

*The Address—Mr. Lundrigan*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the minister to revert to motions?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Davis** moved:

That notwithstanding section (4) of Standing Order 38, at 2 o'clock p.m., Friday, October 31, 1969, the question on any amendment or amendments to the motion for an Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech shall be put forthwith.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, it is correct that this had been agreed to, but at the risk of stating the obvious I hope it is understood that after the vote is taken the debate resumes for the rest of the afternoon. I would not want anyone to think that when we vote, we go home.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to start by congratulating the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) on his very enlightening remarks. As a member of the opposition and a backbencher occupying a seat almost directly opposite the hon. member, it has always amazed me that a man of his ability has been forgotten by his party for so long. He has my deep sympathy for the circumstances facing him and many other backbenchers in that party. I think the hon. member for York West made an excellent speech and I should like to commend him for his efforts.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, members in this House from the old sod back east, Newfoundland, the rock of the east coast, were paid the greatest compliment they have received since becoming part of Canada. I suppose in the general sense that we came to Ottawa with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), who is also from the rock—

**Some hon. Members:** He forgets it.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** Some people forget it and he forgets it, too. But I think we were paid the greatest compliment when he said we were working hard for the fishermen of Newfoundland by coming here demanding things for them. Although he criticized us for doing this, I think we should regard it as a compliment and be very proud of ourselves. An hon. member said a moment ago that the Minister of Transport forgets where he comes from. Perhaps this is a good thing for him because fish do smell and Newfoundland is not the most affluent part of Canada; as a matter of fact, it is the most backward part. If a person really wants to come to Ottawa and central

[Mr. Davis.]

Canada and "make it" in the affluence here and the affluence of the Liberal cabinet, you cannot blame him for disowning the old rock of eastern Canada that is being washed by the heavy seas of the Atlantic ocean.

In many ways it is a disadvantage to profess knowledge of an area so backward, but perhaps we should forgive and forget. Without being sarcastic, it was quite a disappointment yesterday to hear a member for Newfoundland, who was successful in the last election by the skin of his teeth, try to disown other members from that province because they were fighting so hard for the fishermen of Atlantic Canada. It was quite a joke, quite a laugh. He referred to us as the type of people who would have been looking for a subsidy for the rocks in the basket used by John Cabot. We would have been looking for a subsidy for the rocks and the fish at that time, because it was then that the discrimination began against the fishermen of Newfoundland, and it has been continued by many governments ever since.

I wonder if anyone has ever told the people of Canada the story about the fishermen of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and other places. The prices being paid to them today are basically the same prices that were paid 20 years ago. The fish you buy in the supermarket for 79 cents a pound is sold for 18 cents a pound in Newfoundland. Did anyone ever tell parliament that the fresh cod which people buy for 75 cents, 85 cents or \$1 a pound is sold for three cents by Atlantic fishermen? We Newfoundland members are ashamed of this. We are supposed to be satisfied with the salt rebate of \$300,000 out of \$12 billion taken away from the fishermen of Atlantic Canada. We are supposed to be satisfied, too, with the amendment to the Fisheries Improvements Loans Act passed a few months ago. Eighteen loans have been made since that act was passed back in the 1950s, for a total of \$23,000.

● (9:50 p.m.)

We are supposed to be satisfied because the Government of Canada purchased 7 million pounds of fish and sent it to Biafra. Did anybody tell the people of Canada how the fish was purchased and why it was so cheap? Has anyone told our people that the government of this country authorized merchants in Atlantic Canada to haggle with the fishermen and offer them the lowest possible price? The government, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the Minister of