



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 95

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House has heard, with pleasure, the news of the Rev. Father McGrath's nomination to be a bishop. He is, I think, one of the most widely respected and certainly one of the most popular priests in our Province. The new bishop elect was born at Oderin in Placentia Bay, 1912. He got his education at St. Bon's College and at Memorial University and at St. Augustine's Seminary in Toronto.

At the University here, he was prominent as a member of the Student Council, and he was prominent, also, in athletics. He did a few years work, parish work in St. John's at St. Patrick's and at the Cathedral. Then he went to Washington, D.C., to do some postgraduate studies in sociology, and it was there he obtained his Masters Degree, at the Catholic University of America. Returning to Newfoundland, he was attached to the Basilica Parish where he was very active in the Catholic Youth Club Movement and also as a lecturer in an adult labour school. Father McGrath served fifteen years on the Senate of our University. He taught at St. Bride's College and also at St. Clare's School of Nursing. In the 1930's, Father McGrath taught at several summer schools at Memorial University College. He served as private secretary to His Grace, Archbishop Skinner, for a period before receiving his appointment as parish priest in the Parish of Witless Bay, where he served for fourteen years. Then he returned to St. John's last year to assume his responsibilities as administrator of the Archdiocese of St. John's.

Father McGrath, the Bishop elect McGrath, has many friends of all denominations. He is well known for his ecumenical spirit. He is, also, quite bilingual and this asset should be important to him in his work as the new Bishop of St. George's. His eldest brother is the Right Reverend Monsignor William McGrath who was prefect apostolic in Chungsiang Province,

Mr. Smallwood.

China, where he spent a number of years as a missionary but is now in retirement in Toronto. His sister, Sister Mary Bernadeen, music teacher at Holy Heart of Mary Regional High School and another sister is Mrs. G. A. Frecker, wife of the hon. the member for Placentia East and the Minister of Provincial Affairs. Another sister is Mrs. P. J. Howlett now living in Toronto and a cousin of the new bishop is the hon. the member for St. Mary's District and a former Minister of Health.

Bishop McGrath's father was once a member of this House. He was Richard T. McGrath who served in this House as member for Placentia-St. Mary's for quite a number of years. Other relatives of the bishop elect were the famous Captain Jack McGrath who served as private secretary to President Teddy Roosevelt in the United States, a famous hockey player, one of the most famous players of his day. Another relative, I remember, was the first lady in Newfoundland to become a lawyer, that was the sister of the hon. member for St. Mary's District and altogether, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the bishop elect comes from one of the most brilliant families that we have ever produced on this Island. So many members of that family were intellectually brilliant..

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Sir Patrick McGrath?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Sir Patrick McGrath was not in any way related. Sir Patrick McGrath came from Bell Island, was born on Bell Island. No, I do think that there is any relationship not that I ever heard of.

But, Sir, another brilliant son of this Province, another brilliant Newfoundlander has achieved this signal success, and I am sure all Newfoundlanders, all members of this House, certainly, and all Newfoundlanders will welcome the good news.

MR. A. J. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I am sure, when I concur with the hon. Premier in his glowing tribute to Rev. Father McGrath that his kind words are shared not only by the members of this House but by, I would say, pretty well everyone in Newfoundland who has had the great pleasure and privilege to know Right Rev. Monsignor McGrath. Personally, myself, I have known him for many years but perhaps the most intimate^{period} I have had with him was when I was vice-president of the clerks' union back in the 1930's. Right Rev. Monsignor McGrath used to meet with us two nights a week. He had just returned from Washington and he used to lecture on social justice. Since that time, I have been quite honoured to call Monsignor McGrath a friend. I have had many discussions with him on many things. He has recently been closely connected with the parish, my own parish of the Basilica, and in my opinion, I think, Monsignor McGrath is one of our outstanding clergymen. I am very happy indeed to see that he has received this high honour, and I can only say that the West coast, their great gain is the loss of us here in the Basilica Parish.

Monsignor McGrath is a man who although a distinguished clergyman, I believe he is one of the most human persons that one would care to meet and through the years, as I have said, I have been very happy to be associated with him and have called him a friend, and I can only wish that God will bless him in his great work and that the people of Corner Brook, St. George's and the West coast will work closely with him to carry on the great work that he has done not only for the Catholic segment of our population but, I think, for all creeds and denominations, and I am sure that the people of Corner Brook, St. George's are very lucky indeed to have such a distinguished gentleman and clergyman to guide them and look after their affairs, as far as the church is concerned.

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, may I add my words of personal congratulations

Mr. Wells.

to Monsignor McGrath. I know him personally, reasonably well but not intimately and have not known him for a long time. But on the basis of the brief acquaintance I have had with him, I can very sincerely offer my personal congratulations, and I do very sincerely offer congratulations on behalf of the people in Western Newfoundland, in general, which will be the new Bishop McGrath's diocese . Bishop McGrath will, ^{live} now, I assume, in Corner Brook, where Bishop O' Raily has lived . It has been changed from St. George's over a number of years..

MR. MURPHY: I do not think it will be a circuit..

MR. WELLS: I do not think he will be going on circuit. It will be a confined circuit, if it does, relatively short distances. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Western Newfoundland, in general, welcome the appointment and look forward to having their new bishop with them very soon. Thank you.

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources):

Mr. Speaker, I should add a brief word. I think there will be great rejoicing on the West coast today over the appointment of a new bishop; particularly one who is a distinguished son of this Province.

The West coast has been well served with its bishops, with its prefects apostolic, prior to its bishops, with its clergy. The hon. member for Humber East yesterday referred to Monsignor Sears who along with Rev. Curling, I think, if my memory serves me correctly, really established, I suppose, the influence of the church on that West coast and history of the service of the clergy of the West coast of all denominations, and it has been an extremely admirable history.

Father McGrath takes the place of Bishop O'Reilly who has retired, who came to St. George's diocese, to the Parish of Lourdes as a young parish priest in 1918, and I would like to couple, I think, again in behalf of this whole House, coupled with the congratulations of the House to the

Mr. Callahan

House, to the new bishop, the best wishes of the House. to the now retired bishop, Bishop O'Reilly, who for so many years has served that coast.

The Diocese of St. George's, Mr. Speaker, it may not be realized, I think, territorially, is the largest and indeed extends well down the Southwest coast and the result of that is - right down to Bay D'Espoir - the result of that is, of course, that the sphere of influence of that particular diocese and the person who rules that sea, is quite extensive in this Province. So, we are not really talking about only the West coast. We are talking about the whole of the Northwest coast, practically all of the South coast and a good deal in between.

But I do wish Father McGrath, the new bishop is a graduate of St. Augustine's Seminary in Toronto and therefore of an alma mater of mine. I have known him for some years, personally, and I add my personal facilitations in this public way, as I certainly, of course, shall do privately to him on his election as the bishop elect of the diocese in which my particular district is located.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Rural Electrification Act, 1963."

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Parks Act."

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he be kind enough to advise

Mr. Collins.

the House, when we can expect this major announcement concerning municipal water and sewer programs for the year?

HON. E. N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, my answer is, in due course.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, all the municipalities across Newfoundland are waiting, for in June month, much of the work requires tendering.

MR. SPEAKER: This is commenting on a question. You have the liberty to ask it but not to comment on the answer that has just been given.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this is indicative as far as I am concerned. The type of answers we are getting shows the lack of concern...

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Minister of Health a question - that is that the increases in pay that have been agreed upon for hospital workers and Government servants, I understand, they were to receive from April 1st. in their June cheques. I understand that the cheques were - the first part of June has gone out, and there has been no increase over the regular monthly cheques. Would the minister tell us when the nurses and others will be receiving the promised increases? When will it be reflected in their monthly cheques?

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's understanding is completely, totally incorrect. The matter of salaries between the nurses and several other of the paramedical groups is still under negotiation. The matter of salaries for employees of the Government, as my colleague the Minister of Supply and Services indicated the other day, is still under consideration. I believe the N.G.E.A. have a ballot in progress. The results are due on the 15th. In respect of the employees in non-Government operated hospitals, the Department

Mr. Roberts.

of Health, I am told, has made the money available to the boards concerned. I am not aware whether agreements have been signed by those boards, employers, with the representatives of their employees. But in a sentence, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's understanding is completely incorrect.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, do I take from that, then, that the Government employees and others who are to receive pay increases will not be receiving them for some while yet, until all these negotiations are completely settled. Is that the position?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think that is probably accurate. I will put it another way, that the increases will be paid as of the 1st April, but that they cannot be paid until they are agreed upon. We are not paying on account.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Has the investigation into the matter of the sending out from Churchill Falls of Mr. Gus Tremblett, Mr. Fred Tremblett who are supposed to appear there on June 11th in Magistrates Court, has that investigation been completed and has the minister contacted the two men involved, the workers at Churchill Falls who were shipped out after the May 24th. holiday and when would his investigation be completed and reported on to the House?

HON. L.R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received a report from the R. C. M. P. whom I have asked to investigate the matter. I do intend to follow, very closely, because I do not see how these men can return to Churchill Falls on June 11th to appear before court. I cannot just see what the plans can be, but I intend to investigate it, if necessary, to see that the case is either postponed without their going or else dropped. It is absolutely impossible to see that these men are out on bail and that there be a trial in Labrador. It is just...

MR. WELLS: Having been forcefully sent out.

MR. CURTIS: I just cannot...

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that matter. Would the amount of bail be returned to the men in question, if they do not appear in Magistrates Court on June 11th?

MR. CURTIS: I am looking into that matter.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the matter of what happened there being investigated also? I mean are the men themselves being contacted and their stories taken? The R.C.M.P.'s conduct, perhaps, is in question in this matter. How can they investigate themselves?

MR. CURTIS: I have just gotten a report, Mr. Speaker, from the R. C. M.P. I will have to be guided by that.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. minister that this is a very....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this a question. This comment - is this comment? Is this comment?

MR. CROSBIE: This is a very serious question. The whole question of employment at Churchill Falls...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this comment? Is this comment? Mr. Speaker, is this comment?

MR. SPEAKER: This is not in order, to make comments on the answers. Please form it in the way of a question and then it will be decided whether the question is in order or not. But comment, every hon. member knows, is not permitted.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice another question. Does he realize how serious this situation is at Churchill Falls, not only for the men in question but for others there who apparently are not being amply protected by the union involved in the collective agreements there? Does the minister realize how serious the situation is?

MR. MURPHY: Just one short question, Mr. Speaker, to the President of the Council, and this regards the electoral office which comes under his jurisdiction. Is there any plan to update the voters' list of 1966 for the district of St. John's East, between now and the 11th June? I do not want to get argumentive, Mr. Speaker, but as you know, four years ago, there have been many changes, many young people have come of age, and we have already had some questions on this. I am just wondering - it would not take too long.

MR. CURTIS: I think it is very simple, Mr. Speaker, when the voters' list is acceptable according to the law, Under the Provincial Act, every voter, who claims the right to vote, has his name put on the list by being sworn. It is purely formal procedure, and I do not think it would create any hardship.

Now in the Federal election it is different. Unless you name is on the list of voters, you cannot vote, period. But Provincially, you can vote by just signing an affidavit. It is more or less a very formal matter which does not take long, and I think it would be much more satisfactory to proceed according to the wording of the Election Act than to bother taking a new election list. That is my personal feeling.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question. I agree entirely with the hon. President of the Council, but in this case, it has been estimated that something like one-third of the voters will have to be sworn in, and I think this is going to make an awful bottle neck at the polling booths. That is the only reason I bring it forth at this time.

MR. CURTIS: We may need more booths, perhaps.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labrador Affairs. Would the minister tell us, on the occasion of his estimates

Mr. Crosbie.

coming before the House, will he be reporting on the whole employment situation at Labrador? On how the union is carrying out its duties there in connection with employment at Labrador? How many Newfoundlanders are employed there and a report on the troubles that have occurred there on May 24th? Is the minister looking into that; apart from the Minister of Justice?

Does the Premier glaring at the minister mean that the minister is not going to reply?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not permitted to reply.

MR. CROSBIE: He is not permitted to reply.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mines, Agriculture and Resources 815-02-01.

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Chairman, before the Items carry, I just want to finish the answer to a question - actually there are a number of questions in one - asked just before the Committee rose yesterday at six o'clock. There is no connection Mr. Chairman, between the Farm Products Corporation and the Newfoundland Poultry Producers Co-operative. The Farm Products Corporation operate an abattoir and a poultry killing plant, and at Pleasantville they have constructed and until the lease is signed they are responsible for a vegetable processing operation at Pleasantville, which is being turned over to the Eastern Farmers Co-operative. They have constructed and until a lease is signed, are responsible for an agricultural processing complex at Bishop's Falls. They have purchased and have ready to put in use when suitable quarters are found in Corner Brook, egg grading equipment. They are responsible for slaughter houses at Comfort Cove, Notre Dame Bay, at Robinson's, and in the Codroy Valley. And they also are taking over responsibility for all other facilities such as Central storage warehouses and that kind of thing - public facilities which have been provided over the years in various parts of the Province. This is the essential function of the Farm Products Corporation. The Farm Products Corporation Mr. Chairman, lease some of these facilities. They are in the process of leasing vegetable processing facilities at Pleasantville to the Eastern Farmers Co-operative, and at Bishop's Falls to the Central Farmers Co-operative, and when they get the egg-grading equipment installed in the building in Corner Brook, will proceed to lease that to the Western Farmers Co-operative. They have leased property and equipment in the same manner to the Newfoundland Poultry Producers Co-operative, public facilities for which the Co-operative are paying rent, are paying their operating cost - paying for their own management. There is no subsidy now obtaining to that operation. There has been a small subsidy in terms of free rent and assistance with overhead, just as the policy provides for this kind of assistance to the other public facilities that are being leased to Co-operatives for their operation.

The policy Mr. Chairman, and I stated this in the House before earlier in this session - the policy generally is to assist for a period of about two years, in various ways to get these facilities under way. As I said before after spending large amounts of public funds to put these facilities in place, it would be stupid and silly to throw them at the farmers or the farmers' co-operatives without any starter assistance to get them properly operated. And this we are doing and as I think I said yesterday, it includes in the case of Newfoundland Co-Op services, their agricultural division - in includes assistance with the procurement of operating capital. In addition to this, through the co-operative division we have loaned to Newfoundland Co-op Services two of our senior people, Mr. Cyril Janes and Mr. Bert Thoms, and they are advising and helping in assisting Newfoundland Co-op services in setting up the various operations upon which they will sign management agreements at least.

The Abattoir and killing plant Mr. Chairman, are completely public facilities. The question has been raised here as what the Auditor General refers to as a \$266,000 loss that is not a loss Mr. Chairman, anymore than the money provided for land clearing, the bonus for land clearing, or the subsidy on agricultural lime, or the grants to agricultural organizations or the bonuses for livestock improvement or the subsidized veterinary service, or any of these programs can be considered losses. There are assistance programs which apply in various ways in respect of every part of the agriculture industry in the Province. I think the Auditor General for the purposes of his statement, may have to show this as a loss. But in fact what it is, Mr. Chairman, is the difference between the realistic charges that Farm Products Corporation make against the processing of meat products, got nothing whatever to do with eggs, the processing of the handling of eggs - it deals entirely with meat products, the killing of poultry, the killing of broilers, the killing of sheep - the killing of cattle - the killing of pork. It represents both the difference between the realistic price paid to farmers for their products, for these products, and there were 243 farmers last year Mr. Chairman, and that does not indicate to me a favourite few or catering to as somebody said, the great lions of the industry. These are public facilities which may be used by any farmer who wishes

to have his livestock processed through that plant which is a federally inspected plant and which has completely acceptable facilities, and completely approved facilities, because of course having that facility and having the processing done in that facility enables a better price to the farmer. So it is a completely public facility which is not restricted in any way shape or form as to produce through it. They need not sell to it Mr. Chairman - they are completely on their own, and farmers who wish to slaughter their own sheep or their own cattle and sell them to supermarkets or to corner stores, or door to door, or keep them for their own use, are at, completely at, liberty Mr. Chairman, so to do.

As I said yesterday Mr. Chairman, the only provision that can be looked to for orderly marketing at this moment is orderly selling to the abattoir. This does not prevent farmers from selling on their own. All it means is that if they want to come and use these public facilities, and to have our sales organizations sell for them, and thereby get a better price - thereby have a better quality product turned out, they may do so. And it is their choice and their option - if they do not want to use those facilities that is their business. They are not forced to use the facilities except only in respect of farmers who have been provided with SPF stock from the swine station. They must be brought back under the terms of their agreement,, because of the nature of the program, to ensure that the pathological work is done and that we protect the particular strain of animal that we are producing from that plant. But other than that Mr. Chairman, any farmer who wishes to have his animals slaughtered in that plant may do so. It is completely open to the public, limited only by its capacity to handle the amount of product. And I am sure there is no problem with that now. We are not forcing them Mr. Chairman - the hon. gentleman will not listen to reason - he will not listen to fact - he will keep his ears closed. He will continue his stupid unfounded pronouncements. They are not

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is trying to obscure his position. There is only one abattoir and -

MR. CALLAHAN: If the ignorant stupid hon. gentleman would shut up for a minute I would make my point. Now if he does not wish to accept it when it is made that

is fine but I would like to make it. And the point Mr. Chairman, is that nobody but the farmers under agreement in the SPF program are required or forced to in any way put upon to put their product through that plant. And I would say Sir, that there are many farmers, there are many people along the southshore of Conception Bay who keep a few cattle, who slaughter them themselves, and it is well known, go out and sell them to the butchers anywhere they want. And there are butchers who do their own slaughtering and their own selling. They are not required to come to the plant. Nobody is required to come to the plant Mr. Chairman. But on a commercial basis, we will not custom kill.

Now the exception to that is, that we will custom kill for an individual farmer's own use, a limited quantity of livestock. I am not sure what the figures are, but there is a limit on how much cattle or how much poultry or whatever. We will custom kill for one's own use. And we will not custom kill on a commercial basis because that would mean then that we would have the problem of sending all the killed meat back to all the farmers. You would have that additional transportation cost - then the farmers would have to take it and go out and peddle it. And the biggest problem there is in agriculture Mr. Chairman, is disorderly market. And that is what the marketing board is going to be set up for, has been set up for. Again if they agree - if the farmers do not want orderly marketing Mr. Chairman, they can have chaos. But if the majority of farmers in respect of a particular product want to have orderly marketing, we have set up the structure in which they can do it. And it is their decision to make. Now the question was asked about the marketing board. And the comment was made that independents are being forced into it. Nobody has been forced into anything Mr. Chairman. We have set up a structure whereby there will be rules, there will be regulations. The public interest will be protected and the producers interest will be protected if they want to proceed with marketing schemes, but it will be their choice and their option. What they will have to do is come to that board and present a marketing scheme and ask that board to approve. And that board may do anything from giving immediate approval to holding public hearings. And it is within the competence of the board to make the decision, and it is the responsibility of the board to make

it with the entire public interest in mind, and if the farmers in a particular product who want to have a scheme make their case, prove their case, then undoubtedly Mr. Chairman, the board will feel disposed to approve the particular scheme that may be proposed. But nobody has been forced into that - nobody has been forced into co-operatives Mr. Chairman. If people want to stay out of co-operatives, that is their business. As I said here the other day, if they stay - if they wish to stay out - if they decide to stay out, then I think they have no right to criticize any assistance we are giving to co-operatives. At least if they criticized it, they should do it fairly, because I do not suppose there is a co-operative movement anywhere that has not gotten public assistance.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not fair for them to utter a word -

MR. CALLAHAN: They can utter words if they wish Mr. Chairman, providing the criticism is fair. What right have I to criticize somebody who becomes a member of the co-op supermarket down at Pleasantville? What right have I to criticize the benefits he gets if I am not willing and prepared to join? None. And the same thing goes for the thousands of people in the co-operative in Corner Brook, the biggest consumer Co-operative I suppose this side of the Prairies, doing millions and millions and millions of dollars a year. Now other people in Corner Brook who are not members of that Co-operative, do not want to join it, do not want to pay in their share capital - do not want to give that Co-op their patronage. They do not want to do these things. By what right do they claim that there is something unfair, or something shoddy, or something illegal or underhanded going on? Mr. Chairman, we are attempting to assist Co-operatives in every branch of agriculture and we will continue to do that. I assume that hon. gentlemen opposite would desire us to desist from doing that. But the only way we are going to have any success in this thing, as I have said before Mr. Chairman, is that we have Co-operatives and it is not enough just to build the facilities and put them there and say "now you farmers who have no money, go ahead and run it." They need working capital - they need assistance with getting their operation off the ground. They need management advice. They need technical advice, and they need some financial help.

And we have programed a two year pattern of financial help, and help with their expenses. And we have helped them with the provision of working capital, and will continue to do that, otherwise Mr. Chairman, the monies that have been spent to provide the facilities will be lost, will be ineffective, unproductive. Nobody is forced into Co-operatives, and nobody is forced into a marketing board situation so far as this Government is concerned. We have set up the structure and if the farmers want to get into that, then no doubt the majority will force the minority in, but that is not unique. As we discussed yesterday, that is happening all over this country. There were gentlemen who went before the Standing Committee on agriculture down in the Hotel Newfoundland last year, and attempted to make a case that we were doing something quite revolutionary, quite undemocratic, quite unfair, quite improper, and they began and they tried to make their case Mr. Chairman, and they were virtually laughed out of the Committee room - for the very simple reason that every member of that Committee came from a farming area in Canada, and every one of those members of the House of Commons knew that marketing boards and marketing schemes had been there for a donkey's years.

So Mr. Chairman, this is the same old smoke screen. It is the same old smoke screen Mr. Chairman, and the Committee should treat it with the contempt it deserves. So Mr. Chairman

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 1.

Mr. Chairman I think that answers the questions that were asked and I do not know of anything else that usefully can be said in these lengthy preliminary remarks.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman just before that item goes I have a brief comment. Whatever the item is, in connection with what the minister just said. 815-01. What, is the minister going to be allowed to speak and nobody reply? In connection with what the minister has said Mr. Chairman I just have a brief comment. There is only one abattoir as far as I know in the St. John's area. If a farmer wants to have his poultry or his hogs or his cattle or anything else slaughtered there and looked after there and frozen there or chilled there, he must, under the rules that the minister is enforcing, sell his cattle or his poultry or his hogs, or whatever the animal in question is, to the abattoir, that is the only way that he can use the facilities of the abattoir. The abattoir then becomes the owner of the product, processes it and markets it. So if he wants to use the modern facilities of this abattoir he is forced to sell his product to Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation or the abattoir. That is the position and the minister cannot obscure. If he does not want to use the abattoir at all, he may want to, but if he wants to market his own product then he cannot use the facilities, the public facilities of the abattoir, for that purpose, because the abattoir will not carry out custom killing. They will not kill for the farmer who has poultry or cattle or hogs unless he sells his animals to them - that is the very clear position. And for the minister to say that no one will -

MR. CALLAHAN: The rules are supplied equally for everyone, nobody denies that.

MR. CROSBIE: The rules are very equal for everyone but for the minister to say that there is nobody forced to sell to the abattoir is so much nonsense. If you want to use the public facilities the modern facilities of the abattoir the freezing facilities you must sell, you are forced to sell, to sell your animals to the abattoir, do not try to obscure that. That may be a good rule, that may be a sensible rule or it may not. Do not obscure the position. And as far as the marketing board is concerned Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is all out of order.

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 2.

MR.CROSBIE: This is not out of order one single iota Mr. Chairman.

MR.SMALLWOOD: A point of order.

MR.CROSBIE: Point of order is it.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman we passed this item. But some questions were asked of the minister and he said he would get the answers for today and he has given the answers but the item in the meantime has been passed. Now the debate is starting all over again, It is completely out of order, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to Your Honour, completely and absolutely out of order. It was not out of order for the minister to give the answers today to the questions asked yesterday. That was not out of order. He had promised to do it and he has done it. But now to start debating that all over again, an item that has been passed, is completely out of order. I ask Your Honour to rule it so. It is out of order.

MR.CROSBIE: On that point of order Mr. Chairman it is not out of order at all.

MR.CHAIRMAN: I agree with the Premier it is out of order -

MR.CROSBIE: Is the Chairman going to agree with the Premier before I have spoken to the point of order. Before the Chairman has heard my views he is going to agree with the hon. the Premier, is that the position? I say it is not out of order. The minister was allowed to continue speaking on that item and therefore if we would wish to comment on what the minister was saying we should be permitted to comment on it. How can that be out of order? Now that is my position, Mr. Chairman, if you want to make your ruling now. But to make the ruling before we have even spoken to it is a new departure.

MR.ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on that point of order. I have been in this House now I think it is twenty sessions, I have seen more flagrant disregard of the rules of the House and the accepted rules the parliamentary practise here in this session than in all the other sessions put together, and I am not thinking of any one individual. I am not thinking of any one. And my hon. friend has no reason to complain, He has done more talking in the House, Nobody disputes his right to do it than any other single member of the forty-one or forty odd members here, This session he has done more talking, so he cannot say that he has been prevented from expressing his views, He has had every opportunity to do so. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if we do not here, all of us, get our senses together and adhere to the rules of this

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 3.

House and the rules of committee here, that we are becoming more and more the laughing stock. not only in Newfoundland but the laughing stock of Canada. We are taking ourselves too seriously. We are in session here longer, my view, my personal view is we are in session here longer now than we should have been. I do not see why we have to be in session three times as long as any other province across Canada with the exception of the two big ones and even we are in session longer than that. Mr. Speaker, on this point of order I am urging you, Mr. Chairman, and I am urging all members of this House, including myself, to stick to the rules here, otherwise the thing is going to disintegrate into utter chaos.

MR.A.MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, have a word on this point of order. We were on when you rose yesterday. We were then on Item 815-01.

MR.CHAIRMAN: Item 815-01 carried.

MR.MURPHY: Well, if 01 carried what right did the minister have to answer questions on 01? He should have forgotten his answers or anything else and carried on down and my - well we are still debating a matter that arose yesterday, because the hon. member for Burin was planning to speak on this heading and he did not get a chance. I think he has as much right as the minister. You talk about answering questions just another debate for fifteen or twenty minutes, and I do not see why any member on this side, - it is not that I want to - to continue this debate or otherwise restrict the minister from speaking on one that we were discussing yesterday.

MR.NICKMAN: On this point of order Mr. Chairman I suggested item 01 was not passed yesterday. The question was put the hon. the minister had started to speak and there was a suggestion from some of the backbenchers behind him that he sit down and allow it to go to a vote and I indicated that I wanted to participate in the debate on 01 and the motion was not put, it was not put and it was not carried and if Mr. Chairman will recall when the deputy-speaker or the Chairman of Debates reported on the progress there was no indication from him to the Speaker, to Mr. Speaker, that this item had passed. But apart altogether from whether or not this item had carried we have to sit here and

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 4.

listen to the hon. minister of Education lecture us and tell us we better cut out the speeches. WE better not delay the proceedings and the deliberations of this committee., speaking on this point of order. And that we are becoming the laughing stock of the Province and may be of the world. I know that they are waiting breathlessly in the United Kingdom to find out what we are going to say here this morning. But apart altogether from that let me remind the hon. minister that on this one debate on this one item it is not the member for St. John's West who has been monopolizing the time of this committee on that one item. But yesterday we went from Bond to Whiteway to Fisheries to Mines to practically every item and occasionally agriculture, for over an hour by the hon. the Premier and an hour and a-half the evening before, the night before on this same item. Now let me suggest to the hon. the minister of Education that the fault lies not with this side of the House, not by a long shot.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman has called order.

MR. HICKMAN: I can hear I do not have to be reminded by the hon. member for Bell Island.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 01 was called last night was passed according to the official records and we will get on with 815-02-01. Shall that item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, may one ask a question here on this item -03? Why is it up \$20,000, from \$6900, this year? Why is the vote increased to \$20,000?

MR. CALLAHAN: We are buying, Mr. Chairman, a new tractor truck transport for land development equipment, transportation, and a one-ton stake body truck.

815-03-01:

MR. MURPHY: Would the minister tell us what agricultural education entails?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated yesterday we have been some time carrying on an agricultural education program. We have sent and paid entirely the cost of sending 109 students to university, agricultural college over the years. We at present have sixteen students, nine going for both professional technical training and there is a payment to the Nova Scotia Agricultural College for vocational agricultural training of \$15,000. In addition

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 5.

to that, in that amount there is a provision for farmers field days and staff in -service training. Prior to last year, farmers field days generally were held at the Experimental Farm at Mount Pearl. Last year we initiated these field days and demonstration days both in Central Newfoundland and on the West Coast. And we intend to continue to do that.

MR.MURPHY: We voted in 1969-70, \$18,700, the actual spent was \$12,043, \$6000 less than we voted, now we are up to \$27,000.

MR.SMALLWOOD: That was the year before, was it not?

MR.MURPHY: Actual \$12,000.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I wonder Mr. Chairman if the committee would give favourable consideration to this suggestion. This 815-03 is a block of \$413,000 consisting of thirteen separate items. Now Your Honour has called 815-03-01 the first of the thirteen items and we are now discussing that. Agricultural Education. Would the committee consider favourably the idea of Your Honour calling the whole block leaving all thirteen matters open for discussion. and when the discussion is completed vote the block. But if it is voted one by one, thirteen separate votes, it makes it inevitable that we will have long and sometimes perhaps possibly, to some extent at any rate, unnecessary debate. But if Your Honour would call them in blocks, on the clear condition that any item in the block is open for debate until the block is passed. If that is agreed -

MR.WELLS: Anybody who wants to discuss any item -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Any item in the block. Any one of these thirteen in this block and any one of the seven in the next block and any one of the five in the next block. If a block is called it is on the understanding that any item in it can be discussed. But when the discussion is completed the Chairman asks is the item carried.

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on that, no. I think the greatest discussion we have had on this is on the headings without the individual items at all. I think that when we get down through -

MR.SMALLWOOD: That can still be so.

June 4 1970. Tape 1113. page 6.

MR.MURPHY: Yes, but that --

MR.SMALLWOOD: That can still be so. I am not suggesting any change in that.

MR.MURPHY: No. Well let us take item at a time I think it -- just a simple question. The big debates for hours have been on the actual heading without getting down to the items.

MR.SMALLWOOD: That is right and it can still be so.

MR.MURPHY: Let us take it item by item rather than -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Having had the general debate on the block then we go in and have more debates on each individual item in it. Whereas -

MR.MURPHY: I cannot go along with, I want each item.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Alright. I will stay here as long as any one. I am quite happy I like being here.

MR.MURPHY: This is simpler.

MR.SMAELWOOD: I do not go out privately outside and say what is going on, why cannot we get out of here I like being here and I say that both privately and publicly. I like. So I will stay here as long as you like, have a big long debate on each one of these thirteen items and then another big long debate on each one of the next seven items and the next five and right through the whole book. I am happy I like it. I love debate.

MR.MURPHY: We are not going to save anything. if we call the block someone wants to speak on every one of them we are still going to have a great debate on item one, two.

MR.WELLS: But why not just call the block.

MR.MURPHY: Take item at a time. We are talking about a

MR.WELLS: What difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, if we call a block -03.

MR.SMALLWOOD: On a great matter of principle.

MR.WELLS: 03 has got thirteen items. Anybody can speak on any one of the items. Once, twice, dozen, twenty times whatever he wants -

MR.SMALLWOOD: When the talking is over then take the vote. Why not agree to that?

MR.MURPHY: Call the items, come on.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I would respectfully submit that

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 7.

in a matter like going over the estimates. If there is anyone in the House does not want to change the procedure how could we, how is it proper to change the procedure?

MR.SMALLWOOD: The House is the master of its own rules and we can make a decision.

MR.CROSBIE: The House is the master of its own rules but other groups in the House had rights, minority groups too, and it has always been the practise in the House to go over each specific item so how can that be changed? Let us get on, we would have had this block done now if this had not come up.

MR.HICKMAN: On 03-01 Mr. Chairman, would the minister advise the committee whether the students who are attending agricultural colleges abroad and were receiving financial assistance from the Government are they under any agreement to return to the Province and if they are under agreement to return to the Province is there an obligation that they be employed for a period of time with the department of Agriculture?

MR.CALLAHAN: A year for each year they attended.

MR.HICKMAN: The same as medicine .

MR.EARLE: On 02 Mr. Chairman, what sort of demonstration is it? This is in each vote, what is it?

MR.CALLAHAN: This is the programme I mentioned a couple of days ago, Mr. Chairman. The estimate provides the demonstration and experimental work in small fruit production and vegetable production in peat soil, insect control and small scale gardening and also for the expansion of the experimental programme we undertook last year in conjunction with the Bell Island Association.

MR.NEARY: This additional expenditure cover Bell Island?

MR.CALLAHAN: Bell Island, Bay D'Espoir, Port au Port, St. Mary's, Placentia. where development groups have come with proposals which we have agreed to whereby we will provide them with agricultural students for the summer and some assistance and guidance.

MR.HICKMAN: On that item Mr. Chairman, we have in this Province a very fine well-equipped, well-manned, experimental farm at Mount Pearl that is owned and

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 8.

operated by the government of Canada, headed by an outstanding Newfoundland Agriculturist in the person of Mr. Robert Chancey and many agriculturists in various branches of agriculture work in there. Now that farm, as I understand, that Experimental Station does a great deal of experimentation and demonstration and small gardening work. They did a great deal of work on the development of the clearing of bogland in Newfoundland. They did a tremendous amount of work on the development of the root crop farming areas in Lethbridge and I think that this committee can attach some significance to the fact that farmers in Winterland and Lethbridge and in the Codroy Valley, in the Goulds, look to that station much more so than to the provincial department of Agriculture for professional advice.

MR. CALLAHAN: Come off of it, it is a basic research unit.

MR. HICKMAN: It is more than basic research Mr. Chairman, I know from experience that even to the fertilizing of grasslands -

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman enjoys depreciating everything we try to do in this Province.

MR. HICKMAN: This is done through the experimental farm at Mount Pearl. They have advised this government, The question that I want to put because the suggestion has been made that over the years there has not been sufficient cooperation between the Provincial Department of Agriculture and the station at Mount Pearl, to the detriment of this Province. Very much so when you think of the ADA grants, if it is ADA grants that came in here, the ADA Program. When Alvin Hamilton was minister of Agriculture, there was an outright rejection of the Hamilton theory at that time by the then minister of Agriculture, to the detriment of this Province and we lost a lot of money in this Province by not availing of the programs and research that could have been made available to us. Now, this vote under 815-02 Demonstration and Equipment how much of that work is now being done by the Experimental Station at Mount Pearl and if it is being done there does the minister agree it can be done much better, much more effectively than it can possibly be done by the Provincial Department of Agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, none of it/being done by the Mount Pearl

June 4 1970 Tape 1113 page 9.

Experimental Farm. That is a basic research station prior to the Federal Government interest it was known as the Demonstration Farm. It is not a demonstration farm any longer. It is a basic research unit which does none of the kind of work that the hon. gentleman is referring to. I may say further that we did avail of the ARDA programme and that every community pasture built in this Province was built under that programme.

MR. HICKMAN: I might be stupid but you know what I am saying is true.

On this, on 07, on the Improvement of Livestock, I do not know if this comes under this heading or not. On the improvement of Livestock is it under this branch of his department that advice is available to cattle ranchers and people who are on a small scale engaged in the raising of cattle in the Province or attempting.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CALLAHAN:

No, Mr. Chairman, this is purely a bonus program for all kinds of animals, for sheep fairs, for prizes and bonuses at sheep fairs, for support of the artificial insemination program, for the provision of sheep dipping and dipping tanks and the dipping program on community pastures, generally the provision of services for the improvement of livestock per se.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me on standardization and marketing as I was out in the hall for a minute and (I know it is passed but this is only a courtesy) I am asking the Minister; that is marketing of poultry products or hog products or what?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, Mr. Chairman, this is the question I have answered at least five times that this vote provides for the operation of facilities to Pleasantville including the operating of the abattoir, the cold storage and the poultry killing plant, assistance to farmer's organizations in the operation of egg grading stations at Pleasantville, Bishops Falls and Corner Brook, assistance to farmer's organizations in operating vegetable facilities in St. John's, Bishops Falls, Lethbridge and Corner Brook, assistance to farmer's organizations in the operating of slaughter houses at Comfort Cove, Robinsons and the Codroy Valley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall (07) to (09) carry? Carried. Shall (10) carry? *

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry (10), with the great development which is taking place at Bishops Falls which happens to be in my riding and I am sure the Minister is very interested in the further development of that area both from the point of view of livestock and root crop. I do know that many of the farmers out there have complained in the past about the lack of vet. service, and I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the Committee if there are any plans for the provision of veterinary service for that area this year?

MR. CALLAHAN: There are plans, Mr. Chairman, if we can ever get one but I think there is no field in agriculture, in this country, where there is a greater shortage, in veterinarians and so we have not been able to get a veterinarian for Central Newfoundland, but we have changed the terms or the arrangements with the existing veterinarian so that it would be more

MR. CALLAHAN:

remunerative for them to cover Central Newfoundland than it was previously under their contracts - after we can get someone.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on that matter and I realize this has been with us for a number of years, the almost complete absence of vets. Is there any incentive such, as many others, to take courses in this particular field, by the Government, like grants or anything for colleges?

MR. CALLAHAN: Five year agricultural students, Mr. Chairman, can go in for veterinary work if they wish but in terms of incentives we provide a \$7,000. cash subsidy and we pay travelling expenses, mileage, meals, lodgings, you know -

MR. MURPHY: At college and everything and at University you know.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I mean this is for practising veterinaries and then we pay all the expenses of students to go.

MR. MURPHY: What provides the -

MR. CALLAHAN: The students we pay their tuitions, we pay their books, we pay their travels, we give them a living allowance, the whole shot.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAHAN: The same students are eligible to go for veterinary work if they want to but they choose not to.

MR. HICKMAN: They spend additional years studying.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, if we have a man on five years doing vet work we certainly would not cut him off if he needed more time, it would be stupid.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no special -

MR. HICKMAN: If a student is taking a general agricultural program at Truro and he decides to become a veterinary surgeon he then has to go on and take additional studies after that, has he not?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not know. How many years do you go for this? About seven or eight years. They get an agriculture degree and then they go on and do the additional work.

MR. CROSBIE: Is there any program the same as there is with medical students? That is the question. Is there any special program?

MR. CALLAHAN: Not completely comparable with that.

MR. CROSBIE: How many veterinarians do we have?

MR. CALLAHAN: We have three under contract.

MR. CROSBIE: Now in addition to the subsidy, of course, they charge a fee. I mean, the subsidy does not mean they do work.

MR. CALLAHAN: The fee is limited. The fee is only five dollars, is it? The maximum fee on a call is five dollars plus whatever it costs them additional.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, are they allowed to have a small-animal practice too?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, completely open so long as it does not -

MR. CROSBIE: You just said a maximum fee for cows and horses and so on. They do not bother with cats and dogs.

MR. CALLAHAN: They have nothing to do with that unless it appears that the small-animal practice continues on good service to farmers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried. Shall (11) carry?

MR EARLE: Insect control.

MR MURPHY You will have to increase the vote about twenty-five times.

That is not nearly enough. You want about \$1 million.

MR EARLE: Mr. Chairman, the only difficulty with the cancerous fungus, they are apt to spread. We will not use any pesticides here, but while we are on pesticides, if I might be permitted to ask - I thought all of this was controlled federally, that all of these pesticides, and so on, are generally under strict federal control, and brand names, and so on, had to comply with regulations. What is the need of pesticides laboratories here, and just what do we do? It seems to be a duplication of what is being done federally, surely.

MR CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The law is laid down federally but the federal people do not have inspectors running all over the country checking on individual farmers and that kind of thing. So there is an area of operation in which the Provinces take a part and this vote is our share of the cost with the other Atlantic Provinces, an operating an analytical laboratory in Halifax, a pesticide laboratory. So if we have a pesticide problem or a problem of contaminated soil you can get the sample and send it up to our jointly-operated lab, otherwise each Province would have to

MR. CALLAHAN:

operate its own.

MR. EARLE: Does the Federal Government pay anything towards it?

MR. CALLAHAN: Not to my knowledge. They do not pay towards the lab but I understand it is in the same building as the Federal Food and Drug.

MR. EARLE: The lab must be a very small operation really.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it is specifically for this purpose and most of the money is for salaries, I understand, and they operate out of the same building as Federal Food and Drug in Halifax but nobody else provides it so the Provinces have agreeded to do it jointly.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the Minister while he is on his feet give us a short lecture on how to get rid of dandelion?

MR. CALLAHAN: I can tell the hon. gentleman how to cook them. There is a herbicide which is known as 24D which the hon. gentleman might try but I think he should try it on some of his colleagues first and see if it works.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry this. While it is realized that the Federal Government possibly has a major responsibility and jurisdiction in this area I recall hearing the Minister proclaiming on radio or television or some of the media a little while ago that he was watching very carefully the Federal Legislation which was about to come into affect. Now if that did not go far enough he made a statement that he would see to it that the Provincial Legislation would be brought before this House and passed. I wonder if he can inform this House if he is satisfied with the Federal Legislation as such or if he is still anticipating what they might do and what times he asked for Provincial Legislation?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, we have a legislation in draft stage and we have been revising it and revising it to try to get to a good position that would not infringe on Federal jurisdiction and what not and if we get it done in time we will introduce it in the new session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall (11) carry? Carried. Shall (12) carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on (12), would the hon. Minister indicate the areas where grants or the associations to whom grants were made, private agriculture exhibitions last year and the amounts?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago we changed the regulations on exhibitions to provide that assistance would be given only in respect of bonafied agricultural exhibitions. This made a phasing out process and there were two or three places where there was some question of doubt. I think we now have in fact phased out assistance to exhibitions that are not in fact agricultural. The last of them I think being Deer Lake last year although there is still a question there, I would say, with Harbour Grace. We think that it did not qualify but I am not prepared to say finally that it did not. In any event we now will assist only bonafied agricultural exhibitions, based on their prize list. In other words we supply the money for the prizes and this is the assistance and this is what this represents.

MR. WELLS: Industrial and homecraft is out now according to the next vote, is it?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, it is not carried.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, they fall into the agricultural exhibitions but the prize list that is provided for us is for agricultural exhibits.

MR. CROSBIE: This is just prize money is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are Federal exhibitions and they have to be exhibitions of agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, it has to be in agriculture only, it has to be predominately an agricultural exhibition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It can be only and solely that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, it is all sponsored by an agricultural society.

MR. CROSBIE: Is all the money for prizes, is that what you are saying?

MR. CALLAHAN: This is to compensate them for their prize list and to pay the allowances to judges.

MR. HICKMAN: Right but this, Mr. Chairman, I suggest is where the error has been made.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, it is not an error.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, it is very much of an error. The hon. Minister of Finance knows the matter that I am referring to, I am sure he does. If we found growing up in various parts of the Province the fairs that were being

MR. HICKMAN:

sponsored by non-agricultural organizations but there was a great emphasis on agriculture encompassed in that fair. There would be livestock judging, home-crafts, vegetables and it had all the earmarks of an agricultural fair but those who sponsor it found that in order to make it financially viable and to make a few dollars for their particular charitable organization other features had to be included in the fair but this did not take away from it the agricultural contents. The one that I know most about (and that is why I said the hon. the Minister of Finance because I believe he was involved at one point in the committee) was the Lions Fair that used to be held at Grand Bank, for the Burin Peninsula and really for the South Coast. At that fair you would find during the day exhibitions and judging going on of livestock and vegetables, farming and agriculture generally and in the evening they used to have an occasional game of things that had very little to do with agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Bingo, do they have bingo down there?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I would not say it was bingo but if you paid your money you might win and you might not. But be that as it may, during the past year or so that club, as I understand it, has not received any prize money on the grounds that it is not a predominantly agricultural fair and it is not sponsored by an agricultural society. But, Mr. Chairman, anyone who visited that (and I know that the hon. Minister's predecessor and his predecessor used to take part in the opening of this function down there and were very loud in their praise of the contribution that this fair was making to agriculture on the South Coast)

MR. COLLINS: You will have no worries this year provided there is an election called.

MR. HICKMAN: But last year and the year before, it has now deteriorated into nothing more than the ordinary fall fair that one finds throughout various parts of the Province. This may be desirable and the money may be used and it is for very worthwhile causes but the fact is that competition, for want of a better word, amongst the farmers on the South Coast of Newfoundland, has now disappeared. They have no opportunity to display their wares, they have no

MR. HICKMAN:

opportunity as they did two or three years ago to receive profession advice from the judges who were brought in, competent men to judge their livestock. We have, whether hon. members realize it or not, a fair amount of cattle raising still going on on the Burin Peninsula not on the flying "L" scale but by individuals and cattle breeding. They benefited a great deal from the professional advice they got and so did the farmers in the Winterland and in the Fortune area but suddenly there was a change. Now for ten years this was great, it was commended by agriculturalists and by the Minister of Agriculture and then suddenly down came an edict, "You are not an agricultural society, this is not predominately an agricultural fair so no more prize money." You go there now and you see no exhibitions at all, no homecraft, no vegetables, no cattle and the only thing outside of the ordinary games of chance; you will see a competition in fish filleting one evening during the fair. Whilst the money is still being raised and still being used for charitable organizations the whole purpose of this, in so far as that part of this Province is concerned, I suspect the Deer Lake area is in the same position, has disappeared and it seems to me that that, without any real cost to Government, some of that \$25,000. could be put back into prize money for these areas in Newfoundland where we did have agricultural exhibitions not sponsored by agricultural societies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, God forgive, that I should protract the debate but I suppose I have to say this and I hope I can say it very briefly. God save and protect us from these farcical agricultural exhibitions, utter and contemptable farces. I have gone to so many of them, I have opened so many of them, I have been the speaker at so many of them, with my stomach turning. Agricultural exhibitions; a few spuds and a few bits of vegetables stuck up in a corner. Utterly farcical! That is why we stopped it, and we say now that we will give prizes and we will give money to help to get judges and so on for actual agricultural exhibitions and we are absolutely right in that. And all the clubs and all the organizations around will be giving up money, ^{and} to raise money for their good purposes but not agricultural purposes, nevertheless good purposes, but their own purposes, not agriculture,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

always try to hook a few dollars, maybe not all of them and maybe not always those that do, but a good many of them try to hook a few dollars out of this grant to help their own cause and not to help agriculture. It is farcical, it is utterly ridiculous, it is utterly farcical, it is a cod, it is a bit of codology that is what it is. I have seen agricultural fairs in Newfoundland that would do your hearts good, do your hearts good and year after year after year I go to this fair and that fair and open it and I am interested in agriculture, I am, I am interested. You go and see a few cod fish over there and a few spuds over there and that is the agricultural fair and then a bit of homecraft and what is the rest of it? Every commission agent with a booth pushing his own product and then a few local manufacturers putting their products there for sale as well. It is not even a fair of field and factory, it is a fair for commission agents. That is what it is and a trapeze artist, an exhibition to bring people in. But to call them agricultural fairs is an insult to the word, just an insult.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I pursue the insult of the agricultural fairs? Obviously the hon. the Premier does not have a clue as to what has to go in the fair that I have been referring to.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, let us spend next fall travelling around and see where the good ones are.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, sure, sure! This is what is wrong with the agricultural policy. You have to have a full-fledged agricultural fair and in how many areas in Newfoundland can you have them? Codroy Valley, Cormack, maybe at the Goulds and that would be the end of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would not be the end of it.

MR. HICKMAN: But what I do suggest to this Committee is that in other areas in this Province where they are making an attempt at farming that they should not be excluded certainly because they cannot put on a full-fledged agricultural fair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They can put it on. There is nothing to stop them.

MR. HICKMAN: If you go to the fair in Deer Lake or the fair in Harbour Grace or the fair in Grand Bank these promoters or the service clubs are not trying to hook money out of the Government for their promotion.

MR. HICKMAN: All they are asking of the Government is that certain prizes be given in the field of agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Who is going to pay for sending judges down to award the prizes?

MR. HICKMAN: That there be a prize - well what is wrong about sending a judge down to the Burin Peninsula?

MR. CALLAHAN: Ah come on, come off it.

MR. HICKMAN: Is it not the purpose that when you send a judge.....

MR. CALLAHAN: You do not send them to judge nothing.

MR. HICKMAN: What do you mean, you do not send them to judge nothing.

MR. CALLAHAN: Exactly what I said.

MR. HICKMAN: This is what I said, this is why the farmers of Newfoundland have not been paid in years and years and years.

MR. CALLAHAN: The reason we stopped paying is because the fairs had nothing in them to justify it.

MR. HICKMAN: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. CALLAHAN: I do know what I am talking about

MR. HICKMAN: In other words, you do not have a clue, he does not know what he is talking about.

MR. CALLAHAN: I see much further than the hon. gentleman is seeing.

MR. HICKMAN: He does not know what he is talking about Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is this, that you go to some of these fairs and in these fairs you will find limited exhibition, it has to be because, you do not have a great farming area in some of these places but you do have farmers. You do have farmers who want to improve their crops. You do have cattle raisers on the Burin Peninsula who want to improve their stock. You do have a pretty good farming community in the district of Placentia West in Winterland and these people want professional advice and a judge who goes down to the Burin Peninsula, or goes to Deer Lake, or goes to Harbour Grace does not simply go out there to give a few ribbons to the man or person who owns the best bred cattle. What he does do, if he goes out and having judged the cattle, and having awarded the ribbons to the winner, he also meets I would

hope, and used to meet with the breeders of cattle and give them professional advice as to how they could improve their stock.

He does the same thing in the field of agriculture. He does the same thing.....

MR. CALLAHAN: In theory.

MR. HICKMAN: Not in theory I have seen them do it. I have seen the session after the judging is over.

MR. CALLAHAN: Where there are cattle exhibited they do it.

MR. HICKMAN: Now this is all gone. There is no opportunity in these areas for the farmers to get together to get this professional advice to compare their product, to compare their year's work, and why is it that we have to continually persist in excluding these areas from the benefits from the so called agricultural policy? The simple fact Mr. Chairman is that it points up what I said earlier in this committee; that if the farmers of this Province in most areas want good professional advice they have to go to the Federal Experimental Station at Mount Pearl.

MR. CALLAHAN: Let them go to the hon. gentleman, he knows all about it.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I do not know anything about it and I am the first to admit it.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yeah, for one that has been yakking so long.....

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): It is amazing

MR. HICKMAN: But I can spy a Minister of Agriculture who would not know a cow from a horse without any real difficulty, and I can spot a Minister of Agriculture who knows nothing about what is going on the Burin Peninsula in the way of farming. That is easy to spot, no trouble to spot that at all.

MR. CALLAHAN: I know how much the hon. gentleman knows, no trouble at all.

MR. HICKMAN: No trouble to spot the silliness of the reasoning and the abandoning of fairs in places like Deer Lake, Harbour Grace because they are not sponsored by truly agricultural organizations.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right, the hon. gentleman knows it all

MR. HICKMAN: And these fairs, not only do they take agricultural products within their scope, but they also take within their scope a portion of the fisheries of this Province.

MR. CALLAHAN: We will have to call the hon. gentleman when the fairs.....

MR. HICKMAN: Now I have been at fairs, and again the one I attend each year, the one at Grand Bank, this does not have booths that are exclusively commission agents. Quite the contrary, the Federal Department of Agriculture has its booth, it did until the prizes were cut out. The Federal Department of Fisheries had its booth.

MR. CALLAHAN: The Federal Department of Agriculture?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Nutritional Council of Canada has its booth, and some fisheries association, I forget the name of it, they have their booth and all of this is obviously not to sell their products to those who are attending, but to provide professional advice to the people engaged in these primary industries.

You will see nutritionists, you will see fishery inspectors there, and they used to be up to the time that the Government forced this to degenerate into simply a game of chance, you would see them there giving advice to primary producers if they wanted it. This is gone now and the hon. minister justifies it because it is not truly an agricultural fair. Because you have a gallon of "spuds" here, and a couple of cod tails somewhere else. That is a lot of nonsense Mr. Chairman

MR. CALLAHAN: Come off it, come off it. You are darn right it is a lot of nonsense.

MR. HICKMAN: I have seen half of that John Burke High School just filled, and so has the hon. Minister of Finance filled with the produce of the soil.....

MR. JONES: Mr. Cahirman, I am sorry, I cannot let that remark pass, that the John Burke Memorial High School was filled with agricultural fair. It is just not true, I was associated with this fair from the very beginning, I was associated with it before the Burke High School was built, when it was held in another building, and at the early start an effort was made to

make it an agricultural and a fishery exhibition. Gradually, the last year I was associated with it, you had a job to find any agricultural exhibits in that hall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, that is the story all over.

MR. JONES: And furthermore, at the same time there was an agricultural society of Winterland, there was another one at, I believe, some part of Marystown, and I was posed with the question, if we give prize money to the Lions Club in Grand Bank, (and that is what my hon. friend is talking about) for a few bottles of jam, and the last time I attended the fair Mr. Chairman, it was all pushed off on one side of the school, you had a job to find it, it was out in a corridor. I do not think my hon. friend can contradict me. There were actual agricultural Associations on the Burin Peninsula that were endeavouring to get professional help, were endeavouring to get

MR. CALLAHAN: And getting it.

MR. JONES: And getting it, and the bulk of the - there was no great interest in the agricultural - it was not an agricultural fair, it was the Lions annual raffle and fair to get money. I was vice-president for years. Gradually the interest died, and at one time I saw I would say almost one inspector and judge for almost every exhibit that was there. When I was faced with the proposition as to whether or not I could continue to recommend prize money for the Lion's Club Fair in Grand Bank, when the facts were presented to me and I was still the member for the district, I had to agree with the Department officials that it was not truly an agricultural fair and I was not justified in pressing for prize money.

MR. BARBOUR: I have been to a couple of fairs in my time and the one in Clarenville did have a certain amount of agriculture items there. For instance, they had good potatoes, they had good turnips, they had good carrots, beet and cabbage. They also had jam of various kinds and I must say, in fact I opened the fair over there last year in Clarenville. They invited me over (the hon. member was sick or something) and I went over and did it for them -

There was quite a number of exhibits from Bonavista South there, It was about the only fair that I have seen where there was so much agriculture on display. I have been at other fairs - now we have one in Bonavista

MR. SMALLWOOD: The problem is this, year after year there are less than the year before

MR. BARBOUR: Getting less every year, getting less every year and I doubt now, we have a fair in Bonavista by the Lion's Club at the stadium, I doubt - I do not think there is anything there grown in a garden or on a farm. But Clarendville, is the only place that I know of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BARBOUR: Sir, it is not my district, I just want to oblige the hon. member for Trinity North so I did not go into that matter. I do not know whether there was or not. I know that there was a lot of crocheting work, you know what I mean, knitting of socks and sweaters and things like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cooking, and baking, and jamming and bottling and canning all good.....

MR. BARBOUR: Yes, yes, apart from that, that was all that was there except for some advertising like a deisel engine or something like that. There was a fox there pounded up or something like that, but apart from that there was not much to it. You could go through this fair I would say within I would say at least fifteen minutes and then you would be tired of it.

MR. HICKEY: I do not think the hon. minister is going to suggest that we do away with the agricultural exhibition in Flatrock.

MR. CALLAHAN: Not at all

MR. HICKEY: I fell in the light of the remarks I should come to the defence of those people of Flatrock and the general area. Well, if we are going to wipe out agriculture exhibitions

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not

MR. CALLAHAN: We are not talking about agricultural exhibitions at all we are talking about non-agricultural exhibitions, where the vote has been cut to a token.

MR. HICKEY: I was under the impresston that we were on number twelve.

Anyway Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is a sumptuous supporter:

MR. HICKEY: I am

MR. SMALLWOOD: Genuine, admirable, prepared, let us help them in every way.

MR. HICKEY: I can assure the hon. Premier that I am and that is the reason I am on my feet.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman agrees with the policy then I hope.

MR. HICKEY: Pardon!

MR. CALLAHAN: He agrees with the policy

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is a good sensible man how can he fail?

MR. HICKEY: I agree with supporting this kind of exhibition, I certainly do.

MR. HICKEY: To the exclusion of the others?

MR. HICKEY: No, no, not necessarily

MR. CALLAHAN: That is what I mean, does the hon. gentleman agree with the policy?

MR. HICKEY: I am prepared to admit that there are arguments on both sides of this question, but, what I would like to point out Mr. Chairman is that the Government should encourage and continue to encourage and even in a greater way than they are at the moment if possible this kind of exhibition. I look at it from another point of view as well and for example, the efforts that are being made by the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation to get people helping themselves, to get people raising their own crops, and to in a general way get them into helping themselves. Surely there is no better way of doing this than providing some kind of competition and some kind of incentive for them to do it.

The exhibition in Flatrock, in my own district for example can boast of some of the finest vegetables certainly that you will find in most of the areas in Newfoundland. I have not had the pleasure of visiting too many exhibitions, but, I am going on what some people say who have visited

those other places, and I know they would not go to Flatrock and joke with the people and tell them their exhibitions are wonderful if they are not really good. I think, Sir, that in my own area there have been people who have not grown vegetables for a number of years who are getting back into this kind of thing now. Surely the like of this should be continued and promoted.

There is certainly no one making money in terms of commission agents in this particular area. It is strictly the local people exhibiting their own product-- their homecraft, their vegetables, fish, crocheting, carpets of one kind and another and mats. Quite a number of items, quite a variety.

MR. CALLAHAN: Fields and fields of fish

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mercy, mercy.

MR. CALLAHAN: They grow fish down there, they grow crocheting down there.

MR. HICKEY: Fish?

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: There is fish, certainly there is fish exhibited in Flatrock and there certainly are mats and crochet work and jam, and all of those sorts of things. Mr. Chairman,.....

MR. CALLAHAN: And the hon. gentleman goes on exhibition every year too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exhibit number one, and he gets a prize every election.

MR. HICKEY: I go every year, I go every year Mr. Chairman, I would not miss it because, I really believe that this kind of thing should be supported. If the member for the district does not go, if the member for the district did not visit and support this kind of thing, we could carry it Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do we carry it?

MR. HICKEY: We can carry it Mr. Chairman when I am finished, but certainly, when the representatives of the people do not support this kind of project

MR. CALLAHAN: It is getting harder to carry every minute

MR. HICKEY: Then it would certainly indicate that he has no interest in it. On the contrary to that Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support it and I think

that if there is any way that we can increase our efforts in this connection we should do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 13 carried? Carried.

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I have two small amendments to move on behalf of the Minister here and at the rate we are going I am torn between two minds as to whether I will move it now or wait until I come back from Winnipeg. I think to be completely safe I better move them now.

MR. WELLS: Just in case it might get through by then.

MR. JONES: Just in case, but I feel when I get back they will still be on boglands. Mr. Chairman, the two amendments which I wish to move under 815-04-01, the total of \$10,000 to be changed to \$35,000. an increase of \$25,000. The item under 04-04 boglands, changed from \$100,000. reduced by \$25,000. to \$75,000. By doing this Mr. Chairman, we make an adjustment in the subheads without changing the overall total. I move this amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with blueberries. I notice there was \$44,000. spent in 1969 and that is why it is being increased to \$35,000. it is not practical to cut it down to \$10,000. In connection with blueberries, I have been contacted by a blueberry exporter who wants his point brought up. It is Mr. Bursey of Fort Amherst Seafoods. I believe that that company used to export grade "A" frozen.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: That is the Confederation campaign, yes that is right.

He used to export frozen blueberries and used the cold storage at Pleasantville so I understand, which is not the abattoir, and he can no longer get space, and this abattoir is used and the cold storage is used for other things. Last year he was shipping blueberries fresh from the Province. They were being trucked from the Province out to Nova Scotia or somewhere like that in trucks. I believe they are shipped from St. John's and Hare Bay. Now the burden of his complaint is that these are field run blueberries.

MR. JONES: Will the hon. member permit me?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes

MR. JONES: I have made a motion that these two subheads be changed and I would hope that the items would be debated in the light of the change in the totals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendments carry? Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: These are field run blueberries which under the regulations are berries winnowed and picked in the field for shipment reasonably clean, reasonably free from leaves, twigs etc. That is one kind of blueberries. There is a grade "A" blueberry and there is blueberry substandard.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are those red ones?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know, you would have to ask the red berry expert. Under section 7, subsection 7 of the regulations, the minister.....

MR. CALLAHAN: Whorts cannot be jammed.

MR. CROSBIE: Sets a fee at a rate per pound for each inspection and the blueberry packer has to pay this fee at a certain rate per pound. Now, if the inspector is inspecting blueberries which are being cleaned and frozen and processed to be shipped out I think the charge is one half cent a pound. Of course, the blueberry inspector has to be there the whole day to inspect all the berries and stamp them and so on, (not the berries but the boxes presumably).

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not true. They inspect the berries one by one.....

MR. CROSBIE: I imagine it would be a lot of trouble with blueberries or green peas if they all had to be stamped.

AN HON. MEMBER: They pick the rocks off the boxes at the most.

MR. CROSBIE: In any event the inspectors at the freezing plant, he spends the day there inspecting the berries before he stamps them as grade 'A'. Now, if they are field run blueberries, all the inspector can do is stamp the boxes before they go. He does not spend the whole day examining the berries as they are being picked and so on, so he does not have nearly the work, but the inspector is charging the people shipping out field-run blueberries the same inspection fee, one half cent per pound as if they are being processed in Newfoundland, frozen, and then shipped out. This is causing some problem in connection with exporting field-run blueberries from the Province.

Has the minister given any consideration to changing the fee, or lowering the fee for the inspection of field-run blueberries? The people who are ultimately bearing the half cent per pound charge are the people who pick the blueberries, who are going to paid one half cent a pound less for picking blueberries. Could the minister tell us what the position is.

MR. CALLAHAN: In a discussion with Mr. Bursey on the matter of several thousands of dollars Mr. Bursey owes us for rent at Pleasantville, we have very simply told him that we are not prepared to rent him any more space until he is prepared to pay for space he has rented.

In the matter of field run blueberries, it is the law that this crop be inspected. It is the law, we

MR. CROSBIE: It is a regulation.

MR. CALLAHAN: We do not wish to allow other than a clean product to go out of the Province, and in addition to that if they are not cleaned and insepcted here then it is done in Nova Scotia by Nova Scotia labour and why should it not be done here. All Mr. Bursey is trying to do in my opinion is get an edge over operators. He has not asked that the law be changed, he has asked that he be allowed to ship out uninspected field-run berries. Now he is trying to get an edge, go into Nova Scotia a half cent a pound less or whatever it is, which would mean that somebody here who is getting some employment inspecting and cleaning berries would not get it and somebody in Nova Scotia would. It is not a very logical position.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the minister

MR. CALLAHAN: I did not expect that the hon. gentleman would, Mr. Bursey does not either but, you know that does not make the position wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: You do not mind if somebody else speaks on this.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, go ahead.

MR. CROSBIES: If anybody takes a position except the minister, does the minister mind?

MR. CALLAHAN: Not at all, go ahead.

MR. CROSBIE: The point is, that Mr. Bursey's point is that the inspection fee for field-run blueberries should be less since the inspector has to

spend much less time at that particular job.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not his position at all

MR. CROSBIE: That is the position as given to me, and that is the position I am suggesting to the House. Not that the fee be done away with altogether, or that only Mr. Bursey be allowed to ship them without inspection, nor has he asked that they be shipped without inspection.

MR. CALLAHAN: I am telling you what he has asked the Government to do.

MR. CROSBIE: But that the fee for the inspection of field-run blueberries be less than the fee is for blueberries processed and frozen here in Newfoundland and then shipped. Now the Minister's answer I understand is that he does not agree and therefore will not lower the fee.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right

MR. CROSBIE: All right, that is the minister's answer, but do not pretend it is some other position.

MR. CALLAHAN: I am saying Mr. Chairman,

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am saying what Mr. Bursey came to me with, the proposal he made to me which I rejected and why I rejected it. Now I could not care less what he said to the hon. gentleman. All I know is what he has asked the Government to do, and I have said why the Government are not prepared to do it.

MR. HICKMAN: Forget Mr. Bursey, in request that there be a reduction - is that reasonable?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not think it is.

MR. HICKMAN: You do not think it is?

MR. CROSBIE: The minister could care less.

MR. CALLAHAN: It means then again, that we subsidize what will have to be done in any event in Nova Scotia, namely the cleaning and inspection of them.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister's inspector does not clean the blueberries. What kind of nonsense is that? The minister's inspector inspects the blueberries to see that they are clean and that they are graded for field-run blueberries. He does not go around cleaning the blueberries. What nonsense!

MR. CALLAHAN: All right, let us subsidize the inspector then. That means more cost.

MR. CROSBIE: The fact is that inspection charges is paid for by the people who pick the blueberries. They are paid less for picking the blueberries -

MR. CALLAHAN: Does not somebody have to make up the difference to the inspector, or does he just simply take a cut in pay?

MR. CROSBIE: What does that have to do with the inspector's pay?

Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Carried, not at all. It is not carried at all. The minister is subsidizing poultry. The minister is subsidizing hogs. The minister is subsidizing this, that and the other, and when the minister is asked to

help out with blueberries at half a cent a pound, inspection fee, the minister does not want to do it. There is nothing about this request and a hundred thousand requests that have been made from farmers for subsidization. The egg farmers and the hog farmers and the rest of it. Why should Mr. Bursey be a subject of scorn from the minister because he wants assistance

MR. CALLAHAN: Nobody has scorned anybody.

MR. GROSSIE: Well that is what I call it, scorn and contempt. It is a contemptuous attitude - the minister could not care less. Yes, obviously the minister could care less. That is obvious. Agricultural products throughout the Province are being subsidized, and he has requested some help to field-run blueberries a-half cent a pound which the minister does not want to reduce.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government has spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars to help the blueberry industry. Many hundreds of thousands.

MR. HICKMAN: Some Newfoundlanders suggest that there is an industry here - a small industry - a few dollars we need - in the proper manufacturing and maturing of blueberry wine.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member better be careful considering where his own district - it is a tee-totally district.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is running off at the mouth again.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well I have heard a gentleman at a certain meeting in Gander declare that he should be minister of Economic Development because he has a blueberry wine industry going, but other than that -

MR. HICKMAN: But apparently there is a prospect -

MR. MURPHY: What is the situation on our mink farms now Mr. Chairman?

MR. CALLAHAN: The situation Mr. Chairman, as I told the House in answer to a question the other day, that there are some twenty fur farmers still, who this year will produce about eighty or ten thousand first class animals. Mr. Chairman, I think that the Committee knows that the entire fur industry has been depressed for some time. It has not been helped by the attention drawn to the seal industry, and there is no question - it is in a slump. It has had a very difficult time. There are still some people hanging on and

I think are making a dollar at it.

MR. MURPHY: They do not have to use a bat to kill the minks do they?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I do not think so.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. minister indicate where the community pastures will be established in Newfoundland this year?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no program under which we have more requests outstanding at the moment in the Community Pasture Program. We have in operation this season fourteen community pastures in the Province, and we have another six which are under development and on which development will continue this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I ask the minister - this part of our program of ignoring agriculture -

MR. MURPHY: We are talking about pasture lands now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not agriculture. Pasture lands are not agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Pasture lands are not agriculture?

MR. MURPHY: I do not see any heading for ignoring agriculture here - just pasture land.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well there may not be a heading Mr. Chairman, but there is a big head of steam about it the past couple of days.

Mr. Chairman, the pastures in operation this year will be Cochrane Pond, Salmon Cove, Comfort Cove, Searstown, St. Shott's, Cape Anguille, Winterland rather, Brigus, Bay Roberts, Port Rexton, Colinet, Robinsons, Long Point, and Fox Trap. Six will continue in development. It takes two years generally to develop the pastures Mr. Chairman. The land has to be obtained and fenced and treated and seeded in the first year, and allow the first year to establish itself as grass land, and usually the actual usage takes place in the next year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. member^{know} how many will be put out on pasture from the other side, after the next election?

MR. MURPHY: The latest survey shows there will be thirty-three from the

other side put out on pasture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thirty-three? Latest survey?

MR. MURPHY: Thirty-three. A survey conducted by a certain Party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite a survey.

MR. COLLINS: How does that compare with the Premier's survey?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not have a survey.

MR. HICKMAN: There was a farmer named MacLaren who did the survey. He is a good agriculturist.

MR. CALLAHAN: Do you suppose Mr. Chairman, that I might continue?

MR. WELLS: He wants to go to pasture.

MR. CALLAHAN: The pastures under development at West Bay Center, Peter's Arm River, Riverhead, Cormack, Micmac Lake on the Baie Verte road, and Spencer's Bridge.

MR. MURPHY: Riverhead St. Mary's? Or Harbour Grace?

MR. CALLAHAN: Riverhead, St. Mary's. And in addition to that Mr. Chairman, we hope to start ten new pastures this year which will make a total - then within two years of thirty -

MR. HICKMAN: Where are the ten -

MR. CALLAHAN: Sir, will the hon. gentleman please be patient?

MR. HICKMAN: What takes you so long to say something?

MR. CALLAHAN: There was a meeting and we said we would attempt to undertake that project. The pastures that are to start this year are Harbour Grace, in Trinity Bay a regional pasture I am not sure of its location. Down the Trans Canada access road to Argentia. Argentia access Road. Bonavista South, Codroy Valley. We are considering locations in the Bonavista South, Codroy Valley, Cape Shore, St. Mary's Bay, Musgravetown, Woods Island, Bay of Islands in Humber West.

MR. MURPHY: You are going to need all the pastures you can get up there.

MR. CALLAHAN: On the Southern Shore near Ferryland. Now there is one here Mr. Chairman, that says Fortune - Burin Peninsula. I do not think that is

correct. I think there is another name there. But those are the ten Mr. Chairman. Those are the ten we will start this year. To date there have been 44,000 acres fenced, 2,895 acres improved, with the extended program which will fence 24,600 improved, 26,500 acres - we will have roughly 70,000 acres of good pasture, and that is some small help to agriculture Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: For purposes of clarification, Mr. Chairman, the Community Pastures Report, that is the Point May, Dantzic Point Area?

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course it is. That is what we said we would do, and that is what we are going to do.

MR. STRICKLAND: I would like to give special consideration to the one for Trinity South. I will tell the Committee why. In the area from Heart's Desire to Blaketown, both places inclusive, there are today many hundreds upon hundreds sheep. The people who own them are keenly desirous of increasing the number. Today they have to take their sheep to Shearstown, Bay Roberts, and that area is already overstocked. So much so that we find out they are now - a lot of the sheep running wild during the summer season, and this poses a great problem. You take a man coming down in the morning going into a shop, where you have had twenty-five or thirty sheep laying around there all night, and you know what he has to do before he allows customers in. I am receiving a lot of complaints and I strongly urge the minister to give special consideration, because I have been told by good authority that within three years increased number there to five thousand - if they can get the proper controlled pasture land. Please Sir, give it every consideration this year.

MR. CALLAHAN: It will probably be fenced this year Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD (W. R.): Mr. Chairman, no it is not carried Mr. Chairman. Right behind you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that your seat seems to be a bit too far up and you cannot see behind. Would the minister tell us have any plans for making any pasture land in the Jackson's Cove area of Green Bay? I understand Sir, that the people down there, the sheep breeders and cattle breeders, have been after some pasture land for that

area. Does the minister have any plans for pasture land down in the Jackson's Cove, Silverdale area of Green Bay?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the pasture now under development as I have mentioned at Micmac Lake on the Baie Verte highway has been jointly agreed to by the farmers of the Silverdale Jackson's Cove area, and other farmers around that general area - the location is agreed as the regional pasture. The distance is about forty miles, but that is nothing - they bring the animals in the Spring and they take them home in the Fall. But this is the pasture that will serve that area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. minister takes his chair, I would like to ask a question. It used to be the case that substantial numbers of sheep would be carried by truck and put on pasture out on the bogland on the Salmonier Line. And they would be carried distances of sixty, seventy or eighty miles. Is that still done? Are the Colinet boglands occupied by sheep brought there from considerable distances away each year? And how would that compare with what the hon. minister has just said, that in reply to a question from Green Bay - there is to be a pasture land to which they will come from Silverdale and Southwest Arm of Green Bay there. What distance would that be? And will you answer both questions?

MR. CALLAHAN: Compared very favourably. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Sheep are still brought to that area from long distances. In the Green Bay situation, the distance actually is compared very favourably. At Colinet people are coming from all areas, for example, Trinity Bay - we know they are coming from distances up to sixty-five miles. Certainly well in excess of forty to fifty miles. So it compares pretty favourably.

MR. BARBOUR: I will not be a moment. The member for Trinity South gave me food for thought. I know the pastures will charge the cow five dollars I think it is - I mean the owner of the cow five bucks, and I believe it is for sheep one dollar, and I believe calves and lambs are free. Now this is my question. Through the Terra Nova National Park, almost any evening

after dusk, especially when it is foggy, it is difficult to drive over that beautiful Liberal pavement to the Park because the numerous horses which roam at large -

MR. MURPHY: It is the Liberal manure that bothers me.

MR. BARBOUR: The Tories' horses - is there anything Sir, any provision made where a horse must be impounded, or are they going to feed with the sheep and the lambs - lie down with the lambs, and lie down with the sheep?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am told at the moment, we do not accept horses at all on community pastures - that if the need grows and if it is required to be done and we can afford to do it, we might have some segregated areas for the pastures for that purpose. At the moment we do not allow horses at community pastures.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry 04. I have looked up some figures on bogland development over the past ten years, beginning 1961 to 1970, which shows that we spent in the vicinity \$1 million on this particular project. I would like for the minister to indicate to the Committee what we have to show for this particular investment. I know we have a few acres at Terra Nova and Colinet and a few other areas, and hopefully we have done some basic research. Would the minister be prepared to indicate at what conclusions his department have arrived at in terms ^{of} the success of the past development, and the wisdom of carrying it on, and future developments. Undoubtedly the cost since Confederation would have been much higher. What I am trying to get at Sir, is what have we really - what has been derived from this in terms of returns to the Province? Probably the minister could also indicate what areas have been cleared, and what produce, if any, have been grown, and where it has been disposed of?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is a very large question, and I will try to be brief. We have been doing work on boglands now for about I think, twelve years, and for the first three or four years, the cost entirely was that I think of the Province. And then the Government of Canada came into it under the ANDA project, and under the Atlantic Development Board and the

program was accelerated. The Government, in the first instance, brought from Ireland, Mr. Vincent Healey, who is an expert in his own country, and who when he arrived here became if not the foremost expert, one of the two or three foremost experts on this side of the ocean, in this matter of reclaiming and making usable boglands. So what we have done extensively Mr. Chairman, is to spend far more than one million dollars, I think the total amount of expenditure is closer to two million dollars, when you consider the work done in addition to simply draining and that kind of thing. It is much more than that. But it has been essentially experimental, and as I told the House last year at the same point in the Estimates, we have done I think, all the experimentation that we usefully can do. The problem now is getting equipment that can be used properly on these areas which are very difficult to drain entirely of water. You have to have wide-track equipment. It is expensive. Farmers find that they cannot afford to have equipment for bogland as well as equipment for mineral soil, because their costs increase very largely, perhaps as much as double. So we are

Mr. Callahan.

attempting to get assistance for manufacturers from the Government of Canada, from research people and elsewhere on this problem of providing equipment or finding equipment properly designed. The Irish told me last Fall, when I visited with the Department of Fisheries and Agriculture, actually, that they had been using equipment manufactured in Russia, and they agreed to make inquiries for us to try to obtain some of this equipment for us or some design patterns or some suggestions. We, perhaps, could have similar equipment manufactured under licence, as a Government, under licence from the Russian Government and sometime after I got back, the Irish people informed us, I think, that the Russians had gone out of manufacture. so there was no possibility of purchasing equipment and that in the opinion of the Irish people, there would not be sufficient demand to justify factories to produce this kind of equipment. It would not be the demand. So, this problem still exists.

In the meantime, we think that we should not be concerned, only with the agriculture possibilities of these boglands but also with the possibilities of commercial forests on them, and there has been experimentation on that line too. All the money that has been spent, which is being used both in terms of pointing to the possibilities of agricultural as well as forestry development. This has led to the departure, yesterday, of a group headed by the Deputy Minister of Resources, Mr. Malone, with, I think, Dr. Parrell, the head of the Federal forest service in the Province; Mr. Sharp, the management-forester recently appointed to deal with forestation; Mr. Williams from our Department of Agriculture who is our land officer - land development officer and representatives of Bowaters, Price, Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical and Javelin Paper Products, the four major industries involved in this Province - the two Governments, and they will be over there for about ten days going into detail over some of the ground that was discussed

Mr. Callahan.

last Fall, in the hope that we can use the benefit of the experimentation. This \$2 million of expenditure, perhaps, is much and may be more in terms of forestry than in agriculture where the problem is greater because of the harvesting difficulties, annual harvest problems with agricultural products. The return has not been sufficiently - the expense is very high for machinery, and we are not sure how far we can go commercially with root crops.

Now with grass crops, it is a completely different thing. You have at least a fifty per cent better yield of grass. The grass, as the Premier said the other night, is up like that on boglands. We know that for pasture purposes, these bogland areas are tied in in many cases with community pastures. We have a tremendous potential there for the provision of feed.

The area reclaimed - the last figure I have is 3,572 acres of bogland - 3,572 acres, which is a pretty fair acreage, as it is expensive land to develop. The equipment, by the way, Mr. Healey has had to design and build himself at our garage at Holyrood. You cannot buy equipment on the market to operate on boglands. It has got to be special design and this, of course, is also added to cost.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are any of the 1300 acres in commercial production now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, some are, Mr. Chairman, on the Burin Peninsula, in crops, I believe. I think at Collinet in crops, Eastport in crops and Green Bay..

MR. CROSBIE: By private farmers..

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course, there is hay production.

MR. CROSBIE: Not by the Government, but by private farmers.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes. Is there a crop production of St. George's?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hay production.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is hay production. Last year the committee might remember we amended the Crown Lands Act, to allow the leasing of bogland areas, which had not, previously, been available.

MR. COLLINS: Is there any practical experiment of work - practical experiments carried out in the feasibility of spruce or fir trees?

MR. CALLAHAN: Oh, yes. This work is being done ..

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a fairly large scale - they had outstanding authority on that coming from Scotland, several years running, I think. Who is that famous..

MR. CALLAHAN: I am trying to remember the name.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is that famous - was that not brought up here under forestry the other day or was it in private conversation? Who is - the famous experiment done in planting trees on bogs?

MR. CALLAHAN: He was a Scotchman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Scotchman was brought out here. Was it in the Soviet Union or where was it?

MR. CALLAHAN: In Scandinavia, Sweden...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but there is some outstanding, successful example of growing or planting the trees on boglands.

MR. MURPHY: Have we gone past it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we are still on boglands, are we not.

MR. COLLINS: Can the minister now give us an indication whether or not he expects a report on forestry? Can the minister give us an indication of when we might expect the report on forestry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, we will get into forestry, I suppose, sometime next winter, Mr. Chairman, but I would think within a matter of a couple of days.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have done forestry..

MR. CALLAHAN: Have we? Oh, it has been so long ago, I cannot remember.

MR. HICKMAN: While the minister is still on boglands, some of the boglands,

Mr. Hickman.

I understand, will be leased to cattle ranchers.

MR. CALLAHAN: Any farmer who wants...

MR. HICKMAN: This might be as good a heading as any, would the minister give us a report of the Flying "L" Ranch. What is happening there now? How many cattle do they have?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much I can say, in detail, to the committee. When the operation collapsed a couple of years ago, they, among other things, lost their leases, obviously, they were not operating, so their leases were cancelled. As the hon. gentleman knows, because he was Minister of Justice at the time. Yes, I guess he was.

The company, subsequently, re-organized and came back in again and on the basis of the evidence presented, the fact that the owner or at least, I suppose, he is the major shareholder, Mr. Lee. Mr. Lee's decision that he would now live here, rather than be an absentee manager and on the basis that they would start him in a smaller and more manageable operation and various other factors and conditions, new leases were prepared and I think issued in a matter of some weeks ago.

I think they have 200 or 300 head. I am not sure, really, what the number is. It is a much smaller herd than they had started out with originally. I think they have certainly learned a lot through bitter experience and it looks now, as if the thing on a smaller but more manageable scale may have some chance of success. One thing we have not had is any complaints from communities, as we had before about cattle roaming around...

MR. HICKMAN: Is there a provision - the problem before was that the

Mr. Hickman.

cattle, apart from the fact that the herd, some of them starved to death, as the herd was unmanagable..

MR. CALLAHAN: There was no expert supervision.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. No supervision.

MR. CALLAHAN: That was the problem.

MR. HICKMAN: Has there been - in the new leases is there provision that the cattle have to be kept under fence? They will be fenced in.

MR. CALLAHAN: They have to be under control at all times.

MR. HICKMAN: And fenced.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes that is what that means, unless they are moving them in herds.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The trouble with the thing is not the question of fencing. The trouble is the difficulty and so far the impossibility of feeding them in the winter.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are places all over the Island where you could graze, in the aggregate, 1 million head of cattle; several million head of sheep for four months, probably five months a year. I do not think there is any part of Canada where there is such magnificent wild grazing on open, wild land. I mean Crown land. Even the great cattle and sheep ranches of the foothills and also other parts of Alberta, are not in a class at all with our wild pasture on this Island. The cool climate and the dampness that we have brings this about. I had Herman Lynder the champion cowboy of the world, of Canada and then eventually of the world who lives in the foothills, lives near Cardston, in the foothills of Alberta. I visited him and then he came down here. I drove him around.

Mr. Smallwood.

He was amazed at the amount of wild grass, wild white clovers and other grasses and the amount of water. No animal is more than half a mile anywhere, I suppose, on this Island from water, a brook, river, pond, gully or lake, which in the Western provinces is astounding, the amount of water available for drinking without having to dig wells, without having to bore a well or without having to have windmills to bring the water up, watering holes, water places - none of that, just nature providing it and grass in staggering quantities all over the Province.

The funny thing about this Province is that grass even grows among the trees and animals will disappear into the trees to avoid the flies or even to walk through the trees to have the trees scrape the flies off them. In among the trees, there is very tender green grass growing. This is a well-known fact. I had a man from Wyoming - Wyoming, I suppose is the great sheep and cattle country of all of the United States of America, and he was terribly impressed also by the grazing. There is no question about the grazing - the millions of acres of land we have growing wild grasses and wild grasses that are extremely nutritious. As I have said here so often, cattle come out of that grazing after four or five months, butterfat - butterfat. There is no question about it. You could raise 1 million head of cattle. You could raise several million head of sheep a year on this Island of Newfoundland for so many months a year. Then when that grazing is over and peculiarly in Alberta, cattle can beat their way and sheep down through the snow and get at the frozen grass, especially, bunch grass, which grows in bunches and getting its name from that fact that it is little plumps of bulges of grass, and it is called bunch grass.

It is extremely nutritious and when it dies in the winter and it is frozen, when it is eaten frozen, it is extremely nutritious even

Mr. Smallwood.

then, whereas our grasses in Newfoundland, when they die in the Fall of the year, they die and there is no nutriment in them. There is probably more nutriment in sawdust than there is in our dead grass. When our dead grass turns grey, as it does in the Fall, it is of no value at all as a food for animals. Now, if you raise a large number of sheep and cattle on our wild pasture lands of which we have so many millions of acres, what do you do, when the grazing is over? What do you do? How do you feed them? Where do you get your winter keep? Do you import hay? Do you clear tens of thousands of acres of land to grow your winter keep? The cost of clearing land in Newfoundland and cultivating it, whether mineral land or bogland is exhorbitant. It is impossible. It is uneconomic. It just does not pay you. You never can get your money back - the money that you invest in clearing land. It might support peasant farming but that is all it will support. It will not support economic, commercial farming. So, if you cannot clear land to grow your winter keep, where do you get your winter keep? Where do you get it?

If you have 100 head of cattle, 200 or 300 or 800 head of sheep, how do you feed them in the winter? How do you feed them when the wild natural free grazing comes to an end? What do you do with them then? This is the only problem that is in the way of the Flying "L" Ranch on the Burin Peninsula. But this is the same problem that confronts every stock raiser we have on the Island. It is the same problem, whether in a small way or a big way. If you have a woman with seven or eight sheep, which you often do have in Newfoundland, a little garden not an awful lot bigger than this floor, will grow a bit of grass, and they put it in brin bags or wrap up in a piece of brin and lug it in on their shoulders and they can get a bit of grass that way and dry it and keep a

Mr. Smallwood

few sheep, with a few potato peelings and household scraps and they will get them through the winter somehow. I mean that is not commercial. You do not build a sheep industry on that kind of thing. The great problem is, how do you feed them in the winter, whether it be beef cattle, dairy cattle or sheep? How do you feed them in the winter? If it is hogs, poultry, you know how you do it, the feed mills do it. You get your feed from the feed mills, but you cannot feed sheep and cattle on feed. If you did, you would go bankrupt. Well there is the problem of the Flying "L" Ranch. How do you feed them in the winter? Solve that and you have a cattle industry in Newfoundland. Solve that, and we can become the second largest sheep Province in Canada. Ontario is the largest, Alberta is next. We could exceed Alberta. We have what Alberta does not have. We have this magnificent wild grazing on open land, millions of acres of it that probably never will be cultivated, never will be brought under cultivation, and you scarcely need to bring it under cultivation.

I have seen this experiment done. In fact I have participated in it. I saw an area of about fifty acres of land in the winter, with two feet of snow on it, covered back and forth by a limestone spreader, spreading limestone on it, and it melted with the snow and it went down on the ground and it did indeed reduce the acidity of the soil on that fifty acres and it produced a beautiful growth of grass. But the growth was not so much better than the fifty acres contiguous to it as to make it worthwhile going to the expense and the trouble of improving that fifty acres. Now by this, I mean only to say that we have a natural growthiness in our soil for grass that is, perhaps, incomparable in North America. Coaker said that he would make the grass grow on Water Street.

June 4th., 1970 Tape no 1117 Page 9

Mr. Smallwood.

He ~~did~~ not need to do anything about that. You just do not walk along Water Street, and you will have grass there in a year.

I know a man who cleared off the top soil. He put a bulldozer to work, and he cleared it down to the blue gravel to put a mink ranch there.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and he put them in grass there. As you go up and down between the rows of mink cages you do not want to be up to your ankles in muck so he had it down to the blue gravel and then he went out of the mink business and in a year that whole area was a field of grass. How does grass grow out of blue gravel? Well, it does. That might be the subject for an interesting study, scientific study, but the notorious fact is that Newfoundland is a fantastic place to grow grass. I can tell you an even more fantastic place and that is Labrador. In Labrador they have a season so short that it is unbelievable, unbelievably short and yet I have seen grass there up to my chin in Labrador. It grew and disappeared again in about eight, nine or ten weeks. It is a terribly and unbelievable short season but they grow beautiful stuff in that short season. Our season is longer on this Island and we grow tremendous grass, it is tremendous.

To solve the problem of feeding them in the winter I had studies made of getting self-propelled barges that would bring down the grass from Cape Breton Island, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick where you have thousands, tens of thousands of acres of abandoned grass lands, still under fence, still with the old unpainted barns where they used to stow the hay after they cut it and it is not harvested any more, bail it and bring it down in barge loads, self-propelled barges. We went into that and then we went into the idea well is it cheaper to bring the animals up to the grass than to bring the grass down to the animals? What about using our wild, native pastures for five or maybe six months a year then bundle them aboard barges and bring them up where the hay is. Is it cheaper to bring animals to the hay or hay back to the animals?

Then the Government looked into the question of going into Prince Edward Island and the Government of Newfoundland buying up ten or fifteen farms and they were there to be bought terribly cheaply. I suppose the price have gone up now with DREE going in there and they are spending a lot of money to buy them but I know a man in Halifax who bought a three thousand acre farm in Prince Edward Island, a three thousand acre farm with a magnificent home on it, dwelling and the barns and the whole thing for \$20,000., a three thousand

MR. SMALLWOOD:

acre farm and he was buying it for a summer place to live in. I know someone in Newfoundland who has bought a beautiful farm on Prince Edward Island. They were there cheap to buy and I thought of the idea of the Newfoundland Government buying up six, eight or ten farms and making one big large farm out of it, putting in proper equipment, mechanize the thing to produce grass, then again to set up perhaps an animal breeding establishment to breed high class stock, high grade or even pedigreed stock to help the cattle growers here in Newfoundland.

But however this solution is found, if it ever is found, there is the solution, there is the trouble with the Flying "L". I told Harold Lees when he came to me about it, bringing down cattle from Alberta, starting a cattle ranch, I said, "I have gone up all over the Burin Peninsula and I think you have picked a very good place, not necessarily the best place as the best place is up on the southern tip of the Avalon Peninsula say from Holyrood Pond in St. Mary's Bay down that shore, right around St. Shotts and Trepassy and come on up the Southern Shore." That tip is incredible, it is unbelievable the grass that is there. It is like the prairie, it is the only place we have in Newfoundland on this whole Island that would remind you even remotely of the prairies, a great level country running for twenty odd miles.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quarter of a million acres.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quarter of a million acres, is it. I am not surprised.

MR. HICKMAN: Do they have sheep ranching and goat ranching going on down there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is at Branch. Well, I said to them, "Sure, Burin Peninsula very good, good place, lots of good grass there, lots of open country there especially as you get out on the tip of the Peninsula. Do not come up in the woods, do not come up near the more settled and popular parts of the Peninsula. So you will get good grazing there, your cattle will come in in the fall butter fat." And I warned them, "Do not let the cattle go into the settlements, do not let them go near the settlements. You are going to have some mortalities, some of your animals are going to perish especially in the winter but that is bound to be until they get properly acclimatized."

This is the great asset of the Scottish Sheep Industry, the one great

MR. SMALLWOOD:

asset they have in the world is the fact that for hundreds of years not one sheep has ever been inside a building, never under a roof. They are born, they live and they die out in the open and they have acquired, they have built into themselves or nature has done so a hardihood, an ability to forage, an ability to get down through the snow with the bellwether, is that what you call it, the sheep that knows where it is and leads the other sheep could beat their way down through the snow and they know where the grass is because they lived there, they were born there and they know every square inch of it and except when the snow hardens on top, what we call, what do we call it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Call what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, where you can walk on deep snow because there is a thick crust on it. Except where you have that happening in Scotland and then they have to send helicopters and drop the hay down, except when you have that the sheep would beat their way down and get at that grass. But in the Burin Peninsula he brought in 900 head of cattle and following my suggestion he brought in his cowboys, he brought in five or six cowboys from Alberta, he brought in his cow ponies, regular cow ponies and cutting horses. I do not know if any hon. members have seen cutting horses at work but a cowboy gets on a cutting horse and he can go like the lightning and get in and just cut out any animal he wants out of a herd of a thousand head of cattle.

MR. COLLINS: Did the Premier take any lessons in cowboying?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did indeed, I am a cowboy.

MR. MURPHY: You led them in!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am a cowboy, not a good one but I am a cowboy at least I ride -

MR. COLLINS: Keep trying.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I always keep trying, I never give up. Did the hon. gentleman not discover that, did he not discover that? He is the only one that did not if he has not. So I said to Harold Lees, "Look, it will be a flop, it will be a failure, it will be a miserable failure if you do not find a way to feed these animals in the winter." Then he thought he would clear land and he came to us afterwards when he got the animals up there, he came and said, "You are

MR. SMALLWOOD:

so right about winter keep but look if we could clear a thousand acres of land we would grow enough grass" and I said, "Wait a minute, hold your horses. A thousand acres and if you average three tons to the acre, three thousand tons of grass a day, how many animals can you feed on three thousand tons of hay?"

He was a little crest fallen over that and then he said, well alright he would bring it down from New Brunswick where you could buy hay up there for \$10.00 a ton. It might cost you \$20.00 to bring it down and that would be \$30.00 a ton and even that might pay.

MR. COLLINS: Is that for the Minister of Mines to learn to yodel?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does he yodel?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, he is the best. He has been yodeling here for weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not all he can do, that is not all he can do is yodel. He can send the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, to say the least, he can send him berserk with the plenitude of his information and with his great eagerness to give it, to impart it. He can send hon. members on that side of the House completely up the wall. We over here -

MR. MURPHY: The gift of gab and all the rest of it.

MR. ROBERTS: We will put it to music if they really want it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid of that, that is what I am afraid of.

However, it is one o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall (04)(04) carry?

MR. MURPHY: There is just one or two seconds left and everytime this vote comes up it brings back memories and I do not know if the Premier will remember some five or six years ago when the hon. W.J. Brown was sitting here on this side and the Premier was always talking about this winter forage and winter feed and the hon. Mr. Brown brought back to mind a great development was to take place at Donovans, I think the Premier will remember where we were going to have this big sheep pasture in here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. MURPHY: Up around Donovan's area. We were all sitting here listening to hon. Mr. Brown who was very intense as everybody knows and he said the Premier had the wonderful idea to cut the grass and the hay in the fall of the year

MR. MURPHY:

and then throw it up in the trees. So everybody was listening and then Mr. Brown puts up his collar, like this you see, and he says, "I can see the sheep now" and he going around with the lips going and I thought it was the funniest thing I had ever seen happen in this House. I know everybody just took part in it but it was one of the Premier's ideas at the time to cut the hay and throw it up on the branches of the trees and the sheep would feed at winter time from this but Mr. Brown really dramatized it that day. But, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, let me refresh his memory?

MR. MURPHY: Just before I sit down I would like, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the House will not disagree with me in welcoming two distinguished Newfoundlanders here today, Mr. John Lundrigan an M.P. for Gander or Bonavista or Twillingate or whatever the new title is and Mr. Walter Carter of St. John's West who previously sat on that side of the House of Assembly. I am very happy to see these gentlemen and I know they came here for only one reason and that is to learn how we do our business in this House so efficiently.

MR BARBOUR: (Inaudible)

MR MURPHY: Will my constituent kindly refrain until his member is finished. Would he please show a little respect. And I am sure these two hon. members will bring back to Ottawa many ideas that they could use up there. And I am sure we can look to more efficiency in the House of Parliament by the time they get back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope we have not delayed the Premier -

MR SMALLWOOD: No. I do not want to lie forever, have my memory execrated long after I am gone, with the accusation that I advocated putting hay up in the trees. What I did say was that a sheep enterprise with which I was connected, consisting of a flock of seven hundred or eight hundred sheep, in charge of a very experienced shepherd from Scotland, who subsequently went to work for the Government of Nova Scotia and is perhaps the best sheep man to be found anywhere in Canada today, in charge of that flock of sheep. It was in the winter. It was the first flock ever wintered out

June 4th, 1970

Tape 1118

JM - 6

MR. SMALLWOOD:

in Newfoundland - the first one ever wintered out of doors, out in the snow. They were new sheep and they were on land with which they were entirely unfamiliar, and they did not know where there was any grass, and even if there had been it would not have been any good under the snow. So dry hay was brought to them and instead of sprinkling it on the snow for them to trample because a sheep or a cow will trample half the hay that is available and eat half which is a great waste, instead of that as the sheep were in fact kept in a field with trees around in it and they would get under the trees for shelter, that was the only shelter they had throughout that whole winter, the hay, when the bales of hay were broken open the hay was just scattered on the lower boughs so the sheep would not trample it. Do not make me out to be a bigger fool than I am, I mean I do not mind being made out a fool but not a greater fool than I am.

MR. MURPHY: I did not mean to, I only meant to bring up the incident of Bill Brown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even Bill Brown should not do it either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall (04) carry? Carried.

It being one o'clock I now leave the Chair until 3 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 96

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The Committee of Supply resumed at 3 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into any other Orders of the Day, I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have, in the gallery today, slightly over one hundred students. This makes something over two thousand that have visited this Chamber so far during this Session. And I know you would want me to extend to them a very cordial welcome and hope that they will enjoy their visit here. They have had today, a tour of the City, including Signal Hill, the Arts and Culture Center, the dining rooms and Cafeteria downstairs. They have seen the Naval and Military Museum, and now I am hoping they will be able to see their Legislature, their legislators at work and on their very best behaviour. I say this especially because these hundred students, together with their teachers, Mr. Clark, Mr. Janes, Mr. Tapp, Mrs. Tapp and Mr. Peach, have come in here this afternoon just to observe. And I am hoping that they will enjoy their afternoon, and they are of course, from the Davis Elementary School in Carbonear. While we have had greetings extended to nearly all students who came here this year so far, we have had them described as the girls been the prettiest, and the boys looking the most intelligent, well that held good up until this afternoon. And with my well-known impartiality, I say that the record has been established now this afternoon and may hold for a long, long time. We bid them very welcome, and we trust that they will enjoy their stay here this afternoon.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise specifically to welcome the students which Your Honour has done already and very eloquently, but inasmuch as I am about to make a statement, which has something to do with their academic futures, or may have something to do - I would like also to associate myself with Your Honour in welcoming these young Newfoundlanders from one of the most historic parts of Newfoundland, from a community incidentally which has always pioneered in the field of education in Newfoundland. There is

no community that has had a prouder record in education starting back to the first community to establish a school for girls in Newfoundland. The younger ones may not know that was THE first in Newfoundland, and it was one of the first two communities to have a grammar school for the older boys and girls in Newfoundland. It has a very distinguished record, and they are worthy representatives of a fine and historic community.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated when the Estimates for the Department of Education were under scrutiny in Committee that I had hoped to be able to make a statement regarding public examinations in Newfoundland and Labrador at an early date. I am very happy to be able to make this statement at the present time, and I may say by way of preface that no statement that I have made in this House I can recall, has given me greater pleasure than it is to be able to make this one here.

Last November the General Advisory Committee which is the Committee established by law to advise the Government on all educational matters, appointed a sub-committee consisting of Dr. K. Tracy and Dr. C. Brown and Mr. C. Andrews, three distinguished Newfoundland educators, who are ex-officio members of the General Advisory Committee. They were appointed as a sub-committee to study the question of public examinations in this Province to make recommendations thereon.

This Committee was enlarged to include some twelve other persons prominent in education and related fields to study the problem in detail, and I am sure the House will be interested to know these additional members. They were Mr. Clarence Button, (and they are not given in any particular order at all). Mr. Clarence Button, Principal of the United Junior High School here in St. John's. Mr. A. W. Parsons, Assistant Director of Testing in the Department of Instruction, in the Division of Instruction in the Department of Education. Mr. Parsons has been the man who for many many years, has been responsible for actually conducting the public examinations of Newfoundland. Mr. Nobel Regular, Principal of the Pentecostal Junior High School here in St. John's. Dr. A. M. Sullivan, Department of Psychology

of Memorial University of Newfoundland. Dr. C. H. Pottle, Director of Mental Health Services in the Government in the Confederation Building. Dr. H. Kitchen, Assistant Professor in Education at the University. Mr. Robert Butler, Vice President of the College of Fisheries. Mr. R. C. Anthony, Vice President of the Association of the Integrated School Board in Newfoundland. Dr. S. G. McCurdy, Professional Secretary with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. The Right Rev. R. T. McGrath V.P.V.G. who is Vice President, or has been up to now at any rate. The Vice President of the association of Roman Catholic School Boards in Newfoundland. Mr. James MacDonegal, Supervisor of Instruction with the division of Vocational Education in our department. And Mr. R. L. Andrews, Deputy Minister of Welfare. These, with Dr. Tracy, Dr. Brown, and Mr. C. Andrews, made up the Committee.

The report of this Committee received during the past month, recommended that public examination be discontinued in Grades IX and X, for a five year period, and that schools be encouraged to establish their own evaluated criteria for promotion purposes. The Committee also recommended that the Department of Education provide consultative services and general supervision to schools to assist them in developing new evaluation procedures. The report of the Committee studying examinations was accepted by the General Advisory Committee and its recommendation fully endorsed. I am now pleased to announce that the Government has agreed to implement the major recommendations of the Committee. There will, therefore, be no public examinations in Grades IX and X next year. The ones being conducted starting the 18th. of this month will be the last public examinations in those two grades for the next five years and perhaps forever.

Examinations will, however, will be retained in Grade XI, and I should interject here some part of my official statement, the written statement, but I should interject here the fact that we are retaining Grade XI for the present is no indication Mr. Speaker, should not be construed as indicating

that we will be retaining Grade XI in its present form indefinitely. This matter will be reviewed very carefully. But we have to go into this matter cautiously, because Grade XI happens to the school-leaving certificate and is also used for matriculation purposes for entrance into Universities, and we want to do nothing that would jeopardize Newfoundland students getting into Universities here or elsewhere.

This arrangement will be continued for five years, and will then be carefully assessed to determine its overall effect on the quality of education in our schools. Now complementary to this Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education will be appointing specialists to assist school boards and schools in the evaluation of their educational program, and in the development of internal pupil-testing procedures. The purpose of this very significant change in educational policy in this Province is two-fold.

First, it is designed to release our local school system and teaching personnel from dependents on public examination, and any restrictions that these examinations must by their very nature place on curriculum development at the local level.

And second, it is designed to encourage and assist local school authorities in adopting and enriching school programs to meet local needs, and in the development of more effective testing practices for children, for pupils.

What all that amounts to Mr. Speaker, is that the time we feel, should now be gone, done away with, when the fate of a student for one year, should depend on an artificial arbitrary, two or three hour examination written at the end of that year. I do not need to stress the fact that any boy or girl who happened to be out of sorts on that particular day could very well lose his year, because of his inability to cope with a written artificial examination given at one time. Now that we have succeeded in getting a high proportion of well qualified teachers in our schools, and because the new consolidated school boards are able to employ supervisory personnel, we are confident that this change in our system of examinations

will lead to vast improvement and quality of education in the schools of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies of this statement for the Press and indeed, for any hon. members who might wish to have it for their records.

MR. CROSBIE: We are certainly encouraged by the minister's statement - I just want to ask him a question in connection with his statement Mr. Speaker. Did the Committee also recommend that the Grade XI Public Examination be done away with? Did they recommend that to the Government, in addition that Grade IX and X exams be done away with? Could the minister tell us that?

MR. ROWE: I thought I made that clear in my statement Mr. Speaker - No, the Committee did not recommend that - what I have given is the essence of the Committee's recommendations, and they have been adopted by the GAC and referred to the Government, as I must do under the Constitution, and the Government have approved the recommendations. They did not at this time recommend the abolition of Grade XI, but I would like to assure my hon. friend and the House that this matter will be under continuing scrutiny.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal explanation. The failure of the "Evening Telegram," to provide some clue to its readers to enable them to distinguish between factual reporting and report an opinion, has reached the stage in my opinion, where even its own columnists are confused.

Kevin Jardine's letter Sir, appearing in the June 3 issue of the "Evening Telegram," indicates that he has taken for reporting a clumsy attempt at creative humour by the Telegram minion delegated to cover this House of Assembly. It was unfortunate Mr. Speaker, that the "Telegram," should single out for second-class citizenship, the residents of two St. John's streets, as paupers and layabouts. That was definitely in bad taste, and could certainly arouse resentment of the people's paper among the solid block of its subscribers. But Mr. Speaker, to attribute such cruel, sophomoric humour to another under the guise of reporting the truth, was

cowardly as well. Reporting Sir, as you know, to paraphrase an old legalistic adage, must not only be truthful, but also must maintain appearance of truthfulness. My original remarks in this House of Assembly Sir, on June 2, which can be verified in Hansard, merely suggested that recreational facilities in their off hours be opened up for use by those who for one reason or another, have been forced into unemployment. And Sir, as we all know, as technological advances in production occur, this will increase steadily.

My innocent suggestion Sir, which is already in practice in a number of Mainland communities, was distorted into a cruel and clumsy jibe at two groups of St. John's residents.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to another untruth in today's "Evening Telegram," which is headed "Excessive Noise Upsets Smallwood." The last paragraph Sir, says, "the noise which promptly ceased had come from a conversation between Social Services and Rehabilitation Minister, Stephen Neary and an acquaintance of his who had been seated in the public gallery."

Mr. Speaker, this is completely false and untrue. I was standing outside the door of the Press Gallery carrying on a very quiet, calm conversation with one of my constituents, when we were joined by a CBC reporter, Bill Bown, and the three of us as well as the hon. the Premier were startled to hear a noise come out of the Stenographer's office, through that door on my left, from a tape recorder that had been accidentally turned up full volume by the Editor of Debates, carrying the voice of the hon. member of St. John's West, and that Mr. Speaker, is what blared across the House of Assembly, and not the conversation that I was having with one of my constituents.

Now Sir, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Editor and the publisher of the so-called people's paper, have the grace to blush at their breach of such good manners.

Motion, that the House go into Committee of Supply:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Shall 815-04-05 carry?

Carried.

Shall 06 carry? Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: That Newfoundland Marketing Board: The Newfoundland Marketing Board I gather - the minister may correct me if I am wrong - is the new body he announced was formed several weeks ago, and I presume, the minister can tell me if I am wrong, that the Marketing Board will institute marketing schemes for various products to take over the marketing of various products, if the producers of those products or a majority of them want such a scheme instituted. At least this is what I gathered from earlier remarks made in the House. So if the minister could inform us whether that is correct or not, as just how the Board will operate, and how many of the producers of these particular products have to agree before they submit to a marketing board? I would like to have that information. And what are the first marketing schemes envisaged by the minister? What are they going to start with first. I think we should have that information. And I just want to point out what I tried to point out this morning Mr. Chairman, and that is that it is senseless to say; no one will be forced. No one will be forced to join in a marketing scheme, because it is quite obvious that, if there is a minority against it, even though it is a small minority, that minority of poultry producers or hog producers or whatever, will be forced to have their marketing done for them by the marketing board.

Now there cannot be a marketing board without some element of compulsion in it for the minority that do not want to join it. I am not saying that is wrong, but I think it is absolutely ridiculous to try to pretend that there is no force involved. We have to recognize the fact that if there is a minority that does not want to have their product marketed through the marketing board, they have to do it anyway, and it is just as well to recognize the fact. I would like the minister to tell how this is going to operate, and for what products first - or how it is going to go.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is half right. The Newfoundland

Marketing Board is established pursuant to the Natural Products Marketing Act of 1966-67, which was approved unanimously by this House by the hon. gentleman, and by other members of this House. And that legislation has not been changed from the day this House approved it. And it does not provide Mr. Chairman, that this marketing board will market anything, and it does not provide that this marketing board will compel anyone to do anything.

A marketing board very simply is the vehicle or the agency required to be established under the Act to carry out the purposes of the legislation approved by this House. The board will not initiate any marketing schemes or arrangements. The minister will not initiate any schemes or arrangements. The producers themselves if they wish so to do, presumably, and I do not know who might do it first. I really do not. It could be the egg producers, because they are the ones who have been the most clamorous in my time, for this to be done. But any group of producers who desire so to do Mr. Chairman, are free to come together to prepare a proposed marketing arrangement, and then they must go before this board with an application for approval of that scheme or arrangement. And the board, acting under the authority vested in it by the legislation, approved by the House, will take steps to arrive at a determination as to whether they should approve or reject that application.

MR. CALLAHAN: And that is the very simplest description I can give the committee Mr. Chairman of the procedure. The board chairman, is I suppose the most knowledgeable public servant in this Province in terms of experience in the diversity of his knowledge and his contact with farmers over a very long period of years. Thirty-five years Mr. A.C. Badcock has been dealing with and has had the confidence of farmers in this Province. He is the full time chairman.

The part-time members are Mrs. James Lind of Grand Falls, and Mr. Godden Tilley of Robinson's. The board will have in addition to the usual secretarial staff required, it will have a secretary who will not Mr. Chairman, be simply a secretary, but who will be, and the approval for the position has now been given as of yesterday by the Treasury Board, will be not simply a secretary but a trained economist and research expert who will do many more things for the board than simply sit in a meeting and record minutes. Indeed, I suspect that he will do very little of that (he or she), that will be delegated to the clerical staff.

The Board Mr. Chairman, will not initiate marketing arrangements it will pass upon proposed arrangements which may be brought to it by producers groups.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the percentage of those?

MR. CALLAHAN: The practice in these cases as I understand it, and I do not have the legislation in front of me Mr. Chairman, is in the first instance that it is a question, it is a practice of one man one vote which means to say that every producer regardless of his size has some say, and secondly that the percentage usually is a two-thirds percentage. I am not sure if that is set out in the legislation, but I think if it is not in the legislation, the board, from my discussions with Mr. Badcock, will put it in the regulations and I think I can assure the House that that very likely will be, in fact, the required percentage. That is the general description of what the marketing board will do, Mr. Chairman, and this vote provides for the wages of the Chairman, two part-time members,

office staff, and offices.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, on this I presume this committee will have quarters here in St. John's, in the Confederation Building, in the Department of Agriculture.

MR. CALLAHAN: No not in the department Mr. Chairman, we want to attempt to separate the operations of the board physically from the department, and I think we are attempting to find other space, probably in some of the Government space at Pleasantville.

MR. CROSBIE: Item 05, is this subsidized land clearing?

MR. EARLE: He said 05, it is 0505.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, it is 0505

MR. EARLE: On subsidized land clearing Mr. Chairman, just a question or two

MR. HICKEY: The hon. minister explained to us.....

MR. CROSBIE: Promises

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): (First part inaudible) speak as you stand

MR. MURPHY: This our principle of democracy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well let the older boy have the.....

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman recognizes the first man to stand and he works to the best of his ability.

MR. EARLE: (First part inaudible) long ago, the order of speech does not worry me.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, is the fun over now?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: I am going to bring a bottle of lime tomorrow.

Before I was so rudely interrupted

MR. CROSBIE: By whom? As usual?

MR. HICKEY: I was going to ask the hon. minister if he would give us an explanation of number 5, and along the lines of what we do subsidize. For example, do we subsidize people who have land for summer homes or who get grants for summer homes? Is there a subsidy paid for people who clear land for this purpose or are they required to produce in the way of vegetables or some other crop?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, this is the land clearing bonus that I referred to yesterday. This is another example of the lack of concern the Government have for root crop farming, whereby, we in the first instance provide the land for a nominal fee and in the second instance, give people approximately half, in the average case perhaps, a little less than half of what it would cost them to actually clear the land and put it in shape for cultivation.

MR. CROSBIE: Where was it spent last year?

MR. MURPHY: For what purpose? The hon. member asked if it has to be put into cultivation with a year, two years, three years. Grow hay, grow grass, grow what?

MR. CALLAHAN: There is no condition in respect to the bonuses Mr. Chairman, but there is a condition in respect to the land under the Crown Lands Act, whereby the lease, the agricultural lease, requires that twenty-five per cent of the leased area be cleared and put in cultivation within five years.

MR. MURPHY: That is the question that was asked.

MR. CALLAHAN: But that has nothing to do with the bonus, the bonus simply helps them to do the clearing and enables him to hold on to his lease. There is no connection between the two, this is purely assistance. The regulation that the hon. gentleman referred to is the Crown Lands.....

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, now that I have the Premier's permission to speak in the right order, I bow to his wishes, though a very, very young Tory indeed, but nonetheless very proud to be one that historic body

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. MURPHY: Glad to have you

MR. CALLAHAN: Only very young in spirit

MR. EARLE: On the question of land clearing, there are a lot of things that could be cleared around here besides land. We could start off by clearing the air, but we cannot seem to get anywhere with that, the air has become completely polluted in this Chamber and we have not had much success in clearing it, but perhaps the hon. minister will have much more

success in clearing land. ...

The question I started out to ask when I was so rudely interrupted and not by a member of my own side, was subsidized land clearing. Here again I acknowledge complete ignorance, but for a matter of information would the minister tell us generally, is it cheaper to clear land or to reclaim bogs?-- now there is a considerable vote here which we talked about before on bog-lands, the reclaiming of bog-lands and the normal clearing of lands, it strikes me that there are many, many thousands of acres of good arable land which possibly might be cleared cheaper than the reclamation of bog-lands. I wonder what is the situation, is it cheaper to reclaim bog-lands than it is to clear ordinary pasture lands?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know quite where to begin to answer the question. May I say Mr. Chairman, that with the indulgence of the committee for the information of the students in the gallery, that what we are doing at this point is considering the estimates of the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources in the division of agriculture. That is to say, that the Department brought to the House a request for amounts of money to be spent in the coming year, and the committee are now attempting to determine whether these amounts of money should in fact be spent and whether the committee should agree to allow the department to spend them.

Mr. Chairman, the relative costs of clearing mineral land or peat lands vary obviously. There is some mineral land which is not very rocky or which has no trees or stumps on it which can be cleared very cheaply, and there is other mineral land which would be very expensive to clear. There is general consistency I suppose in the clearing of bog-lands in that the major problem is drainage, and on the overall I would think that the more expensive, slightly at least more expensive type of clearing would be mineral soil. Mineral soil would be.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Bog-land the Premier says

MR. CALLAHAN: No, the Premier did not say that, he said that the clearing

is very expensive. The clearing of mineral soil on balance, taking the average piece of mineral soil with the weight of average with rocks and trees and difficult land is somewhat on the average more expensive than bog-land. The point is Mr. Chairman, and this point should be made, that we are talking essentially about apples and oranges. Bog-land as I indicated this morning is very difficult to farm because in the first instance you have the drainage problem, and the second you have some difficulty with some types of vegetables, and in the third place the equipment problem is a real problem.

As I explained this morning we have gone all over the world virtually, and the last hope we had some months ago was that perhaps we could get some equipment from Russia but it is now out of production. It is just impossible, we have had to design our own equipment for experimental work, and the cost of equipment is just too high. Very few farmers are able to get into peat lands. It is essentially, in a practical sense on the basis of commercial agriculture peat lands are irrelevant at this time except for grass production on community pastures and for two or three particular areas where some vegetable production is going on.

MR. EARLE: As I understand it Mr. Chairman, the bog-lands take some time to bring it into condition with the drainage and other preparations whereas mineral lands normally cleared with the addition of certain things such as lime and so on, can be very quickly brought into condition. Is not the process of preparing mineral lands a lot speedier, a lot quicker than the process of reclaiming bog-lands?

MR. CALLAHAN: I would not say so Mr. Chairman, because once the bog-land is drained that is that, and you can go on and seed it or lime it or what ever has to be done. Mineral land improvement can go on for several years because as the committee knows of the heaving, frost heaving, and that kind of thing.

The other thing of course to bear in mind Mr. Chairman is that the applications for agricultural come from all over the Province and there is

mineral soil all over the Province, but there is not good arable bog-land all over the Province. It is in certain areas, and to limit agricultural effort only to bog-lands would be to eliminate the large part of the Province in which there now is agriculture.

MR. EARLE: I am not suggesting one thing or the other I am just trying to get a comparison.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, well this is the position.

MR. CROSBIE: The money that was spent last year, was that spent all over the island?

MR. CALLAHAN: Oh yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Is there any major area where the money was spent, like the Avalon Peninsula, what proportion would that be?

MR. CALLAHAN: I would say that there was very little spent on the Avalon Peninsula. Practically all of it was off and generally we are trying to restrict this. (I should say this because it is important) trying to restrict as closely as possible, and this is a matter of judgement on the part of the field men who make the recommendations, trying to restrict the subsidy as much as possible Mr. Chairman, to full-time farmers. Otherwise, we could get into position as the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern referred to where you could have people using it for things other than strictly agriculture, and agriculture is what we are involved in.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. minister, if a check is kept, a register perhaps of all these subsidies within the past four or five or back to ten years to see how much of that cleared land has been seeded, and used, or perhaps gone to waste?

MR. CALLAHAN: Very little Mr. Chairman, and if it has it has reverted back to the Crown because, the lease immediately expires, is cancelled if the lease holder does not comply with regulations to clear and cultivate.

MR. WORNELL: But Mr. Chairman, that is not answering the question. I am wondering if a list is kept to show whether or not the Government investment

is well made;

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not think so Mr. Chairman, but on the other hand let me say this, that where land has been cleared or partially cleared and the lease has for some reason terminated, there always invariably are several people who know that and who are looking for that very piece of land because, obviously, there is a bit of an advantage in getting land partially cleared.

MR. CROSBIE: That is no answer

MR. WORNELL: That is not the answer I asked for.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not checked on in other words.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not wasted Mr. Chairman

MR. CROSBIE: It is not checked on though

MR. CALLAHAN: It is not wasted Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not checked on. Mr. Chairman, the minister's answer indicates that his department does not check to see if the land is being cleared and used for agricultural purposes.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is twisting it again. I did not say that

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister does not make it clear. It has nothing to do with any one twisting.....

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. the member for Hermitage asked a question, and his question very simply was whether a check was made to determine whether land cleared with bonuses is later abandoned. And I have said no, that a check, or at least a list is not kept.....

MR. CROSBIE: Your answer indicates that you do not check at all.

MR. CROSBIE: That was not the question

MR. CALLAHAN: That was the question. Was that not the question?

MR. WORNELL: Well, that is essentially it. Whether it was used to good advantage or abandoned.

MR. CALLAHAN: Exactly Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman asked if land cleared with a subsidy is abandoned and therefore lost, and the value of the subsidy lost. And I have answered "no" because, the land is only granted or only leased in areas where there is some kind of development

You do not give a man a bit of land out in the middle of the country with no access or anything. Everybody knows the land is being cleared, if the lease is abandoned almost invariably it is picked up by somebody else.

That is not what the hon. gentleman conveyed over there, and I did not in any way convey or tend to convey what he has just reported me to have said.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister never makes clear in his answers just what any position is, and he was asked if a list was kept of the land to see what happens to it afterwards, not just does the minister have a list of what land is abandoned.

MR CALLAHAN: Did the hon. gentleman ask?

MR CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman asked precisely that. The hon. gentleman asked more than that.

MR CALLAHAN: Now, make something out of it. If anybody wonders, Mr. Chairman, why we are still on the Minister's estimates, it is because of his insolence and contempt for the members of the House. Ignorant contempt! The question asked was whether there is any check made to see what happens to this land afterwards, not just whether it is abandoned but what is grown on it. Is there any list kept? And the Minister said; no. The Minister does not know, but all the money spent on land clearing over the last few years how much of that land is now in use for agricultural purposes or what is grown on it. Has it got hay growing on it, has it got potatoes growing on it? What kind of crops are grown on it. The Minister has not got that information because he does not keep the list, has no one check it. That is the answer. That position is clear enough, and no one is twisting it.

MR CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we do not have a list. That is the first part of the question of the hon. member for Hermitage. What we do know is very little, and I have said this, an insignificant amount, maybe five to ten per cent of land leased for agricultural purposes, subsequently, for one reason or another, was not continued in

development. But that does not mean, I repeat, that the bonus was wasted nor the land was not available for use nor will not again be used.

MR CROSBIE: Guess work.

MR CALLAHAN: Not guess work at all. The hon. gentleman is operating on guess work.

MR CROSBIE: 09-04, Mr. Chairman, now I will ask the question very plainly, and the Minister can answer it plainly and if he does there will be no confusion over his answer, no allegations nor any twisting.

The vote this year asks for light and heat is \$3,500. The amount actually spent in the year 1969, according to the Auditor General, is an amount of \$13,882. The revised estimates would show \$15,000 for last year. How is the Minister going to get by with one-fifth of the expenditure of last year, for light and heat? How is that possible?

MR EARLE: He is going to introduce double daylight savings.

MR CALLAHAN: I really do not know, Mr. Chairman. That is something he will have to ask the Department of Public Works.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, that is not something that the hon. Minister should be asking the Minister of Public Works. We are looking at the estimates for which the minister of this department is responsible, including \$3,500 for light and heat, which is one-fifth less than was voted last year.

MR CALLAHAN: Maybe we were over charged last year.

MR CROSBIE: It is just between a-quarter and a-fifth of what was actually spent in 1969. That is a false and fictitious entry in the estimates, an under-estimate that is going to have to be changed, Mr. Chairman. The whole pattern, right through these estimates, are false and fictitious, so that the budget will appear to have a small surplus on current account when in actual fact there is going to be a large deficit - and that is added proof of it. And the Minister cannot explain.

June 4th., 1970 Tape no 1121 Page 1

Mr. Crosbie.

Would the minister explain how the same number of buildings, space and so on are going to be - the light bills are going to be reduced four-fifths and the heating bill is going to be reduced four-fifths this year. There is the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, just in time. Page forty (40) of the estimates, Item 815-09-04 - Light, Heat, etc. This year the minister asked for \$3,500 for light and heat for the whole of the agricultural services. Last year, he had \$15,700, the year before the Auditor General shows \$13,880 actually spent. Now how is the minister going to provide all the light and heat for less money this year?

MR. CHALKER. Mr. Chairman, these estimates are a little bit different than in previous years.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, sure.

MR. CHALKER: It is quite possible that that is being divided up amongst other departments and possibly, in my estimates, it will show something relating to this. I cannot give any definite answer.

MR. CROSBIE: Would you check for us?

MR. CHALKER: Oh, sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, before you pass this item and far be it from me to delay, even by a moment, the passing of any of these appropriations. But I am sure the committee would want me to say what I am about to say. We have in the Speaker's Gallery, two of the most distinguished men that have appeared here in a long time. We had the American Ambassador to Canada here the other day, and we have had other very distinguished men, but we have two citizens who are here this afternoon that are really an honour to us to have them visit us. Two brothers, Mr. Samuel Powell and Mr. Charles Powell. Mr. Samuel Powell was the Governor of the state of New Hampshire, Republican Governor, I regret to say - I regret, although the Republican President of the United States and I are not unknown to each other. But as a loyal Liberal, I would prefer

Mr. Smallwood.

that he were a democrat. However, he was elected as the Republican Parties Governor candidate for Governor of the great state of New Hampshire and served as Governor of that state from 1959 to 1963 inclusive and he lives, at present, in Hampton Falls in New Hampshire. His brother Charles who is with him lives in the town of Elliott in the state of Maine. These two gentlemen are the sons of Newfoundland parents: Mr. Samuel Powell of Carbonear was their father and their mother was Mary Gosse of Whitbourne. They have relatives, at this moment, in Carbonear and in Whitbourne as well.

I would suspect that the great John P. Powell, the great Newfoundland engineer, the great engineer who designed the paper mill at Corner Brook that became the largest pulp and paper mill in all the world, I would suspect strongly that John P. Powell and Mr. Wesley Powell, the former Governor of New Hampshire, were relatives and together with his brother Mr. Charles Powell. They are visiting the Province briefly. It is not the first time they have been here. They visited their relatives in Carbonear and in Whitbourne and the absolutely, remarkable thing about it, Mr. Chairman, is that Mr. Wesley Powell, the former Governor of the state of New Hampshire, is not the first connection that Newfoundland has had with the gubernatorial office of New Hampshire, because another great and historic figure, Captain John Mason, went from Newfoundland to become Governor of New Hampshire. I do not know American history well enough to be able to say whether John Mason was the first Governor of New Hampshire, but certainly, he was one of the very early ones. I believe he was the first Governor of New Hampshire. An historic name in American history and an historic name in Newfoundland history because, of course, he came here to Newfoundland from England, as one of the early colonizers of this Island of Newfoundland and he with another famous person left Newfoundland. One became, I think, the founder of the state of Maryland in the person of Sir George Calvert who became Lord Baltimore and the other being Captain John Mason, the precursor- the precursor of our

Mr. Smallwood.

present distinguished visitor in the gallery today.

We do not have too many ex-governors of American states visit this Chamber. When he visited the Chambers before, he did it as Governor of his state, as the chief executive of that state of New Hampshire, and I want them both to know that Mr. Wesley Powell and his brother Charles, who are here together, we in this old House, which is not as old as the New Hampshire House, but is 120 years old, extend to them a most cordial, a most cordial welcome here today, and although they did not have the luck, the great luck, the good luck to be born in Newfoundland, at least, they did the next best thing, they became the sons of two Newfoundlanders - a Newfoundlander from Carbonear and another from Whitbourne. His Honour, the Speaker is not in the Chair at the moment, but the Speaker of this House is from Carbonear, and we have every day in this Chamber visitors from the schools. It has gone over 2,000 children, boys and girls from various schools visiting us in the present session, and today it so happens that some sixty or seventy boys and girls - how many? One hundred boys and girls are in the galleries, both galleries, from Carbonear - both galleries from Carbonear. So, it could not have been arranged any better. It is Carbonear Day, New Hampshire Day here in the people's House, and I extend a most cordial welcome to these two hon. gentleman who are here visiting us today.

I know I speak for all sides of the House. It is not very often that we agree - both sides of this House, like most houses, elective houses, we do not too frequently agree, but on this; we are as one voice and I am that voice.

Now this does not mean that the Leader of the Opposition is not going to have his say as well, and I will be surprised if he does not, but if he does, I know that what I have said can be taken as the voice of the whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: I would like to say a few brief words to concur with the hon. Premier in the welcome of two distinguished persons, and I am sure, as the Premier has pointed out, being a native of Carbonear, he must be quite happy to be surrounded today by so many of his fellow residents. I do not know, if they can vote for him or not at this time, but I know he would certainly appreciate a gathering such as this in his own home town. But we are very highly honoured, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to have them, and he, too, like the rest of the people from there, I am sure, they will go away with a vast amount of knowledge. There will be many innovations in their own home parliaments as to just how parliaments should be run. Welcome!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 09-04 carry? Carried. Shall 08-03 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: What is this for, Mr. Chairman? Where is it to be spent? In Central Newfoundland or..

MR. CALLAHAN: This, Mr. Chairman, is starter funds for the agricultural complex, which we hope, providing the industrial area is ready, and we can get a site in it. We hope it will begin construction this year in Corner Brook to serve the entire West coast.

MR. CROSBIE: The whole \$100,000 is for that, is it not?

MR. CALLAHAN: Starter funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 816-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Is this helped by the Federal Government or DREE or is it all our money?

MR. CALLAHAN: All ours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 816-01 carry? Carried. Shall 02-01 carry? Carried. Shall 02-02 carry? Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, are we on mineral resources now?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, we are on mineral resources.

MR CROSBIE: I just have a question that really does not come under office but which somebody wanted me to ask for him, if the Minister would not mind telling us. Down around Roncontre East, sometime ago, in fact it must have been several years ago, there was supposed to be a find of molybdenite; I believe the district of the hon. member for Fortune. Well, there is a grant there, to NALCO, or to Javelin or somebody or other, I am not sure who.

Has the Minister any information on this molybdenite? Who has the concession? Whether it is commercially exploitable or what the latest news is on it?

MR CALLAHAN: No, I do not, Mr. Chairman, and if I did I think the concession agreement, which applies, I believe, and which passed this House, and common sense would probably tell me that I should not discuss it, in the first instance because that information such as this is confidential to the company concerned, for the obvious reason that unless they wish to make it public - and therefore I would be in violation of the agreement.

Secondly, I do not find it helpful to speculate on what may be going on in the field, until they are ready to announce it, it would be, I think, a little dangerous to go into any detail. What I can do is make an inquiry of the company, to see if there is anything up to date there.

MR CROSBIE: Which company?

MR CALLAHAN: I think the company is Norlex Minerals.

MR CROSBIE: Have they been spending money exploring down there?

MR CALLAHAN: My understanding is that they have, Mr. Chairman. I would have to check it. What they are required to do, what all these companies are required, under the terms of concession agreements, is to file annually audited statements showing that they have spent at least the minimum amount of money required under their agreement. And I do not think there has ever been a company that has spent the minimum or less

than the minimum. In every case I think they spent in excess of the minimum.

MR EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just a comment on that. The area to which my hon. friend referred is coloured on the map with a huge exploration area. It is coloured, I think, as being let to one particular company for exploration purposes. It is a huge area running right up through the centre of Newfoundland, from Fortune Bay North. I do not know what the terms of that lease are or how much is supposed to be spent every year in exploration, but as the bulk of it falls within my district, the amount of exploration that has been done there in recent years, at least since I have been familiar with it, over the last seven or eight years, has been extremely small, a pitiful example of the exploration of a huge territory. It brings out the point which was made in the earlier part of this debate; huge sections throughout the country had been let to promoters and so on, with apparently no insistence that they comply with the terms of their lease. The Minister says that they have in this case. Well, if they have, the terms of the lease must be very generous indeed, because I know from personal knowledge of that area that the amount which has been spent on exploration is very, very small indeed. And it seems absolutely disgraceful that such a large area of the country should be held up for such a long time, with so little going forward.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister check and see if the holder of this concession, Norlex or whoever it is, have they made their returns and what has been the nature of their activities for the last year or two, and let the House know. Because my information is, as the hon. member for Fortune says; there has been very little if anything done there now for several years and the people down around that area, who were counting on there being a lot of activity down there, in connection with this mining prospect, they are somewhat disappointed. So, if we could find out just how much exploration is going on, if he would.

MR CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. But, as I said, we must be guided, you know, by the amount of information that the companies wish to make available. Under the concession agreements we are bound, this House is bound and the Government is bound by what the House has bound itself to and the legislation, to keep confidential the information that companies turn up in their own concession areas, for the obvious competitive reason. If the company do not wish to make disclosures at this point, I am in no position, under the law, to do it despite them.

MR EARLE: The hon. minister, Mr. Chairman, could certainly determine for us whether or not this particular company has lived up to the terms of the agreement.

MR CALLAHAN: Oh! Certainly! Oh, in that sense, yes!

MR BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, 03-01, Geological, the vote on this has been reduced by \$21,900 from last year and, I would like to refer the Chairman to the Royal Commission Report of the Economic State and Prospects, to this House in late 1967, on page 131, with reference to mining it is stated (and I quote): "...with few exceptions, the fastest growing under-developed countries are those which have discovered rich deposits of minerals such as iron ore, bauxite, tin, copper or oil. A development plan should give the highest priority to geological survey and mineral prospecting, yet rather oddly geological departments tend to be the most poorly staffed in the public service...."

Since they lay emphasis, Mr. Chairman, on the geological surveys, it goes on further to state, on page 149 "...in view of the fact that the value of production of the mineral industry of Newfoundland and Labrador exceeds that of any other industry in the Province, it would be sound practice to apportion a larger share of government services to foster its growth and stability. Newfoundland lags far behind the neighbouring provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the provision of administrative and technical services. For the years 1964-1965 the value of Newfoundland's mineral production had reached three times that of

Nova Scotia and three-point-one times that of New Brunswick. In contrast, Nova Scotia mines branch employed six permanent geologists and New Brunswick's mines branch had nine permanent geologists, while Newfoundland's Mineral Resources Division provided the services of only two geologists, one of whom was the director....."

Now I think this report was in 1967, and I am just wondering if any reference has been made by the department to the support of what is obviously a very detailed report made by people who are thoroughly knowledgeable on this subject. Yet today we see the vote has been reduced. So it would appear that not alone has no attention been paid to this report but that it has even gone contrary to the report in that the vote has been reduced instead of increased. I think, since I come from Labrador West, which is where the main area where the majority of the mineral resources come from, my thought is that there is too much of the Province's resources locked up and handed out to too few people, who employ their own methods to essentially wrap up a concession or resources until it suits themselves to develop it, not when it suits the Province.

M R CROSBIE: Here! Here!

MR BURGESS: And this is very evident in the Julian Lake Project in Labrador West, where you have a mountain of ore that has been sitting there for the past four or five years, with no effort made to develop it whatsoever. And I am aware of the fact of statements made by knowledgeable people in the mining industry, wherein they state that the mining industry can produce at top capacity for the next ten years and still not be able to meet the world demand that there is presently for ore. And here we have a mountain of ore sitting there, a mountain of ore that could be of benefit to the people of this Province, and it wrapped up by one individual.

I think this is wrong and I think that the Department of Mines has essentially got to employ the people who are knowledgeable and who can go out and do the exploration and the geological work that is necessary

to reap the best harvest from our resources. And this is obviously not being done in this vote, where it has been reduced instead of increased.

MR CROSBIE: Here' Here!

MR CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, in fact the vote, the estimate, has not been reduced. The estimates last year were \$30,000 under 03-01 and \$49,000 under 03-02. This year 03-01 is \$60,000, which is double the amount provided under 03-01 last year. That is one thing.

MR CROSBIE: \$81,900.

MR CALLAHAN: That was actual, Mr. Chairman. As the House is aware, there were additional funds (will the hon. gentleman be quiet for a minute and let me finish? I will answer it.) He is aware or the committee are aware that additional funds were provided last year in respect of the mineral exploration project at East Arm, Bonne Bay and, as I have explained earlier, the total of those votes, 03-01 and 03-02, under this head, was devoted last year, almost entirely, to the Bonne Bay mineral examination, which we wanted to do in a hurry. We moved in there and used all the available money in that vote and more. There was extra money provided through authority of a Governor's Warrant, as the committee knows.

The second thing is, Mr. Chairman, that what the hon. gentleman, the member for Labrador West, has just said indicates that he believes that this is all the money that is spent on mineral exploration in the Province. Mr. Chairman, this is what was discussed here in very great detail, just a few days ago, this whole matter. The approach to mineral exploration in this Province is different.

MR CROSBIE: It sure is.

MR CALLAHAN: from the approach in other provinces, but the fact, Mr. Chairman, that some people may say they do not agree with it does not mean it is wrong.

June 4, 1970 Tape 1121 Page 10

MR CROSBIE: NO, just all the experts ..

MR CALLAHAN: Not all the experts, Mr. Chairman, one expert.

MR CROSBIE: Everyone who reports.

MR. CALLAHAN: One expert. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman read three reports here the other day and the specific report he read, the section report in the Economics Prospects Commission, the report in the ADV Report and anywhere else that he may have found the same precise wording was all written by the same individual, in the same department of the Government of Canada; Energy, Mines and Resources. It is just a

MR. CALLAHAN: matter of taking that same report and putting it in every report that comes along. So it is not all the experts, it is one man, one man wrote that Mr. Chairman, and it was injected into every report that has been done in the passed three or four years. Now I will say what the Premier said a couple of nights ago, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, that the mineral resources of this Province in value turned out, have grown from \$25 million twenty years ago to \$327 million last year. And in case someone wishes to remind me most of that has been in Labrador, I say, yes, it has in iron ore. But it is not entirely in Labrador, Mr. Chairman, and that there has been very, very respectable growths on this Island even with the closing of Bell Island, the Bell Island mines. As a matter of fact, one might term it a spectacular growth. And I will try and find the figure, and we are not too far behind, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the time element, in terms of accessibility, we did not even have a highway across this Province less than ten years ago. In terms of all the other difficulties, that we have had, in 1967, by the ADB Report, we are providing more than sixty percent of all the mineral output of the Atlantic Region, in nonmetallics, Mr. Chairman, leaving out iron ore, so that that excuse is taking out of the picture. the excuse that it is all pinned on Labrador.

MR. CROSBIE: What do you mean an excuse?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is an excuse that is used, Mr. Chairman, something that is used to discredit the concession agreement policy to which I am referring. But in fact, Mr. Chairman, the total output of non-ferrous minerals on the Island in the twenty year period has more than tripled, in 1949 it was just over \$20 million, in 1969 it was in excess of \$60 million, and that was despite the close down of Bell Island, despite the close down of the Limestone Mining Operation at Aguathuna, and despite the closing of certain other mines that petered out. And that in the ten year period, Mr. Chairman, from 1959 to 1969 the output on the Island alone doubled from \$29.1 million to \$60.1 million.

So I submit to the committee, Mr. Chairman the Concession Policy is not a wrong policy, it is a right policy. And what it does. is remove from the Treasury and from the people of this Province or from this House, the need or the

obligation to provide funds, as the hon. the gentleman from Labrador has just suggested we should do, removes the need to provide funds for exploration. We do not do that, Mr. Chairman, we say to the companies that come in, you spend every cent you can find on exploration, and you sign an agreement which says that you will spend a minimum amount on exploration, and they do it. And they invariably can see the amount -

MR. CROSBIE: Do not let the House of Assembly know what it is.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the House of Assembly knows, I brought in a report here the other day, an answer to a question, Mr. Chairman, showing an audited statement whereby NALCO, the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, required to spend \$1 million by the last day of May, or by the 1st. of June this year, had in fact spent \$1,641,000, which is sixty percent more than their agreement required them to show, and that is their audited statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Did you table that here?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I brought that answer to the House, Mr. Chairman, on one day of last week.

MR. CROSBIE: It is news to us, we never heard of it.

MR. CALLAHAN: And I am prepared to table the audited statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen over on the other side would prefer that we allowed no one to come in here, that we had no companies spending money under concession agreement, that we had a few grizzled grub steak prospectors out bickering around, and that we, this House, this committee went out and found the millions of dollars that are spent every year in this Province by private companies. Mr. Chairman, it is too silly and ridiculous to discuss any further.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, let me have a word first, then it will be your turn.

MR. CALLAHAN: Just one word?

MR. CROSBIE: No there maybe a few more than that. Mr. Chairman, one wants to deal so patiently with the minister, does not want to become excited, but it becomes unbearable. You have to be calm in these situations. Now, Mr. Chairman, look let us just be reasonable about this.

MR. CALLAHAN: Okay. let us be reasonable.

MR. CROSBIE: Item 816-03-01 Geological this year \$60,000, 02- Diamond drilling \$24,000. Now \$60,000 and \$24,000, in my mind make up \$84,000, I challenge anyone.

MR. CALLAHAN: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: \$84,000;

MR. CALLAHAN: No one is saying that.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, the minister says that is more, that is more than was in the estimates last year.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, no, the minister said, that \$60,000 is double the \$30,000 in the estimates last year.

MR. CROSBIE: That is even better, now, Mr. Chairman, note that. \$60,000 is doubled \$30,000 that was in last year. Now what about 1959,-

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, what about 1959?

MR. CROSBIE: When in 1969, the actual amount spend according to the Auditor General, Geological was \$53,809, and Diamond Drilling was \$73,213 making a \$127,000 actually spend in 1969, now two years later the vote dribbled down to \$84,000.

MR. CALLAHAN: Are you talking about 01 or 02 now?

MR. CROSBIE: You, the minister added 01 and 02.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I did not add them. I said that last year, if the hon. gentleman would allow me, I said, Mr. Chairman, that last year we took -

MR. CROSBIE: I am not allowing the hon. minister, I am not allowing it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well do not allow it, he does not want to hear the truth, he is not interested.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, Bully Boy speaking. He just does not want to be interrupted. The Premier is gone, but we got another brilliant word artist with us, the Minister of Health. I am not even going to say anything complimentary about him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those two items the minister said, in 1969, stop twisting in 1969 the amount spend on both items, was \$127,000. So in 1971 the minister is going to spend \$43,000 less than was spent on geological studies and diamond drilling in 1969. And is the minister going to pretend that, that is progress, that he is spending more, when the Auditor General's report shows he is spending \$48,000 less. That is the kind of clear explanation, we expect from that hon.

MR. CROSBIE: minister in this House. That is why we are on his estimates still, after three interminable days. Three unbearable days, and we are still on his estimates, because you cannot get a straight answer out of the minister. If the minister is squeezed for funds, and there is a reduction in that program, why not admit it? Stop trying to bluff. Stop trying to say it is more than last year, when two years ago, it was a third more money spend.

The hon. the member for Labrador West have the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects Report, and the mining section of that is an indictment of the minister's department.

MR. CALLAHAN: A big deal, a big deal.

MR. CROSBIE: That is the ninety percent trash, that Gordon Pushie and Ches: Pippy and Arthur Lundrigan and all these gentlemen approved, they approved the report. It was their report. And now the hon. gentleman says, "a big deal." And he comes up with another piece of fiction, Mr. Speaker, one man, one evil genius, one fellow who has it in for the people of Newfoundland, the Government of Newfoundland, who has written all the reports on our mining situation in the last three or four years, well was there ever such nonsense heard in the House before? The minister is getting too close to somebody else in the Cabinet, he is getting visions, a persecution complex. Someone in the mining world got it in for the minister and his department. And he is writing all reports, it does not matter who investigates, this fellow writes the reports.

MR. CALLAHAN: It was not Imperial Oil was it?

MR. CROSBIE: Perhaps it was Imperial Oil.

MR. CALLAHAN: I know who it was.

MR. CROSBIE: They are usually the culprits around here, Imperial Oil. Was it Imperial Oil, who wrote it?

MR. CALLAHAN: I know who it was.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the minister knows. The point is, the point is -

MR. CALLAHAN: The point is,

MR. CROSBIE: The point is, Mr. Speaker, the point is, Mr. Speaker, now will the minister let me continue, the point is that we have^a/miserable geological program,

MR. CROSBIE: The minister has only got one or two geologists down there. I read a letter the other day from geology students at Memorial, only one out of the graduating class could get a job here in Newfoundland, the rest had to go off to the Mainland, and the minister out making speeches, what a wonderful future for geology students here in Newfoundland. Come clean. Just get up and say "Thank You" to the House, "gentleman we have got a poor geological program, we have a poor diamond drilling program, we have no money for it, it is a miserable excuse of a program." And then we will have a lot less trouble in the House, but when a minister pretends that more is less, or that less is more, rather, less is more, George Orwell could not write the stuff that the minister is spouting here today.

MR. T. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, with reference to what the hon. minister has said, in these reports, the mining sector reports, it stated the Royal Commission in conjunction with the Atlantic Development Board requested the Federal Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, hence renamed the Department of Mines, Energy and Resources to examine the state and prospects of the mineral resources and industry in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And in the heading of the section, which I outlined earlier, it was prepared by the Mineral Resources Division, the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys in Ottawa, so this is the department that the hon. gentleman is saying is completely wrong, but their policy is right. A hundred percent right, their concessions are a hundred percent right. And this report having been compiled by Ottawa, it states in part on page 135, a long term progressive program to revise Mineral Legislation and Taxation Policy should be undertaken by the Provincial Government. This is a recommendation from Ottawa. This would require in part, a thorough re-examination of the present status of this position of Mineral Rights, the present system of private agreements with respect to Mineral Exploration Concessions between companies and Government should be re-examined and amended so that favourable areas do not become private prospecting reserves for single companies or individuals. Now this gentleman is saying, that the concessions of the Government are all right, despite the fact that recommendations emanate from Ottawa, from people who are intimately more experienced, much more experienced than the hon. the Minister of Mines,

MR. T. BURGESS: Agriculture, and Resources.

MR. CALLAHAN: Come now, come now.

MR. BURGESS: And these are the things that he discusses, ninety percent trash. Well, I would say that ninety percent of the things coming from the minister are ninety percent trash.

MR. HICKEY: That is 180 percent altogether.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Nay. Mr. Speaker, before we carry - oh! I am sorry "Nay", "Nay". The "Nays" have it, Mr. Chairman, there are seven "Nays, and only six "Ayes".

MR. HICKEY: The Deputy Ministers do not vote.

MR. CROSBIE: No Deputies do not vote. Well, in that case I am going to speak, Mr. Chairman, we cannot defeat it, without speaking on it.

Would the minister confirm an announcement of the Premier there, I think it was in the Speech from the Throne, that there was going to be a major Iron Ore Development at Julienne Lake, this year, in Labrador. I think, the Speech from the Throne said -

MR. HICKMAN: I will read it for you now in a minute.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! Am I trespassing on your grounds?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, give him a little help over there.

MR. HICKMAN: We might have a talk on this tax thing too.

MR. NEARY: Do not lose your cool.

MR. CROSBIE: Everytime I am going to lose my cool, I am going to look at the hon. the Minister of Social Services. It is as soothing as a baby's whatnot, you know, when I look at the Minister.

Now, there is going to be an expansion of the Iron Ore Company at Labrador City, there was going to be an expansion at Wabush. Can the minister hear me?

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course.

MR. CROSBIE: And there was going to be a development at Julienne Lake, could the minister tell the House whether there has been any progress in those great developments or do they still exist just in the minds of somebody or other? We know that the Iron Ore Company is thinking about the tax position and the Carter Report, but we do not know what is happening at Julienne Lake, could the minister tell us?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we are still on the Speech from the Throne, may I direct the minister's attention to this statement concerning the Mining Industry. "My Government have followed with care the public discussion and have participated in some private discussions of the effect that the Mining Tax Proposals contained in the White Paper on Taxation could have upon these possible new developments in Western Labrador. My Government has made strong recommendations to the Government of Canada in this regard, for quite clearly it would be tragic for Newfoundland and Labrador, if any system of Taxation were to have the effect of blocking a development so devoutly desired and so urgently needed".

Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. members are aware that during the passed few months in particular, a series of public hearings have been going on before the Senate Committee in Ottawa on the White Paper, and at one point in their proceedings the hearings were restricted to the effect it would have on the Mining Industry. We have seen representation made by the Economic Council of Canada, The Mining Association of Canada, The Canadian Mineral Industry, a report by a gentleman, named Farely, who is the President of Hollinger Mines and Labrador Mining and Exploration

MR. CALLAHAN: Farely.

MR. HICKMAN: Farely Company Limited, and other by the Chairman of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce on the proposed White Paper, if it is implemented and the proposals with reference to tax in mining, will have on the Mining Industry.

All that we have heard from the Province of Newfoundland, and from the Government of Newfoundland, is a very profound statement in the Speech from the Throne that was delivered on February 18th. 1970. And, I think, that anyone who represents particularly in the mining area, such as the member for Labrador West and others and the member for Burin, have been expecting that the Government of Newfoundland would have publicly made its position known to that Senate Committee. But, as of now, the only thing we know is a strong representations have been made to the Government of Canada. Will the minister advise this Committee, the date that such strong representations were made to the Government of Canada? The minister to who such strong representations were made? Were the strong representations made

MR. HICKMAN: in writing? Was there a formal brief from the Government of Newfoundland? What grounds were used, what arguments were used by the Government of Newfoundland to throw its weight behind Hollinger and the President of Hollinger and the President of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, and the Mining Industry generally to try and stop this nefarious scheme, that the Minister of Finance seems to be embarked on right now with his White Paper?

Indeed for some reason, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. the Minister of Finance in Ottawa has got it in for Newfoundland, he is trying to nail the Mining Industry, now he is trying to nail the Fishery Industry and the Pulp and Paper Industry. And unless we are prepared to put -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Let us continue with Geological and Diamond Drilling.

MR. HICKMAN: Let us get back to Geological Drilling and Geological Surveying, Diamond Drilling and the Examination of our Resources.

MR. CALLAHAN: These are not root crops.

MR. HICKMAN: No, but when you are talking about root crops the Committee is treated to a dissertation on Whiteway and Bond, that is not relevant to agriculture or root crops. But, what I do say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that if we are going to have the geological surveying, and the diamond drilling, and the exploration in this Province, we are not going to get it from the Mining Industry, if the Mining Industry is of the opinion that the proposed new tax laws in Canada will be such as to cripple development, as to make it unattractive for investment. And, I think, that Newfoundlanders must take some encouragement from the fact, that in February the Government of this Province appeared to be aware of the disastrous effects that the White Paper would have on the Mining Industry in this Province.

MR. NEARY: The White Paper is not Law.

MR. HICKMAN: Any fool knows that the White Paper is not Law, Mr. Chairman. But, unfortunately White Papers have a habit of becoming Law. And unfortunately,

MR. CALLAHAN: That is a very interesting statement.

MR. HICKMAN: And unfortunately we have not - that is except the foolish White Paper that we saw from the West Coast.

MR. WELLS: That was not a White Paper.

MR. CALLAHAN: No, there were exceptions to that Paper.

MR. HICKMAN: White Papers that we have seen tabled in the House of Commons, and particularly when you look at the attitude of the Minister of Finance of Canada, since he tabled this White Paper. He does not show any signs of spending at all. He is under very extreme pressure from the Mining Industry of Canada, and I would think, that if this Province was prepared to come out publicly and say these are the changes we want, here are our objections and why, there is nothing secretive about it, we are not dealing with a Foreign Government, I do not think, but certainly we are entitled, and the people are entitled to expect to see this Province send its representative, sent the minister up, and we will get the estimates out of the way in a hurry, when he comes back they would all be through, and go before this Senate Committee on Taxation, and go before the Senate Committee, when it was dealing with the Mining Aspects of the White Paper, and let our views be known, But this behind the door stuff, and you know whispering, you do not influence the Government of Canada by whispering, you influence the Government of Canada I suggest, just by openly presenting a case for changes

MR. HICKMAN:

in proposed laws and changes in proposed White Papers when you know and when the Government has stated in this speech from the Throne that the White Paper could have serious effects upon the possible new developments in Western Labrador. Now Government admits that it is aware of it. Then I think the time has come to do something about it and not simply to say that strong representations have been made to the Government of Canada, without telling the people of this Province what these strong representations were all about. What is far more important is to whom were they made and what is now the official position of the Minister of Mines, or whatever his title now is, in Ottawa, with respect to these representations? Would the Minister tell us all about it?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, in the first place the representations that have been made had been a matter of public knowledge. The fact that they are not all reviewed in detail and recollected in the Budget Speech as the hon. gentleman I am sure is quite aware and the Committee is not fooled either, the fact that these things are not recalled in the Budget Speech really does not make any sort of case. The principal representations that have been made have been made by the Premier of the Province and I leave him to discuss that if he wishes so to do in any detail. In the second place the Minister of Finance of this Province, and this is well-known, publicly known, at the meeting of Finance Ministers in Quebec City I think in January of this year, I am not sure of the date but that I think was the major item discussed at that conference of Finance Ministers. At two Mines Minister's meetings, two annual meetings in this past year and in the previous year representations were made directly to the Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources of Canada, by me in concert with the other Ministers of Mines of Canada, in respect of the proposals of the White Paper which derived from the Carter Report and have to do in the first instance with the removal of the three year tax holiday on new mining developments and also with the adjustment over reduction of completion allowances.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not really a matter for Ministers of Mines. As Mr. Green pointed out, when the Ministers of Mines first raised the question with him, I think in Toronto, no, well anyway the year before

MR. CALLAHAN:

last, Mr. Chairman, whenever the meeting was held, he quite properly pointed out that this was a matter that the Finance Ministers would deal with because it was a Finance question. But nonetheless the Mines Ministers raised it again last year and the Ministers of Finance subsequently had been discussing it and I have no doubt that the joint submissions because it is a common problem, Mr. Chairman. There has been some suggestions, some detectable suggestion from what the hon. gentleman has said that this is something that applies only to this Province. This is something that would apply right across Canada and every Province is as concerned with it as we are. The representations have been made in at least four separate submissions that I am aware of and I have no doubt that these representations taken together with those of the other Provinces will bear fruit. Certainly if they do not for us they will not either for anyone else.

MR. HICKMAN: That is a poor consolation.

MR. CALLAHAN: But it is nonetheless the position.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a deal of discussion on the drafting of mineral rights exploration rights and so on and so forth in the Province. The hon. member for Labrador West has quoted from a section on the economic prospects of the Province and another section of that submission deals with land tenure. The conclusion of this Commission was that the mineral industry of the Province operates under three interrelated shortcomings. Too few companies are active in exploration, funds available for exploration are inadequate and far too much land is held in concession by a very few companies. It appears that the last condition has a strong overall effect on the others.

Now the hon. member for Fortune Bay here will be referring to a huge strip of land in his area, Fortune Bay area, and his view is that too little is being spent on exploration and whether there is someone else that wants to go in that area we do not know but apparently they cannot under the present setup. The consensus of opinion of this Commission was that of the few companies now operating some of them are not primarily in the mining business, they are just entrepreneurs or speculators. They do not possess

MR. MURPHY:

the required capital and know-how necessary to justify the large holdings of mineral rights.

Another note is that it is noted that parts of the Island of Newfoundland are virtually a prospectors paradise. Now we have heard the hon. Minister refer to the guy with the pig and the old mule going in there but this Commission notes that it is still a virtual paradise for prospectors. It is probable that, if the ground had been open to normal staking only, the area would have experienced several periods of very intense and widespread mineral search particularly for base metals. Since Confederation, however, apportioning of mineral lands in the concessions granted to a relatively few companies has dampened much of the interest that exploration companies might have had under an open staking system. They also mentioned the possibility of renegotiating some of the private concession agreements and amending them to ensure a broader public participation should be entertained.

Now this is the report of the Royal Commission and the Minister contends that it is one man's opinion. I wonder is that actually the fact? We cannot, of course, question any of his staff in the Department who are perhaps far more familiar with this than the Minister himself but I think it would be of some benefit, a great benefit to the Province, if the Minister would say, and he has stated that this is only one man's opinion and not worth the paper it is written on just about. But I wonder does the hon. Minister still feel that granting these huge concessions to certain individuals who according to this are not miners in the true sense of the word and should we not now have a long hard look at perhaps renegotiating some of these contracts? We know that they have to spend certain sums of money but are these sums of money enough or is it just a token payment each year so that they can hold the vast concessions that they do? I must say that this document in the opinion of a great many people is very valuable and to have it washed down the drain as being of no consequence, I do not think it is fair either to these people or to the Government that appointed them because I am sure that when this Commission was appointed the Premier announced they were the most outstanding men in this Province and they would create more or less the future

MR. MURPHY:

plan for development of the Province in economic areas.

So it seems to be that criticism has been that there are too many areas of our lands tied up and the feeling generally again is that something should be done about it and perhaps ^{Minister} the/might, I think he has already expressed an opinion that it has been watched continuously and renegotiations are being made. But basically, and I have listened to the hon. member for Labrador West mention certain areas that are just there lying fallow perhaps when they could be producing and providing the much needed employment that we do have at this time, and I am sure that the hon. member has further to add to that.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the statements of the hon. Minister, the representation to Ottawa. In the last two months I have seen two separate statements, one by Bill Bennett the president of the Iron Ore Company of Canada and one by one of the directors of Wabush Mines and both of them have in essence said that their plans for expansion depend upon, revolve around the White Paper on taxation issued in Ottawa.

Now while the hon. Minister has said that representation from the Province on behalf of these companies has been made to Ottawa, all I have to do is accept his word that representation has been made. I do not doubt that it has been made but I am in total agreement with the hon. member from Burin when he states that, why is not this representation or why has it not been done openly and in a manner that we can understand what type of representation is essentially being made. Because it is very important, particularly in the provision of jobs, much needed jobs for the people of this Province, that these expansion programs get underway as soon as is possible and any pressures, psychologically or otherwise that can be applied in order to expedite this matter or to have either this White Paper or the proposed taxation laws revised that would expedite the expansion in these areas, it should be done and it should be done with the public's knowledge.

Now the number of people that every hon. member in this House are approached by during the course of a week looking for employment is fantastic and I say that in my area of Labrador West we need the additional economic input that more jobs would provide in the area and I would say that this

MR. BURGESS:

Government should make open and harder representation than has been made. I do not doubt for one moment, what the Minister has said, that private representation has been made, but I have not seen any reference to it in newspapers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not private representation.

MR. BURGESS: Well, representation. I certainly have not seen it. It has not been that large that it has made the newspapers. It certainly has not made any impact. Now with further reference to his statement that the concession system which this Government has adopted relative the exploration and the development of our mineral resources in the section mentioned here by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, land tenure changes this Commission recommends and once again I must emphasize the fact that this is in conjunction with the Atlantic Development Board and the Federal Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, this is a body, a highly skilled body in this field making recommendations to this Government which they tend or choose to ignore and call trash and go on to say that the Commission recommends that the concession system referred to by the hon. Minister that the concession system for mineral exploration be changed to meet the conditions that have arisen since its inception.

Now they are not saying that the concession system was wrong all of the time, that it was wrong at the time that it was introduced but they are saying that there are some changes that are needed now and I do not think that this is an irrational or irradical suggestion. I think it is highly reasonable and they go on to say that it is recommended that the term concession be dropped and that a new one be introduced and they go on to outline what they mean. The areas involved should be called mineral areas and an agreement involving a mineral area should be called a mineral exploration agreement. It is recommended that the original pattern for concession boundries which was the logical alternative up to the present should be revised as follows and they go on to outline the revisions they would like to see.

Now for anybody, particularly a Minister, a Minister of Mines, to claim that logical or rational suggestions by a body of highly qualified people are not radical suggestions for a Minister particularly a Minister to say

MR. BURGESS:

that it is composed of ninety per-cent trash. Well, I just cannot accept it and I do not think anybody else can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Carried. Shall (03)(02) to (03)(05) carry? Carried. Shall (04)(01) carry? Carried. Shall (10)(01) carry? Carried. Shall 817(01) carry?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, on 817(01) I just have a few words. The publication of the Mines Safety of Workmen Amendment Regulations - 1959-60-61-63-66 - the regulations of mines its revised statutes of Newfoundland for 1952. I would like to ask a few questions of the hon. the Minister relative to the type of conditions which workmen are required to work under particularly in the processing of the ore into pellets, the ore that has been taken out of the ground and it is in the process of being made into pellets. Now some of the conditions I am sure that the Workmen's Compensation Board of this Province has been approached on more than one occasion by people who have either thought that they have suffered physically because of the conditions under which they are required to work and also by people who actually have been physically affected. Now I would like to know as to what degree does this inspection branch or the inspection of mines, to what degree does the Department participate in the protection of workers who are required to work under extremely abnormal conditions, in extremely dusty conditions, in extremely hot conditions? I would also like to know does the Department make periodic inspections without the knowledge of the companies involved, when they make the inspections, how often they make them and what have been their findings todate?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the inspections are made, our inspectors visits to the mining operations are made very frequently, more frequently perhaps than would normally be the case because we have been aware of some problems. As the hon. gentleman, I think, is aware there are some problems in Labrador and therefore we have concentrated really on the particular areas, the particular operations in the Province in which there are dust problems. The position in as much as I described it the other day in a long discussion on the St. Lawrence mines mainly that it is the duty, it is the legal responsibility and it is the moral responsibility of employers to protect their employees and

MR. CALLAHAN:

the health of their employees. I think we must, this House must, the Government must and the Department must put their responsibility squarely where it belongs because there are areas, unless the Government were to go in or the House go in and take over the plant and try to operate it there are areas in which it is not possible to exercise the kind of control of the physical facilities or the operations of the company or anything else to be able to create the desired situation unless you have that control.

So the primary responsibility sits right with the employer to protect his employees. The responsibility of the Department of the Government put upon it by the House is to ensure that the commonly accepted standards in the industry are adhered to and the job day to day of our inspectors is to see by checking, double checking, cross checking and even by going in themselves and doing spot checking on the spot to see that the inspection procedures and the safety procedures and industrial hygiene standards in a plant situation are up to standard or even better than standard and certainly not below standard. Now it is possible in terms of workmen to meet that situation in another way. If there is an explosion level which is higher than permissible the other way to meet it is to ensure the rotation of workmen so they are not exposed over a period of time to more than the maximum safe level and both these approaches are taken.

I am aware that these problems exist and I get regular reports of inspections. The latest report shows more improvement over the last report and every report I get shows improvement and we have been pretty tough on this, I might say. I think we can say, so we would not be relying just on our own judgement or even on the judgement of our own inspectors as competent as they might be, we have sent them to the other Provinces where similar situations exist and they have looked very closely at the procedures, at the legislation and at the approach taken there. I think I can say this that while I am not satisfied with this at least it gives us some assurance that we are working in the right direction. But in the first place the general conditions are both the same as we find in our own industry and I suppose you would expect that because the same patterns follows throughout industry

MR. CALLAHAN:

anywhere in a civilized country. So it is about the same, no better, no worse as those prevailing elsewhere and this particularly is the case in respect of the asbestos operation, the Bagging Plant at Baie Verte. As I have said, Mr. Chairman, we are not satisfied with that, we think we have to do better, we think we have to meet and exceed the minimum standards that have been set for these areas of industrial operation, We intend to continue the pressure that we have had on now for some time and to demand more frequent reports than we normally would so as we can be insured that the situation is in fact improving hoping that as quickly as possible we can get into a position where we can say that we are not in the same position as other Provinces but that in fact we are in a better position than exists anywhere in the industry in Canada. So that is the -

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the assurance I give the Committee, and I think the hon. gentleman knows much about this problem, he lives very close to it, and I hope he will feel reassured, or hope that he will feel that we are taking a tough position, as tough as is possible to take, short of actually closing the industry - which I think is not a very realistic action.

MR. BURGESS: I was referring Mr. Chairman, mainly - I appreciate what the hon. minister said, and I am sure that I think I have approached his department maybe when he was there, or prior to it. And I know that they take action within the bounds which they are capable of taking it, and I am not saying that the best efforts are not being carried out by the Company to assure complete safety under these conditions at all times. But sometimes it rests with an individual who feels that possibly he has suffered some physical injury as a result of this exposure. And he will never be convinced unless he sees a real active participation on the part of the department, and this is what I was essentially trying to bring out. I wanted to know the degree of participation on the part of the department, in order to assure him psychologically that his welfare is being looked after by his Government.

03-01

MR. HICKMAN: On 03-01 Mr. Chairman. I do not want to repeat and I will not repeat what I said here earlier in the debate on the Estimates in the Department of Mines, concerning the problem which exists in the mines at St. Lawrence, and Government's failure to implement the recommendation of the Royal Commission with reference to monitoring technicians. But during that debate, it was suggested by the hon. the minister to me, that by pushing for this - number one, I was not relying on the Company's capabilities to do it, or I did not trust them. And secondly, I was only arousing the fears of the people in St. Lawrence. Since we have last had this debate, only yesterday, further representation has been to Government through the Minister of Labour, to the Minister of Labour for transmission

to Government by the St. Lawrence workers Protective Union by submission dated May 28, 1970. Apparently, the St. Lawrence Workers' Protective Union do not agree, or the members do not agree with the statements of the hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course, because they are listening to the hon. gentleman -

MR. HICKMAN: They happen to be listening - they happened to have lived through this Mr. Chairman, and they know a great deal more about it than the Minister of Mines will ever know.

MR. CALLAHAN: The minister knows what the hon. gentleman is saying -

MR. HICKMAN: Let me quote from this submission that was made to Government dated May 28th. "The decision of Government concerning the radiation monitoring becoming the responsibility of an employee of the Company, will in my opinion cause labour unrest amongst the workers here in St. Lawrence. It will cause the workers to become suspicious of the Company, re radiation readings, and will probably cause work stoppages in the mine. We seem to be drifting back to the situation that existed ten years ago, and we are not so sure we want to go back to that situation. After all we have too much proof around here on just what radiation did to our workers, as we are constantly reminded of it by the number of people we have to bury. We are not convinced that this Company operating in St. Lawrence is sincere in its efforts to control radiation. The proof of this is only too evident in the number of high readings that have been discovered in the past couple of years. We cannot understand how the deputy, who was a member of the Commission, and as such was a party to the recommendation number fourteen of the Report, who now says the responsibility of monitoring radiation should be the responsibility of the operating Company under normal conditions. I would like to remind Mr. Gover that normal conditions in our mine do not exist, never did exist, and never will exist unless the mine closes down. This Union has for a great number of years pleaded with the Government to put at least two inspectors in St. Lawrence, to monitor radiation and ventilation and other safety conditions in the mine. And in 1967 when the Government

did appoint a monitoring technician, we thought at last, the Government is showing some concern. However, we now discover it was only meant to be for show during the sitting of the Royal Commission, and a move on the part of the Government to bury a very controversial issue that was a source of embarrassment to the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: There is an awful lot of competition. The member for Burin is speaking and there is an awful noise from the other side of the House. Now we had a protest Mr. Chairman, about a noise up in the gallery. Just listen to them. No, the rules do not apply apparently to the Premier.

MR. HICKMAN: Our request to you Sir, at this time, is to ask if you and your colleagues in Cabinet would take a second look at the decision you have made regarding the Royal Commission Report. And in particular, the decision regarding compensation in the monitoring of radiation in the mines at St. Lawrence."

And another very worthwhile comment is this, concerning the whole attitude - That is the copy of a letter to the Minister of Mines for submission - is a brief to be submitted to the Cabinet, and I presume Cabinet has it.

MR. CALLAHAN: And the hon. gentleman is reading it here before I have it.

MR. HICKMAN: Not to the Minister of Mines, to the Minister of Labour. May 28th.

MR. CALLAHAN: Does the minister have it I wonder?

MR. HICKMAN: I hope he has. I had it. The point I am making Mr. Chairman, is this

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman probably wrote it anyway.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I did not write it. The simple fact Mr. Chairman, is this, that the Union in St. Lawrence, the Mayor of St. Lawrence, the Town Council of St. Lawrence - the representative groups of St. Lawrence, know what the situation is in the mines there. They are very grateful indeed, for the improvements that have taken place during the past few years, and they are more than grateful over the safety precautions that are now being taken, and so they should be. Because these safety precautions were paid at a pretty

high price. Their concern now is, and very properly so, that the Royal Commission and the minister's deputy made a very valuable contribution to that Commission, and he was a very valuable member. That Commission unanimously recommended that despite the fact that the radiation count is considerably below the levels that you would normally find mines of this nature, that to allay any fears or apprehension on the part of the miners in St. Lawrence, that there should be two, not just one, two monitoring technicians furnished full time by the Government in these mines.

MR. CALLAHAN: It does not say by the Government in these mines.

MR. HICKMAN: Well certainly not by the Company. The effect of what happened the past two or three years by having one gentleman there who has done a yeoman service, did a good job, worked long hours. Hours and hours of overtime, has indicated to the people of St. Lawrence, with proper supervision by Government, with proper inspection by Government, that they can, for the first time, feel that the mines will continue in a safe and non-hazardous condition. And all we have to do is listen to this nonsense from the minister, that the Company can look after it, that you might be casting reflection on the capabilities of the Company to protect, and this is Company's responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, without repeating any of the things I said the other day, the simple fact is this. That these people, these miners in St. Lawrence, are asking for a continuation of the protection they have received, particularly during the past three years, since the first monitoring technician was put there.

MR. CALLAHAN: It did not start three years ago. The Royal Commission found that -

MR. HICKMAN: The monitoring technician was appointed in 1967.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, but the Royal Commission found that the thing has been in good shape since 1961.

MR. HICKMAN: Then how does the hon. minister explain the fact that the Royal Commission unanimously recommended that there should be the second

monitoring technician, because the people of St. Lawrence are morally entitled to it. For very obvious reasons. That if you had twenty years of living under the threat and umbrella of fear and disaster that these people have lived under. And now you see a system brought in that gives them - allows them to rest easy, that you do not want the clock turned back again, by withdrawing the service that has been put there, and handing it back to the Company. It makes absolutely no sense at all Mr. Chairman, and when you look at the vote - dust and gas investigations, mine air sampling - \$100. Is the minister going to tell this Committee that he is concerned about the conditions and the mining operations in the mines of Newfoundland - when he sees fit to vote for mine and air sampling -

MR. CALLAHAN: That has never been paid out of this vote -

MR. HICKMAN: Dust and gas investigation. The total vote that has been asked for instruments and equipment, consumable supply, mine air sampling, for the whole mining industry of the Province of Newfoundland-- is \$1,300. And then when we go on to the inspection of mines, there is a vote for \$13,300. Surely the minister does not ask this Committee to believe and to accept the principle that safety in any mine in Newfoundland or Labrador, has to be left to the mining operators. Is not that what it is all about?

MR. CALLAHAN: The law says that they are responsible for it, morally and legally for it.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes, the law says that you should not drive over sixty miles an hour on the Trans Canada Highway -

MR. CALLAHAN: Twist it up now - twist it up -

MR. HICKMAN: You have police to enforce it. This Mr. Chairman, is why you have mining inspectors, to see that the safety laws, the safety rules, and the safety regulations in the mines in this country are being adhered to. And when you have a case, a particular case, for a particular problem, in a particular mine, and you have a particular recommendation arrived at after three years of very intensive study by a highly competent Royal Commission advised by groups of competent health officials and mining officials, and

they make a recommendation, you do not do a complete reverse and then try and justify it. There is no way of justifying it Mr. Chairman.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman Mr. Chairman, is trying to tell this Committee that only what can be purchased for \$1,300, that is the extent of the inspection and safety procedures in the mines of this Province. How stupid! How silly! How dumb does he think this Committee is?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, before this is carried. This vote does look very low indeed. \$100 reduced from \$500 last year. Granted, as the hon. minister said, it has never been paid out of this vote anyway. But this reverts back to what I said originally to the hon. the minister, that if you leave it to the Companies, for instance, you take dust samples -

MR. CALLAHAN: This is spot checking. It is indicators and things to go in and do spot checking in the mine.

MR. BURGESS: I see.

MR. CALLAHAN: To double check what the Company have already done.

MR. BURGESS: At times, would it not be necessary for you exactly to double check, to carry out the same as the Company has done?

MR. CALLAHAN: If you do not do it, only on a spot check, like an auditor audits books, you have to put people permanently in the operation.

MR. BURGESS: You say it is done quite often - even taking these random samples or these spot checks, surely \$100 is not going to be sufficient.

MR. CALLAHAN: It does not even have to be total votes.

MR. HICKMAN: Does the minister agree with that editorial in today's paper?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have not read today's paper, but if it is anything like what the hon. gentleman has just been spouting, I do not agree with it. No.

MR. HICKMAN: Well that is good. We are all wrong.

04

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I presume this is a group of trained men within the department that looks after Mine Rescue?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, Mr. Chairman, it is a provision for the establishment of a mine rescue training depot, which we had hoped to establish last year.

and we could not get a qualified person to take it on. It involves teaching mine people the fundamentals of mine rescue work. This is essentially what it is. We still hope to find somebody to do that kind of training program.

823-02

MR. HICKMAN: Would the minister tell the Committee something about this Canadian Land Inventory? Is this a cost sharing project?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes Mr. Chairman, there is an Appropriations-in-Aid right below for the same amount, and it is part of the Canadian Land Inventory study - Forest Inventory Land Capability Project, and this section of it is an agricultural section, and it involves soil testing in various parts of the Province, and is actually farmed out by us, the hon. gentleman may not believe it - it is carried out in co-operation with the Experimental Farm at Mount Pearl, who have the specialists, and thereby do this work for us. It is paid for in the general project votes.

MR. MURPHY: 824 - Before we leave Provincial Parks I just want to ask a question on a park in the eastern rural area of St. John's. Is there anything in mind for the Middle Cove, Torbay - that area down there, Mr. Minister, may I ask?

MR. CALLAHAN: I take it the hon. gentleman is referring to the Middle Cove beach area, is that it?

MR. MURPHY: Or somewhere around there, Outer Cove -

MR. CALLAHAN: No, I have had some talks with his colleague, the member for St. John's East Extern about this. I doubt if the full-fledged Provincial Park - because there is a lot of problems with land. There is a lot of land ownership. But certainly that beach area is one of the ones to which we will give priority in the designation of protective public beaches in the program, which, as I have told the House a bit earlier, we hope to bring in. And that may involve some equipage in terms of picnic tables and that sort of thing. It would not be a Provincial Park. It might well be a equipped public beach.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would answer me

something in the same vein? I have here a map of Newfoundland and Labrador - its major tourist facilities and it specified - Camping Parks as designated by a special sign. And many of them - I think there are thirty of them on the Island of Newfoundland. And we have another sign which designates Proposed Provincial Parks, and it specifies that the proposal for a Provincial Park at Duley Lake in Labrador West and Happy Valley. Now these have been proposed for quite a long time, and I wonder if there is any information as to when they will actually be implemented or established?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I have to say to the Committee is, that we do not intend, as things stand at the moment, to undertake new Provincial Parks until perhaps the year after next, with one exception, namely the Park of the Codroy area which would solve the critical problem of the influx of people at Port-aux-Basques,

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 1.

other than that we are in the process now and it began last fall of improving nine, most used, parks and that will be essentially, that plus the construction of one new one, will be our provincial parks programme, an expansion programme and one new one will be the sum total of the programme for this year and next year unless we can get approval for a new agreement or get a new agreement an approval for the construction of additional parks under the DREE programme.

We have a number perhaps a couple of dozen areas designated for a future park development. Perhaps a couple of dozen areas. Two of those are in Labrador. Labrador is not included in the last agreement. And I can tell the hon. gentleman that we spent a lot of time trying to get it in but because they were not on Trans-Canada Highway, being highway rest parks as they are termed in the ARDA agreements, not being on Trans Canada Highway, we did not have very much luck but I think we are making some progress on it and our intention is that we shall have in the new agreement at least five possibly new parks including the two in Labrador. That is our intention.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, relative to that I sincerely hope that every effort is made to include us in the next programme. But essentially, Sir, I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister, that this is part of the problem of Labrador. When you look at a map like that and you see the amount of parks that are already established on the Island of Newfoundland and after all we are supposed to be a part of this Province. We are supposed to be but this is a very small indication of exactly what the problem is in Labrador. It has been designated, proposed provincial parks, and I am to understand by the minister I recognize the fact that ^{now} there are problems involved financially and under these new programmes, but I understand now that we will have to wait for a minimum of two years before -

MR. CALLAHAN? No, no I did not say that. I said the present programme but if we get the new DREE agreement signed this year we may be able to start perhaps this fall on new parks and our hope is to persuade, despite the criteria that existed before, namely that they had to be on main highways to persuade them to include in the present programme the two parks in Labrador which we have

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 2.

designated the areas, the question is, can we get the funding under the road development agreement?

MR. BURGESS: Well I can certainly understand why they are not established when we talk about pretty close to the Trans-Canada Highway, I can certainly understand that. Close to that, 800 miles close. But the thing the point +

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the problem but I think we may have it partly solved.

MR. BURGESS: But I think that special at the risk of using that word which seems to be abhorred by some people, priority should be given to Labrador in that the isolation factor itself you must provide amenities in the best manner possible and this is no gigantic expenditure of money and I think that priority should be given to the establishment of these parks and facilities in order that the people can enjoy their recreation time or their free time and I think that priority should be certainly given to Labrador, particularly since there are so many already established on the island here. Because this actually Mr. Chairman is the problem. This is why we have been left out, not only this programme but many many others.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there is just one further question I would like to ask and in doing so I would like again to say how happy we should be, and I sympathize with the hon. member for Labrador West, these two parks I think they are a credit to us all, they are really beautiful. But I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister could, he is talking about improvements to parks and I think this was brought up last year with reference to Butterpot Park and the terrific congestion occurring where the traffic leads into one lane traffic just about coming out. And/^{if}an emergency occurred in that park, particularly on weekends, has there any thought been given to some alternate exit from that park?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that road, as I explained last year, there is a rough road goes down through/^{to}Holyrood and I think we have done some improvement on it and it is usable in case of emergency but we do not want to make it too

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 3.

good or otherwise we have another access and you will have traffic problems coming in both sides both ends of the park. But that access is used as an emergency access. It is available for emergency.

MR. R. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman, the Lockston Park between Bonavista South and Trinity North is but five miles between Port Rexton and going in towards Kings Cove. I understand there are some very nice ponds there for catching trout. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell the committee what facilities are there for the tourists who visit that park in large numbers during the summer time. What picnic sites and what tables and any other facilities of entertainment and for the pleasure of the people who visit that park?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the Lockston Park. I have been down there more than once. There are twenty-seven camp sites and thirty picnic sites, and a beach development and a dock, and water available both for fishing and I guess for swimming although I must say on occasions when I have been there it has been a little cool, not swimming weather.

MR. WELLS: I will not keep the committee long. I just want the minister to answer a couple of questions. He announced earlier that two parks I believe Butterpot and Barachois were being developed for, in particular trailer facilities, for facilities for discharging, trailer toilets and similar facilities. He announced, not in the House, may be it was in the House in the Throne Speech debate, that this was being done, I believe, in two parks this year. The minister, I sat here and listened to him, with facilities for dumping not a system now throughout the lots, I mean a system for dumping just one place. Most of these small home trailers, travel trailers, that people use throughout the parks have chemical toilets. And the way they operate it is with chemicals in them and they have a holding tank and somewhere when you are through staying in the park, you are about ready to leave somewhere you have to discharge that holding tank. And it is not very nice just to pull the plug on the side of the road somewhere. The minister announced earlier, somewhere this year either, I believe it was in the House probably

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 4.

during the Throne Speech debate or somewhere earlier, two parks, these facilities were being put in two parks this year.

MR. CALLAHAN: I think the hon. gentleman heard it by-the-bye somewhere I did not say it.

MR. WELLS: I heard it from the minister and I heard it from another source in Corner Brook. I heard it from two sources.

MR. CALLAHAN: But not from me.

MR. WELLS: Yes, I heard it from the minister in the House I asked him and he indicated that this was so. Is it not going to happen? There does not appear to be any additional funds here for it and that is what prompts the question. My second question is, what has happened to the report done by the committee on the proposed provincial park in the Marble Mountain area - Steady Brook. The basic idea of the committee was to develop the, to assist in the development of the ski area and make it a year-round recreational facility. There are some amenities, yes, the committee suggested a provincial park.

MR. CALLAHAN: It was never accepted on this -

MR. WELLS: I realize this, that is what I am asking and what has happened to it, has it been accepted or rejected or has the decision not been made if it has not, is there any likelihood of it being/^{re}considered in the reasonably near future? The idea is to make it a year round recreational park. - It has certain amenities, there is land available there for trailer and camp and tent, camper trailer facilities that could be made available. Steady Brook, it is right at the nearby the junction of Steady Brook where Steady Brook flows into the Humber on the upper side of highway from it. There is water available, a swimming hole had been made in Steady Brook itself by the community of Steady Brook. Steady Brook Falls are just above it, it is a very attractive pleasant area. The recommendations of that committee was that it be developed into a year-round provincial recreation park. It could attract a goodly number of people and could be a very pleasant park. It would not be beneficial as such

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 5.

from a park's point of view to the people, say the immediate Corner Brook area or Deer Lake because they would probably go elsewhere. But it would I believe operate to the benefit of the Province as a whole and in particular to people in that part of the Province, if it were developed along these lines particularly for winter skiing facilities out there. They have been developed to the maximum extent possible by a volunteer committee. It is just beyond their means to do any more with it. They borrowed about \$30,000 all told, with the assistance of the guarantee from the government for \$20,000 of it. They have repaid some of it. The directors of the ski club themselves guaranteed other amounts of it. But it is beyond the abilities of a volunteer committee to do anything more with it. It does have very real potentials. It can mean a lot to the Province in terms of attraction of tourist dollars particularly in the off-season.

There are pretty good hotel facilities in Corner Brook now perhaps an abundance of facilities, more than economic at the moment with the building of the Holiday Inn there. At the moment, more than is economic at the moment. As a matter of fact I think one of the hotels is having some considerable difficulty. That could change and this skiing development is one of the things that could contribute substantially to the change. It is more than is economic at the moment. It is nice to have the facilities there and it is nice to have ample hotel space to attract people. This is an advantage but when private enterprise has to operate them, or at least two of them, it becomes difficult, if there are too many they cannot continue to subsidize it for the sake of having it available to the community. May be the government can, in the Holiday Inn chain. But these facilities are there and it would vastly aid the hotels if this kind of a development were carried out and it would aid the Province as a whole. It would aid the Province directly, if it assisted those hotels because the Province can use all of the income into the Holiday Inns, it can get to help pay it off. So that it could be a real direct benefit. I wonder if the Minister could give the committee some idea of whether or not

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 6.

there is any likelihood, in the reasonably near future, of anything being done along these lines? It is beyond the capacity of a volunteer group to carry it any further. And unless it is carried further it will stagnate to a local thing with visitation from a few people in Sydney, Halifax or St. John's with nothing beyond that. We have not gone beyond that. We have had inquiries but we have discouraged it because the facilities are not there and we do not want to be in a position where we say, ^{to} the people from Minnesota; "yes, come in for some skiing," and have them disappointed by the lack of good facilities. So that the real potential is there but it is beyond the ability of this volunteer group to carry it on, government has to be involved from here on in and I wonder if the minister could give the committee some idea where we stand on it at the moment.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, as I said in the first instance this is not something that falls within the criteria of provincial parks, as such -

MR. WELLS: I raised it because the committee recommended that it be such.

MR. CALLAHAN: The committee did indeed and I think in fact the committee brought their brief with them to Stephenville and presented it I think to the Premier at Stephenville or discussed it there on one occasion at which I was present.

MR. WELLS: No, no, the brief was done after. I was Chairman of the committee and I brought it directly, when I was a member of the Cabinet.

MR. CALLAHAN: There was a discussion I remember, when I was at Stephenville, about it.

MR. WELLS: Yes, right that is where it originated.

MR. CALLAHAN: And the objection, or not, the objection, certainly the point was raised there, that this was not a provincial park within the normal meaning of a provincial park.

MR. WELLS: It is not now a provincial park.

MR. CALLAHAN: IN addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the provincial parks people look at it in terms of year round capabilities - it is not feasible I think to think in terms of any development. It requires large expenditure unless there can be -

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 7.

MR.WELLS: Unless it is year-round.

MR.CALLAHAN: If there is going to be a lot of money spent it has to be year-round.

MR.WELLS: Well it does not have to be, if the expenditure in the in-season is so big that it makes it economic anyway.

MR.CALLAHAN: But generally speaking if there is a lot of money going into it you plan to operate for three months.

MR.WELLS: Year-round is much more available.

MR.CALLAHAN: Our people, provincial parks people to whom this was directed, nonetheless, looked at this, and their decision was that if a provincial park or anything approximating a provincial park, (the only terms of reference which they could look at) were to be developed this was not the best place to do it. And the reason -

MR.WELLS: Not a conventional provincial park.

MR.CALLAHAN: Well to take advantage of the best recreational area in that particular region. This was their concern. You, say well now, is there any other area better? In terms of year-round facilities and in terms of swimming which is very important, in terms of enough land to provide for any kind of, you know, spread out. so that people would not be all clustered up together, occupation, in terms of parking, this is not the best terrain for that kind, there is not that much property there between the road and the side of the hill. So in fact they identified at Marble Mountain which is very steep mountain and quite close to the mountain. Well there is not much room, there is no beach area, and the only feasible development is felt would be winter-time skiing development. Now, not satisfied with their own opinion, they put this to the Canadian Land Inventory people, again working to our land capability project, and they have confirmed that and confirmed also that the high-rating location in that area is that the south west or north west corner of Deer Lake . This would be the place, if you were going to

June 4 1970 Tape 1125 page 8.

go into a year-round -

MR.WELLS: This is where the town's municipal park is.

MR.CALLAHAN: No, the municipal park is down at Wild Cove

MR.WELLS: No no, the town of Deer Lake, municipal park. That is the east end of Deer Lake.

MR.CALLAHAN: I am talking now about the west end of Deer Lake. North west across the Lake,

MR.WELLS: ON the far side of the Lake.

MR.CALLAHAN: That would be the north-west side.

MR.WELLS: For skiing as well.

MR.CALLAHAN: For the maximum, looking at it, the maximum recreational potentials

MR.WELLS: For year-round skiing as well.

MR.CALLAHAN: I do not know about skiing, skiing too, there are hills over there but I do not know - anyway that is the judgment, this was the high recreation area and I think that is where that particular matter stands except for this, that the hon. gentleman mentioned trailer parks, and that kind of facility: in connection with Marble Mountain and the city of Corner Brook is developing a tourist park at Haghess Brook and I think that it is too bad that that development, if it could have been done at Marble Mountain was not done at Marble Mountain, because I do feel that at the moment municipalities (and I have discussed this with the mayor of Corner Brook and we have offered him any assistance and advice we can give him on it) I think these facilities near municipalities should be municipally developed. Now that does not say they should not have some help with it. Getting now to an area of recreation using artificial facilities, which is not the kind of thing I think the government should be in because you would require commercial activity and we are not anxious to be into commercial activity. But,

MR. CALLAHAN: I think that is where it stands, we have looked at it, and from our point of view, and the point of view the kinds of judgments that our parks people must make, they feel that this particular area, while it has a magnificent wintertime potential, has not a year round potential

MR. WELLS: It is more limited in the summer. It has some potential, but it is more limited than most other areas.

MR. CALLAHAN: It is quite limited in the summer, mainly because there is no nearby swimming area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

MR. WELLS: Not yet, Mr. Chairman, this is rather important now.

AN HON. MEMBER: You made your point.

MR. WELLS: I did not do it to make a point, I did it with the hope of ultimately achieving some development in that area. And something the minister has said may in the end work out. We considered as well the possibility of trying to persuade the City of Corner Brook to participate in the development. We have talked to them, they are quite interested in it. They would like to see it developed. At the moment it is outside the boundaries of the city. Now that is capable of correction, I think under the law they cannot spend any money outside of their own boundaries. But that I presume is capable of correction, but there might be a bit of a problem in that you might run afoul with the boundaries of the community of Steady Brook. But, I think, that this could be worked out.

With all due respects to Mr. Chafe and the parks people, I think, to turn the thing down because there are other areas better suited to summer park development in the conventional sense, is wrong. I think, we got to bear in mind that this is a place that is different, and while it may not be the best from the point of view of conventional summer park development, recreation park development, another area a few miles away may be considerably better, considering the year around aspect of it, and the winter aspect of it, it should not be required to meet the maximum standard from a summer point of view. If he will pardon me, it would be shortsighted to have a maximum requirement on all seasons.

But in any event, perhaps a better alternative if the minister or the Government as a whole is prepared to work with the City of Corner Brook, are they

MR. WELLS: prepared to sit down, as soon as possible, with the City of Corner Brook and consider some alternative toward the development of this?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have already discussed this -

MR. WELLS: I mean would he sit down with say representatives from the people that operated presently the Corner Brook Ski Club, and a representative from the City Parks and Recreation Commission, and from his department to consider some kind of a joint proposal for the development of it, because it can be very significant and it can make a major contribution to the Province as a whole. Are they prepared to do it? Is the Minister prepared to do that?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am glad to be with them, and give him any help we can.

MR. WELLS: Thank you.

MR. HICKEY: I do not wish to delay the House, with all this talk of Corner Brook, I cannot let the opportunity go by without getting my two cents worth in about Middle Cove. I wonder would the hon. minister tell me -

MR. CALLAHAN: That was only distributed in the House five minutes ago.

MR. HICKEY: Ah! But the hon. gentleman was where he could hear.

MR. CALLAHAN: Oh, he could hear.

MR. HICKEY: I heard what the hon. minister said, and it is along those lines that I asked this question. People in that area are very, very interested in the possibility of some development by way of parks. And I would ask him, if he could tell me, is there any hope of getting something done for the coming summer? Supposing it is some small, in the way of picnic tables, something of that nature?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is very doubtful for the coming summer, Mr. Chairman, we have a great number of requests for picnic tables and that kind of thing. This past winter we had to spend most of our time getting equipment of that kind made for the expansion of our nine parks and the building of the new one in the replacement or addition to even other parks and those - what I hope is that next winter perhaps, we can put on a bit of a bit of an extra addition to that project and perhaps deal with a number of requests that we are getting now from all over the

MR. CALLAHAN: Province for picnic tables and that kind of thing made to standard pattern.

MR. HICKEY: If there is an election before then, it will only help the Liberal Candidates to do something additional.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will keep that in mind.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this opportunity pass without making some reference to the beautiful area on the side of Gander Lake, opposite the Town of Gander. I did not mean to be parochial, but seeing that most hon. members are, I suppose I cannot be blamed for doing the same.

I recall some years ago, where the municipality of Gander, the Town Council had a survey done on, and a land survey made by Project Planners of Toronto, I believe, and they came up with a marvelous development plan, lake side plan incorporated into the town plan and referred to it, as a municipal park area. Some work is being done in terms of skiing, some work is being done in terms of tobogganing and riding stables and riding lanes, and some talk has been heard lately about golf courses. And I seem to recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the election campaign of 1966, when the Liberal Candidate, I believe, was Mr. Granger, and I am happy that he is here today, and I am sure he will back me up on what I am saying, he promised that if he were elected, he would see to it that every consideration was given to this particular plan. Now I am sure he still has the interest of the people from Gander at heart, and I would hope that he would get together with the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and also the Minister

MR. SMALLWOOD: There will not be an Oil Refinery at Gander Lake.

MR. COLLINS: And also the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, and see if they cannot come up with a realistic development plan, we are not in a big hurry, get started this year, hopefully finish it next year, or the next year.

I would like the minister to indicate to the Committee, if he has given any thought to that, if he has seen the plan, and if he appreciates the great possibilities there?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen the plan, but if the hon. gentleman

MR. CALLAHAN: would get me a copy of this, I would be glad to have a look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Carried.

MR. HICKMAN: If the hon. the member for Placentia West is not in his seat, I would like on his behalf like to draw to the attention of the minister, the most attractive site in the district of Placentia West for a Provincial Park in the Spanish Room area, I do not know if he is familiar with that area, but you can see it from the main highway.

MR. CALLAHAN: Another one of those foreign places.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize that, but slowly but surely we will,

MR. WELLS: But that is not on the Avalon Border is it?

MR. HICKMAN: I realize it is not on the Avalon, but it is on the Burin Peninsula, and it is in the District of Placentia West, the most attractive.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister list for the Committee the names of the nine parks, Provincial Parks, that will be developed this summer or upgraded this summer. And secondly, in certain areas in the Province as I understand it, where it is proposed that Provincial Parks will be built sometime in the future, maybe not even the foreseeable future, certain restrictions have now been imposed on the construction of summer cabins in many areas.

MR. CALLAHAN: That does not stop them though, I might add.

MR. HICKMAN: But if they build, they build contrary to regulations, I believe.

MR. CALLAHAN: That does not stop them either, unless you burn them down or something.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this business of building summer cabins and summer cottages in Newfoundland seems to becoming more popular all the time.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is for sure.

MR. HICKMAN: And maybe it is the sign of Newfoundlanders becoming more affluent, I do not know what the reason is, but be that as it may, more and more of them are springing up. And obviously there has to be some control, at the same time you do not want to keep everybody barred in the larger towns, if they want to get out in the summer and they have the money to do it. And I would suggest to

MR. WELLS: Go West young man, go West.

MR. HICKMAN: the ministers, that whilst there has to be control, insofar as

MR. HICKMAN: summer cottages are concerned, at the same time, areas should be approved for the building of summer cottages, controlled areas. And that these summer cottages should be built, and sewerage installed in such a manner, that they will not pollute the ponds and lakes on whose shores they are erected.

MR. CALLAHAN: Is the hon. gentleman aware of the conditions attached to leases of summer cottages?

MR. HICKMAN: I realize, but is there any tax? And is there any control? Are there areas in Newfoundland that are not designated to summer cottages areas, and then you have the areas where -

MR. CALLAHAN: Some and there will be more.

MR. HICKMAN: the proposed Provincial Park, which may be many years away,

MR. CALLAHAN: We are not going to have them in Provincial Parks.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, do I gather then, that it is impossible in a reserved area for Provincial Parks for -

MR. CALLAHAN: Theoretically impossible, because people go in, in the wintertime, and no one can get there and put up a shack kind, and you know it is found in the summertime.

MR. HICKMAN: I know of at least one, and there maybe others, there is at least one private part of the Province.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, that is a good description.

MR. HICKMAN: But it is a most attractive place, the most attractive area, I think in the area of Fresh Pond, the Golden Sands area on the Burin Peninsula. Now this is a most attractive area, sandy beach, warm water, good camp site, I suspect it is a very profitable venture.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, particularly when you got a monopoly on the water, and you do not let anyone in.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. But is there any, the question I want to ask, well there is a toll road there. It is a most attractive site this Golden Sands site, I am sure the hon. minister will admit, and there is good boating, good swimming in the area, and good camp site, but do we have control over, I know that the owner wants to use it for a particular purpose, he wants to put in a toll road, he can do it. But at the same time, there should not be indiscriminate useage of these areas. 6160

MR. HICKMAN: Is there any control? Or does the minister have the power to go in, in the spring of the year and say, "let us have a look at your facilities, that you are going to provide tourist visitors during the summer". Because whilst he may have control over the beach, yet that area on the opposite side of that lake there is a reserved area for a Provincial Park, and the whole lake is being used by people who visit there, and it would be regrettable, if any of the beauty of that area was destroyed before Government got around to developing Provincial Parks.

MR. CALLAHAN: That development, Mr. Chairman, as far as the conditions go, and I have not looked at them lately. That development is in existence largely under a Tourist Development Office License, because of the accommodation factor, but it is there, I am not entirely happy with it, but it is there, and the gentleman has some rights, and I do not feel that we can just go in and toss him out. On the business of summer cabinets, there is no way we can have summer cabins in Provincial Parks. So we have to reserve the areas, and we have to be as tough as we maybe with people who go and build in these areas anyway. The difficulty is that, that we have gone to court time and time again with these things, and the magistrate will fine the man a dollar, and say now stay away from the cabin for twelve months, and it happens in September, so you know next June or July he starts sneaking back, and by the time the summer is just about over, he is back in full occupancy again, so you go to court the second time, and the only way I know is to burn him out, and I do not think it would be fair to do that.

MR. WELLS: Do you ever get an order to take them down?

MR. CALLAHAN: Pardon?

MR. WELLS: Do you ever get orders to have them taken down?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, not yet.

MR. WELLS: You will have to get one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Shall 02 carry?

On motion 824-03-03 to 824-09-04 carried.

Shall the Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan carry? Carried.

Shall the Block Provision: Salary Increases and New Posts carry?

HON. G. A. FRECKER: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS): Block Provision: Salary Increases and New Posts, be changed from \$171,400 to \$207,900, and accordingly the total for the department be changed to \$5,223,100.

MR. MURPHY: Where does the money go that we pay into it?

MR. ROBERTS: It goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Mr. Chairman, I will explain the Appropriations-in-Aid, only where they are related specifically to a program, usually Federal/Provincial Contributions the revenue earned by the Department of Mines and Resources, we found on page 10, and totals on the estimates of little over a \$1. It goes directly into the Consolidated -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: But Appropriations-in-Aid are related specifically to the program, as for example, Canada Assistance or Medicare -

MR. MURPHY: The point I was making is fees, actually the same as the Provincial, at Torbay, the Recreation Centre and the revenue for that is shown in the Department of Education, as fees etc. But there is nothing shown here.

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot answer the question in more detail, except what we take in is on page 10.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I know. But in the Department, I think the hon. minister must follow what I am saying, that Physical Fitness are using Torbay down there, and fees are shown, and the revenue actually to the department.

MR. ROBERTS: There are all sorts of anomalies, such as that in the estimates, if the hon. gentleman would give me a note, I will take it up with the Finance people, we will find out.

MR. CROSBIE: I picked it out when we came to the Block Provision: Salary Increases in the last department, there was a contradiction between a statement that have been made earlier by the Premier, that the salary increases, and a statement made by the Minister of Supply and Services a few days ago, in which statement, in the Minister's of Supply and Services statement, he announced that the five percent, the automatic five percent increase, in salaries for Government Employees was to commence on April 1st. 1972. And I pointed out the other day

MR. CROSBIE: that in a statement the Premier had made, it was said that this increase, this automatic five percent increase, and the salaries of all Government Employees and non-Government Hospital Workers would come in 1971. And this was denied. So I now have with me, Mr. Chairman, a statement made in this House on April 29th. 1970, by the Premier, announcing certain Government conclusions, and on page 6.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the date on that please?

MR. CROSBIE: April 29th. On Page 6 of that statement, it was stated; "Mr. Speaker, it will be understood I hope that everything I have said today applies to the present Financial Year that began on April 1st. and will go to the end of the year. But, Sir, it must be understood equally clearly that in the coming year, and the coming year is April 1st. 1971, it is our intention to propose to this House that the Annual Incremental Increase in the new Classification Scales will be not less than five percent!"

That was a statement made by the Premier on April 29th. 1970. This is a statement where he announced there is no intention of dropping the Classification System, which was dropped a few days later, the statement about the Appeal Board, the statement about an amount of \$4,700,000 for increases, and so on. And on Page 6, it was said; "That the Annual Incremental Increase in the new Classification Scales will be not less than five percent in the coming year, that is April 1st. 1971".

Now the Minister of Supply and Services in his latest statement about a week ago said that, "the automatic five percent is to commence in 1972", in that Financial Year. So this is a change, Mr. Chairman, in the Government Policy on Salary Increases. The automatic five percent, the Government of course will not be in office anyway in 1972. The automatic five percent is now to commence a year later than was originally stated.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

MR. CROSBIE: If there is an answer certainly.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course there is an answer, and very briefly. The statement read by the hon. gentleman was not the Premier's last statement, it

MR. ROBERTS: was the second last statement made by the Premier, the last one was made

MR. MURPHY: The last Will and Testimony.

MR. ROBERTS: No, that will be many, many years yet.

MR. MURPHY: Oh! I see.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the position is quite simply that the five percent is the Incremental Scale within the Classification Plan recommended to us by the Public Administration Services and adopted - being implemented through the Personnel Administration Division. When the Classification Plan becomes effective, it will have annual increments of five percent. That is when it is effective. We hope and plan as a matter of policy, working with the employee groups, to have the Classification Plan in effect as of 1st. April, 1971, a year from now or little less than a year from now.

As of that point, the increments are five percent, the first increment will be paid on April 1st. 1972, as spelled out by my colleague, the Minister of Supply and Services. We have gone through this in great detail, particularly with the Newfoundland Government Employees Association. I do not think there is any inconsistency in the positions. The raises next year, some maybe more than five percent, others maybe less, to bring everybody on to the appropriate point in the scale.

MR. WELLS: The Classification's raises will be in effect next year, will come into effect next year.

MR. ROBERTS: The raise is necessary to bring a Classification Plan into being, some will be less than five, some will be more than five. I do not know what the average will be.

MR. WELLS: Next year will be an adjusted year?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is a good way to put it, Mr. Chairman, it will be an adjusting year, and as of then, it is five percent, the annual steps within the scales, which up until now have been \$100. But the first money to be received by an employee under that will not be paid until April 1st. 1972.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, just before we carry, let us just say a few words more on it. What the minister says now explains what were two contradictory statements taken as they were, so in actual fact the first five percent increase will be received in the year starting April 1st. 1972, which is different than had appeared to be the case.

Now in connection with the salary increases, I asked a question this morning which the minister answered, and just to get the point clarified beyond doubt, the increases to Government employees, whether hospital or non-hospital, is retroactive April 1st. 1970, they will not receive that in their cheques until the Government is finished negotiating with the N.G.E.A., until they are finished negotiating with the nurses, lab technicians, X-ray technicians and so on. Is that the correct interpretation to be taken from the minister's statement?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think so.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): But perhaps when we come to my own Estimates, we could go into it in a little more detail because I am not quite sure that the information I had this morning, and the hon. gentleman had not given me notice. I was speaking on recollection on an oral question - I think I will have something to add to it. The increases for the employees in Mines, Agriculture and Resources, which is what we are talking about - the vote before the Committee will be paid as of April 1, 1970, but we are still awaiting the results of a ballot by the employees concerned.

MR. WELLS: Can the minister confirm that the re-classification scheme is not to apply to members of the House?

MR. ROBERTS: Well Mr. Chairman, I understand members of the House have a different classification process. One of these days, some of us will be re-classified.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, before we carry the Block Provision, the hon. minister omitted to answer - or to give us a list of the nine parts that are to be upgraded this year. Could you give us the list and we will pass everything - pass right out.

MR. CALLAHAN: Barachois, Beothuck, Notre Dame, Square Pond, Jack's Pond, Bellevue Beach, Gushue's Pond, Butterpot, Indian River.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:

MR. WELLS: I propose to make a few general remarks while we are discussing the minister's salary Mr. Chairman. I do want to say words further about the Janeway Apartments. I want to draw it to the attention of the Committee, that irrespective of the cost per square foot, and that depends, apparently this is where everybody was at loggerheads on this one, when the original question was answered. The original question asked - "what is the total area of floor space constructed - and how much did it cost?" The minister answered and said to the question what was the total area of floor space - \$49,500. The total cost \$3,052,847. Now the minister corrected this not until yesterday which was eight days later - seven days later. I worked out these figures at the time, and it worked out to sixty-one dollars and

sixty-seven cents per square foot, which I thought was ridiculous. Later that afternoon, which was last Tuesday afternoon, a week ago Tuesday, I commented on it and said, there is something wrong with this. The minister has a lot to explain. But they said, that is all right, we furnished it - was his response.

The next day on Wednesday, I asked the minister. I rose on Orders of the Day and asked the minister if he would carry out an investigation - if he proposed to carry on an investigation into this - because quite obviously there was something wrong with that. If this is what the cost was, it was exorbitant - otherwise the figures were wrong or something. The minister said he would like to have written notice of that. And I said, well now would you take this as notice, that something should be done - it should be investigated. No, he wanted that put in the Order Paper. Well that is when I gave up in exasperation, and that is when I drew public attention to the fact.

Between now and then the minister made a statement here yesterday, clarifying that there is in fact a total floor space of 100,290 square feet, which reduces the overall cost, site development and everything included, down to thirty dollars and forty-four cents per square foot. That includes land development, street services, water and sewer, landscaping, architects' fee and so on. This is the total cost of the whole project, on a square footage basis, works out to thirty dollars and forty-four cents. But bear in mind Mr. Chairman, that that includes hallways, basement space. Now I believe in fairness that basement space is finished to some degree for recreation rooms and things of this nature. So that costs more than just building a basement and leaving a concrete floor and concrete wall I would imagine. But anyway in fairness this has developed for this kind of usage. But again, that is a pretty high, ^{square} footage cost in my opinion. Maybe I am totally wrong. But Mr. Chairman, to determine whether or not I am wrong, look at what we have there. We have fifty-four apartments - six one-bedroom, twelve two-bedroom, and thirty-six three-bedroom apartments, and then

sixteen single intern resident rooms. Single rooms. Now these I believe, again in fairness, are bed-sitting rooms, and they have certain kitchen facilities and they have a separate bathroom. So if you assign to those single rooms what is a fair value. What would be a fair value? Take the figure \$20,000. That is certainly fair. You can buy a \$4,000 block of serviced land with water and sewer, street and curb and gutter, and everything there, and put up a small two bedroom bungalow and sell it for \$20,000. So \$20,000 is certainly ample to assign to a single bedsitting room with some kitchen and bathroom facilities. It is ample in an apartment complex surely. \$12,000 should be enough. \$20,000 and you cannot possibly make any mistakes. So if you assigned \$20,000 as the value for those sixteen rooms - \$320,000, take off the overall cost. That still leaves those apartments at over \$50,000 each. Now the three bedroom cost more than the two bedroom and more than the one bedroom. But averages. That still leaves those apartments at over \$50,000 each. Now I do not know whose fault that is - whether it is the contractor's, the ministers, the architects - but somebody has got to be answerable to that. I presume the contractor built what the plan called for. I can presume that. The contractor built what the plan called for. And if the plan called for apartments that ultimately cost \$50,000 each - that Mr. Chairman, is exorbitant. And it explains why we do not have a hospital in Corner Brook, there is no money left over. It is one of the reasons for it. There are no funds available to build a hospital in Corner Brook, or it would have been started long ago.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works): That is incorrect. That is wrong. You are talking about Corner Brook. Did the hon. gentleman see the Janeway Hospital, the complex down there?

MR. WELLS: I have seen the Janeway. I have not been all through it, but I have seen the Janeway.

MR. CHALKER: I mean the apartments.

MR. WELLS: I have only seen them. I have not been in them. I have not

been in them. Now maybe they are nice apartments. He gave us the rental figures. \$106 for one bedroom unfurnished. If it is furnished, it is \$126. And by the way, that figure of \$3 million does not include the furniture. It only includes the fridge and stove, the basic elements of a kitchen, built-in. And there are twenty washers and twenty driers in the basement. I would like Mr. Chairman, to be able to rent a \$50,000 facility, residential facility, for somewhere between \$106 and \$136. I would like to be able to do that. Rents for a \$50,000 unit will cost an awful lot more than that, if they are going to be anywhere near economic.

MR. CHALKER: I think June 1 the rents are practically doubled, not quite doubled, but practically doubled.

MR. WELLS: As of the first of June? And so they should. And so they should.

MR. CHALKER: They are used by the staff you know.

MR. WELLS: Oh, I realize they are used by the staff. I realize that. My contention is Mr. Chairman, they should not have cost a cent more than \$30,000 average per unit. Maybe a three bedroom would cost \$35,000. Look, you can build an average home. You can buy the block of land at seventy-five or fifty by a hundred, serviced with a street in front of it, so you are contributing to the cost and it is included in your land. And you can build a three or four bedroom home to a pretty respectable and decent standard, for \$30,000. An individual home.

MR. CHALKER: The circumstances surrounding this are entirely different.

MR. WELLS: There is no reason to justify those circumstances. Maybe they are built in the wrong place. That is part of it. Maybe that is part of it. But there is no basis on which that complex can be justified at \$50,000 per unit. No way - can that kind of expenditure be justified in this. It works out if you take what is a fair value for the apartment, for the single room for Interns, of about \$20,000. The overall cost for those apartment is an average of \$50,000 a unit. And if you make the one bedroom one \$40,000, then the three bedrooms are \$60,000. But average it, it is \$50,000 a unit,

and that is exorbitant.

MR. CHALKER: Actually they cost twenty-four dollars and seventy cents per square foot.

MR. WELLS: Sure, exclusive with water and sewer. Exclusive of architects fee. Exclusive of site development. But you have to include all that. That is included when you build your home. When you buy your land.

MR. CHALKER: You see there are certain questions you do not ask. You do not get the right answers. You do not ask the right questions to get the right answers.

MR. WELLS: The minister can explain it. The minister can explain it.

Mr. Chairman, this is another reason why there are no medical facilities in Corner Brook, because this kind of expenditure - this kind of unjustified and unwarranted expenditures - there is nobody building any apartments to attract nurses for Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook. That is not being done. The Hospital Corporation itself thought about doing it, but it was beyond their means. They could not do it. They had not the financial means to do it - they have property available, but it is beyond their means, they cannot do it. The Government were not anxious to rush out in 1966 when there was a nursing shortage there, or '67 or '68 and build apartments to attract nurses.

MR. CHALKER: We built a beautiful nurses' home out there.

MR. WELLS: You did not build apartments to attract staff. There is a nurses' residence sure, for the nursing school. Big deal! Nursing residence for the nursing school. So there should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think the Chair ruled a few days ago it was not relevant to a heading to say money saved on that should have been spent on some other item, and get into a debate on some other area.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, this is an incidental reference to show how ludicrous the expenditure is, merely an incidental reference to show how unwise, how unwise that is. The same thing will take place again shortly, another incidental reference I might make Mr. Chairman. Incidentally, the

Medical School, that is going to prohibit hospital building anywhere. The Minister will not be able to build -

MR. ROBERTS: It is completely incorrect and it is a false statement. And when my own Estimates are called, I would be delighted to engage in a discussion with the hon. gentleman. But to say that the construction of the Medical School will in any way lessen, is completely false.

MR. WELLS: Is this is what the hon. minister was supposed to have done a couple of months ago?

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman wants to talk about Corner Brook when we get to my Estimates, I would be delighted.

MR. WELLS: I will do that then, but I am talking basically about the responsibility. -

MR. ROBERTS: Fine, then do not make false statements. Do not make incorrect statements. Do not make inaccurate statements.

MR. WELLS: This is my conclusion, my opinion. I am expressing an opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: As a statement of fact, it is inaccurate.

MR. WELLS: In my opinion, the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, will not have the funds available to him to carry out in this Province what he should, by reason of such unwise expenditures as the building of that hospital complex, apartment complex at the Janeway and the proposed building of the Medical School complex.

MR. CROSBIE: I will start now Mr. Chairman -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, let us at least have supper, so we can come fueled for the hon. gentleman's verbose oratory.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it will not be verbosed. There will not be any oratory. Just a quiet recital of some points I want to talk on.

MR. ROBERTS: We will be delighted to hear them. Delighted to hear them.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, and have passed Estimates of current expenditure under the following heading: Eight - Mines, Agriculture and Resources with

some amendments, report progress and ask leave to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded the report of this Committee be concurred in. Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay," Carried.

It being now six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 97

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make reference to a matter that appeared in the paper May 28th and that was a report that the Provincial Department of Public Works had applied for a formal Municipal Council permit to cover work in the preparation of Exon House as a home and hospital for retarded children. Apparently, the Minister can confirm this or deny it or explain it, apparently the Department of Public Works had work under way at Exon House for months without submitting their report to the St. John's Municipal Council. Now the municipal authority within the city limits, certainly for all building purposes, is a St. John's Municipal Council and it is hard to understand, if this is correct, why the Department of Public Works or the Government would not submit building plans for approval by the St. John's Municipal Council before they would undertake work the same as every citizen does or every company or any other body or authority who is going to build within the municipal limits.

They first get a permit from the City Council before they start their work and the City Council passed a resolution or at least requested the Department of Public Works in future to seek a permit before work starts. Work on the renovations have been underway for sometime, however, a plan for their work was presented to council only this week. The Department said the project is estimated to cost about \$370,000. and that work is started because of the urgency of the project. Now every project that I have ever come across, Mr. Chairman, is an urgent one. There are dozens of urgent projects but that does not mean to say you do not have to apply and get a permit before you start to build, no matter how urgent the project.

MR. NEARY: That is not so in some districts.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation makes his usual tremendous contribution to the debate by suggesting this is nit-picking. If I wanted to pick a nit I would go over and pick the Minister, that is the nit picking I would do. The Department of Public Works or the Government should observe municipal bylaws and regulations the same as any other body and if that is nit-picking then I am quite pleased to be in the nit-picking game, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE:

Now the Minister may have some explanation but I would like the Minister to tell us if it is the policy of his Department just to ignore Municipal authorities within whose jurisdiction the Government falls? We all know that municipalities are creatures of the Government or of the House of Assembly created by the House of Assembly, that this House can pass laws eliminating Municipal Councils but that has not been done yet at least within the city of St. John's. So the Minister may have some reason or explanation and I certainly am prepared to listen to it but, if he has not, I would like the Minister to tell us whether the future policy will be to have plans submitted and approved by the Government before construction starts?

The next item I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, on Public Works is the Expo buildings because I consider the Expo buildings ^{be} ~~to~~ one of the greatest wastes of money that this Province has ever engaged in. One of the poorest buys, one of the most poorly conceived endeavours that the Province ever got into is the purchase of the temporary summertime Expo buildings from Expo 67 in Montreal, the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak pavilions and the movement of them to Newfoundland and the subsequent plans to erect them at Grand Falls, Gander and Grand Bank, as Arts and Culture Centres and as a museum, is the most poorly conceived Public Works project ever undertaken in this Province. The buildings are of virtually no use, temporary summertime buildings without installation and never erected for permanent purposes. It would have been cheaper for the Province to decided that they were going to be certain Arts and Culture Centres or a Museum built at Grand Bank, to decide that in the first place and to have plans done and build them in a conventional way. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, it would not have been any more expensive and we would have had a much more satisfactory building. Now what did they cost todate?

Questions (63) and (79) dealt with Expo buildings and at the end of December 1969 and I will give the round figures there had been \$881,000. spent on part of the Expo building located at Grand Falls, \$265,000. on part of the Expo building located at Gander and \$217,000. on the Expo building, I think the Yugoslav building is down at Grand Bank, \$1,364,000. spent by the Government to the end of December 1969. Spent during the period, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CROSBIE:

when there was tight money, financial stringency, when hospitals could not be constructed, when other important public facilities could not be proceeded, \$1,364,000. spent on these Expo buildings.

Now at the time the Czech pavilion was purchased there was a story that this was a gift from Czechoslovakia to the Province of Newfoundland in connection with an airplane crash that had occurred at Gander. That was never correct and I understand that we had to pay the Czechoslovak Government or whoever bought the building from them for that building. It was never a gift to the people of Newfoundland I do not believe. We certainly had to buy the contents and there is still no building erected at Gander. The answers given to the question stated is that the original estimate of the cost of the Expo buildings originally given for all of them was \$1,646,000. That was the estimate at the beginning.

The answer to question (63) was that the original estimate was \$1,646,000. to erect them all, bring them to Newfoundland, re-erect them and so on. It goes on to say that the original estimate was for re-erection of buildings as uninsulated shells on sites to be provided by the Government. It was later decided to erect them as insulated buildings redesigned for their ultimate use. Well that just does not make any sense, Mr. Chairman. I mean who would plan to re-erect buildings in Newfoundland as uninsulated shells. That is fantastic from the start with the weather in Newfoundland, the long winters, the cold spring that anyone would plan to erect uninsulated shells on sites to be provided by the Government. So if that was the original estimate, the estimate was based on ridiculous figuring, ridiculous planning and now we are told it was later decided to erect them as insulated buildings redesigned for their ultimate use.

What is the cost going to be of that? Well, according to the answer to the question the estimated cost of these buildings now is going to total \$3,400,000. That is double the original cost if that was the original estimate then it is double the original estimate, \$3,400,000. It is going to cost \$1,510,000. at Grand Falls, \$1,078,000. at Gander and \$812,000. at Grand Bank. That is the estimate now. I think we all realize that it is going to

MR. CROSBIE:

be more than that estimate. There will very, very likely be more than that estimate.

Well, can a Province, Mr. Chairman, like Newfoundland at this particular time afford to take \$3,400,000. of its capital funds that has to be raised through borrowing, we do not have a capital account surplus we have to borrow practically everything that is spent in capital account except what we get from Ottawa, can this Province borrow \$3,400,000. for a purpose such as this at this particular time with the great needs we have for construction of schools, hospitals and the rest of it? I will not list everything else as everybody in the Island knows what other capital works we need here and how much.

It was an ill- conceived scheme in the beginning, it was started in the fall of 1967, I presume it was, yes, when the by-election was on in Gander and the Government has held to that scheme ever since and \$3,400,000. is going to be spent on it. Now Gander should have an Arts and Culture Centre or it should have a recreation centre, Grand Falls should, why not, St. John's has one, Corner Brook, Grand Bank should have a Maritime Museum or whatever. It is a good project but these projects are not as essential as other projects for those areas and others. And certainly there is no excuse for buying beat up, temporary, old Expo buildings and to convert them for these purposes.

Now there is a discrepancy given in the cost under question (63). It says that for the Grand Falls Expo building it is going to cost \$1,510,000. and there was another question asked (40) where there was a different cost given. Here is another trouble, Mr. Chairman, in answers to questions, how inaccurate some of them are. Question (40) was asked by Mr. Wells and it was answered. On what date the construction work started on the Arts and Culture Centre at Grand Falls? The answer was November 1968. What is the planned opening date of the new centre? No date set. What will be the approximate cost and what was the estimated cost? I have it here as one answer: \$1,376,598. That is the approximate cost of the Grand Falls Expo building. Well then the answer to question (79), the estimated cost of the Grand Falls Arts and Culture Centre is given as \$1,510,000. Now there maybe some explanation for that for

MR. CROSBIE:

that is a difference of several hundred thousand dollars.

In connection with building cost there would also appear to be two contradictory answers given as to the cost of the Government Building at Corner Brook. Question (23) asked for particulars in connection with the Government Building at Corner Brook? It is 83,980 square feet and so on, eighty-four employees, building cost \$130,000. to operate in 1969. Now the trouble maybe that this is only building construction but what was the cost of (b) building construction and that was given as \$2,192,920., that is the Government Building at Corner Brook. Then there was question (39) asked, what was the total cost to the Government? Question (23) was asked by the member for St. John's East Extern, building \$2,192,920., furnishings \$140,000. and that would be a total of \$2,338,000 roughly. Question (39) was asked by the member for Humber East, what was the total cost to the Government of the construction, equipping and furnishing of the Government Centre at Corner Brook? The answer given was \$2,631,920. So that is about a three hundred thousand dollar difference in the answer to those two questions. Answer to question (23) \$2,192,000. plus \$140,000. for furnishings.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but I am just giving the questions. When one asks what is building construction? \$2,192,920. What does it cost to furnish? \$140,000. Well that is a total of \$2,338,000. roughly. The other question asked, what was the total cost of construction, equipping and furnishing? There is no difference between construction, furnishing and equipping.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is difference, sure.

MR. CROSBIE: You mean that in one you do not include the cost of equipment.

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not remember these questions and neither do I remember the answers.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, there is a difference of three or four hundred thousand dollars. These are the same questions but different figures given. \$2,631,000. Well, if there is an explanation for discrepancy the Minister can give it. It would be interesting to know which figure is right or are they both right then there is some explanation for it.

MR. CROSBIE:

There is a Provincial building at Grand Falls, Mr. Chairman, the Government Building at Grand Falls cost \$2,056,000. and \$17,000. to furnish, that is \$2,074,000 the cost of the Government Building at Grand Falls according to the answer to questions. Now the construction cost, the building has 47,385 square feet so the construction cost is about \$43.00 per square foot. There are 31,000 feet of that building rented to the CNT and the RCMP and the rentals come to \$31,164. a year which comes to \$4.63 per square foot. In other words the Government is renting space at Grand Falls and getting \$4.63 a square foot.

Now look at some of the rents the Government are paying for the same elsewhere.

MR. CHALKER: But you must also look at the location, look at the location. That is silly!

MR. CROSBIE: We will look at the location, we have a grand time, we look at the locations too. The Minister thinks it is silly. I think it is silly the rents the Government is paying. I think it is silly that the Government has not built its own building, that is the silly part.

MR. CHALKER: Well, that may be so but they are the going rents.

MR. CROSBIE: I would say they are not the going rents.

MR. CHALKER: They are the going rents.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, wait until I put my view in and then the Minister can put his view. So it is \$4.63 at Grand Falls the Government is getting in rentals. Now what are some of the rents the Government is paying lately, the Government or Government agencies? These are all in answer to various questions, Mr. Chairman.

In the Prince Philip Building the Government is renting the following space, that is the Prince Philip Building on Elizabeth Avenue. The Workman's Compensation Board is paying a yearly rental in the Prince Philip Building, they have a twenty year lease in the first place which is a very long term lease, they are paying \$6.00 per square foot for office space and \$3.00 per square foot for vault space, the Board is paying a yearly total rent of \$79,164., that is the Workman's Compensation Board. A twenty year lease. Why a twenty year lease? The Workman's Compensation Board is quite capable of constructing its

June 4th, 1970

Tape 1128

JM - 7

MR. CROSBIE:

own building. It has its own funds to invest, it could have its own building,
it could build a building and rent it to other Government agencies with the
funds it has but it is paying \$6.00 a square foot for office space and \$3.00
for vault space and \$79,164. in the Prince Philip Building on a twenty year
lease. Not even a four or five year lease, and not only that but the Board
has to pay \$51,000., using round figures, to prepare the space in the Prince
Philip Building for use as offices and the Board is paying \$200.00 a month to
rent twenty parking spaces for cars which is another \$2400. a year. Now that--

Mr. Crosbie.

Now that is expensive rent for space and particularly when it is a twenty year lease. That is the Workmen's Compensation Board. The Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission are renting 25,962 square feet of space in the Prince Philip Building under a five year lease. Well, at least, it is only a five year lease. That is a bit more sensible. They are paying a rental of \$5.49 per square foot, which is more reasonable also. I would agree that is about the going rate. The total yearly rental of \$142,788 the Power Commission are paying. Now they occupied 16,000 square feet at Pleasantville, and they were not paying any rent, but now they are up in the Prince Philip Building, occupying roughly 26,000 square feet, and they are paying \$142,000 a year on rent. And they pay \$74,100 to move up there. That is what it cost them to change the offices around and move their staff and so on - \$74,000.

The Newfoundland Liquor Commission are renting 6,054 square feet in the Prince Philip Building. Again it is a twenty year lease - a twenty year lease. A twenty year lease, the yearly rent \$32,449 at \$5.36 a square foot. And the Public Utilities Board, another Government agency are renting 7,629 square feet at \$5.50 a square foot - \$41,959 yearly. So, the total rental from these four Government agencies and the money is coming from the pockets of the people of Newfoundland one way or another and are paying \$296,360 a year in rent for the Prince Philip Place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that to me seems to be a crazy Government policy. Here is a Government that knows that Public Utilities Commission, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and the Public Utilities Board are looking and requiring this kind of office space..

MR. EARLE: The Power Commission.

MR. CROSBIE: And the Power Commission, Workmen's Compensation, Liquor Commission and Public Utilities Commission are looking for this kind of office space.

Mr. Crosbie.

I mean, obviously, the Government should then go out and build a building for itself..

MR. CHALKER: You can build with the money.

MR. CROSBIE: What do you mean, they have not got the money - \$296,000 a year in rent.

MR. ROBERTS: Surely, the hon. gentleman knows the difference between paying rent and borrowing the capital...

MR. CROSBIE: I would say borrowing the capital and amortizing it is more sensible. The Government owns the building..

MR. ROBERTS: Screams about debt

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, for something that is self-liquidating one would hardly squeal about borrowing the money.

MR. ROBERTS: It is self-liquidating because we paid for it.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly. Why should you be paying it over to some private owner, when you could be paying it over to yourself and paying off the building.

MR. ROBERTS: Because our studies show that it is cheaper..

MR. CROSBIE. That is the whole point. I would like to see those studies, if they show that that is cheaper.

MR. ROBERTS: All right.

MR. CROSBIE: If the Government could have gone out and built that office building for perhaps \$25 a square foot and the Government - what is so amusing about that?

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to build it for \$25 a square foot.

MR. CHALKER: You could have about seven or eight years ago, yes.

MR. CROSBIE: I tell the minister, today, that the Government could have that building for \$25 a square foot.

MR. ROBERTS: That is incredibly good

MR. MURPHY: On tender now..

MR. ROBERTS: On tender - the Royal Trust Building are renting...

MR. CROSBIE: Let us go big on it and say \$30 a square foot, which is about

Mr. Crosbie.

what the St. John's City Hall is costing and that is quite an elaborate building. So, we will go the whole hog and say \$30 a square foot.

MR. ROBERTS: There is nothing elaborate about that.

MR. CROSBIE: In six years time with these rents, you have the construction costs back..

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, come off it. In six years the money will have doubled itself.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if the minister would let me finish my remarks he would see that I am going to take that into account.

MR. ROBERTS: Go ahead.

MR. CROSBIE: In six years the capital cost - you have got in rentals what you would have to pay for construction and then, of course, you have got the interest and amortizing and so on. The interest today would be nine or ten per cent. So, in ten or eleven years, you would own the building..

MR. CHALKER: It would cost you double.

MR. CROSBIE: At these rents, you would own the building. What do you mean would cost you double? And if you are tied into a twenty year lease...

MR. CHALKER: And maintaining and paying..

MR. CROSBIE: You are maintaining anyway. You do not think that the owner is maintaining and paying for the cleaning and maintenance of the space.

MR. ROBERTS: No, of course not, but we would have to pay it, if we ran our own building.

MR. CROSBIE: They are paying it now. The Workmen's Compensation Board will have to pay it..

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they are.

MR. CROSBIE: The Public Utilities are paying it and the Liquor Commission are paying it.

Mr. Crosbie.

Now if the minister has studies that have been done, carried out by experts that show that occupying space at these rentals is cheaper than the Government putting the building up itself...

MR. ROBERTS: Until we build the extension on this building, of course.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the minister builds the extension on this building and what does he find?

MR. ROBERTS: One twenty year lease.

MR. CROSBIE: Government agencies locked in the twenty year leases.

MR. ROBERTS: Well how many?

MR. CROSBIE: Workmen's Compensation Board - twenty years.

MR. ROBERTS: We use to collect rent from them here in this building.

MR. CROSBIE: The Workmen's Compensation Board does what it is told in these matters.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course we are responsible. But they are a self-financing body..

MR. CROSBIE: A twenty year lease that they are locked into.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they are a self-financing body.

MR. CROSBIE: A twenty year lease that the Liquor Commission are locked into..

MR. ROBERTS: That is a commercial store..

MR. CROSBIE: The Public Utilities, I will have to look it up here. I do not have the answer but the answer to the question is here somewhere. No, I forgot to ask how long a term that lease was. The minister may know. I do not know if it is five years...

MR. CHALKER: Twenty..

MR. CROSBIE: There are two twenty leases and the Government are playing to put an extension on this building.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. We are not going to put a liquor store out there. We are not going to put a liquor store out there.

MR. CROSBIE: The Workmen's Compensation Board could be there. The Workmen's Compensation Board could have built that building. They had the funds to do it.

Mr. Crosbie.

It has funds to invest.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it has funds..

MR. CROSBIE: The minister knows that that is crazy economics. It has funds to invest. A Government agency to be paying \$296,000 a year..

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! come off it. You know better than that.

MR. CROSBIE: If I knew better than that, I would not be saying this. If I knew better, I would not say what I am saying now.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a matter where, perhaps, opinions might differ.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister can have whatever opinion he likes. I am just stating the facts.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. That is damn decent of you.

MR. CHALKER: Watch your language .

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. But that is extremely decent of the hon. member.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister is taking over from the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I would not attempt to improve upon....

MR. CROSBIE: Or is it from the Premier..

MR. ROBERTS: I would not attempt to...

MR. CROSBIE: What is it? What is he appointed Hilter for the night?

MR. ROBERTS: I would not attempt to improve upon either gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: It is the minister's turn to be Hilter for the night, is it?

MR. ROBERTS: All right.

MR. CROSBIE: You let us deal with the Minister of Public Works and everything will go along very smoothly and we will give our views and he can give his. At the moment, I am giving mine.

MR. ROBERTS: On that premise, I will be quiet.

MR. CROSBIE: I think it is outrageous that these rents are being paid, when

Mr. Crosbie.

the Government could have put that structure up itself or the Workmen's Compensation could have.

Now while we are still on rentals, let us go on to some other rentals that are being paid.

MR. CHALKER: You questions are not answered - when they are answered, you complain that they are wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, if you get answers that appear to be incorrect, surely, you should point them out.

MR. CHALKER: No they are not incorrect.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, just look at some other rentals, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHALKER: Made one mistake out of 551 questions. That is a pretty good average.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is a genius of thinking up explanations. Question 170 asked by the member for Humber East. The number of rental purchase buildings constructed for the Newfoundland Liquor Commission since April 1st, 1968? That was the question. How many buildings? What rent so on and so forth?

Now the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are another Government agency. There is a list of them here. They have liquor stores around the Island. There are eighteen places that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are renting. Now a Board of Liquor Control store - a building with a BLC store - you know, a building that only has that, is not an expensive building to construct. It is a simple building. It is a retail store. It can be done \$20 to \$25 a square foot, definitely - not one question about it. Let us see some of the rents that are being paid. Here is a building that is in the name ,Royal Trust Company down at Grand Bank. Now the Royal Trust Company does not own it. They are acting for somebody who is trustee. They are not the owners. It is in their name. The building is located in Grand Bank, length of lease, twenty years. The lease expires February 1st., 1989, the number of square feet, 1,665 square feet. It is only a small amount of space. Rental paid per year, \$12,036.

Mr. Crosbie.

It is \$7.22 a square foot - \$7.22 a square foot. Now that is more expensive than what the Government is paying down here in the Prince Philip Building, which is in St. John's, which is the highest rent area, presumably, in the Province. Three years of that rental will pay for the building - \$7.22. What is the minister's explanation if he deals with that? What is his explanation? Look at Marystown, that is a twenty year lease - Royal Trust Company. It will expire in 1984 - 1,665 square feet - \$10,880 per year is the rent at \$6.53 per square foot. Placentia, a twenty year lease in the name of the Royal Trust Company. The lease does not expire until August 31, 1986 - 1,665 square feet, yearly rental, \$12,240 - \$7.34 per square foot. Whoever did this - whoever advised the Newfoundland Liquor Commission to do it, that they should do it, should be fired for gross incompetence..

MR. MURPHY: The Royal Trust Company should be complimented on the great investment...

MR. CROSBIE: Or somebody or whoever made the investment.

MR. MURPHY: Three guesses and the first two do not count.

MR. CROSBIE: Well that is \$7.34 per square foot. The most expensive space in St. John's would be either Prince Philip or the Royal Trust Building does not get \$7.34 or \$7.22 per square foot and this is for a central little store that you walk into and there are shelves in there. You pick out a bottle of liquor - there is a counter and get your bottle and walk about again and probably a bathroom and some storage space - not elaborate.

MR. CHALKER: It is nice, though. It is attractive.

MR. CROSBIE: Sure it is nice and attractive and it is costing about \$22 a square foot to build in Grand Bank or Marystown or Placentia. Why? And not only \$7.34 a square foot but also a twenty year lease - a twenty year lease. Sure the commission has got the credit of the Newfoundland Government

Mr. Crosbie,

behind it. It is very profitable anyway. It can drive bargains. It can get cheap rents. It can say to an entrepreneur, look, we will give you a ten or twenty year lease, if you build a building for us, but we want a darn good rent. We want that now for \$4.50 or \$5.00. Get your pen out and see if he will do it for that - not for \$7.34 per square foot rental per year and the person who owns the building will have it paid off scott free in five years, at least, allowing for interest and what not at those rentals. It has to.

St. Lawrence - the Burin Peninsula is whipping it on Newfoundland Liquor Commission stores. St. Lawrence..

MR. HICKMAN: I wish you would stay away from the Burin Peninsula.

MR. CROSBIE: A twenty year lease. This is not doing anyone down on the Burin Peninsula any good - the high rents are not.

St. Lawrence, a twenty year lease, expires February 1st., 1989 - 1,665 square feet - rental \$12,036 per year - \$7.22 per square foot. That is another high one. Now what space on the Burin Peninsula rents for even \$5.00 a square foot? It is just crazy business whoever arranged this. It should be dismissed. Any man who arranged that should certainly be commemorated or remembered. Now there are other BLC places around the Province where they rented space at various times. Carrol Lake \$4.00 a square foot. Now these are different years, but I am showing that some of the rentals are lower. That is a five year lease. Buchanan is quite low; St. John's , \$5.00; Mount Pearl - here is Mount Pearl, warehouse space, \$4.00 a square foot; Gordonna Ltd., a twenty year lease, It expires in 1986. It is 7,000 - \$4.00 a square foot. That is high for warehouse space; particularly on a twenty year lease. Then there is Philip Place here in St. John's . Here is Philip Place which is \$5.35 a square foot - the modern building over here; Grand Bank, St. Lawrence, Placentia and all these other metropolitan areas \$7.22 and \$7.34.

MR. MURPHY: It is cheaper by the dozen.

Mr. Crosbie.

Lewisporte \$5.83; Clarenville \$5.10 a square foot; Deer Lake \$5.10; Churchill Square, St. John's Housing, \$4;00 a square foot; Stephenville \$2.77. That is a reasonable one. That was entered into in 1965. Wabush \$4.21 a square foot and entered into in 1965. Altogether the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are paying, according to this answer, \$222,696 rental per year for these various Board of Liquor Control stores.

Now whoever is operating the real estate management branch of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission or if it is the Department of Public Works, the person responsible for these latest leases should go or he should be transferred to some other job where he cannot do serious and grievous damage to the public interest.

Now, I would like to hear the minister or somebody from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission justify twenty year leases at \$7.22 and \$7.34 per square foot. It cannot be justified. The board has money to burn - money to burn. It certainly has enough money that if it has to have stores around - if it cannot get people to build better stores and rent them at a better rent, it can build its own, because it will save in rental in four or five years the cost of building a whole lot of them.

MR. CHALKER: In theory.

MR. CROSBIE: In theory or not. I mean the figures speak for themselves. Now the minister has to agree that those rents are outrageous. I cannot believe that the minister has had anything to do with this. Here is another interesting rental situation. This is question 178: the names of all persons or corporations within the City of St. John's or five miles thereof from whom the Government is renting office or storage space? St. John's Housing Corporation, 100 Elizabeth Avenue - that is the famous Elizabeth Towers - the following Government agencies are renting space in the Elizabeth Towers - now this is the only thing that is saving the Elizabeth Towers from collapsing altogether. If the Government were not doing this, it would be practically getting no revenue. The apartments are not rented. Here they are! Newfoundland

Mr. Crosbie;

and Labrador Water Authority - a five year lease -(Well thank God we have come across a five year lease and not a twenty year one) 1,686 square feet. They are paying \$7,587. Newfoundland Medical Care Commission are there - five year lease - \$43,125 and that is \$5.75 a square foot.

Now the Government are paying the Government itself more reasonable rentals than the Government are paying to other people, because this money is going from one pocket in to meet the deficits of Elizabeth Towers and the other pocket - that is \$5.75. The Newfoundland Medical Care Commission , additional space, 964 square feet, \$4,338 a year. The St. John's Metropolitan Area Board - five year lease - 1,300 square feet - \$6,500 a year at \$5.00 a square foot. Now that is getting reasonable - \$5.00 a square foot. The Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, 100 Elizabeth Avenue, a ten year lease, 15,991 square feet - \$92,140 a year. Now these are five Government agencies renting space in Elizabeth Towers and they are paying Elizabeth Towers - \$153,690 a year in rent. The rents are reasonable for modern office space - \$5.00 to \$5.75 to \$5.80. The term of the lease is not too long, five years. The longest one is ten.

The Government, when it is dealing with Elizabeth Towers, which God knows needs the money. because, you know, it is losing, it is going to have a deficit anyway every year, at least, negotiates a half decent lease. We will come to Elizabeth Towers too. Will we deal with ^{it} here or will we deal with it in Municipal Affairs?

MR. CHALKER: That is under my department.

MR. CROSBIE: Okay, fine. Now, the Government have the Elizabeth Towers there. These agencies needed space, well it is reasonable to put them down in Elizabeth Towers and try to save it but at least the Government was reasonable with itself. It did not allow Elizabeth Towers Ltd to give it a real dubbing.

There is mother - if a building has been built for the Public Utilities

Mr. Crosbie

Board, Workmen's Compensation, the Power Commission, Water Authority, Medicare, Metropolitan Board and Computer Services, you are going to have a jim-dandy of a building built and there will be another \$153,000 rent a year, making a total of \$453,000 a year in rent which the Government could be paying on that building. Now do not tell me. I am prepared to learn and accept it that it would not have been good economics for the Government to put up a building to put those agencies into and that it would not have saved and certainly would be saving in four or five years a tremendous lot of money for the Government. Well the rest of the rentals - the rest of the property that the Government are renting is also listed here, but there is no point of going into it all.

Now there is something wrong Mr. Minister with the rental policy of the Government: It is just not sound in anyway at all and the Government is going to put an extension onto this building, when the money loosens up,

MR. CROSBIE: we are told, and all these concerns here, except the five year, even the five year leases are not going to have a chance to get out of their leases for five years.

Shopping centre space today you can get in St. John's for four dollars to five dollars a square foot.

MR. CHALKER: It is commercial space?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, an office or a shopping space, now a big groceteria, or a big triple A tenant, who takes a lot of space, he gets it for \$2.00 or \$2.50 a square foot. And the small little speciality store have to pay more.

MR. CHALKER: He has to pay a percentage of his profits, has he not?

MR. CROSBIE: Right. This is why I am saying that \$4 to \$5 -

MR. CHALKER: Why do I have to put words, why can I not tell the truth.

MR. CROSBIE: Do you want me to tell the whole story on how you can rent shopping centre space, I will do it. Four dollars to five dollars a square foot. I am just pointing out, if you are a triple tenant in a big supermarket and so on, you will get it a lot cheaper.

Retail store space, I am told, can be constructed for \$12 to \$15 a square foot. Warehouse space rents from between \$1.50 to \$2.50 per square foot in St. John's, for \$2.50 a square foot a tenant can expect a fairly new building, sprinklered, concrete blocked construction, loading doors and heat included in the rent, \$2.50 per square foot, in that kind of a building, and the Government is paying \$4.00 on a twenty year lease.

The Royal Trust Building down on Water Street, a very modern building, here is what you can do with the Royal Trust Building, here is how you can rent space there, \$5. to \$6.25 a square foot, the term is a five year lease minimum, not twenty years, a five year lease, and the rent varies according to your location in the building. In other words it varies with the floor that you are on. That is the Royal Trust Building.

The Prince Philip Building is \$5.50 to \$6.75 per square foot, a five year lease minimum. The rent does not vary with the term of the lease. Now, if the

MR. CROSBIE: Government had not taken all that space in the Prince Philip Building, was there sufficient commercial demands in St. John's to take all that space? It is very unlikely.

MR. CHALKER: I would not know.

MR. CROSBIE: I say it is very unlikely.

The Department of Community and Social Development is paying \$6 a square foot for space.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. CROSBIE: The Gordonna Building.

AN HON. MEMBER: I still cannot hear you.

MR. CROSBIE: Out on the Kenmount Road. And the Government rents space itself in Grand Falls for \$4.63. Now it is a good thing the Government is not renting down in Grand Bank, or down in St. Lawrence or down in Placentia or Marystown.

MR. HICKMAN: You just do not understand the buoyant economy we have down on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. CROSBIE: And the Royal Trust Building is the only building getting more than \$5 a square foot from commercial or professional interests. That might be exaggerated, and still there are others between \$5 and \$6.

Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps you have some light to throw on all of this business to show us that it does not make any sense, but certainly on the information that we have got, it would appear that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and the various Government agencies have entered into very, very poor rental arrangements, poor economically, they tied themselves in for twenty years, when they should not have. Now they are stuck with it, the high rents for twenty years.

We have not seen the leases, Mr. Chairman, we do not know what else they are paying for. I would venture to guess, in most cases they are paying for light, paying for their own cleaning, paying for parking spaces.

MR. CHALKER: No one have seen the leases. I can inform the hon. gentleman, that they have yet to be prepared.

MR. CROSBIE: They are Government agencies, Mr. Chairman, moved in for months into these buildings. And still the Government says there is no lease entered into yet. Gross negligence again. Why not?

MR. CHALKER: The slowest people in Newfoundland today are the lawyers, it takes a year -

MR. CROSBIE: I will tell you a few who are not so slow, ^{if} there is good money in it, they do it pretty quick. Do you not pay your lawyer?

MR. CHALKER: Oh, I pay my lawyers, I happen to have no trouble with them.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister knows just as well as I do, it is just not reasonable, here is Prince Philip Place, the Workmens Compensation Board moved in months ago, Public Utilities, the Power Commission, and we are told that the leases are not available yet.

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman can move justice, he can literally move mountains.

MR. CROSBIE: Justice is slowed down a lot, since the previous minister left.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, everything is coming up in the House.

MR. CROSBIE: How do you like that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is good, that is marvelous.

MR. CROSBIE: I am glad the Premier liked that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very tempting remarks.

MR. HICKMAN: There is a plot on between the Premier and member for St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a conspiracy on between the hon. the member for Burin and myself. So that is a pretty sorry record, Mr. Chairman, a pretty sorry record. And I would like to hear what the minister's explanation of it is?

MR. CHALKER: I would like to answer them altogether, Mr. Chairman, if I may, because there is going to be a lot of duplications. I will try and sieve out the proper things, and answer them in my usual intelligent manner.

MR. MURPHY: I am glad the minister has such a high opinion of himself. I trust it is shared by the rest of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into any great detail. I think the hon. member, my assistant, has done a very good job there on this. There are just one or two items I would like to mention.

In the passed number of months, in fact the passed number of years, this side of the House has been criticizing to some great extent the real estate deals with the present Government, I think, that is where a lot of our money has been wasted basically.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. the member for Humber East this afternoon raised a question concerning the Janeway Apartments costing \$3, 052,000. The Architect's fees alone were in the vicinity of \$170,000. That raised the first thought in my mind, if the Government have not architects within their Department of Public Works to do this work, why we should have to go outside and get architects, and it must run in over the years to many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Millions.

MR. MURPHY: Millions possibly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Millions.

MR. MURPHY: I do not use the word "millions", it is strickly a Liberal statement millions. We do not use that.

MR. WELLS: When you people take over the Government, it will be trillions.

MR. MURPHY: When we take over the Government, pretty soon, I guess we will have to apply it to the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation to help us out.

Question 2 - Where tenders called for the construction of the said apartment complex? If not, why not?

Now this is a point that has been stressed on many occasions by every group that has examined the economic policy of this Government. Tenders were not called, as negotiations with the construction firm, who were already on the site with equipment and supplies in connection with repairs and alternations to the Janeway Hospital construction. and reconstruction, would make considerable savings possible.

Now. Mr. Chairman, how anybody can figure that out, when we look at many large businesses, and again I refer to the St. John's Municipal Council who have adopted in late years, and possibly for many years, the calling of tenders. And one reads in the newspapers where even on smaller jobs, there is variance of from twenty to twenty-five percent between the lowest and the highest tender. And how anybody can honestly tell this House, that this was a savings, without comparing prices from other construction companies.

These apartments were furnished with electric stove, frig, electric washer etc. Now there is just a wide open thing, here is a building, you go and build it \$154 I wonder who did the electrical work on these buildings? Who did the plumbing?

MR. MURPHY: Who supplied these appliances? It is no good of asking the question here in the House, were tenders called for these, or who supplied them? Because the minister will tell us, he does not know because the contractor dealt with other sub-contractors. Now this is the way, and I maintain this, and I maintained it for years, and I still maintain it, that so many friends of this Government are enabled to make a darn good living, because they are not obliged at anytime to compete with other firms. It is just a carte blanche. Look you go and do the building, -if it cost, this could have cost \$5 million, easily it could have cost \$5 million, and not one person could say a word about the cost of this building, because no tenders were called. There were no comparison between one firm and another. But this firm can apparently go ahead and build buildings when they want to. They are liable to come in here tomorrow with a key to the Minister of Public Works, and say, "look, that building we built for you down there in Twillingate is finished." And the hon. the minister may not know what building he is talking about. May not know! And that is what has been happening. That is where our money is being squandered, wasted, thrown away. No wonder we are facing the crisis we are facing, with reference to the monies that we owe.

The hon. the member for St. John's West mentioned again a point, I think. I brought the question up in the House in the first instance on this Philip Place Building. Three hundred odd thousand dollars in rents. Amazing, amazing. And he did not mention. While we have no control over the Federal Government Departments that are rented in that building, I would like to know the owners of that building, this Philip Place, and what revenue they are getting, not only from this Government but from the Federal Government. What these services cost for these apartments, we do not know. I do not know, if tenders were called for the electrical work, and the hon. minister will tell me that, he does not know, he just gave someone permission to go down and build a building. The same as this building here. You get who you like to put the plumbing in, if he charges a \$100,000, you go ahead, it is all right with us. We have barrels of money, the people of Newfoundland can throw it right, left and centre.

Some questions are being answered as to the cost of these apartments. I think, when it was estimated first, it was \$50 a square foot. Now, I think, it has been corrected, it is down to \$30.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, no, now he even got me scared. It is \$22.98 per square foot, that is the building itself.

MR. MURPHY: \$22.98?

MR. CHALKER: Now your hon. friend from Humber East, he just put in the figures, as he feels and puts the point in -

MR. MURPHY: The original figures we obtained, you just divide the number of square feet into the cost, and that is where he came up with his cost. But, I think, it came back afterwards where the hon. minister told us, that instead of multiplying the figure 50,000 by two, some way along the way.

MR. CHALKER: I made a mistake, and I will apologize for it now.

MR. MURPHY: "I made a mistake." Well, was it not a mistake on the part of the hon. the member for Humber East?

MR. CHALKER: No, no, no, he still had a mistake.

MR. MURPHY: He took the original figures.

MR. CHALKER: He is still contending it, after knowing it.

MR. HICKMAN:\$50,000 in the park.

MR. CHALKER: No, I could say that it could be a \$100,000, if I added everything else into it, and that is stupidity.

MR. MURPHY: No, no.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, it is.

MR. MURPHY: As I say the hon. the member for St. John's West has gone pretty well over all the details. That has been discussed in the House, since we opened. And I am sure when we get down to the actual items under the different headings, we will get what information we need on it. But one of the great mysteries, and one of great suspicion is our rent from the Board of Liquor Control Stores particularly from the Royal Trust Company, we would like to know who is the Royal Trust Company, and who is using the nom de plume? And to whom are these being paid?

MR. CHALKER: I would not know.

MR. MURPHY: It seems to be a great business. Great work if you can get it to go out and build a little store, a bulls-eye shop, and get the rent that we are paying

MR. MURPHY: for them over a period of years. I think, these are some of the questions that we might get answers to on the estimates. Twenty year leases, prominent plans of the Government, just build a building. I do not know, they told me on this Philip Place there was no prior agreement made on the building, any agreements made, any leases undertook, before the building was actually built. Anybody that is a devote and faithful Liberal apparently, there is no trouble to get excessive rents from this Government.

The Expo Buildings, I think, there is a vote in it, so we will discuss that when we come to the vote.

MR. CHALKER: There is not one, but we will put one in.

MR. MURPHY: For Expo Buildings. Grand Bank is going to get its museum this year. Are you happy over that?

MR. CHALKER: I am. I can tell you that.

MR. MURPHY: So, Mr. Chairman, that is the few words I have to say, and when we get down to the estimates of course, we can discuss item for item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I always felt that I represented a highly industrialized district, with a pretty high standard of living, but I suppose, I should take a great deal of pride in the fact, that our rentals are so much higher in that area than anywhere else in the Province. But, I am inclined to agree with the hon. the member for St. John's West that these rents are not at all realistic, when you bear in mind what few building there are in the area that are presently being rented to other agencies.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have had before us a large number of questions concerning the leases that are about to be entered into with the owners of Prince Philip Building. And the answers that we have been consistently getting, since February, are that the leases are still in the hands of the Department of Justice or the draftsmen or the lawyers for the owners of the buildings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me draw to your attention that the Workmens Compensation Board and the Public Utilities Board have been occupying these buildings for quite sometime. Before this House commenced this session, if I recall correctly,

MR. HICKMAN: and I feel reasonably certain that before that building was constructed, if the owners are at all prudent, that they would have had a letter of intent from perspective tenants, in fact that is the only way you can raise money to put up an office building, is that you get a letter of intent from perspective tenants before you start construction, you go out and borrow your money.

And I find it a bit difficult to accept and understand, that if you assume that they have a standard lease for all Government agencies moving into the Prince Philip Building, that we have to wait for many, many months, or wait from last Fall for the leases to receive final approval, wait since last September for the leases to receive final approval. What I would like to have, and I am sure this Committee would like to have, is an assurance from the minister that if and when these leases are signed, that the leases will be a standard form lease. Now, if we have to accept the fact, that these high rentals are going to be paid -

MR. CHALKER: Would that not be more or less the job of the Department of Justice?

MR. HICKMAN: No, that is a matter of policy, Mr. Chairman. Any department of Government can arrive, or the Government itself makes a policy decision. It gives its instructions to the lawyers in the Department of Justice to carry them out. And if certain terms and conditions are agreed to for a lease or a tenancy, then it is not to be within the discretion or the draftsmen, be they the lawyers for the landlord or the tenant to change them.

And what I would like to have from the minister is an assurance that these leases will contain the standard clauses, the standard obligations on the part of the tenants and no more. And, Mr. Chairman, the standard lease of commercial premises in this city, the lease that is used by the Elizabeth Towers or St. John's Housing Corporation, and by the Royal Trust Company, and by the owners of the building up near the Grace Hospital, provide for a fixed rental for a number of years. Say five years, generally it is five years. The only escalation provision, there is in that lease, is that in the event there is an increase in Municipal taxes, which is something over which a landlord has no control, that

MR. HICKMAN: the tenant will pay his proportion of that increase in tax.

And that is the standard lease. There is no establishment in Newfoundland that would have a more onerous clause in it than that, or any other escalation clause.

And what I would like from the minister is a firm assurance that when these leases come to him for approval, and for the life of me I cannot understand why they have been hanging around since September, there will not be any undertaking in that lease, that in the event that there is an increase in general operating costs, and I repeat this very slowly, in the event that there is an increase in operating costs. that this will not be passed on to the tenants.

Because -

MR. CHALKER: Is that usual? Is that usual?

MR. HICKMAN: I know of no lease in Newfoundland where it has been contained.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the advantage in twenty year leases, we get fixed rents for twenty years.

MR. HICKMAN: That is correct, or be it for five years, or ten years, or fifteen years, or twenty years, whatever the term is, you get fixed rents with the only escalation permitted or agreed to is an escalation, if city taxes go up. But not if the cost of a janitorial services increases, or not if the cost of maintenance goes up, that is the landlords problem. And I would like a firm assurance from the Minister of Public Works, that he will not sign a lease that contains that type of clause in it, that provides for an escalation covering maintenance costs. The rents are high enough anyway. But, that I think is most important. Now, I have no doubt at all, that the hon. minister has never seen a lease with that sort of provision in it. But I would ask for his assurance that he will not permit any department, or any agency of the Crown to sign a lease with the Prince Philip Building containing that type of escalation clause.

MR. CHALKER: Right now I will not, because I do not think we have any leases like that in the department at all, I never heard of one.

MR. HICKMAN: I have no hesitancy in saying. that you will not find it in any existing lease in this Province. I am not saying this without some very good reason.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the member for St. John's West has referred to the advantages that would have accrued to Government if we had built our own building. May I direct the Committee's attention to the fact that in the Winter Report, that was filed and tabled in this House in 1966 by the late Mr. Justice H.A. Winter, who chaired the review committee examining the Workman's Compensation Act, that that Committee recommended very strongly that the Workman's Compensation Board build its own building and the logical course to have followed was not only for the Workman's Compensation Board to put up the building but, at that time, in 1966, it had a prime tenant looking for space and that was the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. The logical place for buildings housing that type of operation, I suggest, was in downtown St. John's because that is where you find most of the people who come in seeking assistance from the Workman's Compensation. Many of them have great difficulty moving around the city, they would not be in here, if they were not disabled, looking for Workman's Compensation. Most of them gravitate around that part of St. John's and this Prince Philip Building offers them no advantage at all, none.

The only advantage that accrues to the Prince Philip Building is that the staff have no difficulty in parking and I suggest that even though the staff may be very commendable people that the service of the public, the service to the clients, for want of a better word, to the Workman's Compensation Board, comes first and I have no doubt at all that in that city of tall complex there would have been lots of space for the Workman's Compensation Board to have put up its own building.

But, Mr. Chairman, these answers (and the hon. the member for St. John's West referred to some of them) I am sure that when you look over and examine the rentals that are being paid say in the city of St. John's by various Government agencies one is struck by the fact that there is absolutely no rhyme nor reason, no yardstick or formula being applied to the buildings and all these buildings apparently are fairly new buildings. For instance, I note in the answer to one of the questions that the rental being paid to St. Andrews Presbyterian Church on Queens Road is \$14,000. The Receiver General charges

MR. HICKMAN:

for the new building on the Experimental Farm, I presume it is the new building, \$626.00. Then further up we see that here these are short term leases or three of them are yearly leases. Then we look further up the list and we find that the Board of Liquor Control on a twenty year lease is paying \$20,000. a year to Mr. J.D. Frazer for a building on Water Street, a twenty year lease at \$5.00 a square foot. But if you look at the type of buildings that are being occupied now by Crown Corporations, they all seem to be fairly good, new. The Prince Philip Place, there again the Royal Trust is the agent, and Elizabeth Towers and the Gordonna Limited, (I do not know who that is) Building in St. John's, all of these are long term leases at, I suggest, rents that are above the market rents that are going in St. John's at this time.

I have no quarrel with anyone who wants to promote and put up a building and who has to go around and look for tenants and get letters of intent but why do they always have to take advantage of the Government? Why is it the Government has to be picked on as sort of the sucker? That we can get more out of Government than we can get out of anyone else so we will nail them and take them for a ride and we will get enough out of Government to pay for the building in a short time and the rest of it is pure gravy.

Mr. Chairman, maybe all Governments everywhere are suckers for anyone who comes around with a quick buck and silver tongue but I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, that particularly when we know that in the case of the Workman's Compensation Board we have this recommendation from this highly reputable committee that the funds were available to invest and this would have been first class security with the assured tenants that Government knew of should have known were available at that time, nobody was risking Workman's Compensation funds and to pass up that and wander into the luxurious and, I suggest, inconvenient Prince Philip Building is something that is rather difficult to justify.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of argument back and forth between the hon. the Minister and the member for Humber East as to just how much these Janeway Apartments cost to build. But I do suggest and I am sure the hon. Minister would have to agree that the reason that was given for not

MR. HICKMAN:

calling tenders is a pretty lame one. It certainly is not something that is followed by prudent building owners.

MR. CHALKER: You are like thousands of young children by just rushing ahead with that now.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, alright -

MR. HICKMAN: Well, let me give the hon. Minister a very good example of another institution that looks after the health and welfare of young children and sick people in this Province. Just take a look at St. Clares Hospital. St. Clares Hospital had a contract let to the lowest bidder, Seaboard Construction, for the boiler house. Now they are on the grounds so that if you followed the philosophy that was used in the Janeway then obviously you would negotiate with Seaboard to put up the rest of the hospital.

MR. CHALKER: Then follow the years and put 1966 against now when everybody is looking for work.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, not everybody looking for work. This contract was let last year.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, be reasonable.

MR. HICKMAN: But what the Board of St. Clares did was a prudent thing and you do what any Board would do.

MR. CHALKER: Did you hear about the hospital equipment and the extra \$200,000. and \$300,000. there?

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know anything about the hospital equipment.

MR. CHALKER: Well, I know about it.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, maybe you do. Maybe the hon. Minister knows about it.

MR. CHALKER: You left it in a mess.

MR. HICKMAN: Maybe I did leave a mess.

MR. CHALKER: I found it.

MR. HICKMAN: Good for you. I am glad you did find it.

MR. CHALKER: \$5.5 million it is going to cost you.

MR. HICKMAN: Pardon.

MR. CHALKER: Look, will you get back to Public Works, you are getting too -

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, this is not, Mr. Chairman. What I want to say is this and what I am trying to say is that the reasoning used that because a contractor is on the grounds a Government agency cannot spare a month or two months or three months to call tenders and simply has to renegotiate or to negotiate with the contractors or they just will not add up. That is where the St. Clares Hospital Corporation were very prudent and that is where that is a very comparable example that rather than take the contractor who was there they went back and called bids for the next phase of their construction.

MR. ROBERTS: There was a two year difference in the -

MR. HICKMAN: Not two years difference between the time of completion of the two jobs.

MR. ROBERTS: Not completion, no. One is not completed yet.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. Two years between the time of the calling of the contract on number one and number two but Seaboard were still on the job -

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they were.

MR. HICKMAN: And if you follow the theory -

MR. ROBERTS: And I suppose they are still there, I do not know.

MR. HICKMAN: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this and the hon. Minister will not listen. If you follow the reasoning and the theory behind the Janeway Hospital then you would never call contracts for the second phase of any building development. You would simply take the contractor who is already on the job. There has to be a better reason than that and anyone knows that if you want to save money the way to save money particularly when contractors are hungry for business is to go to tender. You never lose by going to tender.

MR. CHALKER: We go for tender all the time.

MR. HICKMAN: You did not go to tender on the Janeway.

MR. CHALKER: We could not at the time.

MR. HICKMAN: Why not?

MR. CHALKER: Because I said it was an emergency.

MR. HICKMAN: What sort of an emergency?

MR. CHALKER: We handle thousands of emergencies, we may have -

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, Mr. Emergency!

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, if I may -

MR. HICKMAN: Emergency to -

MR. CHALKER: I would like you to finish first because I have an answer to everything you ask.

MR. HICKMAN: What sort of an emergency could there have been at the Janeway that you could not have spared a month or two months to go to tender to put up accommodation to house the staff of the Janeway, not to house the sick children if they came, but to house the staff of the Janeway? What sort of an emergency could there have been and, Mr. Chairman, surely when the Janeway was under construction the hon. Minister must have been able to estimate the time when this construction would be completed and surely any prudent Minister would have been able to anticipate and know then that staff accommodation was necessary, so call tender six months before. If there was any emergency then the emergency obviously was created because this had not been foreseen in the Department of Public Works and suddenly the Janeway is ready for occupancy and everyone says, "An emergency, let us negotiate with the contractor."

MR. CHALKER: Right and it is not the first time they did either with many other contractors.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, why is it that Governments and business and everyone else deem it to be prudent to go to tender and to call tender and call public tenders, to open public tenders, to allow those who tendered the right if they so desire, to be present at the opening? Why do they do it?

MR. CHALKER: That is not our policy, it never has been.

MR. HICKMAN: But obviously other people do it for the very good reason that they want to save money. That is the only good reason why you call tenders, you want to save money. Now if a fellow is in business out in Corner Brook or St. John's and he does not want to call a tender or a fellow is building a house and he does not want to go to tender that is his own business, it is his money. But when you deal with public monies then surely the obligation to go to tenders is something that just cannot be gotten around. If the hon. Minister can explain to me or to this House any other good reason why people go to tenders, why Governments call tenders, why Municipalities call tenders,

MR. HICKMAN:

school boards go to tender, why they all do this, tell me some other reason other than they want to save money and they know by experience that you can save money, I would like to hear it?

No, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the suggestion; that because the contractor is already on the grounds doing another job, then it is more prudent to go out and negotiate a contract that results in the building of these apartments at the Janeway, which my friend from Humber East said works out to \$50,000. per apartment.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, that is his figures.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, supposing he is out ten per-cent or he is out twenty-per-cent -

MR. CHALKER: He could be out thirty per-cent.

MR. HICKMAN: Or even thirty per-cent.

MR. CROSBIE: No, he is exactly right.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, whether he is exactly right or take the Minister's word for it that he is out thirty per-cent let me draw the Minister's attention -

MR. CHALKER: I said supposing, I never said it was a fact I said supposing.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, supposing he was that far out, let me draw the Minister's attention to the fact that right now on Kenna's Hill in the development that has been going ahead down there, the Federal Provincial Development, by tender, that they are building three bedroom apartments at a cost per apartment of \$21,000. -

MR. CHALKER: Ah, come on now, compare the apartments!

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, compare the apartments, compare the workmanship of the material and the carpets may not be quite as thick but the outside materials, the main structure of the buildings are just as good and even if they were not quite as good there is a great difference between \$21,000. and \$50,000. and you should expect something a little more luxurious than you are getting down there.

MR. CHALKER: Well, they are fireproof, absolutely fireproof, sound proof -

MR. HICKMAN: I hope they are more sound proof than Elizabeth Towers.

MR. CHALKER: I do not know. I never slept there.

MR. HICKMAN: If ever there was a building put up in this Province that was

MR. HICKMAN:

supposed to be sound proof and it is not, anyone who has been in any of these apartments -

MR. CHALKER: They are supposed to be one hundred per-cent sound proof but I never lived in an apartment so I have no idea -

MR. HICKMAN: I know; and regretfully this building, Elizabeth Towers is advertised as a sound proof building. Well, I have been in the apartments of this building and -

MR. CHALKER: With your ear to the wall.

MR. HICKMAN: You do not have to put your ear to the wall, in fact you hear if you are on one side of the apartment you can hear what is going on over in the apartment on the far side of that apartment. Somebody -

MR. CHALKER: Static electricity.

MR. HICKMAN: No it is not static electricity. I suggest that there was not a careful inspection by the architects and that is the job of an architect because he gets paid a supervising fee to see that the specifications are met and to see that the sound proofing was properly put in and that has not been done.

MR. CHALKER: I hear that gentleman has bolted, somebody told me the other day.

MR. HICKMAN: He has what?

MR. CHALKER: He has bolted, he left the Province.

MR. HICKMAN: Maybe he shot his bolt. But be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister has to be the first to admit that the cost to Government of doing business seems to be astronomically high when compared with that of private individuals or private business and whilst any Government seems to be taken for a bit of a ride on this type of work and this type of construction yet I do suggest and I would hope that the Minister agrees that a great deal of money can be saved by public tendering and by the public opening of tenders.

MR. CHALKER: In many instances, yes.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, why do we not do it, it is a matter of policy.

MR. CHALKER: In many instances we do.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about rentals and other things concerning public buildings. I was encouraged by the Minister's inference

MR. COLLINS:

just now that he is going to show some funds in the estimates for the Expo building and on the basis of what the Premier said a couple of weeks ago and what the Minister says now I suppose we can assume that the section of the Czech building to go in at Gander will be getting under way pretty soon, that is the construction of it and hopefully we will see the completion late this year or early next year.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few points I would like to bring the Minister's attention and have a comment from him on. In the town of Gander for instance we have various Government Departments who are exercising their responsibility in performing services of various kinds to the citizens of the town and indeed the citizens of the area served by the town. First of all we have the Department of Justice there and the Magistrate's Court in rented space in the shopping centre, we have the Department of Community and Social Development occupying rented space in another section of the shopping centre, we have the Department of Welfare occupying a fair amount of space in a section of the shopping centre, we have the Department of Health, we have the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and -

MR. CHALKER: You are looking for a public building.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is anticipating what I am about to say. Certainly with so many Government Departments around there, a fair number of staff there is every good reason why we should have a Provincial building in the town. As it is now it is a terrible inconvenience to the public not knowing many times where to go or where to find the office which they need to find. People coming into the town from other areas looking for service are caught in the same squeeze. It certainly is an inconvenience to the public. It is the cause of inefficiency in a great many instances on the part of the very fine civil servants who occupy those particular offices. Certainly it results in inadequate services to the public of the town and the area which Gander serves.

Now, Sir, I am not aware of the rentals which are being paid per square foot of space to the various places in the town, perhaps the Minister could indicate that to us when I sit down. One other observation I would like to make is that some years ago, possibly five or six years ago, I might be out

MR. COLLINS:

a little bit as it might be seven or eight or it might be four or five, but roughly five or six years ago the Board of Liquor Control saw fit to erect a building, a retail building in the town. It is not all that elaborate but it has served the purpose of a retail store for the sale of liquors, wines and beers and so on. It has been a little bit of a drawing card possibly for the business men who stuck their necks out years ago and invested a fair amount of money in that particular shopping area when there was a lot of people not only in Gander but all over Newfoundland that were crying doom, the town could never survive but business men did invest their monies and we all know that the town has prospered and is still growing and it has a great future.

I am being told now, Sir, that in spite of the fact that this is a new building and it has only been there for five or six years -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which building are you referring to?

MR. COLLINS: I am talking about the Board of Liquor Control building, Mr. Chairman. It has been in use about five or six years and I am told now that there is a plan to demolish that particular building and already arrangements have been made to rent space in the proposed shopping mall which is in the South East land development area of the town. I have had several telephone calls and some communications by mail from business men in the area who are quite naturally and quite rightly complaining and objecting to this particular move because they feel that if the Liquor Store is a drawing card in terms of attracting people to a particular area then since they were the first ones to have occupied a shopping centre and indeed built a shopping centre in Gander they are the ones who should receive every consideration now and not some new firm which might be coming in and starting a new shopping centre.

Now I would like the Minister to indicate to me if this is true, if the new Liquor Store is being demolished, if plans are already made to occupy space in a new shopping mall? That is about the only comment I have to make, Mr. Chairman. Just about everything else has been covered by previous members and perhaps the Minister might like to react to that.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great degree of interest to particularly the first speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West, and it amazes me at the prodigious amount of work that he must have put into his research, because I am sure, if it is reported quite accurately, the facts and figures which he quoted, and facts and figures, which I have, no doubt demonstrate the fiscal irresponsibility of this Government. And it was very revealing.

Now while I listened with this amount of attention, unfortunately I have to compare the area in which I live with the amount of government investment and the government buildings that have been installed, particularly in St. John's. And I have to compare it with the district of Labrador West. Now there are not too many things that I can complain about - about government buildings in Labrador West, because Mr. Chairman, there are none. When I say that, I am referring specifically politics - we all know the essence of politics Mr. Chairman. It seems to be today that the one who promises the most gets elected. Now I am referring specifically to one, and I say just one of the promises, and not alone was this a promise Mr. Chairman, this was a Bill, an Act that was passed in this House on March 25, 1966, by coincidence the year of the last provincial election. And I am sure it was just a coincidence. March 25, 1966. And this Act Mr. Chairman, was an Act Respecting The Construction of a Public Building in Western Labrador. In Wabush.

Now I think the suggestion was made by the previous leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, at one time in this House of Assembly, when he said that it may be a good idea, based on the geography of the Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, if you were to hold or to establish, or to hold Cabinet meetings in Labrador, in order to make Labrador a vital part of this Province.

Well Mr. Chairman, at that time, when that suggestion was made, I viewed it in the term that it was creating a vaster distinction in the minds of the people, than the name Newfoundland and Labrador. So I did

not agree with that suggestion at that time, but since that suggestion was made, we have had an effort made on the part of this Government to draw the West Coast of this Province to make it feel sort of a kin to the Avalon Peninsula, and to St. John's, in that a government building was established in Corner Brook, where allegedly Cabinet meetings were to be held. I do not know how many have been held there, but allegedly Cabinet meetings were to be held.

Now in the passing of this Bill, this Act that was passed on March 25, 1966, respecting the construction of a public building in Western Labrador, I respectfully submit Mr. Chairman, that if this had been carried out, and I know that I am going to hear all kinds of excuses. I am not saying it is the hon. minister's fault. I am not saying it is the hon. minister's fault at all. Just that today I listened to the Hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, and I heard him explain some of the answers to some of the questions that I had asked. And I heard him explain quite logically why some of the things that had been promised had not been done. I am not blaming the minister, but I am blaming people, who for political reasons, who made promises that they know cannot be implemented. And if this Act Mr. Chairman, was passed in 1966, of March 1966, that is four years ago, that is ample time. I cannot see why the basis of this Bill has not been carried out, because this is what Labrador West essentially needs. We need the attention. We need to be made feel that this Government that is established on the Island of Newfoundland - that it does have our interest at heart. And we do not want to listen to these promises, and we do not want to see Bills passed that are passed for no other purpose than the reason that there is going to be an election that year.

Now every time that I come to this Island to attend sessions of this House, or on other business, I carry with me - I do thirty or forty chores for people who are not in a position based on their geographically location in Labrador - picking up licences for various things - motor registration - picking up drivers' licences - going to every conceivable department with

small queries, queries that I should not even have to be bothered with. And this could be completely eliminated. And not alone eliminated, it could instill in the feeling of the people - of the residents of Labrador West and Labrador, that their interests were being looked after - if this Act had been implemented.

be

Now I know I am going to be told it is tight money. Vietnam, probably is going to be the reason that this building was not constructed. Cambodia now, exactly. The tight money; sure. But there is enough money to pay for the Bulletin, the Newfoundland Bulletin.

Mr. Chairman, I say in part this Bill reads, Section 10, Page 29 - "Her Majesty represented by the minister and the Crown Company may separately enter into execute and deliver agreements with any company or person providing for the construction of a building in Western Labrador for use as a public building and the construction and establishment of such other ancillary buildings, erections and improvements as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may approve. Or providing for the financing of all or any of such construction and establishment or providing for all or any such construction and establishment and the financing thereof and every agreement made under this Section may contain such terms and conditions and may be made for such consideration as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council approves. Her Majesty represented by the minister may take lease from the Crown Company of all or any of the lands conveyed pursuant to Section 9 of the building ancillary buildings, erections and improvements, constructed or erected in pursuance of the provisions of any Agreement made under Section 10."

Now the land that was actually approved for the site for the construction of this building - it was obtained from the Wabush Mines, the Iron Ore Company in Wabush and this land, they have waited so long that they have given up hope and this land is no longer available. The land that was originally approved for the site of this building is no longer available. Now I want to ask the hon. minister, and I do not know if it

is possible for him to answer this. I want to know when is this Act that was approved in the Session in 1966 - when is this going to be implemented?

It is one of our Statutes now. It is on the books, and I want to know when will it be implemented and when will the people of Labrador be made feel that the contribution they are making to the Province is recognized, even in such a small manner such as this. And in the same year, there was another Act passed in this House Mr. Chairman - and that was the establishment of the Department of Labrador Affairs. And just as one section in that which reads that it is established basically for the purpose of assisting the development of Labrador as to Natural Resources and public or social services. And this would be one means of providing these public and social services. But nobody sees fit. We are not important enough. We do not contribute enough maybe. It is only that the district of Labrador West alone contributes enough - one district that contributes eighteen or twenty percent of the whole economy - to the revenues accrued to this Province. We do not deserve a public building though. Oh, no - we are geographically removed 800 miles, but we are psychologically removed a billion miles.

I hope the hon. minister can answer that question or give me an answer which I can give to the people of Labrador West, who are fed up sick and tired of having every time that they do have a small problem or a large problem, that they have to do it either by long distance or they have to pay \$150 return on an aircraft to come down here and conduct their affairs, that normally you should be able to conduct with Government in our own area.

There is another question I would like to ask the hon. minister. If he could inform myself or this hon. House, as to the actual cost per bed of the construction of the hospital in Labrador City. The average room cost. And the average room cost of hospitals from Newfoundland to British Columbia?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, it is quite easy for a member on the other side of the House who have been members of the Cabinet up until this year, to ask questions. Because in most cases, they know the answers themselves.

I exclude from that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the true "Tories," and also my hon. friend from Labrador West. . But the other three people reminds me of going to school Mr. Chairman. We used to get an Arithmetic book - the sums were in one part, and the answers were in the other part. And they are in that wonderful position, not that I ever want to be in it, but it is a wonderful position to be in, because they know the right questions to ask, and they know the answers they should get.

However, that does not happen too often. I think it has happened in this House probably ten or fifteen times in the last hundred years. But now we have three, or four actually - four former ministers over that just went across the House this year. Five is it? Oh yes, he has not been here for awhile.

MR CHALKER:

Now answering first the hon. member for Humber East, who is very parochial in his thinking. He is a very smart, intelligent young man, there is no doubt about it - an up-and-coming debater. He is a little bit too young, and I will just forecast his future for the next ten years. I will say, if he has any sense, which he has a lot of, that he will leave politics for ten years, and I do not think I will be very far out. He should take another course in mathematics regarding his computations on the Janeway Hospital. He thinks of Corner Brook as the ultimate. I love Corner Brook as much as I love St. John's. I am a Newfoundlander. But I say in the twenty-one years Mr. Chairman, which I have spent as Minister of the Crown in the Department of Health, Education - the Department of Economic Development, and the Department of Public Works, which I have the honour to be minister of now. That I would say Sir, without any doubt whatsoever, that on a per capita basis, excluding St. John's, that this Government has spent more money in the City of Corner Brook than any other part of Newfoundland. I have been out there to open two hospitals, a new Nurses' Home, a new Government Provincial Building. And I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about - he just cannot get his mind -

he must frizzle the moment that he comes inside the overpass coming into St. John's. But I think he is young, and when he matures, he will be like wine - he will spread himself all over and appreciate Newfoundland as I appreciate it. In answering the Janeway Hospital question. I think there were three hon. members who criticized the cost on the hospital, or the apartments rather, and why did we not call for tenders? These tenders - this hospital was started in 1966. We made an agreement

MR. CROSBIE: No, the apartments were -

MR. CHALKER: The apartments that is right.

MR. CROSBIE: No, you said the hospital.

MR. CHALKER: I am sorry. It is the apartments - were started in 1966. On the job at the time the Construction Company ^{who} were then re-building to a certain extent and adding additions to the present Janeway Hospital, were asked if they would give - submit a price on the erection of those apartment complex associated with the hospital. They did this. We have the agreement there. It is quite a sizable agreement, which they lived up to. We were asked Mr. Chairman, to hurry along this thing, like in 1966. It is not the only occasion. I think it happened to the University several times. Certain things they wanted in a hurry before September - if we had to go out on contract for it Sir, I would say it would take us a month - it would take us at least a half a year before we would be able to really get the work completed. And this in itself was a rush. And we had to do it and we completed it, and to the satisfaction of the officials of my department, and to the officials of the Janeway Hospital - and everybody is satisfied except the hon. members - my former colleagues in Cabinet, who are quite well aware of it as I am now, and as they were two years ago.

Now the hon. member for St. John's West, while the Government of Newfoundland does not obey the orders of the Municipal Council, St. John's Municipal Council in requesting a permit, now he is treading on very dangerous ground there, but I will come to that later on. Actually Sir, we, out of courtesy, just out of courtesy (we do not have to do it otherwise)

do apply to the various municipalities where Government buildings are being changed or erected at the time. This Government is not subservient in any way to any municipality in this Province. In no way whatsoever. But we do, out of courtesy -

MR. MURPHY: Does the minister obey all regulations pertaining to buildings?

MR. CHALKER: We do - out of courtesy. Just out of courtesy. We do not have to. We are not compelled to - because the Municipal Government here is a creature of this Government, of this House. But it true. It is like, I am not going to walk across your lawn - I could possibly get away with it two or three times, but I would not do it, out of courtesy. We do the same thing here.

Now Sir, mention was also made of the fact that - why do we invite architects which is costing thousands, and I would say millions of dollars - when we have our own bases of architectural design in the Department of Public Works? Actually Sir, we have one architect, one full-fledged architect, two others I believe, and several draftsmen. It is only a small department, whereby we take small government buildings for alterations, which they are working on, this Exon House now. That will be done by our own -

MR. HICKMAN: What is the estimated cost of Exon House?

MR. CHALKER: Around \$270,000. They will take over the handling of all that themselves in this department and submit the plans and go ahead with the work. The Government themselves, our own workmen, are doing that. It is not too big a job actually. Then the Czech. buildings - the EXPO buildings.

Well Sir, I could honestly say if those buildings were available today, that we would not have bought them, for one reason only

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 1.

on account of the cost of money but we did buy them back several years ago, and we will erect them in the various places for a cost of not over \$3.5 million that will include the cost of purchase and redesigning. Those buildings have to be redesigned in certain cases. We take the one for Gander which I am most familiar with. I understand now that we have to rearrange the building within the size of the steel that we have purchased and I think also that the, I am not quite sure of this but the feeling is in Gander that they would like to have a swimming pool associated with it, but that can be done within a matter of two months. Once the money is available we can go ahead with that building. We have started the one at Grand Falls and the one at Grand Bank, I believe my hon. friend from Grand Bank will remember that it was so designed to be part of a memorial I believe and a library. It is just a matter of a few weeks when money is available that we will go ahead with those -

MR. HICKMAN: On the same site

MR. CHALKER: As far as I know. I cannot say no. We bought the site I think from the council down there, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: The council acted as the agent.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, they acted as agent, that is right. You see, Mr. Chairman, they know just as much as I know because they were in cabinet when those negotiations were being done.

MR. HICKMAN: I asked that question Mr. Chairman, for a reason that there is grave doubts whether that site is suitable. It will make more sense if it were on the other side -

MR. CHALKER: But, according to the remarks of your hon. friend from St. John's West we could not afford to buy land down there any more now. It would be way out of our -

MR. CROSBIE: Cannot afford to rent buildings down there.

MR. HICKMAN: Cannot afford to rent especially outside of the metropolis.

MR. CHALKER: I can assure the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that before we will proceed with that building that the site, if it is not proper I am sure the

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 2.

municipality down there will advise us and assist us in getting another site.

MR.HICKMAN: It is a problem.

MR.CHALKER: But, now again on the Expo Buildings, we have been criticized for the steel. You see pictures in our famous papers, for misleading the truth. I never saw the like. I saw one of the scraps of steel down at I believe at Grand Bank. You know, somebody just took it out and threw it this way or the other way. Mr. Speaker, I have been associated with contracting business for quite a number of years, long before I came in the Government. And I have seen steel come from England and from Belgium in a worse state than any of the steel that we have on the site today. I say the steel at Gander is in perfect condition. Somebody said they were stealing it. We have not any notice of anybody stealing it.

MR.HICKMAN: It is too heavy to steal it.

MR.CHALKER: Down at Grand Bank there are a few twisted girders. If you brought that building in complete today I bet you would have about the same amount of damage done. We have had to maint it. And due to the lack of funds and there is no one more interested in getting those buildings erected outside of the Premier than I am. I can assure you. Because in those buildings themselves I have been a great believer against, not against the wishes of the hon. Leader of the Opposition but probably in opposition to him, with respect to the Arts and Culture Centres. I have a great, not that I am to say I am the Art. type. I do not believe I am. But possibly a little bit of culture would not hurt. But I was very proud, Sir, when I was asked to take over the centennial year and we had this grant of money given to us. I think that building cost us here in St. John's about, a little bit over \$6 million.

MR.NEARY: More than estimated.

MR.CHALKER: No, no, no, no, the original figure on that Mr. Chairman was around \$5 million.

MR.MURPHY: You said it was over \$6 million.

MR.CHALKER: I said the building here, the Arts and Culture Building which my

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 3.

friend would rather see spent on -

MR.MURPHY: On housing, low-cost housing.

MR.CHALKER: On a playground - No, No, No.

MR.MURPHY: Look up 1964 - 1965.

MR.CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, man cannot live by bread alone, what in the Name of God are we going to end up with a crowd of football players living in houses like ants! This building, the Arts and Culture Centre, I say is one of the nicest in this world and I am as proud as anyone can be as a Newfoundlander to go up there, not too often unfortunately. I am busy at other things, but I understand from Mr. Perlin, who is doing an exceptionally fine job on it, that it is completely occupied every single day, 365 days in the year. And they say the greatest investment, Mr. Speaker, this government ever made in any building was made in that Arts and Culture Centre. That one we have out in Corner Brook another beautiful building! It is out of this world, Sir, something that makes you feel proud. I do not feel too proud of a hospital, I certainly do not. It is a necessity everybody has to have - a necessity. There is no one who would be happier to see those centres put up in those various areas around Newfoundland and have a bit of culture associated with it. God knows we lack it, we lack it. We have been a seafaring race now, back three or four hundred years.

MR.HICKMAN: The greatest culture in the world.

MR.CHALKER: Yes, it is the greatest culture but let us add a little more and we could stand it Sir, and we need that little bit of polish; It would not hurt us one little bit.

MR.HICKMAN: Has the hon. minister been up to take a look at the Art Exhibits lately?

MR.CHALKER: No, I have not.

MR.HICKMAN: They are worth seeing.

MR.CHALKER: The House of Assembly has been open here and I have been kept busy.

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 4.

But has my hon. friend been up there?

MR. HICKMAN: No, I will go with you, so that two of us, you know, we can compare.

MR. CHALKER: It depends on the Art. Certain Art with me scrapes the bottom of the barrel you know.

MR. MURPHY: You will have to get a guide to show you where the building is.

MR. CHALKER: No, I will take the hon. gentleman through though anytime and show him places he has never seen.

MR. MURPHY: You cannot show me, I have been in it more often than -

MR. CHALKER: Not in those places, never mind I will show you one of those days.

MR. HICKMAN: When was the minister last in the Arts and Culture Centre?

MR. CHALKER: Oh, about three months ago. That is not bad is it?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, you have missed some pretty good exhibits since that.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, we are getting down to the -

MR. HICKMAN: Nitty-gritty -

MR. CHALKER: No it is not nitty-gritty. The Arts and Culture Centre as you know I still say is the greatest thing, one of the greatest things this government has done. And one of those days -

MR. MURPHY: Next to Confederation.

MR. CHALKER: Well Confederation is an issue that is over and done with I do not even mention it.

MR. MURPHY: I wish someone would tell the Hon. the Premier.

MR. CHALKER: Well he has the right to do it. That is his baby. I talk about my baby too. Arts and Culture is my baby. Okay. And I get very jealous when the Premier takes any colour away from mine. Those two buildings, the one in Corner Brook and here in St. John's, cost in the vicinity of \$7 million, combined, the ones that we have. One, half erected now, and one three-quarters to be erected, two others/erected will cost us \$3.5 million. So we are getting three buildings for less than half of what two buildings cost. I do not think that is pretty bad going. We would have never had them otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we would never have them otherwise, unless the hon. the Premier accepted the gift from the Czechoslovakian government, who gave him this building, Now they

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 5.

did not give him the artifacts that were in it. We bought those. I answered the question in the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. I must ask about that in a minute.

MR. CHALKER: The question has been answered. And we had to pay the dismantling and transportation here to the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. minister remember that great announcement where it was going to cost less than a million dollars, does the hon. minister remember that?

MR. CHALKER: Does the hon. minister remember when you could buy bologna for fifteen cents a pound?

MR. MURPHY: Now we are talking about the same subject that I am talking about, the bologna that was handed out on this.

MR. CHALKER: Now my hon. friend from St. John's West again, I am trying to answer as many as I can, I am not going to spend as long as you people there. You have all asked practically the same question, you say, about the twenty year leases, that we have actually helped the contractors, or the owners of those buildings to pay them off in the matter of three or four years, according to his calculation. Now, if he were on this side and I was on that side I would be doing exactly the same thing. Now, we get those buildings on lease for twenty years and Mr. Speaker, I must say the position of the department of Public Works (and I am not hiding anything and I am not ashamed nor have anything to hide, as far as that is concerned) we have requests from various departments of government to lease a certain building which they have picked out. Now I am assuming that the Board of Liquor Control would like Woolworths years ago. I remember then when they bought the Crosbie Building on Water Street, due to the fact that more people passed that place, as I think my hon. friend from St. John's West will tell me, than any other part of St. John's, which amazed me. Where Woolworths is now on Water Street, there were more people passed in a day, by that particular building, than any other part of Water Street.

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 6.

MR.HICKMAN: That was the attraction of the Arcade.

MR.CHALKER: Possibly so, I do not know. But anyhow I should imagine too Sir, that the Board of Liquor Control would then themselves find a spot where they have a lot of people passing, a lot of accommodations for parking and they got to pay for that. It is all right to say put it in a barn. Mr. Chairman, I will give you one example, you will notice going through my estimates. In my district of Flowers Cove, which is sparsely populated, my friend from Labrador West says they have no government services. With the help of the government, the department of Public Works purchased a new hotel. We have the services there now probably the best there are on that coast, for welfare, R.C.M.P. accommodations, for the personnel of those two people. We have a most beautiful court house I only wish, Sir, that every part of Newfoundland could have the same thing. In every district where there was a possibility to have it, a wonderful provincial building would make things better for the average Newfoundlander everywhere, Sir.

My hon. friend from Burin, in his legal mind, and I am not a legal man, but I should be, I suppose, after the other day, we had a legal discourse or discussion here, and I think, if we had the textbooks, we could have probably passed the bar examination. I think the hon. member for Burin was talking at the time.,

MR.HICKMAN: No question about that.

MR.CHALKER: He complains that the leases should be so arranged that maintenance should not be covered in the leases. Now I have never seen a lease go through where maintenance has been covered, not that I know of.

MR.HICKMAN: Not I, all I ask is -

MR.CHALKER: Oh well! You are accusing me, you are putting bad ideas, the hon. gentleman is putting bad ideas in my head, Mr. Speaker -

MR.HICKMAN: No, no. Right the reverse. I am asking the hon. minister to assure this committee that he will not approve the signing of a lease that contains a clause in it, an escalating clause whereby the lessee has to pay for an increase in operating cost during the term of the lease. Very simple request.

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 7.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, I can assure him that I have never signed one yet and I have no intention to, that is all I can say, No intention whatsoever. My hon. friend from Gander covered the cultural building there and I remember Gander, I have a lot of friends there, a beautiful site, a growing town, I think, through the assistance of their committee there, we put up a centennial building which I think is greatly appreciated by the people of the town of Gander. I can assure the hon. member that serious consideration is given to the erection of a provincial building in that town. And he asked about the changes in the liquor store, location of the liquor store. As of yet Mr. Chairman I have no knowledge -

MR. COLLINS: What is serious consideration?

MR. CHALKER: Just what I said. I could have said no consideration that would have been fine, but serious consideration is that consideration is being given to it. Now I have no knowledge whatsoever Sir, about the change in the liquor store. That means to say, it may not be happening, I will not know because the Board of Liquor Control work in their own orbit and just bring us in when they want their leases signed and set up to move into a store.

MR. COLLINS: The existing building must be owned by Public Works.

MR. CHALKER: I could not say. That question was not asked. Labrador West, my hon. friend from Labrador West, he has not gone back. He is still here I suppose. Yes, he was right, legislation was passed on the building for Wabush, site selected. There is no doubt about that. And again, through conditions, financial conditions, we just could not go ahead with the building at that time. And I can say that eventually we will have a building down there and I can assure my hon. friend I will push it as much as I can because I agree wholeheartedly with what he said. Those people are seven or eight hundred/miles ^{air} from here and it is growing very rapidly, ^a growing centre. And within the next five or six years it will be, hopefully, or ten years, connected by tunnel to Newfoundland and by road to Quebec. I think that is as definite as I am standing here now. I hope it will be in my time. But I know it will happen because if anybody had to tell me twenty-one

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 8.

years ago that I could drive from St. John's to Port aux Basques on paved roads well I would have a nice story to tell them what I thought of this judgment. But today that is here.

MR.BURGESS: Not a very good analogy.

MR.CHALKER: Oh it is a good analogy, something I did not believe in. Now it is here so I believe in this other project for Labrador. It has to go there it is just as plain as the nose in my face and that is plain. I can assure the hon. member that as far as I am concerned and my colleagues in government on this side of the House are well aware of the needs of Labrador.

MR.BURGESS: Nothing has been done about it.

MR.CHALKER: Oh yes, there has been done about, lots been done about it. As far as land there is land can be readily available for the new building. Now Mr. Speaker, I have answered every question asked of me. I think probably the only member given that courtesy to the House and I hope they treat my estimates rapidly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister's remarks when he was sitting down was stretching the bologney out into weiners. He certainly answered every question, that is for sure. As only the minister could answer them! I just have a couple of more comments Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that the minister really satisfied us with all his answers but he certainly entertained us with them. It was mentioned earlier, when we were discussing the rent for some of these B.L.C. Buildings that are out under twenty year leases, at seven dollars odd per square foot per year, for buildings that only cost twenty or twenty-five dollars at most, per square foot to build. It was suggested an economic study would show that this was really a sensible arrangement, that the government was very sensible and this was the right economic thing to do. Now the minister did not produce any such studies. But while he was speaking I just figured out the position say on the building at Placentia or the one at Grand Bank. Sixteen hundred and sixty-five square feet. Assuming that that is the total building - now I do not know because I have not seen those buildings. If that is the

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 9.

building, twenty -five dollars per square foot would cost to build \$41,625, call it \$41,000 to make it easy to multiply, 1665 foot building.

If the Newfoundland Liquor Commission borrowed the money to build the building, that is \$41,000. Say they paid nine per cent interest, twenty year mortgage. The interest alone, forget the repayment of principal, but the interest alone forget repayment of principal but the interest alone over twenty years on the whole principal amount and if you had a mortgage to be paying off some of the principal each year. The interest, at nine per cent on \$41,000 for twenty years, would come to \$115,000. That is the interest on \$41,000 a year, at nine per cent, for twenty years. So that would give a total, that it would cost the Newfoundland Liquor Commission \$115. plus the building, \$155,000 over the twenty year period. The interest was \$115. I am sorry I have the interest too high. The interest per year would be \$73,000. \$41,000 for the building is a \$115,000 total it would have cost the Newfoundland Liquor Commission to put the building there and pay interest on the whole thing for twenty years. Now rather than do that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission is paying the total rent, in Placentia \$12,240 a year, for twenty years, \$244,800 in rent over the twenty year period of the lease. In other words over double - rent is double what the commission could have built the store for and paid interest on it over the whole twenty year period.

MR. MURPHY: Are we getting heat and light supplied for that figure or not?

MR. CROSBIE: We have not seen the leases but presume the owner supplies the heat but the tenant supplies the light so on. If it is the whole building probably the government is providing the heat too. But economically there is no question about it Mr. Chairman, that economically what should have been done is that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission should have put up its own building or should have got a place for five dollars or five-fifty a square foot, on a twenty year lease. It is a twenty year lease, not even a four or five year lease. And the same figure applies to these other stores, so it is a very poor bargain. The minister did not say whether it was his department

June 4 1970 Tape 1133 page 10.

or the Newfoundland Liquor Commission was responsible. But whoever is responsible has gone mad. The minister said that the government is not subservient to any one, whether it is municipal council or a person or whoever. There is nobody suggesting that this government is subservient. It is certainly not subservient in this House. We know that by law municipalities are created, the legislation creating them is passed by the Province and they cannot give the Province orders and the Province can stamp them out, wipe them out, crush them, eliminate them, abolish them any time it wants to do so.

Mr. Crosbie.

But what does that have to do with a Government complying with the rules and regulations that everyone else has to comply with. Anyone who wants to build in St. John's has to get a permit first and have his plans approved and whether it is just a courtesy or what it is - the Government should do the same, surely.

MR. CHALKER: The building referred to was already built - just minor alterations.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but it does not matter if you only altered one room, you have to go down and get a permit.

MR. CHALKER: We got the permit.

MR. CROSBIE: So, the minister..

MR. CHALKER: We have the very best of relationship with the City Council..

MR. CROSBIE: Well there appeared to be a certain, you know, a certain irritation because of the fact that you ignored them for months on this matter.

MR. CHALKER: We did not ignore anyone..

MR. CROSBIE: Perhaps, it was not the hon. minister but the hon. Minister of Welfare. I do not know.

MR. CHALKER: No, it was not.

MR. CROSBIE: One of you ignored them.

MR. CHALKER: Actually, we are doing that work ourselves, Mr. Chairman.

If that were on contract, the contractor, I would assume, would go to the City Council and get a permit, but we are doing this ourselves so we just go as a matter of courtesy, when we started the job or probably before we started, any instance of getting the necessary permit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: It will be carried in about a few seconds, Mr. Chairman. I would

Mr. Crosbie.

like someone to carry me, too, because morning, afternoon and night in this place, we all need to be carried.

One other comment - not through the tunnel of Bell Island that the minister talks about. Now, there is one other point, Mr. Chairman. The minister was talking about Expo buildings and he said, "if he had money this year how delighted he would be, charmed, pleased."

MR. CHALKER: So I would.

MR. CROSBIE: He wants to open up these centers in Gander, Grand Falls and Grand Bank. There is not one cent in the estimates of his department for these Expo buildings.

MR. CHALKER: I am asking for a token vote, when we come to that.

MR. CROSBIE: We are going to come to something on these Expo buildings. The hon. the Premier has said that they were all going to be constructed this year. Now, if there is not a cent in the estimates to do it, someone else must be doing it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the Premier has always been misunderstood.

MR. CHALKER: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: If there is no money in the estimates for it then somebody else will have to do it, and it will have to be paid for next year. So, there is not much difference unless Cambodia is all settled next year and easy money comes in and hundreds of millions become available.

MR. CHALKER: Do not forget Northern Ireland.

MR. CROSBIE: And Northern Ireland settled away. And there are no earthquakes in Peru or whatever other excuses that are going to be used next year or a highjacker. So, the announcement that the Expo buildings would be proceeded with is not borne out by the minister's estimates. Otherwise,

Mr. Crosbie

Mr. Chairman, the minister is so charming that he is certainly the right one to be in Public Works. Although his arguments were not convincing, they were so sincere and amusing that one has to take them at face value.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. BURGESS: The question I asked him, relative to the hospital in Labrador City, did he answer that question?

MR. CHALKER: No, Mr. Chairman, I will get the information for the hon. gentleman tomorrow though.

MR. BURGESS: Thank you.

MR. CHALKER: You see we have 261 public buildings in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman. I cannot remember the details - up to 100, but after that, I sort of slip up somewhere along the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I think we should note that the Minister of Education is back in our Chamber. This morning he was up to say how ridiculous it was the time that everybody is taking here and then he left. He came back and made an announcement on education and tonight we hear him there saying, "carried." Welcome back Mr. Minister.

MR. MURPHY: He was on television. Did you see the minister on television this evening?

MR. CROSBIE: He was on television.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 901-01 carry? Carried. Shall 901-02... ?

MR. CROSBIE: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 901-02...?

MR. CROSBIE: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 901-01...?

MR. CROSBIE: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN Shall 902-01 carry? Carried. Shall 902-02 carry? Carried. Shall 902-09 -01 carry? Carried. Shall 902-09-02 carry? Carried. Shall 06 carry? Carried.

MR. MURPHY: Is there any reason for a cut in this vote, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHALKER: Where is this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Office equipment and furniture.

MR. CHALKER: No we do not need so much this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 06 carry? Carried. Shall 911-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: This is salaries in connection with buildings, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHALKER: The details are on page 113.

MR. CROSBIE: Page 113. I wonder would the minister explain to us what seems to be inequitable in connection with some of the employees - that is the caretaking staff. It is doubtless. I heard this before from the caretaking staff. But what is the position with reference to overtime - with reference to the caretaking staff in this building and others. What is their work week? If they work more than forty-two hours or whatever it is a week, are they paid overtime and particularly in connection with the commissioners who patrol the House of Assembly, maintain order and all that business while the House is open, including morning, afternoon and night - is there any arrangement made to compensate them for the extra time they must put in?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they are paid on the basis of a forty-hour week and any time over that is considered overtime.

MR. MURPHY: Do they get time and a half for that?

MR. CHALKER: Time and a half. It is based on the Civil Service scale. I would imagine about time and a half.

MR. BURGESS: Are they being paid overtime now, over forty hours - are they being paid?

MR. CHALKER: Oh yes, of course. Sure.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, those employees, are they classed as civil servants and are they entitled to the proposed increase in wages? Is there any consideration given to them?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they are qualified civil servants.

MR. MURPHY: Are you expecting confab over the telephones this year - more phone calls?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: That is the story.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Where are we now? There is an overtime vote there of \$70,000 - page 113 is overtime, \$70,000. That would be for people like the commissionaires is it?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, and holidays and sick relief, etc.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All Government buildings.

MR. MURPHY: I presume that there would be a great number of these people on hourly pay rather than on regular salary?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: What does extra...

MR. HICKMAN: How about whacking out \$100 for my friend out here, will you?

MR. CROSBIE: What about extra..

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, I am not Minister of Justice yet. I do not know what I will be tomorrow but at this moment I am Minister of Public Works.

MR. CROSBIE: It is time that you were.

MR. MURPHY: Very uncertain.

MR. CROSBIE: Then you would catch up with the leases that are over there that you have not got. What about the extra assistance - \$70,000 what is that for?

MR. CHALKER: That is additional people we take on in the summertime.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, I could ask down below but I can ask - no, I will wait until we get down below.

MR. HICKMAN: Where are we now?

MR. CROSBIE: We are on 911-02.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 911-02, 03, 04, 05, 06 carried.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, at this time, I think, it is appropriate that I should make mention of the fact (as he is paid under this vote) that Mr. Harry Conroy who has been Government engineer for thirty-six years, will be retiring this year, and I would like to pay tribute to him at this time. He has been an excellent person to deal with but a little bit difficult at times. You know he is a little bit deaf and at a time, when he does not want to agree with you, he just does not hear you.

MR. MURPHY: A very sensible chap.

MR. CHALKER: He is trained like any engineer is trained, but we have had - I received the greatest co-operation from him, and although he is retiring, I know he justly deserves this retirement and, within the next few weeks, we will be advertising for someone.

MR. MURPHY: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to join with the hon. minister in expressing good wishes to Mr. Conroy and for his faithful service to the Government and I trust that he can now spend pretty well all his time in the South playing golf.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to join the minister in wishing Mr. Conroy a happy retirement, when he retires this year, because anybody who has dealt with the minister's department over the years has a very high regard and respect for Mr. Conroy. The minister is going to lose the most valuable official..

MR. CHALKER: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: We will have a job to find an adequate replacement.

Now this is 911-03 is it, Mr. Chairman? The maintenance of public buildings and grounds. Now this year, Mr. Chairman, the amount to be voted is \$2,256,000 in round numbers, but the Auditor General's Report for 1969 - a year ago, showed the total actually spent that year, \$2,637,000. That is just about \$400,000 more than the minister says he can get by on this year. This year's vote is considerably less in the revised estimates for the year that just ended a month

Mr. Crosbie.

or so ago.

How are these savings..

MR. CHALKER: Which number is this now?

MR. CROSBIE: This is 911-03.

MR. MURPHY: The page is 149 not 148.

MR. CROSBIE: How does the minister expect to achieve such a big saving in the maintenance of public buildings and grounds? I mean the same buildings are there. We have not got rid of all our grounds or our buildings or even a tenth of them; yet the vote is down about what, twenty per cent.

MR. CHALKER: Last year, actually. up to the end of March this year, it was \$2,426,691, so we based it upon that.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but it is \$200 less.

MR. CHALKER: Well a lot of it, as you know, Mr. Chairman, we have a head gardener here, if that is what you call him and most of the heavy maintenance that is done is just a matter of cutting the grass, trimming and setting up other - I would say that eighty per cent of the heavy work is being done..

MR. HICKMAN: You are going to let the grass grow a little longer.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bet the minister now, just a small bet and if it is too big a bet, the minister will go all out to really achieve this saving - \$5.00 that next year, when we get the actual amount spent in the present financial year, the minister is going to spend about \$2,600,000 on this vote and not \$2,256,000. Is he willing to take me up on this?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, I will take you up on it. I will hold the bets though.

MR. CROSBIE: A bottle of Captain Morgan.

MR. CHALKER: No, Black Circle.

MR. CROSBIE: Okay.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, our actual last year was \$2,400,000 and we are definitely cutting back this year. We are cutting back on a lot of the work.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, not wishing to display my ignorance too much, we have here a hospital for chest diseases. This is a new type that is being used....?

MR. ROBERTS: I can answer that. That is a more correct title for the sanatorium.

MR. CHALKER: You were thinking about that Japanese dancer, were you?

MR. MURPHY: Well that is not a disease.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we carried 03 yet. Have we?

MR. CHALKER: There is no 03.

MR. HICKMAN: There is no 03.

MR. MURPHY: Page 149.

MR. CHALKER: 04=04.

MR. MURPHY: Rentals - are these rentals that are paid outside...

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: What buildings would these be for?

MR. CHALKER: Oh, gosh!

MR. CROSBIE: I mean does this include, i.e., the Newfoundland Liquor Commission?

MR. CHALKER: I gave the hon. gentleman a list the other day. *

MR. CROSBIE: Well that just showed around St. John's. It is not the Newfoundland Liquor Commission buildings, is it?

MR. CHALKER: Most of them around the outports: Welfare offices - I should imagine the town in Gander, there is quite a few that the Government have rented..

MR. COLLINS: We just have one Welfare office.

MR. HICKMAN: We just have one Welfare office in Marystown.

MR. CHALKER: That is all you need, you are lucky.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 911-04-04 carry? Carried. 05?

MR. MURPHY: Cleaning. It looks as though we are going to have a dirty year.

As I see it - I do not know what the actual was last year..

MR. CROSBIE: \$689,000.

MR. CHALKER: No, last year, it was \$530,278.

MR. MURPHY: Now \$567,000 was the revised estimate. The actual was \$530,000 was it. On what basis is the cleaning being done, like in this building now? Is it contracted out?

MR. CHALKER: Starting 1 July, in order to save money, we are going to try it for a year anyhow. We have asked for tenders for three times a week to clean.. By that time we should save money even on that vote, I hope.

MR. MURPHY: Tender goes...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: It is okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Now 07.

MR. HICKMAN: The minister is going to have his water cut off.

MR. CROSBIE: \$900,000 is the minister's estimate for the cost of fuel this year and the actual cost in 1969 a year ago was \$1,188,000 - how is the minister going to save \$288,000. Is this going to be a hot year, an easy winter, where does the minister get the \$288,000? It is going to be a dirty year and it is going to be a hot year. It is going to be a dirty hot year according to these estimates.

MR. CHALKER: You are not talking about the election now, are you?

MR. CROSBIE: That, too.

MR. CHALKER: The actual for last year was \$848,335. I know this

MR. CHALKER: I know this seems rather peculiar, but here is what used to happen until last year, we used to have to carry over a considerable number of bills of the previous year, which went against this vote. Now this year we have practically none to carry. That is true is it not? Little or none to carry over, that is the reason we can put this amount in and save money. Actually, we are not saving any money, our bills were paid, which we did not pay last year.

MR. MURPHY: On this fuel, is this put out on tenders to the various companies?

MR. CHALKER: No, I do not think so.

MR. MURPHY: I know Golden Eagle have some sort of an "in" there. But just basically what is it, are all the oil companies asked to tender on this, or do Golden Eagle get it automatically? And do we set an actual price that they should be paid, commensurate with what we would get when I think of all the church buildings and I think of all the schools boards.

MR CHALKER: Do what?

MR MURPHY: Call for tenders. I was just wondering.

MR CHALKER: Actually there is a formula made up with the Golden Eagle. When they came here they asked just one concession of the Government, when they started their plant at Holyrood, that we give them the oil for a certain number of years. And the form was made up in such a way, that the price they give it to us would be similar to any that we received from other oil companies. It is based on the lowest of the other oil companies.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but do we look for the lowest, this is the point I am making. Do we ask for prices?

MR. CHALKER: Oh, no, no. We know just by investigating, the engineers in my department would investigate the prices. I think it is based on the prices in Nova Scotia too.

MR. MURPHY: What price do we pay, can the hon. the minister tell us?

MR. CHALKER: I could not say.

MR. MURPHY: Pardon?

MR. CHALKER: I do not know, but I will make a note of it, and find out.

MR. MURPHY: No, but I mean even a-half a cent or a-quarter of a cent a gallon -

MR. CHALKER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: If another oil company tenders below that, am I correct on this, that if tenders were called, and some other oil company in the Province tendered below the posted tank wagon prices on Nova Scotia's part, that they would be entitled to get the contract.

MR. CHALKER: Unless Golden Eagle could match it.

MR. HICKMAN: Unless Golden Eagle could match it. So there is an advantage still in calling tenders.

MR. CHALKER: We do not call tenders.

MR. MURPHY: No, you do not call tenders, that is the point that I am making. About \$20 million during the passed five years on oil - Another Arts and Culture Centre for the minister, and he would love it.

MR. CHALKER: I did not get that, I am so busy trying to -

MR. MURPHY: I say the money we saved on the oil, we could have had built you another Arts and Culture Centre.

MR. CHALKER: Sometimes, I wish we could. I wish we could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 07 carry? Carried. On Motion 08 to 10 carried. Shall 911-05 carry?

MR. CHALKER: That is payment on Confederation Building, \$296,700. What is the other part of it?

MR. HICKMAN: That is the interest.

MR. CHALKER: Possibly so, one is capital and the other is interest.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not just one building, that is a number of them?

MR. CHALKER: No, no, that is just Confederation Building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 05 carry? Carried. Shall 07 carry?

MR. MURPHY: 07. Less: Services provided to Other Departments, what would be the nature of the services?

MR. CHALKER: Well, repairs, and light and heat.

MR. MURPHY: In other words, it is suppose to be charged out to the appropriate departments.

MR. HICKMAN: This is what can be found on page 149, Appendix IV, is that it?

MR. CHALKER: No, maintenance is on page 149.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: 08 is the Harmon Corporation.

MR. CHALKER: Sometimes there is a transfer from other departments.

MR. HICKMAN: Appendix VI.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, Appendix VI.

MR. CROSBIE: Are we talking about the Harmon Corporation now?

MR. HICKMAN: Not yet, no, no. Not yet, no, no. Hold on a minute, I have a question to ask about that.

MR. CROSBIE: All right. No, but services are less, that does not have to be voted. Sure that is already voted.

MR. HICKMAN: I already know that.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, is on 08, is he not?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, Mr. Chairman is on 07.

MR. CROSBIE: But you cannot be on 07.

MR. HICKMAN: Why?

MR. CROSBIE: There is no vote there.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize that, but I simply want to ask the minister a question.

MR. CROSBIE: All right, go ahead.

MR. HICKMAN: In Appendix VI, whether it is under 08 or 07, is not too important. There is a vote there for Construction and Alterations to the Penitentiary of \$100,000. Would the minister give the committee an indication as to what is involved there?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are very interested in this project, it is called "a gang lock", I think every door down there now has to be unlocked individually. Whereas this one now, I think, in case of a fire, we can just pull a lever now, and all the doors will open the same time. I think, that is correct, is it not?

MR. HICKMAN: That was done a long time ago.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, no, it was not.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, that item should come up under 912-01 - Construction

MR. CROSBIE: and Alteration. We are on the Harmon Corporation now. Now in 1969 there was \$1 million voted for the Harmon Corporation. The year that just ended \$735,000 and now the minister is down to \$595,000. So the minister might explain why the saving, but might the minister explain - this money is to operate the Harmon Corporation area physically, you know is this the cost of heating it, and repairing it, and maintaining it.

MR. CHALKER: The actual cost last year was \$735,000, this is a net figure, Mr. Chairman,

MR. MURPHY: The actual cost hit the estimate right on the head, \$735,000.

MR. CHALKER: That is what they have here.

MR. MURPHY: They should have had you in Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. CHALKER: Our total cost for operating that building, gross - is \$995,000, and our revenue is \$400 and some odd thousand dollars, it gives a net amount here in this book. The heating plant costs us \$211,000, it covers all the building, the two big buildings, you will notice they are for sale now. Fire Protection - \$64,000, Electricity - \$100,000, Administration - \$120,000, there is \$20,000 of that which we have not spent for quite awhile. Actually, my Deputy Minister, Mr. George Warren, is acting as the Former Manager of it, Mr. Albert Martin. And house maintenance, and various things comes to \$995,000, against we have a revenue of over \$400,000.

MR. MURPHY: Is the huge bachelor quarters still vacant out there?

MR. CHALKER: Yes, those two big buildings, one is used partially to house the Vocational students -

MR. CROSBIE: The upgrading.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, the upgrading. And the other one, I think, is empty. But the unfortunate part about the whole complex is similar to Fort Pepperrell, used to be central heating. They just used to pipe their heat in.

Now those two buildings are up for sale, and if they are sold. Actually, the original cost of those buildings was about \$12 million, about \$6 million for one, and \$5 million.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, would the minister tell us whether the Harmon

MR. CROSBIE: Corporation is now leased to the Melville Pulp and Paper Products Limited, whatever the company is called now. Has he leased to them all the land they need in the Harmon Corporation? And what the minister plans to do with these plants of International Fish Meal, Fisheries Limited, which plant has to be moved, if the Melville Pulp is going to go there in its location at Harmon. Is it arranged now for this Fish Meal Plant to be taken out of the way or shut down, when the Pulp Mill goes into operation? And could the minister tell us whether everything is agreed with the Department of Transport about land along the waterfront, and what is going to be done along the waterfront title of the land.

MR. ROBERTS: We do not own the waterfront.

MR. CHALKER: That is Federal.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I say has - nobody listens, nobody listens.

MR. CHALKER: I am listening.

MR. CROSBIE: Have arrangements been made to the Government of Canada about the waterfront?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: They have?

MR. CHALKER: I suggest to the hon. gentleman that those questions in connection with the Melville Paper Unit or this Fish Processing Plant, it is only a little small thing anyhow,

MR. ROBERTS: That is the one that burned down?

MR. CROSBIE: It is re-erected the building is out there.

MR. CHALKER: The rent goes to the Department of Economic Development.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, but I understand the Minister of Public Works is the effective landlord.

MR. CHALKER: I am, yes.

MR. HICKMAN: It is the Minister of Public Works, in right of the Crown, or well, the Harmon Corporation, and the minister for the Harmon Corporation is the Minister of Public Works.

MR. CHALKER: It reports to me, my department.

MR. HICKMAN: It reports to you, well would the minister tell the committee, what the situation is now on the building that has been leased to Atlantic Brewery?

MR. CHALKER: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I do not know at the present time, but I think the building itself is taken over or controlled by the Department of Economic Development. We have nothing whatever to do with it in my department.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like, to add a little to that, Mr. Chairman, the building wherever it is, then is under a lease to the Brewery Company, and I assume that the trustees in bankruptcy, (I do not know whether they are bankruptcy or insolvent). But, anyway the trustees have the lease, and when Mr. Ginter takes it over, as we understand, he is going to presumably have the leases assigned. I think, there is covenant in the lease that it cannot be assigned without the consent of whoever was the minister who entered into it, or the corporation, I am not sure who it was.

MR. MURPHY: Is there any part of that equipment that we have frozen now in view of our interest in it or not?

MR. ROBERTS: The trustees, I believe, have catalogued their trust. Legally the trustees are in possession of the assets. Our claim, as it was funded earlier, was a preferred claim, coming after the secured creditors and before the unsecured creditors.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government have no claim on the assets.

MR. ROBERTS: No, we have a claim against the company, and if we get Government consent we could execute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry? Carried. Shall 09 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, 09 is the C.A. Pippy Park Commission, which controls all the land around here and to the north of us. Somewhere further down there is another vote for the C.A. Pippy Park Commission. Would the minister tell us what the progress has been with the Pippy Park, because all the building in there is frozen, of course, in the sense that you must get a permit, you cannot sell your property without first offering it to the minister for sale, the minister has the right to buy it, if you want to sell it. And the people are not allowed

MR. CROSBIE: to repair them, do extensive repairs without getting the minister's permission under the Legislation.

MR. CHALKER: And the Department of Health.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, and the Department of Health. A part of it is within the limits of the City of St. John's, and a part of it is outside. Could the minister tell us what progress has been and when he thinks these restrictions can be lifted, if ever?

MR. CHALKER: This vote here, Mr. Chairman, is for \$93,450. Labour materials, and maintenance \$48,450, childrens playground/pool -\$35,000, master plans \$10,000.

MR. MURPHY: Childrens playground and pool?

MR. CHALKER: That is right.

MR. MURPHY: Where is this going to be situated?

MR. CROSBIE: Before the Colonial Building.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, no.

MR. CROSBIE: The fountain spray is it?

MR. CHALKER: Out here in front of this building, we hope.

MR. HICKMAN: The pool?

MR. CROSBIE: All we need this year is a pool outside of this building here. We can skate on it in the wintertime can we?

MR. CHALKER: You would I suppose, yes.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister is on thin ice now.

MR. HICKMAN: May be some of the ministers can take a long dive.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Mr. Chairman, some of us are living in the vicinity of this park and on the border of it, I am sure we are in it. And a lot of the trees there around us are dying, old fir trees. I wonder if the minister is responsible, I wonder if on some weekend if he would take an axe and clean out some of those tress, or get somebody else to do it. It is an eye sore up around there.

MR. CHALKER: I had a complaint actually from the lovers of dogs -

MR. MURPHY: Pick up your axe and follow me.

MR. HICKMAN: It is the hon. minister's responsibility, he is responsible for the public works of the building.

MR. CHALKER: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: He is doing a first-class job, occasionally the heat goes off, and that sort of thing. Will the minister report to the committee as to the stages of the fountain at Long Pond? When is it going to surface?

MR. CHALKER: Actually, Sir, it is physical trouble, last year it was a mechanical one, the pumps broke. This year the filth coming down the river is filling up that placed very, very rapidly, and soon we will be putting it out, Sir. We are going to put it out shortly.

MR. CROSBIE: Put it out where? Out in Kent's Pond.

MR. CHALKER: Out in the pond. As a matter of fact, we had a lot of congratulations on it.

MR. MURPHY: Well, here in front of the hon. minister's house, in Kent's Pond.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: Sure. Put it in Kent's Pond.

MR. ROBERTS: Or Lawrence's Pond?

MR. CHALKER: Well, I do not know, but I hate to see the minister with an oil hat on, you know.

MR. ROBERTS: Or put it in Hogan's Pond.

MR. HICKMAN: But I missed the hon. minister's comment, you say you have been receiving a lot of congratulations on it.

MR. CHALKER: Of course, it is beautiful.

MR. HICKMAN: Is this to congratulate us, because of the fact that it is under water all of the time.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, because when it is working properly, it is absolutely a beautiful fountain.

MR. MURPHY: How many times last year? Twice.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, no. How many days in a year? 365. About sixty days.

MR. MURPHY: That is not too bad, that is a good average.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall I carry?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just a question, with reference to the purchase of homes, has there been any purchased up on the Nagle's Hill area, actually completed and people moved out or not, or is it just this freezing that we have referred to?

MR. MURPHY: Have any homes been actually purchased? I notice that pretty well all of Allendale Road here is just about gone.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, we have purchased some, and there quite a few claims being processed all the time. And actually they can build on the perimeter of that area, and repair their houses subject to, I think, the Metropolitan Area Board and confirmed by the Department of Health.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, the reason why I ask the question is; this came up, I think, some three years ago, when this was moved at first, and this property was more or less frozen. Now the people were given to understand, that they could not do any extensive alterations or anything else, but in fairness to them, costs have risen continuously from year to year. But, I do not think, when the Government is taking this property, they are going to value the houses any more, at this time, than they were three years ago. But, if they had to get out and purchase other property, and say it is this year, or next year or the year after that, the value of the dollars that they are going to receive from Government are going to be, you know, much less actually than if the deal had to be done three years ago?

MR. CHALKER: No, actually, I think, I will not say a hundred per-cent, Mr. Chairman, but close to hundred per-cent. They have been very satisfied with the amount that they received for their homes. If you will remember, the Premier said at the time, that they would not lose anything, if they had to move, they would be given sufficient recompense for their present homes to buy another one elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 09 carry? Carried. Shall 912-01-01 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Now on 912-01-01, on the Penitentiary, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHALKER: That is still the gang lock.

MR. HICKMAN: The gang locking was replaced expect in the old wing, \$100,000.

What I would like to draw to the minister's attention is the fact that, the prison officials desperately need down there amongst other things a combined recreational centre and a chapel. And they have certain facilities down there that can cut the cost very considerably in building that sort of an erection.

I believe that they make their own concrete slabs, whatever it is called.

MR. MURPHY: Concrete blocks.

June 4th. 1970

Tape ~~1136~~ 1135

PK - 10

MR. HICKMAN: Concrete blocks,

MR. MURPHY: Not concrete bricks.

MR. HICKMAN: There is an arrangement, an arrangement had been moved whereby the Trades College would use some of their apprentices in conjunction with the people in the Penitentiary, and for a very modest sum a chapel could be built. A few years ago, there was one built in Salmonier Park, which cost next to nothing.

MR. CHALKER: Was that not done by the prisoners?

MR. HICKMAN: That was done by the prisoners.

MR. CHALKER: Under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, but with the cooperation

MR. CHALKER: Not Public Works.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, but with the cooperation of the Department of Public Works, and certain supervisory work provided

MR. HICKMAN: The supervisory work provided and done at that time, and then various churches and organizations throughout the Province provided furnishings and equipment. And I would draw to the minister's attention, there is desperate need down there of the main Penitentiary building for a similar facility. And it can be done with much less cost than \$100,000. There is enough land there - there is sufficient space there to put the type of building that they planned. A small recreational building could be used as well for a chapel, and I know that this has been very high on the list of priorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 01-01 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Before it carries Mr. Chairman, we are used to not getting any information from the Minister of Public Works. He does not give it nicely, that is the best thing about him. This year we notice on Page 151, that the Pippy Park, you are only going to spend \$150,000, and you spent \$515,000 last year. I would gather that that means that you are not going to ^{be} very active in the Pippy Park this year.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, all we will do with that \$150,000 is to pick up the tabs from last year. We will not be buying, as far as I know, at the present time -

MR. CROSBIE: Well what do you allow here for Memorial - \$2.5 million? Who is going to explain that? Health? Or will the minister explain it?

MR. CHALKER: The \$2.5 million? Now Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of criticism out around here about the Animal House is it?

MR. CROSBIE: Animal Farm.

MR. CHALKER: Well, this is a \$250,000 for an Animal house.

MR. CROSBIE: That is essential.

MR. CHALKER: \$1,500,000 to have four floors to engineering building. \$350,000 roads and services on the North campus. And \$450,000 temporary buildings and planning for engineering school.

MR. HICKMAN: What is this Animal House bit?

MR. ROBERTS: I can answer that. It is a place where they breed animals

used for research work at the school.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mice and things like that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mice, yes. Guinea pigs, mice, rabbits. They make the rabbits pregnant and that is very useful for a gynecologist.

MR. CROSBIE: Health Scientist Center. Is that the Medical School?

MR. ROBERTS: That is a planning vote for one phase of the Medical School. Perhaps we can go into that on Health.

MR. CROSBIE: Mental hospitals, \$100,000.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a planning vote.

MR. COLLINS: Cottage hospitals - \$234,500 - Page 150.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, that is just building. I thought you were on the construction. That is in connection with light, fuel, water rates. The construction of cottage hospitals will be changed we hope to Channel, Burgeo and Harbour Breton.

MR. HICKMAN: How about Come-by-Chance?

MR. ROBERTS: There are no plans this year for Come-by-Chance.

MR. CROSBIE: The Wornell wing is going on the Harbour Breton hospital.

MR. CHALKER: 912-04 I would ask some hon. member to move that this vote be opened, the hon. Minister of Health, to move that \$100 be placed there.

MR. CROSBIE: Who is going to be reckless there, and move that?

MR. HICKMAN: This vote of \$100 for the EXPO buildings - I gathered from the hon. minister is simply a token vote. But we do have the hon. minister's assurance that construction will start on the three EXPO buildings at Grand Falls, Gander and Grand Bank, this year. And can I get this straight too? That whilst the hon. Minister of Education was out of the House, the hon. Minister of Public Works indicated that the priorities have been reversed, and that Grand Falls now stands third in line. Would the minister confirm that? Before it is carried now Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHALKER: We are going to get the buildings there.

MR. HICKMAN: I know we are going to get the buildings. If the Minister of Public Works says that we are going to get an EXPO building at Grand Bank

this year, that construction will start this year, I will take his word for it. Well, are you going to do it or are you not?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, what I said actually, but nothing would give me greater pleasure than to erect those three buildings. I assure the hon. member for Burin I had every hopes of doing that. I have no great assurance at the present time, but the feeling I have

MR. COLLINS: The hon. minister can believe the Premier.

MR. CHALKER: I cannot speak for the Premier.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister is the boss.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, before you call the vote, there are just two things. I think the Premier has stated here publicly and outside, that work will be carried ahead on those buildings this year. Technically the hon. member for Burin was wrong when he spoke about starting the construction, because at least one of those, one of those buildings has been completely erected. And the only thing that remains to be done is the interior work. And that \$100 - I am supporting that \$100 because I am going to need that in -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just before it is carried, do not let people say that it is going to rank discrimination - that only the Liberal district got their Arts and Culture Center. Let us do a couple of Tories - not that they need the culture, but let us put the buildings anyhow.

MR. HICKMAN: There are a couple of comments I want to make on the Grand Bank Pavilion. Number one, the plan as I understand it has been completed for the EXPO building at Grand Bank. And that building is to house the Maritime Museum - accommodation for the Extension Department of Memorial, and accommodation for the Fisheries College.

AN HON. MEMBER: No place for the member?

MR. HICKMAN: The only hon. member of this House who has an office outside the Confederation Building, other than the Premier, is the hon. Minister of Education - in Grand Falls. And he has a most attractive office.

MR. MURPHY: And a lovely secretary.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what I meant when I said attractive office. Going out

to the hon. minister, with respect to that Museum - there has been a great deal of interest aroused in it when it was first announced. And the plans were approved. There was a great deal of support from my hon. friend's district of Placentia West.

MR. CROSBIE: They were delighted out in Grand Bank. They were thrilled.

MR. HICKMAN: The Marystown Town Council offered to provide certain historic objects connected with the deep sea fishery. The same applies to Your Honour's district of Burgeo - LaPoile and Hermitage. Now the enthusiasm is there, and if we keep putting this off, and you can understand why they are getting a little bit skeptical. Despite what the hon. minister says about that steel. It has been rusting. The engineers say that if the markings disappear, no matter how you paint it, if the markings disappear from that type of design building, they will never be able to put the jigsaw puzzle together again. And the markings are slowly but surely fading on that steel.

MR. CHALKER: I think we remarked them when we painted them.

MR. HICKMAN: Well I hope that is correct. But if we could only get the minister moving now, and get this on the way, it will be great. Now, while I am still on my feet. In answer to Question (437) the hon. minister gave the value of the works of art that have been acquired by this Government from the Czechoslovak pavilion as \$178,270.19, and there are some very valuable works of art in that collection. And I believe they are all stored at Fort Pepperrell. What I would suggest to the Minister, that rather than keep the works of art in storage awaiting the construction and erection of EXPO buildings, that they be put on display now in the Arts and Culture Center here, and the Arts and Culture Center in Corner Brook. There is \$178,000 worth down in Fort Pepperrell -

MR. CHALKER: The first pick of these paintings will be for the public buildings.

MR. HICKMAN: All right, well that is settled.

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 921-01 Carried. 02 Carried.

DR. FRECKER: Mr. Chairman, there is a slight amendment. I move that block provision, salary increases and new posts be changed from \$168,300 to \$182,500, and that taking into account \$100 token vote just passed, that

the total be changed to \$5,437,300.

MR. CROSBIE: Could I move that you report progress and ask leave to sit again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We have not passed those two Items yet - we have not passed the amendment.

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed Estimates of current expenditure under the following headings: Public Works, with some amendments, to Items 9,1,2,4. Block Provisions, Salary increases, New Posts, and ask leave to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 10:30 A.M. and that the House do now adjourn.