they have paid out to subsidize agriculture at least one hundred dollars for every one dollar they have paid out to subsidize the fisheries. The Government of Canada poured out in untold hundreds of millions - I saw an estimate in a

report that the Government of this Province had prepared for it on the fisheries, a report that we had prepared for submission to the Government of Canada, an estimate of what the Government of Canada had in fact paid out over the years to subsidize agriculture and the figure was up in the thousands of millions. In other words, billions of dollars. Right now at this moment, the Government of Canada are subsidizing agriculture in Canada to the extent of possibly one thousand million dollars a year. One billion a year to subsidize agriculture.

Wheat farmers are being paid at this moment not to grow wheat. They are being paid at this moment cash by the Government of Canada to let their land lie fallow, not to produce wheat from it. This is not the first time the Government of Canada have done that. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if in the last fifty years the Government of Canada had not given the subsidies they gave to agriculture in Canada, agriculture in Canada would have perished, and I am quite sure that the fisheries of Newfoundland would have perished long years ago if they had not been subsidized up to Confederation by the Government of Newfoundland and, since then, by both Governments. This is as normal a part of our modern life as anything you could mention. Subsidizing primary industries, and the subsidies are given either to the entrepreneurs in them, the merchants, or the primary producers or both, or organizations of the primary producers.

Not only is this so for the Government of Canada, it is so also for every Provincial Government in Canada. Agriculture could not have continued to exist in Canada or in any Province of Canada without massive subsidies paid on it by the various Governments in this nation.

Now if the Government of Newfoundland are subsidizing the fishermen we are doing what had to be done. Mr. Chairman, people do not realize how much money has been poured into the fisheries directly and indirectly by the Government of this Province. It is not normally realized, but we have put thirty-eight millions, this Government have put or caused to be put thirty-eight million dollars into the fisheries by way of loans to fish firms or to fishermen. To fish firms to enable them to build modern fish

plants, or to enlarge or modernize their existing fish plants, or to build or buy modern draggers with which to supply those fish plants, or money lent to fishermen to enable them to build or buy boats, to buy engines, to buy fishing gear. Why, there was one occasion alone when the Government sold the Newfoundland Savings Bank (and made a profit of something over two million dollars on the sale of that bank to the Bank of Montreal) when we took \$1 million of it, \$1 million of our profit, and spent it to subsidize the purchase of nets and fishing gear of all kinds for the fishermen of this Province, of this Province.

We subsidized the price in the purchase of some thirty-eight thousand nets, I think it was, I am speaking from memory and I think that was the figure. Well, we actually subsidized those net to the extent of two and one-half millions of which one million came out of the profits we made on the sale of the Savings Bank. I said \$38 million we had lent the fish plants; it is thirty-seven and one half million.

MR. COLLINS: What source is the Premier quoting from now Sir?

MR. SMALLWOOD: From Government statistics. I am quoting Government statistics. In addition to the thirty-seven and one half million that the Government lent to the fishing industry, the Government spent another three and one-half million to develop fisheries - to finance fishery developments at LaScie and Merasheen and Seldom, three and one-half million. Then we spent a total of fifteen and one-half million for fishery ventures on the south west coast. Then we spent another four and one-half million, \$4,511,000. in loans, direct loans made to fishermen.

Then on top of that, the Government, through the Fisheries Development Authority, spent another \$2.1 million, \$2,100,000. and then the Department of Fisheries itself spent six and one-quarter millions with rendering services to the fishermen and the fishing industries.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

this comes to a total and then we spent bounties, in bounties on boats and gear \$2,900,000. call it \$3. million and this makes a total of \$72. million from the Newfoundland Government. \$72. million spent to subsidize the fisheries of this Province not counting the relief, not counting the welfare that we had to pay out to fishermen to make up for the wages they did not get or for the prices they did not get from the merchants for the fish they produced, not counting that, not counting any other forms of help direct to the fishermen and the merchants to the fishing industry \$72. million. Now that is cash, that is hard cash, that is money and we do not apologize for it. Our only regret is that instead of \$72. million it was not \$144. million.

Now in addition to what we have spent, this Government spent to help the fishing industry, the Government of Canada have spent far more, far more indeed. The Government of Canada spent a total in the same period to help the fisheries of this Province \$207. million and \$72. million that the Newfoundland Government spent is \$279. million, well over one billion dollars spent by the two Governments in this Province alone to subsidize the fishing industry. I will say to you here today that if that had not been spent in these last twenty-one years there would be no fishing industry in this Province this afternoon, not any sign of one. If the boats that the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, the two of us between us, enabled to be built had not been built, if we had not enabled them to be built, if we had not enabled the engines to be procured that were procured, if we had not enabled the gear to be procured that was procured and put into use, if we had not enabled the stages and flakes and other fishing facilities and means and tools to be acquired and put into use that were acquired, if these things had not been done there would be no fishery today.

Now I am not one to stand in this House and say we ought not to have done it. Would anyone say that we ought not to have spent the millions we have spent to help agriculture? Would anyone say that we ought not to have spent the millions we have spent to promote the mining industry? This Government, the Government of Newfoundland, spent \$3,104,000. to help the mining industry to develop minerals, to develop the mining industry of our

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Province and in the same period of time the Government of Canada spent \$2.25 million that is \$5.5 million the two Governments spent to promote mining in this Province. Would anyone say we ought not to have done it? Would anyone say it was not a good investment? Would anyone say that the money spent on the fisheries by the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland was not a good investment? Would anyone claim that it ought not to have been spent, that it was a poor investment?

Now some of the money that was spent was wasted, some of the money that was spent was lost, some of the firms to whom money was lent failed, some of the fishermen to whom money was lent failed in their effort, some of the money went down the drain but these are the chances that have to be taken. You can guard against them all you like and you will still have business failures, you always did and you always will. You try as best you can to guard against these failures but you will have them no matter how hard you try to guard against them. But who will say, even taking into account the failures and the losses, who will say the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland were wrong to invest that money to help the fishing industry, to spend that money to help the mining industry? Who will say they were not good investments? The times this Government sent out diamond drills and drilled and drilled thousands of holes to try to find minerals, to try to find salt, to try to find oil, the millions that were spent on that, but did not find minerals, did not find salt, did not find oil, was that money that ought not to have been spent? Must you have a guarantee that you will find oil or salt or minerals before you stick a diamond drill down, ought we not to have done it, were we wrong to do it?

The same thing applies to agriculture. We have spent, since the coming of Confederation, certainly not less than \$15. million of public money to help agriculture in this Province. Some of it was wasted, some of the people who received it wasted it and some of the people who received failed and went out of business. We went out and we cleared land at an enormous cost, for farmers who asked to have it cleared, and they went farming and failed and that land now, some of it, is growing up with small trees, abandoned.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Ought we therefore not to have cleared any land? Were we wrong to spend the millions we spent clearing land, were we wrong? Are we to be condemned for that, are we to be condemned for the hundreds of thousands of dollars we have spent as free gifts to farmers to supply them with agricultural limestone? Ought we not to have done that, was that wrong and in all the services we have rendered and we are continuing to render to agriculture in Newfoundland is this wrong?

We have spent money to promote poultry in Newfoundland, it has been one of the best investments ever made by any Government in the history of this island, it was an investment made in the belief, the firm belief, that the Government held that if we were to back the poultry industry strongly and boldly we would develop a poultry industry that would make Newfoundland self-supporting in that particular brand of food. Now we were already self-supporting in fish, so far as supplying our needs of food was concerned, we were self-supporting in fish and now we are self-supporting in eggs. We are getting to be self-supporting, not yet, but getting to be self-supporting in poultry meat, we are getting to be self-supporting in pork.

Now, Mr. Chairman, please remember one thing, that there is precious little difference between starting an industry that produces some goods of some sort that you export and for which you get back dollars from the United States or dollars from any other country, there is precious little difference in starting an industry that produces goods that you ship away and for which you get back dollars, precious little difference in that and an industry which produces goods that you do not ship away but you consume yourselves, but in consuming them here you do not have to import them. In the one case you are earning new dollars, you are bringing new dollars back into the Province in return for goods that you produce here such as pulp and paper, such as minerals, such as fish, such as marine oils, such as any other product that you produce in this Province and ship away in return for dollars that come back. That is good. That is the basis of it all, that is fundamental and if you do not do that you will perish. This Province cannot go on, except for the money we get back into the Province in return for the goods we make

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and ship out but having done that is not enough because the money that comes back we have to ship it right straight out again. It is no sooner back here than out it goes again to pay for goods that we have to import into our Province, but the goods that we produce in our Province and consume in our Province and do not export from our Province, these are goods that we do not have to import. We do not have to ship the dollars out to buy those goods and that is almost as good as producing goods that you do ship out in return for dollars coming back. A dollar saved is truly a dollar earned. A dollar that you do not have to ship out to buy eggs is a dollar saved and that is a dollar earned. A dollar that you do not have to ship out for pork and, already we are up to \$1. million a year now that is a million a year we are not shipping out of this Province for pork because we are producing that much pork ourselves.

Let us hope that the day will come when we will be producing \$10. or \$12. million worth of pork a year and importing none except perhaps some speciality products. The Danes put up some pork in beautiful form in tins and others put up pork in specialized ways and people of high income and affluence will always want to buy some of that but the vast majority of the people would be quite happy to buy pork and bacon and boiled ham and smoked ham and salt bulk and pork and spare ribs and all the other forms of pork produced in Newfoundland if they could, if it was here, if we did produce it. We are producing \$1. million worth now and every nickel of it is sold in Newfoundland and if we can produce \$1. million worth of pork and everybody buy it, out of the \$12. million they spend, \$1. million of it is spent on Newfoundland pork and \$11. million of it is shipped out, if we can produce the \$12. million worth that is another \$11. million we will keep here in Newfoundland to raise our standard of living.

Now try to make that out to be something dirty, try to make that something infamous, try to make it sound suspicious, try to make it sound dirty. We are very proud of the money we have spent and we are still spending and will go on spending to develop a poultry industry in Newfoundland and it has been a brilliant success story, more successful than the fisheries, far better returns for the money that we have spent on agriculture than we ever

MR. SMALLWOOD:

got for the money we spent on the fisheries although we do not begrudge a dollar that we spent on the fisheries, not a single dollar. Every dollar we spent we should have spent it and we did right to spend and we would have been wrong if we did not spend it. We ought not to be condemned for spending it but we ought to be praised and if we really deserve condemnation it is only for the fact that we did not spend more.

The same thing applies to agriculture. I said here last night and I developed the theme at some length, that our future, as a people, as a Province does not, it does not lie in the production of potatoes, it does not lie in the production of root crops, that agriculture in Newfoundland has no great and brilliant future if you think only of the production of root crops.

MR. CALLAHAN: That should be a contribution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It can be a contribution.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it could not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, of course it can be a contribution and only a jack ass would deny it and only a jack ass would fail to see it. Who was it said, "What Newfoundland makes, makes Newfoundland?" Every dollar you can conserve, every dollar you can keep from going out of the Province, keep bringing dollars in and let none go out and you would have the ideal situation and we would live like kings and queens. If Newfoundland shipped out and shipped out and shipped out and brought dollars back and brought them back and brought them back and did not have to ship any of these dollars out but could hold on to them here and supply ourselves with all the things that we now import we would be rolling in wealth.

MR. WELLS: We would all be millionaires.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We would all be millionaires. We would be a wealthy Province and we would probably be the wealthiest Province in Canada if we could do that, but we cannot do it. We have to import flour, we have to import sugar, we have to import molasses, we have to import coffee, we have to import tea, we have to import the bulk of our food and the bulk of our clothing and the bulk of the things we eat and use, we have to import the bulk of it but what we can produce ourselves is something that helps our economy to be more solid

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and to be more stable. This is what agriculture does and agriculture is the perfectly obvious way in which we can do that, it is an obvious way, it is a natural. We do not have the best soil in Canada. We have spots and patches of magnificent soil.

The hon. the member for Fortune Bay told us of Leonard Earle's place up the Humber River, magnificent soil and there are other patches and spots on our island where we have magnificent soil but taking Newfoundland in general we are not a part of North America where you can say we have lots and loads and an unlimited supply of good soil because we do not have it, it is not here but the soil we have here will produce certain crops and let us produce them. Every bushel of potatoes we grow is a bushel we do not have to import and that is so much money we do not have to ship out of our Province.

These things are so obvious, Mr. Chairman, that I am ashamed to say them, I am ashamed to be saying them, I feel shame that I think there is any need to say them, it is a little sad after all the history of this Province, the history of this Island, it is a little sad to think that anyone should feel a need to say these things. You would think that they are so obvious they do not need to be said, you would think that they are so apparent that anybody can see it, you think so but that does not stop a suggestion, an attempt to suggest crookery. This does not stop an attempt to suggest feeling, this does not stop an attempt to suggest that there has been some kind of impropriety, robbery, embezzlement or some kind of financial impropriety. Then we hear today a shocking suggestion, we hear the shocking suggestion this afternoon that there is a move afoot to set up marketing boards to control the marketing of certain commodities such as eggs, a shocking suggestion could only be born in the twisted and criminal minds on this side of the House. They would not dream of doing that in Quebec, you never heard of that in Ontario, Manitoba would not entertain anything like that, Saskatchewan would throw it out the window and if anybody suggested it in Alberta they would be lynched and as for British Columbia they have yet to hear of any such a suggestion as that. If you go to the home of democracy, go to the United Kingdom and suggest over there that all eggs

MR. SMALLWOOD:

should be pooled compulsorily by order of the Government, that every man in the United Kingdom who has a few hens and produces any eggs should be obliged by law to pool with them all the other eggs or all the other producers and have compulsory co-operative marketing. Suggest that in the home of democracy where the mother of Parliament is, where Parliamentary democracy began, the most democratic people on earth, suggest that and you would be deported.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that so? Have I given the right description of the Canadian Provinces? Is this idea of a marketing board, a compulsory marketing board for prime products, is this new? It is not new with cod fish, it is not new with salt fish.

Before Confederation the Government of this Province, the Commission of Government, passed legislation providing for compulsory co-operative marketing of cod fish and every cod's tail that left Newfoundland were shipped out of Newfoundland and sold and marketed around the world by a compulsory co-operative and that compulsory co-operative was known as NAFEL. The idea was basically as right as any idea ever was. The only thing wrong with NAFEL was that it was a co-op of a few merchants at the top and the primary producers were not members of it. You had to pay, I think it was, \$10,000. fee to join it and today by order of the Parliament of Canada, the Parliament of this nation, and this House of Assembly passed supplementary legislation and no-one on the other side opposed it, no-one on that side voted against it. The legislation we enacted here in this House, earlier in the present session, providing for compulsory co-operative marketing, the pooling of all salt cod, nothing criminal about that. Every salt cod fish produced in this Province this year must, I say, it has to be, it must be marketed by a marketing board and that marketing board is made up of employees of the Government of Canada, is made up of civil servants, is made up of public servants and the fish merchants are not allowed to market their own fish. That has been taken away from them. They are not allowed; they are not permitted by law, the law of Canada and the law passed by this House a few weeks ago. Every cod's tail that is shipped

MR. SMALLWOOD:

out of Newfoundland, this year and in all years to come, is shipped out by a Government board and no merchants are allowed ever again to ship a cod's tail out of Newfoundland. He is not allowed to market any outside Newfoundland as it all has to go into the hands of the Salt Cod Fish Board and that is not all. The other half the story is this; that no fisherman can sell any salt dried cod fish to anyone in the world except to the board. The Board has a

Mr. Smallwood.

complete monopoly, this Government Board, remember, set up by the Parliament of Canada and by this House of Assembly. That board headed by Aidan Maloney and Dr. Ernest Weeks and their staff - that Government Board are the only outfit in Newfoundland that are allowed to buy salt cod from the fishermen and they are the only outfit that are allowed to market salt cod fish outside Newfoundland. That is a compulsory, pooled, co-operative marketing system imposed on the Fisheries and on the merchants and on the fishermen by the Parliament of Canada and this very House of Assembly. Yet, we hear the shocking suggestion here today, the absolutely abominable suggestion, that the Government are actually thinking of doing the same thing for farm products. It is not even the same thing. The same thing would be this: that the Newfoundland Government would set up a Government Board made up of civil servants and that board made up of civil servants, employed by the Cabinet, appointed by the Cabinet, that board would take over all those products produced in Newfoundland and would own them and would market them, but that is not what is proposed. What is proposed is not the same thing they are doing for salt cod fish. What is proposed is that the producers themselves - the producers themselves, voluntarily, share four main marketing boards and market all these products.

Now, this is common-place all across Canada. If this committee were in close touch with what is happening across Canada, every hon. member of this committee would know this: that in every Province now these boards are being set up. These boards are being set up now all across Canada and they are being set up for the very purpose of allowing and enabling - allowing and enabling and requiring - remember the three words: permitting, enabling and enjoining, that is obliging the primary producers to market their products through

Mr. Smallwood.

a marketing board. This is being done all across Canada today.

MR. HICKMAN: With enjoining, you can leave out the other two words.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, being permitted - if a certain proportion of them decide that they want this, then the remainder are enjoined - the remainder are required. Right. Now this is what is happening all across Canada, right now, in the last three months.

MR. WELLS: We have legislation now that enables ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know we have legislation. I am well aware of it. I am well aware of it. This House passed that legislation and the legislation said that it would come into effect - it would become law upon being proclaimed. Well it was proclaimed and it could not have been proclaimed, if the Cabinet had not so decided. The minister came into the Cabinet and he said, "Will you now proclaim this legislation that the House of Assembly passed?" When did we pass it, last year was it? When did we pass that legislation?

AN HON. MEMBER: 1966-1967 session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Four or five years ago, we passed it and it did not come into law until it was proclaimed and it was proclaimed a few weeks ago. Now this is the same kind of legislation that they have now all across Canada, but where our blood has turned cold here today by being told in hushed tones, in a hushed voice by a man who could not believe his own ears - he could not believe that a Government could sink to such infamy. He could not really credit that a Government could sink so low as to take away from any primary producer, the sole and independent right he now has to market his own products.

MR. CROSBIE: Who said that..

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is exactly what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman who is now asking the question, that is exactly what he said.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, that is entirely incorrect. The only thing

Mr. Crosbie.

I have said about marketing was: is the minister going to proceed with a marketing board for eggs? The hon. the Premier seems to be very sensitive on anybody even asking that question. There was no one got up here today and argued for or against the marketing board for eggs. The question was asked: is the minister going to proceed with it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I, with my very good hearing..

MR. CROSBIE: Well, you heard wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: With my very good hearing, with my very excellent hearing, I heard the hon. the member for St. John's West say to this committee, this afternoon, since we met here at 3 p.m., I, with my own ears heard him suggest and suggested - he did not use the word infamous, but the whole tone, the whole implication of it was that it was infamous in his opinion, that you were going to take away from the independent primary producer the right to market his own products. He said that and I will bet my life, and if he did not say it, produce the Hansard, and I will resign before this day is over.

MR. CROSBIE: Get the Hansard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will walk about.

MR. CROSBIE: Get the Hansard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will walk out. I know what I heard. The hon. gentleman made it quite unmistakable, and we all understood and heard what he said.

MR. CROSBIE: I will say more in a few minutes, when...

MR. SMALLWOOD: He can say more in a few hours or in a few years, if he likes, but I am talking about what he has already said. He has suggested to this committee that the idea of setting up a board that would require - that would require any primary producer to pass the marketing of his product over to a board was infamous, was wrong. That was his unmistakable...

MR. CROSBIE: I did not say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was his unmistakable suggestion to this committee. He is as wrong in that as anyone could possibly be. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that in the United Kingdom..

MR. CROSBIE: I will give you my position on it in a minute.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What this noise I hear?

MR. CROSBIE: Hens.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there another meeting going on? Mr. Chairman, would you ask the Sergeant-At-Arms to attend to the noise outside the Chamber? Whoever they are, they were not elected members of this House or if they were, they are too cowardly to come in here and be seen and heard. It is bad enough to be interrupted by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman, they passed a law in the United Kingdom, in the Mother of Parliaments, the Mother of British Democracy. They passed a law to this effect: that nobody, but nobody, but nobody in the United Kingdom could market even one dozen eggs on his own. The marketing had to be done and could be done, only, by a national marketing board set up under law. They are now doing the same thing all across Canada - not just for eggs alone but for broilers, for tobacco. In Ontario they had a referendum among the farmers and the farmers turned it down. This was about a year ago by a very, very narrow margin, the farmers, in a secret ballot referendum asked if they favoured this scheme and turned it down by a very, narrow margin indeed. They turned it down.

I believe now that they have had a change of heart. About two-thirds had to vote for it...

MR. WELLS: Where was this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ontario - the province of Ontario.

MR. HICKMAN: This is the whole key to marketing. It is the producer who decides, is it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. HICKMAN: Not the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the Government introduces legislation into the House. The House passes the legislation and the legislation provides that if a certain proportion of the primary producers in a given product favour a marketing board, then the others have to join it, whether they like it or not. It then becomes compulsory.

MR. WELLS: That proportion is pretty high, two-thirds.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not always two-thirds, no. Right now, I can tell the committee this: that some poultry men who have resisted, strenuously, resisted, even violently resisted, even written orders to the newspapers resisting the idea, are now among the most clamorous for this very move to be made.

MR. WELLS: These are poultry men in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Newfoundland I am talking about. Yes. As long as any poultry man can sell his eggs and make a profit out of them and does not have too much trouble selling his eggs, he is not going to be worried very much about a marketing board. There never would have been any bother about a marketing board for salt cod in this Province, if the fisherman had been getting good prices and if the merchants had been getting good prices for the salt cod. There would not be any demand for pooling or co-operative marketing or the setting up of a Governmental board or any other kind of a board. There never would have been any demand for NAFEL, before the commission of Government, if the prices, returning to the fishermen and to the merchants for their cod fish, had been good prices.

It is always, when the prices are poor. It is when the primary producers are suffering from poor marketing or low prices, it is always then that they begin demanding something or other to be done that will get them a better market. Mr. Chairman, there are certain products that we all buy that are controlled from the cradle to the grave. Every step: the manufacturer fixes the price to the jobber, the manufacturer fixes the prices at which the jobber must sell them, he fixes the prices

Mr. Smallwood.

at which the wholesaler who buys from the jobber must sell them, he fixes the prices at which the retailer must sell them. The prices are controlled by the maker, by the manufacturer from beginning to end so that when you go in a shop and you buy a product, the price you are paying is the price dictated by the manufacturer, because the manufacturers have pooled their brains. They have their trade organizations. They have their trade associations, and they agree on the prices that the retail public will pay and the prices are set and scaled all along the line. Then you have women's organizations forming, to try to protest the cost of living.

Every product, every branded product, virtually, offered by sale in Canada is offered for sale at prices which have been dictated by the manufacturers, and the price all along the line is dictated. They call it suggested prices. But not the products of the primary producers, until they, too, form their organization, and I would like to know this: I would like to have an answer to this from someone. If there is anyone capable of answering it, satisfactorily and adequately, I would like to hear the answer. If you go into the supermarket, and you see great batteries of shelves of products in handsome bottles and handsome cans, beautifully lithographed labels, eye appeal, eye appeal, appealing to your sight, and you go in and every single item that is there for sale has had its price fixed for the buyer, for the woman that goes in or for the man to buy, with a shopping basket, every price has been fixed and dictated by the manufacturer or the canner or the processor or the bottler of that product. If that is so, and it is so, then, I ask, why should the few products that are produced here on this Island be subject to rampant competition, to price cutting, using them as price leaders using them to cut the primary producer down to a lost position so that the

Mr. Smallwood.

department store, the food market, the supermarket can have a special article that is marked down. He is not losing on the mark down. He is not losing, when they are sold as a price leader for that year. The man who is losing is the primary producer. He pays for it. Of course, it is true of processed branded groceries. Of course, it is true. Absolutely true. Well it is true. It is true. The royal commission on price spreads in Canada, read the evidence, read the report, read the verbatim, shorthand evidence, case after case, after case, manufacturer after manufacturer, processor after processor, wholesaler after wholesaler, retailer after retailer, brought in, put on oath and the evidence taken and see what happens. There is no country in the world, I suppose, where there is such monopoly practice as there is here in Canada.

Everything is priced...

MR. WELLS: Toothpaste, soap suds, soap but I have not yet to see it on cans or bottles of food..

MR. SMALLWOOD: See what?

MR. WELLS: This price - this suggested retail price.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not marked on the cans, necessarily or the bottle.

MR. WELLS: You would see it on, say, a package of toothpaste or a shirt that you buy or something like this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not have to be marked on the tube or the bottle or the can or the case or the package to be true, whether it is marked on or not, it is still the case that the price is, as suggested by the maker, by the processor..

MR. WELLS: You mean the average retail grocery store has its price determined by the manufacture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. WELLS: I find that difficult to believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not that the manufacturer goes to the little retail grocery store on the corner and says to him: the president of the company puts out this brand of beans or peas or what have you or pickles. He does not come down personally and go down to the little corner grocery store and say to the woman behind the counter that owns that little shop: look! you are to sell these for these prices. He does not do that.

MR. WELLS: I assume it is the sales agent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the agents who do it, not even the agent of the factory, because the agent of the factory does not go around selling those goods.

MR. MURPHY: Is that not now an offense against the Federal Law.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Probably. That is why it is only a suggested price.

MR. EARLE: No, the offense says, if there is collusion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. EARLE: The fact that one manufacturer sells a brand at one price, he has...

MR. SMALLWOOD: But now read the evidence of how they got together, of how they did it by phone, how they met in each other's offices, how they met in each other's clubs, how they met at each other's country homes, up in the country for the weekends, the ways they have of getting together and agreeing on the prices. Read the evidence! A few were fined.

In the United States, the monopolists in the electrical trade, Westinghouse, General Electric, all the great Moguls were all brought together and fined; \$100,000 fine for this man, \$250,000 for this man, and they paid the fines with smiles and chuckled back in their clubs - a \$250,000 fine for the president of a company that makes, say, \$200 millions profit by fixing the prices, and he pays \$250,000 fine. It is farcical.

Mr. Smallwood.

It is farcical. But, all right, I am not tinting against windmills. I am not tinting here today against that practice. I am opposed to it. I am against it. But I am not trying to destroy it. It is too big for me to destroy. The point I am making is this, a very simple point, we are not manufacturers in this Province of canned beans, of bottled pickles, of processed and packaged goods of all kinds. We are now turning out - Mr. James over in Hant's Harbour is turning out beautifully canned or bottled queen crab. You can go into the supermarket now and the queen crab is a Newfoundland product. You see a few items of fish, canned or processed, but not much.

What I am talking about is where the few articles that are produced in Newfoundland are sold, why should not the producers of those products who also have to live, why should they not have an opportunity to have a marketing board? The biggest poultry establishment in Newfoundland is small fry compared with anything on Water Street - small fry. The biggest of them and the bigger they are the more in debt they are. I happen to know. I happen to know. I happen to know some of the debts of some of the firms that are in that business - in debt to the banks, in debt to the Canadian Credit Corporation, in debt to the feed company, one feed company or another - they are all up to their ears in debt - everyone of them. How could they build the businesses they built except by borrowing and if you borrow heavily and pay interest on that debt let alone pay off the debt, just go on paying interest. You have to make profits, and if the profits are eaten up by cut throats, silly, stupid competition, as indeed they have been for the last four to five years, if that is the story, as indeed it is, then it is no wonder that at last these primary producers are asking to have some action taken and they have been going to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture

Mr. Smallwood.

and asking him to get this Act proclaimed so that they can set up their marketing board.

Now what is wrong with that? Why make that sound infamous? Why make it sound foul? Why make it sound improper? Right at the very moment that the attempt is made, they make it sound improper, at that very moment, every salt cod in Newfoundland is being marketed, not by the primary producers, (I wish they were. I wish they were) but rather by a Government board appointed in Ottawa, headed by a gentleman who sat in this House as Minister of Fisheries, a better man than whom they could not get if they searched Canada from end to end, a better man

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): for that particular job, and while that is going on, right before our eyes why, why throw out this suggestion that there is something infamous because the poultry producers are trying to get a marketing board going for their own protection.

Now Mr. Chairman, remember this; if they get that board and they meet once a week, and they agree on the prices they will try to get from the shops, if they do that and they are stupid enough, if they are stupid enough, if they are greedy enough, if they are grasping enough to start gouging the public what will happen? What will happen is there will be a buyers strike, what will happen is that more eggs will be brought in from nearby Provinces, what will happen is that the attempt to gouge the public will collapse, it will disappear and so these producers who have gone through a veritable hell for the last five years, as I happen to know, if they get their board, will I believe have enough common sense not to attempt to gouge the public, not to attempt an essay in grasping, greedy, selfishness. I do not think they will, but we will have to wait and see.

MR. WELLS: They will only hurt themselves in the long run

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will only hurt themselves and they have already been doing that for the last four to five years. The debt that has been created I happen to know, I know every poultry producer in the Province, without any exception at all, and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture knows them all intimately and he visits everyone of them one by one, he goes to every one of them, he has their trust, he has their confidence and he is the father of this whole idea. It is through him and the confidence the poultry men have in him and in his impartiality, and in his ability, and in his decency, his inherent integrity, it is because of their faith in him and his qualities that they are willing not only to go along with this idea, but are demanding because they know that he knows of their losses. They know that he knows of the horrendous debts they have had to contract in the last four or five years and do not let it be thought, do not let it be thought that the poultry business in Newfoundland has been built up to

its present level, where we are now self-supporting. It is one of the few food articles - look, Mr. Chairman, we are not self-supporting in potatoes. We heard here last night that about thirty per cent of the potatoes we eat in this Province, and we are big potato eaters, thirty per cent we produce ourselves and seventy per cent we import. We are not self-supporting even in "spuds" but we are in eggs.

Is there something infamous about that? Is that something that calls for some screamingly, witty remarks? Is this something that should be deprecated? Somehow or other there is another indictment of this Government, look at our eggs, look at our eggs, is this the tone in which it should be said? Are we not to take pride in the fact that after a few years, ten, twelve years of strenuous effort and the expenditure of some money we have now made our little Province self-supporting in eggs? Not only self-supporting, consuming twelve million dozen a year, producing a bit more than twelve million dozen a year and shipping the surplus out to Georgia and Quebec, is that not something to be proud of? Why cannot we take pride in that? Have we so many things we can take pride in in our economics, in our Newfoundland economy, that we can take that in our stride and yawn in the face of it? Is it something to sneer at, that we are making a strenuous attempt and spending money to accomplish it to make Newfoundland self-supporting in pork?

We are spending \$12 million a year, \$1 million a month for pork product and we are producing \$1 million worth. Why cannot we produce the \$12 million worth? Why not? Why not? Why not? Someone tell me, why not? Why should not the Government spend money to help bring that about? Why not? The Government spent untold millions to help the fishing industry, why should we not spend something to help the agricultural industry, the livestock industry why not? Why not? Is there any reason why we should not?

MR. WELLS: No, but

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. WELLS: But let us do it for the "spuds" too, that is what I am saying.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are doing it, we have always done it for "spuds," and in spite of all we have done we are producing a smaller proportion of our potato needs today than we ever did before.

The reason for that is that there are thousands of women, I suppose there are thirty or forty thousand women in Newfoundland this afternoon who, in years gone by, or they or their mothers, or their grandmothers, would grow their own potatoes. They set their two barrels or a barrel and a-half, or three barrels of seed and they would get their ten, twelve, fifteen barrels of potatoes and stow them away for the winter, Tens of thousands of women who did that now go to the supermarket. They now go to the grocery shop and they buy potatoes, imported, beautifully graded, graded into uniform size, washed and polished almost like buying a bushel of apples. Even if they wanted to buy Newfoundland potatoes they are not there to get. They are not being produced. We are helping, we have been helping potatoes. But when I say that we dare not put much of our dependence for our future economy on the production of potatoes, do not take it, from that, that I mean we should not grow any potatoes. I am only trying to put it into proper perspective that, if we have a future in agriculture, it is not in the growing of potatoes or carrots or parsnips or beets or cabbage. That is not where the future lies.

MR. WELLS: But that can be a big part of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It can help

MR. WELLS: Sure it can.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And every mickle makes a muckle, and every job you have, every dollar you save, in this precarious economy of ours in this Province, the most precarious economy in Canada. I did not make it the most precarious economy, it was always that, it still is and it is the work of utter desperation to try to improve it. You can work yourself to the bone and you can be as bold as ever a man was, piratically bold if you like, and try to expand and strengthen our Newfoundland economy and what do you get? What do you get after ten years, after twenty years? You still have fifteen per cent of your work force unemployed, looking for jobs.

I know that you have an awful lot more men working than you had, but you still have fifteen per cent not working. I suppose in a month or so it will be down to twelve, down to ten, and I suppose by the fall it will be down to five or six per cent. In Newfoundland when you only have five or six per cent unemployment you do not know but you are living in heaven.

MR. WELLS: That is pretty good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is pretty good for Newfoundland, it is not pretty good for Ontario.

MR. WELLS: It is as good as ever we had.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is as good as we have ever had here in Newfoundland yes, indeed it is. The year I was born, from the first of November to the first of June eighty per cent of the Newfoundland work force would be unemployed, eighty per cent. The year I was born, eighty per cent of our wage earners, our breadwinners in Newfoundland would be unemployed from the fall to the spring. Then it dropped from eighty per cent to seventy and sixty and fifty per cent. That is pretty bad is it not? One half your work force unemployed for five or six months a year, that is pretty bad is it not?

MR. WELLS: That is not a fair comparison now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now from fifty per cent it dropped to forty, it dropped to thirty per cent, it dropped to twenty per cent and even here since Confederation, even since Confederation, the figures are here given in the Budget Speech, page 33. Listen to this, listen to this, page 33: "1958, twenty-eight per cent of our work force unemployed, twenty-eight per cent. Next year, 32.7, thirty-two and three-quarters per cent of our whole work force unemployed. The next year, twenty-eight and three-quarters. Next year, thirty-one and one-half per cent, twenty-eight and one-half per cent, twenty-five point eight per cent, we were up as high as thirty-two and three-quarters per cent of our work force unemployed, even ten years ago.

I remember when we were luck when there was only forty per cent

for about half the year. If you could feel that sixty per cent of your work force were working all the year round you felt that you were living in Paradise.

MR. WELLS: The same thing was true with the farmers in Manitoba, and Ontario. They were sort of unemployed during the winter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am well aware of that, but there is no province in Canada that had those high per centages in the years that we had them. In the years, - I am talking about 1963, I am talking about 1962, 1961, 1960. In this decade just past our unemployed ranging from twenty-eight, twenty-five, twenty-six per cent to thirty-three per cent.

We are going to arise at 6:00 p.m., we are not going to be passing any of those estimates, everybody wants to make speeches, fine, let us get it out of our system. I want to get it out of my system and I have not said quarter of what I would like to say, but I will not say much more in spite of that, so others can have a chance between now and six o'clock when we rise until tomorrow.

Sir, I bitterly resent, I resent bitterly, deeply, the suggestion of impropriety, the suggestion, because a drunk, because a drunken bum, (I better curb my tongue at this point) because someone writes and speaks, I, as the Premier of this Province, have to defend myself against that. I will not stoop to it! I will not stoop to it!

MR. WELLS: I would say it is a wide spread allegation and should be cleared up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know it is, I know it originated with one person, one person and I have to descend, I have to stoop to defend myself against him? I will not do it! I will not do it! I made a remark here in this House earlier that after twenty-one years as Premier of this Province and with more opportunity than any man in the 500 years of our history, more opportunity of certain kinds than any man in our history, than any twenty men put together maybe, after twenty-one years of it, if I have to pay my personal debts now I would have to go down to the court and plead insolvency. Can the hon. gentleman say that? He is just out of school, He just got out of school the other day.

MR. WELLS: Yes, I had to say it too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not now the hon. gentleman would not say it, he could have said it maybe a couple of years ago

MR. WELLS: I could say it now too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has not been Premier for twenty-one years, has not been the head - the leader of the Government for twenty-one years.

MR. WELLS: Maybe I am not in quite as bad a position as that, I do not know, at least I hope not, not as bad as the Premier is making it sound. I am no millionaire I can assure him that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say that the hon. gentleman is earning double my income now, double, at least double my income. I do not begrudge it.

MR. WELLS: I worked for it. Dam~~a~~ hard for it too!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did a little work occasionally myself. I manage to punch in an hour every week, two or three hours every day in fact.

MR. WELLS: Has he ever heard me deny that?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. WELLS: But I have heard him deny me, about.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: What have I denied in the hon. gentleman?

MR. WELLS: About the sneers about law practice in Corner Brook, half a dozen times in the House. What is wrong with it? It is an honoured profession.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not sneered at the practice of law. Yes, all professions are honoured except the profession of Premier. In Newfoundland there is honour for everyone except the Premier. If you do not like him, if he has been in office so long, if he has licked you, if he has beaten you, if he has beaten you down into the ground in six general elections in a row then, none so poor among those that he has beaten down, none so poor as to do him reverence.

MR. WELLS: But that applies to most of the ministers and most every member of this House I would say. There is damned little honour if you will pardon my using that word, Mr. Chairman. You stand and take incredible

treatment.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not believe that

MR. WELLS: I do not mind it in the House

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not believe that. That is a statement that I do not accept. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of Newfoundland do honour the office of Premier and the present occupant of it. He has had lots of evidence of it. I have not lacked for evidence that there is some regard for me and some respect for me. There is no more attack on me now than there always has been. I have been the victim and the subject of attack for twenty-one years and before I became Premier for three years in my struggle. Who was attacked as much as I was? I had to go around with a body guard. I had to have a body guard to keep me from physical attack. I mean, I have been under attack right down through by some, but Mr. Chairman, the people who attacked me are no more representative of the people of Newfoundland in general than was the university student who spat in my face. Was he representative of the 7,000 - 6,000 students at the university?

MR. WELLS: No, of course not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think so, and the fact that I am attacked sometimes gives me some pleasure. If I had no importance no one would be bothered to attack me. If I did not amount to anything, if I did not have any strength, if there was not an awful lot of jealousy of my strength in Newfoundland, in the hearts of the Newfoundland people, no one would bother to attack me. I would not be condemned. No one would ridicule me. No one would hint that I was a robber. No one would hint that I was an embezzler. No one would hint that I was a crook. They would not bother, I would not attract any attention, I would be unimportant.

Knowing this I am rather proud of the attacks that have been made on me.

MR. WELLS: Political attacks yes, but not that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If sometimes I am inclined, which is very rare if ever, if ever I do have a slight temptation to be worried about it, I remember the attacks made on others. I remember the attacks made on Sir William Whiteway

"an old fool, an old scoundrel, an old crook." The great Whiteway, it is incredible what they said and wrote about that man, it is past believing.

What they said about Bond, Bond, the patriot Premier. He was a rich man. He inherited money from his father, a wealthy merchant on Water Street. He inherited the money. He studied law, he never practiced it he did not need to practice it he was a wealthy man. Newfoundland got in trouble and he pledged every dollar he owned in the world, he pledged it to raise a short-term loan for the Government. The Government were broke, they were bankrupt and he went out, he could not raise a dollar, and he pledged every dollar he owned of his own money, his own personal - can you imagine that?

Huh! do you know what they did with him? Do you know what they did with Sir Robert Bond, that great Liberal Premier? I will tell you what they did with him Mr. Chairman. He went around campaigning. He had a little boat hired, a little steamer, a little small, short steamship. Maybe she weighed 200 tons, I do not know what she was. He goes into Western Bay, and the boat could not get into the wharf, the water was too shallow in at the wharf for the little steamer, so they lower a boat and they row him in. The great Sir Robert Bond, he was dressed in his Prince Albert coat, handsome, a great Victorian statesman, a patriot, and he climbs up the wharf and a man with his foot kicked him in the chest back down into the water of the bay. Bond, (One of them walked out, yeah). all that they said about Bond.

Squires, I was present, I was in the House of Assembly when the mob came for Squires

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and I saw the mob seize him, he was almost free, he almost got out of the building, he was nearly over on Bannerman Road when they caught him and they brought him back through that crowd and out through the front gate to hustle him down to the harbour to drown him. Corner Brook, Humber, the father of the Humber industry, "drown the bastard, drown the bastard" but they saved him, Squires, But why should I mind? I am proud to be attacked, to be in company like that. What is wrong with being in that kind of company? My name can be linked with the names of Bond and Whiteway long after I am gone and I will be happy, I would like to die thinking that they will link my name with those men. Go to the really big ones, go outside Newfoundland, go to the really big statesmen; Churchill. Ever read the book, somebody wrote a book and compiled in it all the attacks made on Churchill and all the names he was called. Churchill, it is impossible, is it not as no one ever said anything against Churchill. Oh yes a whole book was written to collect them all together, all the things said about him.

Did you ever read the book on Abraham Lincoln? Even now when you read the book you cannot believe that anyone ever actually said those things about Abe Lincoln. They do not bother to say things like that about nonentities and that is one thing I have never been accused of. I have never yet been accused of being a nonentity. No-one ever called me a nonentity, a nobody, a nothing and thanks be to God for that!

Now we were talking about eggs about Bond and Whiteway and Churchill and Abraham Lincoln and columniation and hatred and envy and jealousy but, Mr. Chairman, thanks be to God I have what the young curate told his Bishop while crossing Placentia Bay in a schooner. From Placentia they went over to Burin and on the way over, they went over in the night, and on the way over they had one of the worst storms ever known in Placentia Bay and the schooner turned inside out and upside down but she did not sink and the curate slept all through it and in the morning when daylight came the Bishop asked him how did he fare and he said, "What do you mean my Lord?" He said, "Well, how did you get on?" and he said, "What do you mean, my Lord?" and he said, "How did you fare last night, were you not frightened by the storm?"

MR. SMALLWOOD:

He said, "What storm?" He had slept through it and the Bishop said, "What kind of a man are you?" He said, "Clear conscience, My Lord. Clear conscience. And that is me, as I have a clear conscience.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, much of what the Premier said is true but again most of it is a camouflage - the reversion back to Bond and Whiteway and the effects on those great men and the comparison, and he would not stoop to deny this. As I recall it the papers, for a period of a couple of months, were full of it and nothing but that, Well that is not quite true, to say nothing but that, but it was pretty extensive. And when the Premier of the Province sits back and says nothing, the Minister of Agriculture says nothing about it or there is no formal statement or no resuscitation of it in the papers or in the press, news media generally. What are people expected to believe? Of course it should be denied. There is no sainthood in not denying something like that. If it is incorrect it should be denied.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. gentleman remember the Duke of Wellington?

MR. WELLS: I remember - "Publish and be damned!" Sure! Publish it and be damned.

MR SMALLWOOD: That is what I would say.

MR WELLS: Publish and be damned. He would certainly deny it.

MR SMALLWOOD: He did not deny it.

MR CALLAHAN: Was the hon. gentleman here this morning when I dealt with this? And on at least two occasions in public, I had in fact denied the basic allegations; and heard that?

MR WELLS: I think the minister is talking with several tongues in his cheek now. Of all of the persons who sit on that side of the House, including the Premier, he is the one who finds it easiest to get his mug or his opinions in any newspaper, on any television or radio media in the Province. Now is he going to stand there and tell me that he could not get a denial of that published? Nonsense.

MR CALLAHAN: Sure I can.

MR WELLS: I am not likely to believe that.

MR. CALLAHAN: I wish I could do as well as the hon. gentleman when it comes to publicity.

MR. CROSBIE: He certainly tries hard enough.

MR. CALLAHAN: Maybe.

MR. WELLS: I am not about to believe that nonsense or accept it. But again it is a great camouflage. He made a great, brilliant, heart-rending speech and he was very emotional about it obviously. Does that make it right? Does that justify? Has there been anything at all said in this debate that has justified the Government's failure to really seriously encourage root crop? Have they really showed why we could not make ourselves sufficient in potatoes? No! No good reason whatsoever given when a few thousand acres, four hundred, five or six even thousand acres would make us totally sufficient in potatoes and perhaps even less than six thousand acres and we cannot get sixty, one hundred acre farms, in this Province to produce potatoes with a little bit of help and incentive from the Government. I do not believe it for one and I would say it would be a lot less difficult, considerably less difficult than trying to promote either the poultry or the hog industry.

Until the Minister or somebody else establishes for me why it cannot be done instead of just standing there and saying no, I do not accept that, - instead of just standing there and saying no -

MR. CALLAHAN: We went through all the reasons this morning but the hon. gentleman does not want to be convinced, so he is not going to be convinced.

MR. WELLS: The reasons because he cannot have a ten thousand acre farm and five or six thousand would produce all we need.

MR. CALLAHAN: Do you know how big the biggest farm is in this Province right now, the biggest farm with crops planted?

MR. WELLS: I do not know. Five or six hundred maybe.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, I said it this morning but he was not listening. Roughly two hundred acres.

MR. HICKMAN: Where is that, in Lethbridge?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, and that is by far the biggest.

MR. HICKMAN: They make a good living in Lethbridge.

MR. WELLS: A farmer tells me and I do not know, maybe he does not know what he is talking about, but he has been in the business all his life and he has been successful at it all his life, that he has or he planted fifteen or sixteen acres and he makes a decent living on it.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is all he does.

MR. WELLS: That is right and he makes a decent living out of it. I said to him, "What would you do if you had twenty-five acres?" and he said, "Oh it would be marvelous." Then I said, "What would you do if you had fifty acres?" and he said, "Boy, we would really have something then." Then I said, "What would you do if you were one of ten or twelve farms in an area of fifty acre farms where the Government had the machinery and rented it out to you?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why does he not have forty acres or thirty or fifty, why not? Why does he not have it?

MR. WELLS: He does not have the capital to do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He does not need the capital.

MR. WELLS: Yes, he does need capital. He needs capital to acquire the land and acquire the equipment. With a bit of capital assistance from the Government and with the Government participating in potato harvesting equipment one farmer with a fifty acre farm cannot use one of those.

MR. CALLAHAN: He needs no capital to get the land. That is absolutely wrong to start with.

MR. WELLS: He needs capital to get the land and get it cleared. He needs capital to buy existing land that has been cleared that is owned by somebody else and not being used.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now we are getting into something. That is a different quintal of fish entirely.

MR. WELLS: Sure and the Government is taking no steps whatsoever in it. Your Honour I am not going to quote from the newspaper I am going to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell the man to come in and have a talk with me and talk it over.

MR. WELLS: I most certainly will.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell him to come in.

MR. WELLS: I most certainly will.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My colleague and I will sit down and talk to him.

MR. WELLS: And I think he would be anxious. I realize that it is improper to quote from opinions expressed in a newspaper but this is not really an opinion expressed in a newspaper. This is the recording of a historic document and I think the House might take, let us see what kind of notice might they take on it, take notice of it that it is equivalent to judicial but they cannot take judicial notice of because they are not judicial by nature, administrative notice of some kind on it.

A reference is in todays column,"The Wayfarer", in the Daily News, to a letter written one hundred years ago by Monsignor Sears, after whom Searston in the Codroy Valley is named and I can see that he and I would have been great friends, I really can. Let me start out first with a quote from Archbishop Howley in a letter to the Government. Apparently the Governor or somebody enquired as to whom this Reverend Father Sears was and Archbishop Howley wrote to the Governor, "Your Excellency may thoroughly rely on all his statements and I am in a position to prove that he is as fully authorized as an ecclesiastic as he is experienced as a man in forming and publishing the conclusions he has arrived at with regard to the country in which he has made his home, which is in the Codroy Valley area". Monsignor Sears went on to say in his letter to the postmaster general, "We are left here in a perfect state of barbaric. No roads, no schools, no law or order and if we wish to communicate with any other part of the island we must send a letter by some passenger or sailor to Halifax, Nova Scotia, to be sent to the capital of our own island." This sounds familiar, Mr. Chairman, in principal I mean.

Father Sears found it astounding that a place of such resources and so many people would be left unprotected and uncared for, as the district of St. Georges had been with the single exception of 1850 when a Mr. Tobin had been sent there to represent the Government of the Island. Father Sears had no doubt about the economic virtues of the region. "They were second to no locality of equal extent", he said, "in any part of the lower Provinces or of any of the New England States." He mentioned minerals but felt that the

MR. WELLS:

greatest natural wealth was to be found in the agricultural capabilities of the soil. He said; "In my experience of most of the fertile parts of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton and even Prince Edward Island, I am now certain, after a year's residence at St. Georges, that the soil here is superior in point of fertility to any I have seen, especially for the growth of hay, while the climate being less subject to both extremes is consequently more salubrious than any of it." "But what;" asked the good priest, "is the use of these natural advantages while the Government of the country will do nothing to encourage the settling of the country or in fact recognize the right of the people to enjoy the privileges of the British law or constitution?"

Father Sears had a solution. Since the French rights, much of this dealt with the French rights too, the exclusive French fishing rights at the time, since the French rights extended only to fishing the thing to do was to deprive the Newfoundland inhabitants of the right to fish as they were in that area although to some degree it was not enforced but it was the basic law of the land at the time. Then they would have to fall back on the more lucrative and happier means of getting a livelihood which agriculture affords.

"There was much more of the same," wrote the commentator, "some of it of great interest but this is sufficient to show the state of the people between Cape Ray and Bay of Islands just one hundred years ago."

With certain exceptions, Mr. Chairman, there has not been a great deal of change. There has been many changes in this degree or in that area or some other area but the principle still remains the same. To a large extent the area is ignored and that is what Father Sears was talking about, the Government ignoring the area and ignoring the people in the area and that is what the Government has done as far as agriculture is concerned. There are not many areas in this Province, as the Premier has said and he is quite right when he said it, that are conducive to agricultural activities. The whole of the Codroy Valley right from Codroy right on up through to Flat Bay area and into St. Georges these are really suited to it, most if not all of the Humber Valley is ideally suited to it and there has been little or no significant help from the Government in this field of endeavour. I am not yet convinced,

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Chairman, that it was more difficult for the Government to help the farmer who wanted to use the soil to produce root crops than it was for the farmer who wanted to produce poultry products or pork products. It seems to me it would be and until I am shown I cannot conclude otherwise.

The farmer says that if we had one-half of the kind of assistance and help that the Government has given in the area of poultry and hogs we would be laughing, we would be home free. But they do not have that kind of assistance. The Government made some effort after the war, not this particular Government, in the settlement of the Cormack area and laid out basically fifty acre farms, I believe was the basic size of them, for the veterans who came home. They were all wooded areas and they were sufficient, they were some help for them but most of them did not make a success out of it. They were given the land but some made a great success out of it because they had either greater means or greater inclination and even without the help of the Government and they make a very, very good living out of farming today and there are some very productive farms.

There is another one in the Howley area that I do not recall, and maybe there has been assistance given by the Government, which is a very productive farm and he does very well with it and it can be done without a great deal of assistance. The fact that people do it without any assistance except for warehousing facilities for the crops, the fact that they do it without any assistance other than that is proof positive that a far greater number could do it with some assistance. Does that not necessarily follow? I think it does, I think it necessarily follows like night follows day.

MR. CALLAHAN: Would the hon. member give me the names of farmers that are doing it without any assistance?/

MR. HICKMAN: I can give you one who has two farms out there.

MR. WELLS: I can give you one name.

MR. CALLAHAN: With no assistance whatsoever.

MR. WELLS: John Carter.

MR. CALLAHAN: Without any assistance whatsoever.

MR. WELLS: Well, maybe, I was talking about - Okay, so he provides a place

MR. WELLS:

for the vegetables to be stored or there is a district representative from the Department who calls around to see him occasionally.

MR. HICKMAN: Ern Rideout has two out there.

MR. WELLS: Ern Rideout.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. WELLS: In Cormack.

MR. HICKMAN: A good farm and good living.

MR. WELLS: Good farm.

MR. HICKMAN: As good as anywhere else in any other land.

MR. WELLS: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: I know Ern Rideout very well.

MR. WELLS: That is right and the man up in Howley, what is his name? I have forgotten it now. Not right in the community of Howley but his name does not matter anyway.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: The hon. gentleman knows what kind of assistance I am talking about.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, there are all kinds of assistance but we just cannot write it all off and say -

MR. WELLS: We write it all off in hogs and hens. There is no significance there.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman blindly goes on and says there is no assistance being given.

MR. WELLS: Little or no assistance to these farmers and with a little bit more effort on the part of the Government, something of real significance could be done. I am not condemning what the Government has done, Mr. Chairman, in the fields of poultry and hogs as I have no reason to condemn it. So good - if we can make ourselves, within economic sanity, if we can make ourselves self-sufficient as far as eggs are concerned or poultry products or pork products, well and good and I give the Government every credit for the contribution they have made to it, but do not do it to the exclusion or the effective exclusion of all others. This is my complaint and that is all

MR. WELLS:

that I said last night.

MR. CALLAHAN: This is what is now being done and the hon. gentleman just will not listen.

MR. WELLS: What is being done?

MR. CALLAHAN: What about some co-operation with -

MR. WELLS: They tip their hat and say hello to the root farmer and he has his assistance. You know by comparison that is the assistance. This is where the Government has failed and there is one man I am sure who would agree with me were he around, it is Newfoundland's misfortune that he died a considerable time ago, and that is Monsignor Sears. Just read about him, Mr. Chairman, in today's Daily News.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I will not be any lengthier than any of the members on the other side have been. The Leader of the Opposition and I

an hour or an hour and a-half ago asked some questions, perhaps the hon. minister is going to answer them if he indicates he is, fine.

MR. CALLAHAN: I will answer them right now if the hon. gentleman wishes.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is going to answer some questions about Farm Products Corporation and its relation to poultry producers and the abattoir, is going to see about that. Good, because the questions have not been answered. In the second last speech we have heard there was nothing answered. There is nobody saying he is against subsidizing the hog business or the poultry business or any other business that makes sense. But I have not heard anybody here today produce any figures and say there are "X" number of poultry producers in the country or in the province and they employ so many people and the cost to the government each year.

MR. CALLAHAN: About eighty registered.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister can answer me when I sit down. I am saying that we have never been told how many poultry producers there are. How many people they employ. Just told clearly by the Government what it is costing to subsidize the poultry business each year, so we can see just how many people are involved, how many people get employment, and what is spent in the year. That is all we are asking Mr. Chairman. It would be interesting to know how many people are involved in the raising of hogs, how many people they employ and just what forms of government assistance are available and what it cost in the year. That is all, it is just straightforward information. And you can look at it and see, make your own mind up as to whether it is a good thing or not. But that kind of information is not given. It has not been given yet.

MR. CALLAHAN: It will be given if we want to be here until Christmas.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not need to be here until Christmas. If it is going to take the minister so long to talk about it, perhaps he would give us a little memorandum on it. The information is not given, there is no reason why it should not. Now Mr. Chairman, all I did earlier was ask the minister; were they proceeding with a marketing board for eggs? Were eggs to be taken under the wing of^a compulsory marketing board? And this caused practically an hysterical

speech by the Premier, because somebody asked is there going to be a marketing board for egg producers. Now we have not been told that there is going to be one, it is intimated there is going to be one and we have not been told whether the poultry producers have all voted on it yet. Apparently they have to vote on it. Have the poultry producers yet been asked to vote on it, and if so, what was the result of the vote? Were there any large groups opposed to it or substantial group? We are not given that information. Instead we hear an hysterical speech about allegations and insinuations some members were supposed to have made but were not made at all. Very Tender Toes, for some reason, on that particular subject.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman wants the answers before six o'clock.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman do not worry. I have only been about two minutes so far and I think I will be another two or three. If an hon. member cannot answer the question about something Mr. Chairman without causing hysteria there is something obviously wrong. And with reference to the last part of the Premier's speech, I am a bit tired of self-pity. I get feelings of self-pity myself occasionally, when I am being attacked scandalously inside this House or outside it. So I intend to pay no attention to self-pity on the part of the Premier, when he says he has been attacked for twenty-one years. Who is the greatest personal attacker in the public life of this Province? The Hon. the Premier. And for the last two years I have been bearing his personal attacks. I am not going to get up in this House and wallow in self-pity about it. Unfortunately anybody in public life who gets engaged in public life in this Province is subject to that kind of thing. And I have my own views as to where it originates from. And it does not occur in other provinces because there seems to be a different setup or different kind of personality in other provinces. So enough of this self-pity about attacks. There is no one in this House has been attacked more, the last two years, than I have. - personally and every other way. There was no self-pity when I left the Cabinet, was given a letter that alleged slanderous and untrue things about me, so do not give me out any malarkey or any self-pity about attacks. That is

something that anyone who goes in public life in this Province today had got to endure apparently.

I do not infer that there is anything wrong with the poultry business or the hog business in this Province, Mr. Chairman, but I say that we are entitled to have the facts that this is an excellent thing to do and what it is costing and how many people are getting employment through it and what it is generating. And if the producers who have been opposing or competing with provincial poultry cooperative, if they are satisfied with an egg marketing board we are delighted to hear it. There is nobody against a marketing board per se. Why should they be? What nonsense! We all know there are marketing boards in every province. The situation in every province is not the same as the situation in this Province. And there is no comparison to the salt-fish marketing board at all, Mr. Chairman. The Saltfish Marketing Board is going to buy fish from thousands and thousands of fishermen, not from a handful of poultry producers. That is an entirely different matter. Is there more than, at the most fifty or sixty poultry producers in this Province? There is no comparison between the Saltfish Marketing Board and the Provincial Poultry Producer or Hog Producer or anything else. They are two entirely different situations. And they are cooperatives that have limited liability ^{companies} of their members they are even true cooperatives.

Now the minister wants time to answer a few points, so I will conclude with -

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is possible to answer all the points, there have been eight or ten points raised. But I will get to ~~Dank~~ Point Mr. Chairman when we get further along the estimates, hopefully. I will try in the few minutes left to answer some of the questions that have been asked and I will try to answer some of them briefly. As to the last point the hon. gentleman raised, about the impropriety of so-called corporations coming together and becoming cooperatives, I think the first farm Co-op in Canada Mr. Chairman was the Ontario Grains, which was founded I believe in 1878. And the cooperative farming movement or the development of farming cooperatives

has progressed from that point. And today in Canada the members of the Canadian Wheat Board are the representative co-operatives. The farm Co-Ops in Canada own oil refineries and operate them. They own and operate fertilizer plants. They own strings of service stations. They own publishing houses. And God Only Knows, Mr. Chairman, the numbers, the kinds of operations and assets that are, that come under these farm co-ops, these giant corporate organizations which are known as Farming Co-operatives in this country. So for our little producers down here, who are pigmies by comparison, to join, to come together and market cooperatively hardly is improper, hardly is unique or strange or something that the world has never before seen.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of the Auditor General's Report on Newfoundland Products Corporation, I do not know why it is that this was handled pretty thoroughly last year and not as much wind and noise/^{as}this year.

I had thought the House and members who have been around for several years would have known what the position is.

The position very simply Mr. Chairman, is that Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, which is not new, was established in 1964.

MR. CROSBIE: A large loss is new.

MR. CALLEAHAN: It is not a loss Mr. Chairman, the same question was raised last year and I said then it was not a loss and I say now it is not a loss.

MR. CROSBIE: Well it is a subsidy.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman can call it what he likes but it is not a loss. And I do not care what the hon. gentleman calls it, the Auditor General is using what he must use, I suppose, in his position, accounting terminology to cover situations in the accounting practise -

MR. HICKMAN: Operating loss, what does that mean?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, there are about three minutes let me ^{to} just say this. That Farm Products Corporation operates a provincial abattoir. The abattoir has nothing whatsoever, nothing whatsoever to do with, nor does Farm Products have anything whatsoever to do with in a corporate way or in any other way except by leasing space with the Newfoundland Poultry Producers Cooperative.

The second is referred to in exhibit two of the Auditor General's Report under Products-- Poultry - those figures Mr. Chairman have absolutely - have no relationship whatsoever to egg production or to the poultry producers co-op. That is part of that question. I hope it -

MR. WELLS: Does that sell the output of the abattoir or anything like that for Newfoundland -

MR. CALLAHAN: The abattoir buys and did buy in the year that is covered by that report, bought product, cattle, sheep, hogs, poultry from 243 farmers in this Province. And slaughtered that livestock and sold that livestock and paid the farmers the best price it was possible to obtain for that livestock - not for the chosen few as I heard today but for 243 farmers.

MR. WELLS: Who marketed it, did the Newfoundland Farm Products market it?

MR. CALLAHAN: The Newfoundland Products marketed the livestock, market the meat products, directly. And this is why, Mr. Chairman, when people come to us - as I have indicated, one large poultryman came to us and wanted to buy the abattoir or either that or we start killing for him, custom killing, we said no. Because too much of the stake of too many farmers is involved to put it into the hands of one man. Secondly, we are not prepared to engage in custom killing on a commercial basis as the next thing we would have, Mr. Chairman, is complete disruption of the marketing system for which Farm Products corporation is now the only possible control, the only control on quality, the only control on orderly marketing. And we are not prepared to hand that over to any individual. Mr. Chairman it is now six o'clock.

On motion the committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted, committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I move Mr. Speaker, that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 10:30 o'clock and that the House do now adjourn.

On motion the House stands adjourned until tomorrow Thursday June 4, 1970 at 10.30 a.m.